IX. RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS IN OR FROM THE NETHERLANDS

1. Introduction

Until 1996 runic attestations from The Netherlands were known only from the terp-area of the provinces of Groningen en Friesland, and the runic Corpus was called the Frisian Corpus. In April 1996 an object with runes was found in the river estuary of the Rhine, on a site called Bergakker, in the Betuwe, the former habitat of the Batavi. This find, dated in the early fifth c., exhibits runes from the older fuþark plus an anomalous rune. It has no typical Anglo-Frisian runic features. Finds from the terp-area exhibit runes from the older fuþark plus, in some cases, the two additional runes that are common to the early English and Frisian inscriptions. This stock of runes is called the Anglo-Frisian fuþork. Characteristic of this fuþork are two new runes ᚼ and ᛔ for o and a sounds, and a new value for the old a rune ᚷ, which came to render the sound æ. This development is associated with Ingveonic sound-changes specifically concerning the Gmc phoneme a and the diphthongs beginning with a (see also Chapter VII, Early Runic Finds in England).

The Frisian runic corpus has been edited by several scholars in different compilations (for a brief survey of editors, see Nielsen 1996). The first edition, treating 9 inscriptions, was published in 1939 by Arntz & Zeiss. In 1951, Boeles included the then known runic objects in his major study of Frisian archaeology Friesland tot de elfde eeuw. W.J. Buma published about several objects with inscriptions; his inaugural speech (1957) at the Groningen university was devoted to the Frisian runic corpus. W. Krogmann discussed the authenticity of some Frisian inscriptions in his 1953 pamphlet Zur Frage der friesischen Runeninschriften. Sipma (1960) published a survey of 16 Frisian runic inscriptions, including items that later on appeared to be falsifications or which exhibit no runes; these are the so-called ‘hilamodu’ and ‘agu’ items, Westeremden C, and Jouswier. Düwel & Tempel (1968/70) were able to extend the number of the Frisian Corpus by their discovery of four inscriptions on combs (Kantens, Hoogebeintum, Oostum and Toornwerd). Moreover, they (Düwel/Tempel 1968/70:376ff.) proved that two items were falsifications (‘Jouswier’ and ‘hilamodu’); one item (‘agu’) did not have any runes. It only shows some scratches on a bronze book-mounting, which, according to Buma (1957:29) were runes. The bone plate from Jouswier is kept in the Oudheidkundige Kamer at Dokkum. Westeremden C is in private possession, ‘hilamodu’ is missing; ‘agu’ is at the Fries Museum at Leeuwarden.


Close examination has demonstrated that the scratches on a bone-piece of a horse’s leg (Buma 1975), found near Eenumhoogte (Eenum), are no runes. The carvings may be slaughter-
marks. The marks on the Doijem piece of bone may have been cut recently (Pieper 1991, Looijenga 1991). The Uden stone was also recently provided with ‘runes’. The examination of the stone was carried out by the present author in cooperation with the geologist G.J. Boekschoten on 5th November 1996, at the Streekarchiefdienst Brabant-Noordoost, Veghel. The incisions (‘runes’ reading ‘wot’) on the surface of the stone have not been weathered in the same degree as the rest of the surface, hence the scratches must have been made recently. Moreover, the carver used a modern tool. The find history of the stone is spurious; it is said to have been part of the foundation of the local church, but there are no traces of cement. On the contrary, the surface shows a veneer of humus, which cannot possibly have formed around a stone in a foundation. Therefore, both find history and ‘runic’ inscriptions are false.

About the runic text or runes (if any) of the inscription of Westeremden C, described in a publication only once (Kapteyn, 1934), nothing can be said. The object is not accessible for inspection. Non-Frisian, but authentic, is the Hitsum bracteate; the object may be related to the Sievern (North Germany) bracteates (see Bracteate Corpus).

The combs, coins and symbolic swords are clustered; three objects are listed according to material (yew wood); the remaining objects are listed as ‘various objects, various material’. As in the Anglo-Saxon Corpus, this division is made to show the variety of objects and material. The order is in accordance with the numbers/quantity in which certain objects or materials occur, and within this order the date (starting with the oldest) is the determining factor.

Except for Amay and Hoogebeintum, which are gravefnds, the majority of the objects have been found in a terp or wierde during commercial digging of the soil at the end of the 19th century and at the first third of the 20th. Other objects were casual finds, such as Schweindorf (Page 1996:137). The other gold coins have no known findplaces and therefore have no find-context. Page (1996:139f.) suggests that all four gold coins could be either English or Frisian. Wijnaldum B was found with a metal detector in 1990 and Bergakker was also found with the help of a metal detector in 1996.

In general it can be said that ‘Runic Frisian’ cannot be analysed very well with the help of existing grammars and descriptions of Old Frisian, such as have been published by Steller, Markey and Ramat, since they merely describe ‘Manuscript Old Frisian’ of much later centuries. Reconstructing Runic Frisian is therefore a laborious task. Old English, which has been recorded from much earlier onwards is an indispensable help for the analysis of Runic Frisian, as is Old Saxon, and, to a lesser degree, Old High German.

Abbreviations: FM = Fries Museum; GM = Groninger Museum; BM = British Museum. When a findplace has delivered more runic objects, this is indicated here Wijnaldum A, or B; and Westeremden A, or B. The indication A, B, C, is the current practice for the Frisian inscriptions.
2. CHECKLIST OF RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS IN THE NETHERLANDS

Legible and interpretable inscriptions

THE COMBS

1. Ferwerd (Friesland), combcase, antler, found in 1916 in the *terp* Burmania I, during commercial digging. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. Date: 6th c. The runes run from right to left and read *me ura* or *me uræ*.

There are no particular Anglo-Frisian runeforms in this inscription. The ultimate rune may be transcribed either *a* or *æ*, but as there is no *āc* rune in the inscription, the sound value of Þ cannot be determined. The inscription starts with a bindrune *me* which has another ductus than the rest. OE *me*, OFris *mi* is a pers. pron. 1 sg. dat. ‘to me’. *ura* may be a masculine PN, nsm. *n*-stem. *uræ* may be taken too as a woman’s name, nsf. *ō*-stem. The text can be interpreted as: ‘(this comb belongs) to me, Ura, Uræ’, an owner’s formula.

2. Amay (Liège, Belgium), comb, bone, bought in 1892 from an antiquary at Liège, Belgium. Seen at the Museum Curtius, Liège. Date: ca. 575-625. Said to be found in a row-gravefield near Amay, which lies on the Meuse between Huy and Liège. The gravefield was in use from the end of the 6th c. till the beginning of the 7th c. The comb is broken; the runic inscription (or what is left of it) starts from the break and reads from right to left: *eda*.

The ultimate rune is *āc*. *eda* is probably a PN nsm. *n*-stem, showing monophthongization of Gmc *ai* > OFris ēída < *aid-* < *haið-* < *haiþi-* ‘clear’, cf. OE hāðor, OS hāðar; or ēída < *hāidu-*, cf. Go haidus ‘way, manner’ (Kaufmann 1965:200, 201). In OFris, normally Gmc *h* is retained in the *Anlaut*, but in some cases it disappeared, for instance before *a* or ē (Steller 1928:33). On the other hand, the fact that *h*- has dropped may point to Romance influence (Kaufmann 1965:196), which, in view of the findplace, will not surprise.

3. Oostum (Groningen), two halves of a comb, antler, found in 1908 in the *terp*. Seen at the GM, Groningen. Date: 8th c. On both sides are runes. Side A: *aib ka[m]bu*; side B: *deda habuku*.

The runes have so-called ornamental forms: the *b* has three pockets, the *h* has three bars. These graphic variations are unique so far. A parallel may be the recently found inscription from *Fallward* (Continental Corpus, nr. 15), which shows an *a* with three side-strokes. *Aib* is a PN, *i*- or *ja*-stem. The ending is lost, which occurs frequently in Runic West Gmc.,
certainly at this date. **ka[m]bu** asm. a-stem, Gmc *kambaz* ‘comb’. The omission of a nasal (here *m*) before a homorganic consonant is a typical feature of runic writing (although not without exceptions, such as can be seen in *awimund*, *Weimar III*, Continental Corpus). Another instance that shows omission of the nasal is **umaedit** = *u(n)maedit* (see below, *Rasquert*). The nom. and acc. ending -u of a masculine a-stem (*kambu*) can only be a reflex of Gmc *-az* (Duwel/Tempel 1968/70; Nielsen 1991a:300).

**Side B:** **deda** 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘did, made’ (Nielsen 1991b:299, Bammesberger 1991c:305ff.), OFris inf. *dua*. **habuku** < *habukaz*, PN nsm. a-stem. The text runs thus: ‘Aib made the comb. Habuku’. However, a female PN **Habuke** is equally possible, here dsf. *ð*-stem (cf. Nielsen 1984b:13f., Duwel/Tempel 1969/70:366), hence we get the text ‘Aib made the comb for Habuke’. Last but not least **Habuku** may be in the nominative, nsf. *ð*-stem, and is thus subject. ‘Habuku made the comb (for) Aib’ (cf. Duwel/Tempel, 1970:367). The syntax is then VSO. In the first interpretation the syntax is SOV. The ending -u < Gmc *-*ð* is not restricted to Runic Frisian, but occurs also in the North and West Gmc languages, like for instance in **lapu** ‘invitation’, nsf. *ð*-stem (cf. Nielsen 1984b, 1991 and 1994). As regards the name **Habuku** ‘hawk’, cf. **haukopuz** on the VÅNGA stone (Östergötland), which has been interpreted by Krause (1966:148) as an agent noun of the verb *haukōn* < *habukōn* ‘being like a hawk’.

4. **Toornwerd** (Groningen), comb, antler, found in 1900 in the terp, dated 8th c. Seen at the GM, Groningen. It bears four runes **ko[m]bu**.

**ko(m)bu** nsm. a-stem, Gmc. *kambaz* ‘comb’, cf. above **Oostum kabu**. According to Steller (1928:9) Gmc *a* > *o* before nasal in Old East-Frisian and it became *a* or *o* in Old West-Frisian. Toornwerd lies east of Oostum, the places are separated by the river Hunze.

The interchanging of *a* and *o* in words with the same meaning may have led in earlier times, probably the 5th c., to the development of the *āc* and *ās* runes (Looijenga 1996a:111). An excavation of the Viking-age settlement near the terp **Elisenhof** at the Eider mouth in Schleswig-Holstein revealed a non-inscribed comb similar to the Toornwerd one. Another comb from **Elisenhof**, dated to the end of the 10th c., bears the inscription: **kabr** ‘kam’, which shows the North Gmc development *kambaz > kambr*.

**THE COINS**

5. **Skanomodu** is the runic text on a struck gold solidus. Date 575 - 610. Findspot is unknown, the solidus belonged to the coin-collection of the English king George III (also Kurfürst of Hanover and Ost-Friesland). The runic solidus came in 1820 in the possession of the BM, London. The legend reads **skanomodu**, which might be taken as a dithematic PN (cf. Bammesberger 1990a, with ref.).

**The first element is Gmc *skaun-* ‘fine, beautiful’; the second element may be derived from Gmc *-*mōðaz nsm. a-stem, or *-*mōðō nsf. *ð*-stem (cf. Nielsen 1993:81-88); OFris mōdl m.
‘mind’. Because of monophthongization of Gmc *au > OFris ă: *skaun- > skān- and the ending nsm. -u < Gmc *-az the text is regarded OFris. If the name were a female PN nsf. ő-stem, the name need not be OFris, as -u < -ő is common to all West Gmc languages and to North Gmc as well. skanomodu probably was the name of the moneyer, therefore a woman’s name is not likely. However, the coin might have been made to serve as a piece of jewellery and in that case a woman’s name is appropriate. The a is represented by the ăc rune, together with Harlingen and Schweindorf the earliest attestations of ăc in the Frisian tradition.

6. Harlingen (Friesland), a cast gold solidus, in 1846 bought by the FM, Leeuwarden, from a Harlingen silversmith, who obtained the solidus from a terpdigger. Date 575 - 625. The runes read hada. The h is double-barred, both a’s are ăc runes.

Blackburn (1991:141-143) links the hada and weladu (see below, nr. 7) solidi together because they are cast pieces, not struck like the skanomodu one. Whether the three runic solidi are to be regarded as a coherent group and whether they are Frisian or represent different traditions are matters of speculation, according to Page (1994:187). But the iconography of the three rune-solidi agrees to such a degree that they may originate from the same source. Page (1995:160) wonders "whether the cast hada and weladu specimens should be defined as coins, or rather considered as cast ornaments". In any case the coins may have served as jewellery or precious gifts. The provenance of the coins is difficult to establish; from their runic legends they seem to be Frisian, but from their context they point to England. hada may be a PN, with the element *hafu- `battle’, nsm. n-stem. Otherwise the base may be Gmc *hædu- `restraint, confinement’, according to Beck (1981:75). A third possibility is to postulate a rare case of monophthongization of Gmc *ai > OFris ă: hædla < *haið-, cf. Go haidus ‘way, manner’ or *haiði- ‘clear’ (Kaufmann, 1965:17, 200). If this were so, it would be the only instance of monophthongization of Gmc *ai > OFris ă in Runic OFris, represented by the ăc rune. Therefore this rune may not necessarily have been imported by the Old Frisians, as is suggested by Nielsen (1994:121) and Seebold (1991:507f.) on the assumption that monoph-thongization of Gmc *ai only partly took place in OFris and would not be found in Runic OFris.

7. Schweindorf (Ostfriesland, Germany), a cast gold solidus, found in Schweindorf near Aurich in 1948. Now in the Ostfriesisches Landesmuseum, Emden. Date 575 - 625. Runes run left: weladu or peladu.

The initial rune has a large loop, from the top of the headstaff to the bottom, so either w or ð may be read. As peladu does not render something meaningful, generally the reading weladu is preferred. This is a PN Wēld(n)du, cf. OE Wēland, ON Volundr, NG Wieland < *wēla-handuz, nsm. u-stem, ‘trickster’. (Düwel/Tempel 1968/70; Beck 1981:69ff. with references). The first part of the compound is *wēl- ‘trick, ruse’ cf. ON vél ‘artifice, craft, device’ followed by the suffix -and < Gmc *handuz. The name might refer to the well-known legendary smith Weland.
8. Folkestone (Kent, England), a gold tremissis or shilling, found in 1732. Date ca. 650. Unfortunately the object got lost in the BM. A few years ago a similar authentic specimen turned up in the coin collection of the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow. The coin came from the same die as the lost BM one and thus bears the same legend æniwulufu.

This may be taken as a PN nsm. a-stem. The language may be OFris: æni < āni- < *aun-i-. The æ is in that case not a product of fronting, but of i-umlaut. One may assume that i-umlaut had taken place by 650 (Insley 1991:173). The etymology of Gmc *aun- is obscure, according to De Vries (1962). Nielsen (1993:84) is of the opinion that æniwulufu should be read, without a sign of i-mutation. He may have come to this conclusion prompted by a wrong dating: 6th c., of the tremissis. Blackburn (1991:143f.) now dates the coin mid 7th c. -wulufu < *wulfaz has an interconsonantal svarabhakti vowel.
The iconography is copied from a Merovingian tremissis from South West France. The iconographic history and the findplace in Kent would not exclude a Frisian origin, but one may consider a strong Frankish element.

9. Midlum (Friesland), a silver sceat of the Frisian, or Continental, type was found at Midlum in 1988 and is now at the FM, Leeuwarden. Date ca. 750. The runic legend is æpa.

Hundreds of this type of sceat are known, which has been defined as "at its best, a careful copy of the English primary C type, with runic ‘Æpa’ or ‘Epa’ in front of the head" (Op den Velde et al. 1984:136). These sceattas may not be purely ‘Frisian’ in the sense of ‘originating from the terp-area’, as they are rarely found north of the Rhine, but their find distribution suggests an origin along or south of the Lower Rhine (Grierson & Blackburn 1986:508). The runes are copied along with the rest of the iconography. æpa PN nsm. n-stem, Æpa, based on Celtic Epo ‘horse’ (Kaufmann 1965:14). Probably the name of the monetarius. (See also the sceattas of the English Corpus, Chapter VIII).

77 The text may have some connection with the legendary Wylfings of East Anglia, since their ancestor was called Aun(n), which, according to Ingveonic sound-changes would regularly develop to ān-, ān-., after i-umlaut took place, thus forming the first element of the compound āniwulufu. It is interesting that this specific development is considered a typically Old Frisian or Old Saxon feature. The name-element ‘wolf’ appears to have been particularly popular among Germanic leaders; cf. the Alamannian/Bavarian Agilolfings, a family of dukes, and the Franconian Arnulfing family of stewards. As to the pedigree of the Wuffingas from South Sweden, it is tempting to think of the -wulf- family from Blekinge: Haduwulf, Haeruwulf and Hariwulf, mentioned on the Gammarp, Iståby and Stentoften stones (see ‘Danish’ Corpus).

78 Over 2000 sceattas were found in The Netherlands. In 1988 for instance, about 140 sceattas came to light, in what was called 'The Remmerden hoard'. These all had a runic legend, reading ēpa, æpa or æpe.
THE SYMBOLIC SWORDS

10. Rasquert (Groningen), whalebone swordhandle, found in 1955. Seen at the Hoogelandster Museum, Warffum. Date late 8th c. The handle may have been part of a symbolic sword (Looijenga & Van Es 1991), as is probably also the Arum wooden sword. Both sides of the handle may have been inscribed. On one side what signs there were are erased. The runes on the other side are rather difficult to read; the whalebone surface has weathered badly. I propose to read ekumæditoka.

The sequence may be divided thus: ek u[n]mædit oka.

ek 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘I’. u[n]mædit, adj., part. pret. of *mædan, cf. OE mæded ‘mad’; OE *mædan < Gmc *maidjan- ‘to make mad’. mædit shows i-mutation preceded by monophthongization; -t instead of -d may reflect devoicing at the word’s end. oka PN nsm. n-stem, Oka; OE Oca, ‘mind, intelligence’ (Kaufmann 1965:198,249ff.). Gijsseling (1980:18) reads eku[n]mæditoka too, but interprets otherwise: ek u(n)mædi(d) tok a ‘I, the not mutulated one, took this sword’. My interpretation: ‘I, Oka, not (made) mad’, might have been Oka’s device. (Cf. for instance with Gårdlösa ek unwodz of the Danish Corpus, Chapter V).

11. Arum (Friesland), a yew-wood miniature sword, found in 1895. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. Date late 8th c. In the blade some ornaments and runes are carved. The runic text shows Anglo-Fris. āc and ēs runes, hence the † rune is transliterated æ. The runes are clearly legible edæ:boda.

Medial æ in edæ- may be product of fronting of unaccented a after a short syllable (Nielsen 1991*:300). In my opinion, this æ is a Kompositionsfugenvokal, as found in the earliest English glosses, e.g fulæ-tree, etc. (cf. Nielsen 1984*:17; and Kluge 1913:201, Anm. 2: the composition vowel æ < a); eda- ‘oath’. OFris ða- < Gmc *aîba- reflects OFris ð < Gmc *ai; the rune d is used to represent voiced ð < ð. Several interpretations are possible. Nielsen (1984) reads edæboda as one word, nsm. n-stem ‘return-messenger’. I take edæ:boda as nsm. n-stem: ‘oath-messenger’, Du ‘eed-bode’, with reference to the object itself, which is a symbolic sword. A sword had a function in the practice of law: people swore their oaths on it.
12. Westeremden A (Groningen), a weaving-slay of yew-wood, found in 1928. Seen at the GM, Groningen. No date. Because of the warping and desiccation of the wood some of the thinly carved runes have become quite vague. The runes read **adujislu(me)**(b)ji**suhi/ldu**.

The **p** rune, which, according to Arntz & Zeiss (1939:383) was present in the bindrune-cluster **me(b)**, cannot be distinguished anymore. Whether there is either an **i** or an **l** in **jisuhi/ldu** is unclear. Still visible are the Anglo-Frisian **a** and the **s**ternrune, which in England is transliterated **j** and **g** in Friesland. This is unnecessarily confusing, since the same phonetic development (palatalisation) is concerned, and it regards especially the syllable **gīr**, **gi-**, with a palatal pronunciation (see also below, **jibada**, nr. 13). **adujislu** is a PN, nsm. a-stem, **ād lu** < *auda 'wealth', **jīs lu** < *gīsalaz 'hostage' or 'sprout, shoot, offspring' (Kaufmann 1965:94). In **ād lu**- we have a case of monophthongization of Gmc *au > OFris æ, cf. **skanomodu**. **me(b)** means 'with'. **jisuhi/ldu** PN dsf. **jō-stem** (Nielsen 1984:13f.). A well-known name-element is **hīdlu** < Gmc *hildjō 'battle'. Interesting is that the names rhyme, both ending in -u, but that these endings represent different cases and genders, the first in the masculine nominative, the latter in the feminine dative.

13. Westeremden B (Groningen), small yew-wooden stick, found in 1917. Seen at the GM, Groningen. No date. The stick has three prepared sides, two of them covered with runes. Some runes exhibit a unique form. They appear to represent mirror-runes. Other runes belong to the younger Scandinavian **fuþark**. Furtheron there are Anglo-Frisian runes and runes from the common older **fuþark**. The **h** is double-barred. The **s** is represented by the book-hand **s G**. The **p** has a somewhat unfinished form. It appears once in a single form and once in a mirrored form: []

Three separate parts can be distinguished in the runic legend. The inscription starts with **oph?muji?adaamluþ:**, ending in a word-division sign. When the stick is turned 180°, reading can be proceeded on the same side, starting from the division mark :wimœ?ahþu??.

On a second prepared side can be read **iwio?u?du?ale**.

**FCHLMDHWFVMPN:**
**PMXBLHPNY**
**PPHNCWMHFTM**:

Seebold (1990) reads: **ophæmu givēda æmluþ:iwi ok upduna (a)le wimov æh þusë**.

The form **l** occurs thrice in the inscription. From the context it must represent a vowel; probably **æ**, which could have been rendered by the Anglo-Frisian **æsc**, but for some reason this rune does not occur in this inscription. I suppose **l** might be a younger **fuþark** variety. It is transliterated **æ** in **ophæmu**, which would reflect a fronted **æ** in hæm < hām < Gmc *haim- 'home', an intermediary stage towards OFris ë in hēm, rendering the development of Gmc *ai
OFris \( \ddot{a} \) > \( \dddot{a} \) > \( \breve{e} \) in which case we would have another attestation of monophthongization of Gmc \( \dddot{ai} \) > OFris \( \ddot{a} \). The same rune also occurs in \( \dddot{ae} \) and in \( \dddot{aelap} \).

The \( \ddot{a} \) in \textit{upduna (a)le} is the Anglo-Frisian \( \dddot{a} \), written once but meant to be read twice in \textit{upduna (a)le}. (This occurs more often; in \textit{Fallward skamella (a)lguskaþi}).

As has been said above, the inscription contains some mirrored runes, such as \( \dddot{p} \) in \textit{upduna} based on the form of single \( \dddot{p} \) in \textit{ophæmu}.

\begin{center}
\textit{Yew-wooden stick of Westeremden.}
\end{center}

The rune \( \dddot{b} \) might be taken as a mirror-rune \( \dddot{b} \) in \textit{jibada} (instead of Seebold's \textit{givëda}; the \textit{Sternrune} \( \dddot{v} \) should be transliterated \( \dddot{j} \), see above, nr. 12). The middle rune \( \dddot{a} \) I transliterate \( \dddot{a} \), rendered in a rune form known from the younger Danish futhark. Also in \textit{þusa} it is transliterated \( \dddot{a} \), although the sidetwig slants to the right, whereas it slants to the left in \textit{jibada}.

It might seem strange that we would have two different runeforms both transliterated \( \dddot{a} \) in one
word, *jibada*, but I suggest the runecarver wanted to differ between two *a*-like sounds. The \( \ddot{a}c \) appears to represent a palatal *a*, whereas the \( \dot{a} \) denotes a velar *a*. There is no opposition stressed - unstressed, or long - short.

\[ jibada = gibada \] ‘fate, luck’, recorded twice in the OS Heliand: 3161 and 5828, meaning ‘comfort, reassurance’ or even ‘new life in Christo’ (Opitz 1978:21), cf. *Bad Ems* (Continental Corpus). The mirror-rune \( \dddot{b} \), here transliterated \( b \), occurs once again in the inscription; from its form it can both represent \( b \) or \( d \); it represents \( d \) in *wimœd*.

My transliteration runs thus:

\[
\text{op hæmu } \text{jibada } \text{æmluþ : iwi ok up duna (a)le } \text{wimœd æh þusa.}
\]

\( \text{æmluþ} \) has been explained by Seebold (1990:421) as 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘stays, remains’, analogous to ON *amla* ‘to strain oneself’.

\( \text{iwi} \) appears to mean ‘yew’, cf. Gmc *hwaz*, *waz*, m., although it is difficult to explain its form; it might be a locative or instrumental, according to Seebold (1990:415).

\( \text{ok} = \dddot{a}k \) ‘also’; \( \text{up} = \dot{a}p \) ‘upon’, \( \text{duna} \) asf. n-stem ‘dune, hill, terp’.

\( (a)le \) is an optative to Gmc *ala-* ‘to grow’ (Seebold 1990:415).

\( \text{wimœd} \) is probably a masculine PN, nsm. *a*-stem. The *æ* is the product of *i*-mutation of *o/ð*, represented by \( \ddot{x} \).

\( \text{æh} \) 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘to have’, cf. OFris *ach* (Markey 1981:157).

\( \text{þusa} \) may be compared to the dem. pron. masc. acc. *þisse* ‘this one’ (Markey 1981:136).

The interpretation of the text is nearly the same as the one proposed by Seebold: ‘at the homestead stays good fortune; may it also grow near the yew on the terp; Wimœd owns this’. The stick can be taken as a building offer.

Since the inscription exhibits *i*-mutation, bookhand *s* and runes from the younger *fuþark*, the date must be later than, say, 750 AD.

14. *Britsum* (Friesland), a small yew-wooden stick, found in 1906. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. No date. Most of the runes are carved in three, four, five lines, which reminds of the inscriptions on the *Lindholm* amulet and the *Kragehul* spearshaft (Danish Corpus). On one side is carved LID in what looks like Roman lettering.

\[
P\text{HIBNRMTNW}\
P\text{HHYRY}\
\text{LID}
\]

One of the runes has the form of a younger-*fuþark* *k*, or else the so-called English ‘bookhand’ *s*. Both transliterations meet with difficulties; one would get *þkniaberetdud* or *þsniaberetdud* on one side; on the other side, running from right to left: *jn:bkrdmi* or *jn:bsrdmi*.

Neither of these sequences allow for a meaningful interpretation. The rune \( \ddot{r} \) probably represents a vowel. For instance, Bugge (1908:176-177) took it as representing *i* or *e*. Odenstedt (1989:158) proposed to take it as a variety of the Anglo-Frisian *ð*. Bugge (1908:177-179) read *þin i a beret dud LID* "Trage immer diese Eibe, darin liegt Tugend. LID". The second line would go thus:

\[ jn bered mi \text{ or } jn birid mi, \]

which Bugge interprets: "N.N. trägt mich". Odenstedt (1989:158) read *þon i a beret dud /hn borod mi liu*, "always bear this yewstave against paralysis (or drunkenness), NN perforated me. liu". Obviously Bugge read LID as Roman letters, whereas...
Odenstedt took the signs for runes. **borod**, according to Odenstedt (1989:159), can only be the 3rd pers. sg. pres. of a verb like OE *borian* (< *borōkan*) ‘bore, perforate, make a hole in’. There is, however, no hole in the stick, therefore this reading must be rejected.

---

A solution may be, to take it to represent æ, a variant on the Danish æ. I suggest to transliterate: þæn i a beret dud =in bæræd mi.  
þæn dem. pron. acc. sg. ‘this’.  
i refers probably to the piece of yew wood, also in the acc. sg. masculine. This part of the text must be the object.  
**beret** is plural imp. ‘bear’ of OFris inf. bera.  
When interpreting a < *aiwi* ‘always’, we find an instance of monophthongization of Gmc *ai* > OFris å, represented by the *ansuz* rune, or the Anglo-Frisian æsc rune, which, accordingly, should be transliterated æ. If so, it should represent another sound value than æ in bæræd. To avoid confusion, I transliterate it σ, although this might be misleading.

**dud** has several interpretations, such as a PN, according to Gijsseling (1980:7). Bugge (1908:179) interpreted dud as ‘virtue’, dud would be a contraction of duguf. Arntz (1939:1-67) proposes ‘Kraft’ or ‘Betäubung’. Buma (1951:316 ff.) connected dud with OE dugud ‘the warriors who sit near the king in the hall’, ‘the tried warriors’ (Beowulf 359), which means the king’s comitatus, see also Campbell (§ 345 and 588,5).

**bæræd** I read as bæ-ræd 3 sg. pres. ind. of the inf. bæ-rædan ‘to prepare’ (Holthausen 1963:252 lists OFris bi-ræda), perhaps in the sense of carving the runes? It could otherwise be 3 sg. pret. ind. of the strong verb Gmc *rædan*, OFris rædan ‘to guess’.  
**mi** is dat. sg. pers. pron. ‘me’.

**LID** is in Roman lettering and means ‘ship’ (Holthausen 1963:201), or ‘retinue’, according to De Vries (1962:354). The text may be interpreted as: ‘warriors: bear always this yew stick (on the) ship (or in the retinue, a metaphor for ‘on the warpath’?); ...jn prepares me, or ....jn guessed = read me’. Possibly the stick is a kind of amulet.

---

**VARIOUS OBJECTS, VARİOUS MATERIALS**

15. **Hantum** (Friesland), a small decorated plate made of (sperm whale?) ivory. Found in 1914. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. No date. Any function of the object is unknown. Several sorts of decoration motives seem to be practised on it. One side bears runes. The other side has in Roman letters ABA. The runes read ?:ahaːk or ?:æhaːk.
æhæ reminds of eh(w)e dsm. a-stem ‘to the horse’, a legend found on the bracteates of Åsum and Tirup Heide (Bracteate Corpus). The h rune is double-barred. Since the edges of the object have been notched, and the decorations have partly been cut away, the object may have been much larger and so would have been the runic text. Maybe aha or æhæ is a PN, nsm. n-stem.

16. Bernsterburen (Friesland), a whalebone staff, found ca. 1880. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. Dated ca. 800. The staff is broken in seven pieces, two of them are lost. The T-formed handle ends on both sides in a stylized horse’s head. The a is the Anglo-Frisian æc. The k is rendered by a rune known from the younger fuþark and the Continental Corpus, e.g. in kolo (Griesheim), in elk (Nordendorf II).

About halfway on the staff are runic inscriptions in three separate places, tuda æwudu (or æludu) kius þu tuda.

The middle part has no division marks. The first part, tuda, is preceded by a slanting stroke, which I interpret as an "inscription-opening sign". tuda is a PN, nsm. n-stem, cf. Gmc *þeuð- ‘people’. The first two runes of the second part, in æludu or æwudu, are nearly vanished as a result of weathering. æwudu appears to have a parasite vowel in the middle; æwdu may be derived from the past part. of OFris åwa, auwa ‘to show, reveal, represent’, declined as a strong neuter adj.; or æwðu is a feminine abstract noun (Mitchell & Robinson 1986:59), asf. ‘representation, evidence’, or asm/apm. ‘oathhelper(s), cf. OE ðwþa ‘witness’ (Knol & Looijenga 1990:236). Another interpretation of æwudu may be a PN nsm. < *æwþaz. The second part -wud- occurs in many OE names: Wudumann, Widia, Wudga, Wudia (Insley, 1991:320-322); cf. also OHG Wüdiger, Woderich, Witaram, Widego etc. However, the element wud etc. in these names is always attested as the first element of a dithematic PN, therefore a PN is not likely here.

When reading an I instead of w, we may get æludu, perhaps nsm. a-stem < *aludaz, or an n-stem *aluda, with a weakened pronunciation of the last syllable. The element alu- is found more often in PNs, cf. alugod (Værloese, Danish Corpus) and aluko (Fórde, Norway), cf. Seebold 1994:63. However, the part -du is difficult to explain as the second element of a PN, hence a PN æludu I do not think likely.

The part that follows, may exhibit a short-twig k and s, and would thus render the sequence kius þu 2 sg. pres. imp. ‘you will choose’. The u in kius has an ambivalent form and may as well represent r (cf. Chapter IV.10.2). The short-twig s may be taken as a rather short-cut i (cf. Quak 1992:63f.) hence we would get kiripu, which may represent runic Swedish kiripu (cf. Peterson 1989:17f.), 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘made’, cf. Old Swedish gærðu, which would suit a preceding PN. This would render a well-known type of runic text: A. made (the inscription or the object or both) for T. Or, if æwudu indeed means ‘witness’, the text might mean ‘Tuda, a witness (witnesses) he made, Tuda’.

A runic Swedish word in a ‘Frisian’ runic inscription is remarkable but not impossible.

18. **Wijnaldum B** (Friesland), a gold pendant, found with a metal detector in 1990. In the FM, Leeuwarden. Dated ca. 600. This type of pendant is known from 6th-century women's graves in Mittelfranken, Germany, and East-Gothic cemeteries in Lombardy; the origin may be (east) Mediterranean. On the back is a runic inscription, which can be read *hiwi*.

19. **Bergakker** (Gelderland), a gilt-silver scabbard mount, found with a metal detector in 1996. It is dated early 5th c. In the Museum Kam, at Nijmegen.

The ornamentation is in provincial-Roman style and might be compared to objects from nearby Gennep (North Limburg), a 4th c.-settlement of Frankish immigrants into a region which was situated within the *limes* (Bosman & Looijenga 1996). In general, according to the type and ornamentation, the scabbard mouth belongs to a group of swords from North Gallia up to the lower Rhineland of Germany and the Netherlands. The runes could have been added anywhere, but I do not think it likely that that has happened outside the above mentioned area, and that the object subsequently has been brought back to its area of origin. Bergakker site probably was a settlement site, although there existed a shrine of the goddess Hurstrga on the same spot. The scabbard mount was part of a large find-complex, which may have belonged to a local smith, or, in view of the sanctuary, it may as well have been part of a votive deposit. The scabbard mount does not show traces of wear, hence it may never have been collected by the commissioner (personal communication from the finder, Mr. D. Jansen, Wychen). Among the many other finds from the same spot, is a stylus, a small silver votive sheet, showing three ladies, probably Matrones, and a bronze seal-box, typical for votive deposits.

In the first, preliminary publication (Bosman & Looijenga 1996) the inscription was transliterated as *haþeþewa*.
Drawing by D. Jansen, Wychen, The Netherlands.

Photo by courtesy of the Museum Het Valkhof, Nijmegen, Holland.
One character is anomalous and hitherto unattested. It has the form of a double-lined Roman capital V and occurs four times in the inscription. One other character, s, appears twice in double lines, and once in single lines. The s is in three strokes. It is remarkably small, shorter than the other runes (apart from k, which is carved very small). There is one bindrune, forming wa, an unusual combination.

The runes run from left to right. The words are separated by division marks: three times composed of two dots and one time of four dots. The inscription contains four words. The last word is followed by a zig-zag line, filling up space. A similar technique can be found for instance on the Pforzen (Continental Corpus) silver belt buckle.

The first rune is a single-barred h. The second rune is a, the *ansuz rune. The third rune has only one sidetwig to the right, at the middle of the headstaff. I think the rune has been inserted afterwards, since it is smaller and tucked in between the preceding and following runes. In that case it is most probably l. At first I took it for an incomplete thorn. The fourth character is anomalous, at first sight it resembles no known rune. I contemplated the possibility of a double u rune, executed upside-down. But, if it should be considered a writing sign, and part of the text, its value may be established by the context (i.e. the rest of the text). The fifth rune is clearly a thorn. The sixth character is similar to the fourth one, only rendered somewhat larger. The following character appears to me as a bind-rune of w and a. The w was cut first, since the lower sidetwig of the a cuts through the lower part of the hook of the w. The last rune is an s, rendered in double lines.

Thus we have halþwaš.

The sequence b?was reminds of a well-known Germanic name-element, nominative bewaz, such as occurs in owlþuþewaz of the Thorsberg (Schleswig-Holstein) bronze sword-chape. Therefore I take it that the mysterious sign that looks like a double V must represent e. When comparing its form to the well-known runic e, both characters share the upper part. Normally the two hastas of the e rune run vertical, and here we find two slanting lines that touch at their ends. There is a parallel in the lost inscription of Engers (Continental Corpus), reading leub (see there, nr. 15). Here the hastas of the e rune slant towards each other, without touching, though.

haleþewas I take as a personal name in the genitive, masculine a-stem. The first part of this compound might be hale-, < Gmc *hail-, adj. ‘whole, safe, unhurt’, or, if hale, it may be connected with ON hali (and Middle Irish cail De Vries 1962:204), the meaning might be ‘spear’. The second part is -þewas, gsm. a-stem, ‘thane, retainer, warrior’.

After the division dots follow three runes ann. This is a verbform, 1 or 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘grants’, cf. Seebold 1970:79f., who lists ON ann ‘grants’, inf. unna ‘to grant’.

The next part of the inscription has a remarkable lay-out, probably caused by lack of space. The upper part reads kesjam. The lower part reads logens.
De Vries (1962:307) lists ON kesja f. ‘javelin’. This strikes as puzzling; the scabbard mount belonged to a sword, not a spear. Fritzner (1891:279) lists ON kesja f. ‘spjót’ and gives examples of attestations: in Gammelnorsk bibelhistoria, Formanns sögur, Egils saga, Sturlunga saga and Flateyjarbók. These attestations are of a much later date than the Bergakker inscription. Since the meaning ‘javelin’ is recorded at least six centuries later, I wonder, (a) whether kesja had another meaning in the early fifth century, and (b) what could be the weapon’s background. In the centuries that have elapsed, a change in the naming of weapon-types might have taken place. I investigated the possibility whether kesjam might be a loanword. In that case it may have been the name of a certain kind of weapon that was adopted from Celts or Romans into Germanic society. If kesja initially were a designation of a sword, one may assume that much later a confusion in the naming of weapons might have taken place somewhere in Germanic history. Much (1959:84ff.) observed in his description of the kind of weapons used by Germanic tribes that a sword was a rare type of armament. It seems plausible for Germanic warriors to have adopted a Celtic sword, since the Celts had a long and famous history of forging swords.

A confusion can be noticed in the meaning of the weapon that is recorded in Latin as GESA, CESA, GÆSUM (Du Cange 1954:62, 278), and which could be either a "hastas Galli, vel jaculum" (= javelin) and a "gladius" (= sword).

According to Schmidt (1983:761), gaesum is a loan from Celtic. Latin gaesum, Gallo-Greek gaisos or gaison ‘light javelin’ is, as then connected with Old Irish gai, gae ‘spear; gaide = pilatus; in OHG, OS we have gēr, in OE gēr, in ON geirr ‘spear’ < Gmc *gaizaz; cf. De Vries 1962:161f.: ‘heavy iron javelin’ Gmc *gaizaz m. a-stem, should be equalled with Latin *GAESUS. Latin has GAESUM, so the Gmc word might have been borrowed directly from Gallo-Celtic. Together with the
introduction of the Celtic sword into Germanic society, the name of the sword was adopted too. I suggest the form CES\(A\), GESA etc. to be vulgar Latin, cf. vulgar Latin carra, cerasa, pruna, pira, pisa against classic Latin carrum, cerasum, prunum, pirum, pismum (Kluge 1913:28, b, Ann.). This would explain the co-existence of GESSUM and GESA. If we find in the early fifth c. a form kesja in a formerly occupied Roman area, this might indeed reflect a vulgar Latin word such as GESA or CES\(A\). One way or another, kesjam seems to be connected or related to a root GAES- or perhaps better CAES-. In the latter case I suggest an early or secondary (and perhaps later lost) connection with Lat. caesim [caedō] adv. ‘by cutting, with cuts’, ‘with the edge of the sword’, as opposed to punctim ‘with stabs, to prod, to pierce’. The basic meaning of the Latin verb caedō, caedere, cecēdō, caesum is ‘to strike, beat, cut, kill’. The form *caesia- might be a nomen agentis, with a root caes- + the suffix -jan (Meid 1967:97). If the word is borrowed from Latin, it should have been done so before the 6th c., when the c was still pronounced k. The meaning would then be ‘cutter’, e.g. a person fighting with a certain weapon, such as a gladiator, only here the weapon is not a gladius, but some different type of sword. One may also think of the tribe known as Gaesatae, who were called after their special weapon, the gaison.

After being borrowed into Gmc, kesja would have been declined after Germanic standards. The ending -am in kesjam indicates then a dative plural, and might thus be the indirect object of ann + dative, which would render ‘(he) grants the sword-fighters logens’.

logens appears enigmatic; its ending -ens as well as the ending -am of kesjam (acc. sg. of Lat. a-stem) makes (in the light of the foregoing deliberations) the impression of (vulgar) Latin influence. It might be the nominative of a part. pres. of lūcere ‘to shine, to flame’; logens ‘shining’ is then an adj. in the nominative. However, o for u and g for k is remarkable.

In OS we find logna ‘sword’, f. ē or n-stem. De Vries lists ON lög n., or logi m. ‘sword’. The weak declension has in Gothic the genitive singular and acc. plural ending in -ns. Hence, logens may be gen. sg. or acc. plural of *loge ‘sword’. I suggest we have here in the endings of both kesjam and logens a relic of an older stage of Gmc, which is attested in Gothic, but not in West Gmc. Anyway, when interpreting the text in this manner, we get a semantically perfect sentence: ‘possession of H., he grants the sword-fighters a sword (swords)’. I can imagine that the weaponsmith wrote this text on the scabbard mouth as a sort of promotion for his work. Or the text refers to a leader, who bestows certain precious swords on his comitatus.

Summary: both gaesum and gladius end up in Latin as loanwords from Celtic. It stands to reason that at least one of these words could and did turn up in Germanic as well, borrowed either from Celtic or Latin. The borrowing went with the adoption of a certain sword.

3. Legible but uninterpretable inscriptions.

20. Kantens (Groningen), combcase, bone, found in 1903 in the terp. Seen at the GM, Groningen. The comb is dated in the early 5th c. which makes it the oldest rune find of the Frisian terp-area. Only two runes can be distinguished: li.

The i has a dash at its foot, so a w might be read. No interpretation.
21. Hoogebeintum (Friesland), comb, antler, found in 1928 in an inhumation grave in the terp. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. Date ca. 700. The comb is broken and badly damaged. According to Düwel/Tempel (1968/70:368) some runes can be read on one half of the comb: ?nlu.

The Hoogebeintum comb.

The other half of the comb shows a few lines which may be taken for a bindrune consisting of three runes. Two d runes are connected by a zig-zag line, perhaps rendering ded, possibly 1 or 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘did, made’, OFris pret. dede, inf. duā ‘to do, make’. The regular form would be dede, cf. Bammesberger 1991:305-308.

22. Wijnaldum A, piece of antler, found in 1914. Seen at the FM, Leeuwarden. No date. On two sides the antlerpiece is inscribed, on one side with ornaments such as crosses, squares and triangles; the other side has runes in a cartouche ending in some ornament. One end of the antlerpiece is badly weathered and so are the runes that were carved there. If some of the runes would be mirror-runes, a reading could be, from right to left, zwfuwizw???

I have no interpretation for this sequence. At least two runes, f and u, are in double lines. At least one rune is upside-down. If taken as single runes, it is possible to read z ng z u ng i z ng ??? which, when read from right to left may be interpreted as ?ngz inguz ngz, which might be the name of the Germanic god Inguz, repeated thrice (Sipma 1960:70).

4. Summary and Conclusions

The runic finds described in this Chapter concern 22 objects, of which 21 are considered to belong to the Frisian Corpus, although they are not all found in Frisia. One object turned up in the river-estuary of Rhine and Meuse. This object and its inscription apparently does not to
belong to the Frisian runic tradition. Five inscriptions have been found outside Friesland; in Belgium, Ostfriesland (Germany) and England.

Of the 22 listed inscriptions, 19 are legible and interpretable; 10 consist of one word, 2 have two words, 7 consist of more than two words. Totally I counted 17 personal names, of 13 men and 4 women. 6 times the object is mentioned. There are 9 verbforms. There are 9 sentences. I did not differ between two runic Periods, although this might be possible. Period II would then include Westeremden B (no date), Britsum (no date), Bernsterburen, Rasquert (*circa* 800), Oostum, Toornwerd, Arum (all 8th c.).

other than metal: antler: 5; bone: 3; yew wood: 3; whale bone: 2; whale ivory: 1.

Sixteen objects have been found in the provinces of Groningen and Friesland, all excavated from *terpen* and *wierden*. They are therefore difficult to date, due to a lack of context. Two Frisian runic objects have been found in a grave: the combs of Hoogebeintum and Amay. The symbolic swords, the coins, combs and the Bernsterburen staff can be dated approximately, on the basis of stylistic or iconographic characteristics. Although the corpus is small, there is quite some variety of texts and objects, in the use also of material.

The fact that one of the oldest inscriptions turned up in the Betuwe, is highly interesting. The object belongs to a provincial Roman context, that might be labelled Frankish, regarding the date: early 5th c. One may wonder, if ever a Frankish runic tradition was in existence, since the runic *sceattas* (7th c.) have a Frankish connotation, too. The provenance of the *sceattas* could fit into a Frankish numismatic context, since they were struck in the regions near the estuary of the Scheldt (Page 1996:136f.). In the 5th century, there were several connections between the Rhineland, the central and southern parts of the Netherlands, North Gallia and South England, which may indicate a Frankish sphere of influence. Runes may never have entered that sphere, but it does not seem unlikely, certainly not since the Bergakker find.

The beginning of runic writing in the Netherlands may be dated shortly after 400 AD. The runic tradition probably ended because of a political change: the definite conquest of the Central Netherlands and Frisia by the Franks in the course of the 8th century.

Twelve objects exhibit Anglo-Frisian runes and/or the double-barred h. The latter was common to the Anglo-Saxon, Frisian and Continental traditions. Two inscriptions exhibit single-barred h (Bergakker and Wijndalum B). Generally, single-barred h points to Scandinavia, but both the Bergakker and Wijndalum B objects have continental connotations rather than Scandinavian. Of course, one may consider whether both single and double-barred h have existed from the beginning of runic writing and therefore should be labelled Common Runic. Thus the diagnostic nature of single-barred h should be questioned.

Four inscriptions may show links with Scandinavia: multiple-line runes in Wijndalum A and Britsum, the ‘I so-and-so’ formula in Rasquert, and the appearance of younger *fuþark* runes in Westeremden B, Bernsterburen and perhaps Britsum. On the whole this may point to nothing more than that there were contacts between Scandinavia and the Low Countries in the early Middle Ages. But on the other hand, this may imply that at least around 800 (Bernsterburen and Rasquert; Britsum and Westeremden B have no date, but both may be 9th c.) there existed a substantial Scandinavian influence on Frisian rune-writing, possibly due to Viking-activities. A recently found Viking silver hoard from around 850 on the former island of Wieringen points to contacts. The Viking Rorik had obtained certain privileges in Holland and Dorestad from 840 onwards. If the rune-Swedish rd *kiríþاو gerðu* ‘did, made’, is indeed recorded on the Bernsterburen staff, this would indeed point to contacts between Frisian and Scandinavian runic writers, because the form *kiríþاو* is rune-Swedish, according to Lena Peterson’s *Svenskt Runordsregister* (1989 and 1994*).
Oostum, Toornwerd, the silver and gold coins, Rasquert, Arum, Westeremden A and B, Bernsterburen and Hamwic exhibit Anglo-Frisian runes, or witness of Anglo-Frisian contacts. It has been assumed that the Frisian runic objects were not indigenous to Friesland, but were imported, for instance from England. This idea is based on linguistic ambiguities, and on the fact that occasionally the find-contexts of the objects are obscure and the dating is arbitrary. Some significant linguistic features are not only characteristic of Runic-Frisian but of Anglo-Saxon as well. It is possibly best to speak of a mixed tradition in the Low Countries, which, in view of the geographical position need not surprise. One may conclude that Frisia reflected its geographical position as an intermediary between England and Scandinavia in the nature of its runic inscriptions.

Finally, it may seem strange that my readings and interpretations differ in some ways from my earlier findings, such as published in Looijenga 1996. The results such are presented here now, are based on the conclusions of this researchproject, which aimed at a comparison of runic traditions from North-West, West and Central Europe. This method of comparison has led to a greater understanding of the Frisian Corpus, and thus, I hope, to better interpretations.
Most inscriptions run from left to right; when the inscription runs from right to left, this is marked ←. When both directions: left - right, right - left are mixed in one inscription either direction is marked. In case the inscription runs exclusively from left to right, or contains a single reverted rune, there is no marker.

**a** Britsum → adv. ‘always’

aaaaaaa Lindholm ← *assumingly eight times a means eight times* *ansuz

aala* Vimose II ← adj. asm. ‘all’ ← ala


ado Gammertingen PN nsm.

adon Lečani PN dsf.

adons Lečani PN gsf.

adujislu Westeremden A PN nsm.

æbæ Schwangau PN nsm.

aeraalius Fünen (I)-C = Aurelius, nsm. Roman emperor

aergu[n]þ Weingarten I PN nsf.

Afatz Istaby → prep. after ‘in memory of’

afd* Oberflacht prep. ‘after’? ‘later’? ← aft

aft* Bülach prep. ‘after’? ‘later’? ← afd

agilaþruþ Griesheim PN nsf.

æh* Westeremden B 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘owns’ ← aig

aha* Hantum PN? nsm. ← æhæ

æhæ* Hantum PN? nsm. ← aha, (e)he, eho

ahti Nydam II ← 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘owned’ or nsf. ‘possession’

aib Oostum PN n/dsm.

aig* Aquincum 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘owns’ ← æh

aigil Pforzen PN nsm.

aïlrun Pforzen PN nsf.

aisgzh* Thorsberg II ← aisk-z h[agala-]? ‘seeker of hail’

aiplatatæ Nydam I ← PN? or epithet nsm.

Ak* Björketorp 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘T ← ek, ik, ika, ekA, ika

akaz Åsum-C ← PN nsm.

æko Chessel Down II PN nsm.

al* Börringe-C ← = alu ← alu

ala* Overhornbæk (III)-C ← adj. nsm. ‘all’ ← aala

alagu[n]þ Schretzheim I PN nsf.

alawid Skodborghus-B ← PN? voc./nsm.
alawin Skodborghus-B = PN? voc./nsm.
[a]le Westeremden stick 3 sg. pres. opt. 'may it grow'
[a]lguskaþi Fallward = dog's name nsm.
'ofering'? 'battle-cry'? ← lua, al
æludu* Bernsterburen PN? nsm./f.
alugod Værlose PN? nsm./f.
aluwaludo/a Whitby adj. nsm. 'allmighty'
amiluk Balingen patronymic? nsm.?
æmlup Westeremden B 3 sg. pres. ind. 'stays'
an 'Tjurkö (I)-C ← prep. 'on'
andi Pforzen conj. 'and'
æniwulufu Folkestone tremissis PN nsm.
an Bergakker 1 or 3 sg. pres. ind. 'grant(s)'
a[n]su Overhornbæk (III)-C ← voc. sg. m. 'one of the Æsir'
a[n]sugisalas Kragelih I PN gsm.
a[n]sula* Vimose III nsm. 'ring, buckle', cf. Latin anula ← a[n]sula
a[n]sulaas Vimose III epithet nsm. 'godless'
a[n]sulo* Overhornbæk (III)-C ← asm. 'ring, bracteate', cf. Latin anula ← a[n]sula
æpa* Kent III and Midlum sceattas PN nsm. ← EPA
ArAgeu Björketorp, Stentoftten = argeu, adj. dsf. 'cowardly, unmanly'
arogisd Schretzheim I PN nsm.
arsiboda Bezenye II PN gsf.
arwi Heibrønn-Böckingen ← PN nsm.
aet Boarley ← prep. 'at, to, with'
auijab[r]rg* Oettingen PN nsf. ← auja, auwija
auja* Raum Køge-C ←, Skodborghus-B ← nsm. 'hail, good luck'? ← auijabrg, auwija
auwija* Vimose III = auja n/asm. 'good luck'? ← auja, auijabrg
awa Nordendorf I PN nsf.
awimund Weimar III PN nsm.
awo Leťcani nsf. 'grandmother'
æwudu* Bernsterburen asf. 'presence, evidence', or asm/apm. 'oathhel per(s)'
bada* Kirchheim Teck PN nsf. or (gi)bada 'consolation' ← jibada, u[n]bada
bæræd Britsum = 3 sg. pres. ind. 'prepares', or 3 sg. pret. ind. 'guessed'
bAriutiþ* Stentoften 3 sg. pres. ind. 'breaks' ← bArutz
bArutz* Björketorp 2 sg. pres. ind., but intended is 3 sg. 'breaks' ← bAriutiþ
bekka Chessel Down I PN nsm.
bera Kragelih II ← PN? nsm.
beret Britsum = 2 pl. pres. imp. 'bear'
bidawarijaz Nøvling PN nsm.
b[i]gina Weimar III PN n/asf.
birl[in] Nordendorf II nsm. 'little bear'
bliþgu[n]p Neudingen-Baar II PN nsf.
boda* Arum nsm. ‘messenger’ \(\rightarrow\) edæ:boda
boso Freilaubersheim PN nsm.
bubo Weimar II, PN, nsm.
buhui Wakerley nsm. ‘ring, piece of jewellery, brooch’
buirso Beuchte PN nsm./m.
bu[r]sæ* Watchfield asf. ‘purse’ \(\rightarrow\) wusæ, ðusæ
dado Weingarten II PN nsm.
da[æ]us Whitby Lat. nsm. ‘God’
ded* Hoogebeintum 1, 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘did, made’ \(\rightarrow\) deda
deda* Oostum 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘did, made’ \(\rightarrow\) ded
de(d)un Niederstotzingen, Schretzheim I 3 pl. pret. ind. ‘did, made’
desaiona Suffolk shillings no interpretation
di Osthofen 2 sg. pers. pron. dat./acc. ‘you’
d[o]mi[n]u[s]? Kirchheim Teck Lat. nsm. ‘Lord’
dorih Wurmlingen PN? nsm.
du Büchel 2 sg. pers. pron. ‘you’
dud Britism = dugudnpm. ‘warriors, comitatus’
dulþ Oberflacht nsf. ‘religious feast’
duna Westeremden B asf. ‘dune, hill, terp’

edá Amay PN nsm.
edæ* Arum gsm. ‘oath’ \(\rightarrow\) edæ:boda
(edæ:boda)* Arum nsm. ‘return-messager’ \(\rightarrow\) edæ, boda
(e)he* Åsum-C \(\leftarrow\) ehædsm. ‘to the horse’ \(\rightarrow\) eho, æhæ
eho* Donzdorf PN nsf./m. \(\rightarrow\) (e)he, æhæ
ehwu Tirup Heide-C nsf. ‘mare’
ek* Kragehul I, Gårdsö, Lindholm \(\leftrightarrow\), Gallehus, Rasquert, Sønderby-C \(\leftrightarrow\), Eskatorp-F, Väby-F, I sg. pers. pron. ‘I’ \(\rightarrow\) eka, Ak, ik, eka, ika
ekA* Stentoften 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘I’ \(\rightarrow\) eka, ika, ek, Ak, ik, ik
elk Nordendorf II nsm. ‘elk’
em Ash Gilton 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘am’
epa* Kent III sceattas PN nsm. \(\rightarrow\) æpa
erilaz Kragehul I, Lindholm, Eskatorp-F, Väby-F = nsm. a title, rank or tribal name?
f* Sønderby-C \(\leftarrow\) fæhi 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘draw’ \(\rightarrow\) fahi
fahi* Åsum-C \(\leftarrow\) 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘draw’ \(\rightarrow\) f
fahide Halskov Overdrev-C 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘drew’
f(æ)hidu Eskatorp-F, Väby-F fæhidō 1 sg. pret. ind. ‘drew’
fakaz Sønderby-C = PN? nsm. ‘horse’
fAlAh* Björketorp 1 sg. pret. ind. ‘buried’ \(\rightarrow\) felAh
farauisa Raum Køge-C = færa-uiusa nsm. ‘knowing of danger’ or fara-uiusa nsm. ‘knowing to travel’
feha Weingarten I PN nsm.
felAh Stentoften 1 pret. sg. ind. ‘buried’ \(\rightarrow\) fAlAh
fff Gummarp *assumingly three times f* means three times *fehu = ‘property, cattle’
fiaginnp Eichstetten PN nsf.
[fjilba Neudinglen-Baar I asm. ‘woolen garment, cloak’
ofzo Hitsum-A ← tribal name nsf/f.
frifridil Büchel nsm. ‘husband’ or PN nsm.
frohila Darum (I)-B ← PN? nsm. ‘little young lord’
fura Osthofen prep. ‘before’
fuþar Gudme (II)-C fuþark-quotation
fuþarkgw Aquincum fuþark-quotation
fuþarkgw = hniþ?? → tbeml(i)ngod ←, Grumpan-C complete fuþark in three ættir
fuþarkgw:hnijbzs:tbeml(i)n:go(d) Våstena-C = complete fuþark in three ættir
fuþarkgwñ Lindler-C ← fuþark-quotation
fuþarkgwñhniþþs:tbeml(i)n:go(d) Charnay fuþark
fuþarzj Beuchte fuþark-quotation
fuþi/u Schonen (II)-C ← fuþark-quotation

gabar Schretzheim III, PN nsm?
gadu Kent I n/dsf. ‘companion, wife’
gAf Stentoften 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘gave’
gagaga* Kraghul I battle cry? → gægægæ
gægægæ* Undley ← ‘password’? → gagaga
gakā* UFO-B → Schonen (I)-B → ga(u)kaz? nsm. a bird?
gasokun Pforzen 3 pl. pret. ind. ‘quarreled’, ‘sought’ or ‘condemned’
gatano Soest PN? nsm.
gauþz Illerup V PN? nsm. or ‘someone dedicated to be offered’ or tribal name

gibete Harford Farm 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘repaired’
gibu Raum Køge-C ← 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘give’
gihiali* Kirchheim-Teck = gihaili 2 sg. pres. imp. ‘make well’ → hiali
gina* Björketorp adj. ‘broad, mighty, very’ → gino, gino

gino} Stentoften adj. ‘broad, mighty, very’ → gina, gino

ginu* Kraghul I adj. ‘broad, mighty, very (many)’ → gina, gino

gisaijo Vimose IV scribal error for PN Gisaijo?, nsm.
gluajgiz ← Nebenstedt (I)-B PN? or epithet, nsm.
god Whitby GN nsm.
godah[i]l Björketorp adj. nsm. ‘Gothic’
goda[i]l]d Bezenyei PN dsf.
godun Arlon PN dsf.
golida Freilaubersheim 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘greeted’
groba Hitsum-A ← n/asf. ‘groove, furrow’, or ‘belonging to a grave?’
gutani[s] Pietroassa adj. nsm. ‘Gothic’
g[e]ba Oberflacht nsf. ‘gift’

h Thorsberg II = hagala, nsm. ‘hail’ → hag alu, hagela
ha Vimosø II = *ha[bæ] 3 sg. pres. opt. ‘may have’
hAborumz Stentoften dpm. ‘with he-goats’
habuku Oostum PN dsf. or nsf/m.
hada Harlingen PN nsm.
hAerAmAlAz* Björketorp adj. nsm. ‘without rest’ → herAmAlAsAz
hAeruwulafiz Istaby patronymic nsm.
hag alu* Ølst-C = npn. ‘hail’? – h, hagela, alu
hagela* Overhornbæk (III)-C nsn. ‘hail’ – h, hag alu
hagiradaz Garbølle PN nsm.
hahwar Weimar III and IV PN nsm.
ha[li]derA* Björketorp adv. ‘here’ – hederA, her
hAidz* Björketorp adj. ‘clear, shining, bright’ – hidez
hailag* Pietroassa adj. ‘holly’
haiteta Kragehul I 1 sg. pres. med. ‘I am called’
haijteka Lindholm 1 sg. pres. med. + enclitic eka ‘I am called’ – haitika
haitika* Raum Køge-C = 1 sg. pres. med. + enclitic ika ‘I am called’ – haijteka
haleþewa* Bergakker PN gsm. – haleþewa
hamale Neudingens-Baar II PN dsm.
haemu Westeremden stick dsf. ‘homestead’
ha[n]gestumz Stentoften dpm. ‘(with) steeds’
hari Raum Køge-C = nsm. ‘army’, ‘battle’
haribrig Weimar I PN nsf.
hariso Himlingøje II PN nsm./f.
hariuha* Raum Køge-C = PN? nsm. or ‘the first among warriors’? – hari, uha
hAriwolAfz Stentoften PN nsm.
harjatika Raum Køge-C = PN? nsm. or asm.
hArjulafza Istaby PN asm.
harja Vimose V PN, tribal name, nsm.
harkilaz Nydam II PN nsm.
hAleþewa* Bergakker PN gsm. – haleþewa
hAþuwolAfA Gummarp PN nsm. or asm.
hAþuwolafz* Stentoften PN nsm. – hAþuwolafz
hAþuwofafz* Istaby PN nsm. – hAþuwolafz
hAþuwofafz* Stentoften PN nsm. – hAþuwolafz
haþeþewa* Bergakker PN gsm. – haleþewa
(h)hAþuwolAfA Gummarp PN nsm. or asm.
hAþuwolafz* Stentoften PN nsm. – hAþuwolafz
hariAmAlAusz* Stentoften adj. ‘without rest’ – hAerAmAlAusz
hial* Kirchheim Teck = haili nsf. ‘salvation’ – gihial
hiba Weimar II PN nsf.
hidez* Stentoften adj. ‘clear, bright’ – hAidz
hiwi Meldorf, Wijnaldum B dsf. ‘mater familias = spouse’
hlaw Loveden Hill asm./n. ‘grave’
hleuno Vimose IV nsf. ‘protection’
hlewagastiz Gallehus PN nsm.
holtiyaz Gallehus nsm. ‘coming from the place Holt’ or patronymic ‘son of Holt’
horaz* Fünen (I)-C adj. nsm. ‘beloved’ – ho.z
horna Gallehus asm. ‘horn’ or dualis acc. ‘the two horns’
ho.z* Maglemose (III)-C = horaz adj. nsm. ‘beloved’ – horaz
huisi?ald Steindorf PN nsm.
i Britsum = asm. ‘yew’
ida Weimar III and IV PN nsf./m.
iddan Charnay PN asm.
iduni Weimar III = PN nsf.
ids St. Cuthbert Greek nomen sacrum Ie(os)
ids Sonder Rind-B =, Kent I 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘I’ → ik, Ak, ekA, ek, eka, ika
ids Heilbronn-Böckingen = 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘I’ → ik, Ak, ek, ekA, eka, ika
(id)ng Kong PN? nsm.
imba Neudingen-Baar II PN nsf.
io(anni) St. Cuthbert Greek PN nsm.
isd Weimar III 3 sg. pres. ind. ‘is’
iwi Westeremden B locative or instrumental sg. m. ‘yew’
io(h) Nordendorf II conj. ‘and’
j Pietroassa, Stentoften, Skodborghus-B = jára n/asn. ‘good year, harvest’
jibada* Westeremden B nsf. ‘fate, luck, good fortune’ ~ u(m)bada, bada
jisuh[i]du Westeremden A PN dsf.
ka[m]bu Oostum asm. ‘comb’
kate Hamwic nsf. ‘knucklebone’
kesjam Bergakker dsm. ‘sword fighters’
kinga* Aquincum asf. ‘brooch’ → kingia
kingia* Aquincum asf. ‘brooch’ → kinga
kiriþu* Bernsterburen 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘made’ → kiusþu
kiusþu* Bernsterburen 2 sg. pres. imp. ‘you choose’ ~ kiriþu
klef Neudingen-Baar I 1 or 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘fastened’
ko[m]bu Toornwerd nsm. ‘comb’
kolo Griesheim PN nsm.
ksamella Fallward = = skamella, Lat. nsm. ‘footstool’
ksamella Fallward = skamella, Lat. nsm. ‘footstool’
kunimu[n]du Tjurkö (I)-C = dsm. PN? or epithet ‘protector of the gens’

I* Svarteborg-M, Nebenstedt (I)-B = laukaz ~ laukaz
laguþewa Illerup III PN nsm.
lak* Lynge Gyde-C = laukaz ~ laukaz
lamo Udby = PN nsm.
laukaz* Skrydstrup-B =, Börringe-C =, Schonen-(I)-B, UFO-B nsm. ‘leek, chives, garlic’
        ~ l, lakz, lauz, ikaz, luz
laus* Vimose III adj. ‘being without’ ~ a[n]sulaus
lauz* Allesø-B =, Bolbro (I)-B =, Vedby-B = = laukaz ~ laukaz
lap* Welbeck Hill = laþu nsf. ‘invitation’ ~ laþu, laþa, lþu
lapa* Gurfìles (?)-C = nsf. ‘invitation’ ~ laþu, laþ, lþu
lapo* Halskov-Overdrev-C = asf. ‘invitation’
lapo* Raum Trollhättan-A laþodu asm. ‘invitation’ ~ laþu
        . ‘invitation, summons’ or 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘I invite’ ~ laþu, lþu, laþ
liði* Neudingen-Baar II nsf. ‘love’ or adj. nsm./f./n. ‘dear, beloved’ ~ leob, leub, liub
leob*, Weimar I, PN? nsm. → leub, liub, lbi
leub* Engers nsn. ‘love’ or adj. nsm./f./n. ‘dear, beloved’ → leob, liub, lbi
leuba Schretzheim I PN or petname, nsf. ‘love’
leubo Schretzheim II PN or petname, nsm. ‘love’
leubwini Nordendorf I PN nasm.
leþro Strårup PN nsm.
liano Charnay PN nsm./f.
LID Britsum = asm. ‘ship, retinue’
liub* Weimar I, Niederstotzingen nsn. ‘love’ or adj. nsm./f./n. ‘dear, beloved’ → leub, leob, lbi
liub* Engers nsn. ‘love’ or adj. nsm./f./n. ‘dear, beloved’ → leob, liub, lbi
lkaz* Danmark (I)(?) ←, Seeland (I) ←, Maglemose (II) ←, Hammenhög = laukaz → laukaz
logens Bergakker apf./m. or gsm. ‘sword(s)’?
lori Chessel Down II dsn. ‘loss’?
lua* Nydam III = alu → alu
luda Harford Farm PN nsm.
luwatuwa* Vadstena-C = uninterpretable → tuwa
luz* Hesselagergårds Skov-C, Hesselager-C, Südfünen-C = laukaz → laukaz
lpú* Skonager (III)-C ← = lapu → laþu, laþa

madali Bad Ems PN nsm./f.
maga Undley gpm. ‘of the kinsmen’
makija Vimose II = asm. ‘sword’
márcus St. Cuthbert Greek PN nsm.
mari Vimose II ← nsm. ‘lake, water’
marings Szabadbattyán PN, tribal name nsm.
mauo Bopfingen mawō dsf. ‘to the girl’ or PN nsm.
ma[θ][h][eus] St. Cuthbert Greek PN nsm.
mæus Whitby Lat. 1 sg. pers. pron. ‘my’
me Ferwerd pers. pron. d/as. ‘me’
medu* Undley nsf. ‘reward’ or (ge)mědu apn. ‘consent’ → midu
me[θ] Westeremden A prep. ‘with’
mi Britsum = pers. pron. d/as. ‘me’
midu* Neudingens-Baar I nsf. ‘reward’ or adj. sf./m./n. ‘in the middle’ → medu
miën West Heslerton = mene? nsm. ‘ornament, jewel’
muha Kragehul I PN? nsm. or (ga)mūha ‘retainer’
muni Eichstetten 3 sg. pres. opt. ‘may remember’
niu Stentoften numeral dpm. ‘nine’
niujiš* Darum (V)-C PN? nsm. ‘young, little newcomer’ → niuwila
niuwila* Skonager (III)-C ← PN? nsm. ‘young, little newcomer’ → niujil
niwajemariz Thorsberg I epithet nsm.
nipjö Illerup II ← PN, tribal name nsm.
nnn Lindholm ← three times n assumingly means three times nauðors = ‘need’
noru Aalen PN nsm.
ok Westeremden B adv. ‘also’
oka Rasquert PN nsm.
op Westeremden B prep. ‘at, upon’
owlwewawaz Thorsberg I = Wollwewaz PN nsm.

pada Kent II coins PN nsm.
r* Sievern-A ← = r(ūnōc), npf. ‘runes’ → rnz, ronoz, runAz, runa, runoz
rada Soest 3 sg. pres. opt. ‘may guess’
rAginArunAz* Björketorp ‘a fate-predicted message’ → rAginoronoz
rAginoronoz* Stentoft en ‘a fate-predicted message’ → rAginArunAz
raiβan Caistor-by-Norwich g/d asm. ‘roe, of a roe’
rango* Letçani nsm. ‘ring, spindle whorl’? → rawo
ranja Dahmsdorf nsm. ‘router’
rasuwa(m)u[n]d Arlon PN nsm.
rauniβaz Óvre Stabu nsm. ‘tester’
rawo* Letçani dsf. ‘for the restingplace’? → rango
ra[u]zwi? Liebenau PN? nsm. ‘consecrated to the spear’?
rrnz* Nebenstedt (I)-B ← = r(ūnōc)ōž, apf. ‘runes’ → r, ronoz, runAz, runa, runoz
ronoz* Stentoft en apf. ‘runes’ → r, rnz, runAz, runa, runoz
runa* Freilahbersheim, Neuding en-Bar II apf. ‘runes’ → r, rnz, ronoz, runAz, runoz
runAz* Björketorp, Istaby apf. ‘runes’ → r, rnz, ronoz, runAz, runoz
runono* Stentoft en apf. ‘runerow’ → runoronu
runoronu* Björketorp apf. ‘runerow’ → runono
runoz* Tjurkö (I)-C ← apf. ‘runes’ → r, rnz, ronoz, runa, runAz

sa* Lindholm dem. pron. nsm. ‘who’ → sawilagaz, sA, sAz
sA* Stentoft en dem. pron. nsm. ‘who, which’ → sAz, sa
salusu芦 Lellinge Kohave-B edible alga? or salus alu? or twice alu?
sAte Gummarp 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘put’
sawlilagaz* Lindholm ← PN nsm. → sa, wilagaz
sAz* Björketorp sa-ez, dem. pron. + relative particle nsm. ‘he who’
sbA Björketorp 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘foresee’
segalo München-Aubing I PN nsm.
segun Bezenye II nsm. ‘bless’
sekka Chessel Down I PN nsm.
sigib[a]ld Weimar II PN nsm.
sigila* München-Aubing I PN nsm., or nsf. ‘brooch’ → sigila, sil
sigila* Harford Farm asf. ‘brooch’ → sigila, sil
sigimer Ash Gilton PN nsm.
sikijaz Nydam I ← nsm. ‘coming from a bog’
sil* Boarley ← = sigil asf. ‘brooch’ → sigila, sigila
sǐpæbaęd* Loveden Hill PN nsf. → sǐpæba[e]ld
sǐpæba[e]ld* Loveden Hill PN nsm. → sǐpæbaęd
sǐ[n]pwag[i]a[n]dīn Schretzheim II PN? nsf. ‘female travel companion’
skanomodu solidus PN nsm./f.
stAbA  Gummarp  apm. ‘staves’
sufhe  Lečani  3 sg. pres. opt. ‘may she sleep’?
swarta  Illerup I  PN nsm.

tahu  Pforzen  adj. ‘tough’?
talgida  Udby → 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘carved’ → talgidai
talgidai  Novling  3 sg. pret. ind. ‘carved’, or talgidai i ‘carved in’ → talgida
talijo  Vimose IV  nsf. ‘plane’
tanulu  Börringe-C ← nsf. ‘protection, thrive’?
tæpa  Kent III sceattas  PN nsm.
tawide  Illerup II ←, Garbølle  3 sg. pret. ind. ‘made’
tawido  Gallehus  1 sg. pret. ind. ‘made’
tawo  Raum Trollhättan-A ← 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘make’
tilarids  Kowel  nsm. ‘goal-pursuer’
ttt  Lindholm ← assumingly three times t means three times ‘*tʰwaz = Tyr’
tuda  Bernsterburen  PN nsm.
tuwa*  Vadstena-C ← something spun, e.g. linnen and/or wool? ← luwatuwa

þAi az  Istaby  dem. pron. apf. ‘these’
þAt  Björketorp, Stentoften  dem. pron. asf. ‘this’
þicþ*  Loveden Hill  3 sg. pres. ind. ‘gets, receives’ ← þiuw
þk  Freilaubersheim  pers. pron. asf. ‘you’
þen  Britsum  dem. pron. asf. ‘this’
þiuw*  Weimar IV, Loveden Hill  nsf. ‘maid, servant’ ← þicþ
þr  Gummarp  numeral apm. ‘three’
þrkgwh  Overhornbæk (III)-C ← fuþark-quotation
þu  Bernsterburen  pers. pron. nsm. ‘you’
þurþhild  Friedberg  PN nsf.
þusa*  Westeremden B  dem. pron. nsm. ‘this one’ ← þusæ
þusæ*  Watchfield  dem. pron. nsm. ‘this one’ ← þusa, wusæ, buþæ

uf  Lečani  prep. ‘under’
uha*  Raum Køge-C ←, Kragelhus I u(n)ha or ûha? ‘young’ or ‘the first (among warriors = leader)? ← hariuha
ui*  Kjellers Mose-C ← vǐ ‘sanctuary, temple’ ← wi[h]
uniz  Sonder Rind-B  winiz nsm. ‘friend’
ūu*  Nebenstedt (I)-B ← 1 sg. pres. ind. ‘consecrate’ ← wiþgu
u[m]bada*  Bad Ems  PN? nsf. or compound of umbi ‘around’ + (gi)bada ‘consolation’ ← jibada, bada
u[n]maedit  Rasquert  adj. nsm. ‘not made mad’
unwodz  Gårdlösa  PN or epithet? nsm. ‘not raging’
up  Westeremden B  prep. ‘upon’
urait*  Neudingen-Baar II ← wrait 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘wrote’ ← warAit, wraet
ura*  Ferwerd  PN nsm. ← uræ
ura*  Ferwerd  PN nsf. ← ura
utiaz  Björketorp  adv. ‘farther away, to the south’
uuigaz  Eskatorp-F, Väsby-F ← wîgaz nsm. ‘warrior’
uuilald  Eskatorp-F, Väsby-F = wílald asm. ‘work of art’
upArAbA  Björketorp  asm. ‘something unwished for’
upf[i]nþpai  Charnay  3 sg. pres. opt. ‘may find out, get to know’

wagagastiz  Nydam I  PN nsm.
wagnijo  Illerup IV, Vimose I  PN, tribal name, nsm.
walhakurne  Tjurkö (I)-C  =  dsn. ‘strange, imported granule of gold’
warAit*  Istaby  3 sg. pret. ind. ‘he wrote’  –  wraet, urait
wekka  Chessel Down I  PN nsm.
welAdAude*  Björketorp  dsm. ‘death by treachery’  –  welAdud
wela[n]du  Schweindorf = PN nsm.
welAdud*  Stentoftten  dsm. ‘death by treachery’  –  welAdAude
widuhu[n]daz  Himlingøje I  PN nsm.
wigka*  Dischingen I  PN nsf.  →  winka
wiguponar  Nordendorf I  GN nsm.
wi[h]*  Pietroassa  wih, weih, nsm. ‘sanctuary’  →  ui
wihaìlag  Pietroassa ‘sacrosanctum’
wiðgu  Nydam I  =  1 sg. pres. ind. ‘fight’ or ‘consecrate’  –  üü
wilagaz*  Lindholm  PN nsm.  →  sawilagaz
wimèd  Westeremden B  PN nsm.
winka*  Dischingen I  PN nsf.  →  winka
witriding*  Slemminge  PN. nsm.  →  witro
witro  Slemminge  PN. nsm.  →  witriding
wiwogan  Eichstetten  PN asm.
wodan  Nordendorf I  GN nsm.
wo(r)gt  Arlon = worht(e), 3 sg. pret. ind. ‘worked, made’
wraet*  Freilaubersheim  3 sg. pret. ind. ‘wrote’  –  warAit, urait
wrulu  Sievern-A  =  wrül  1 sg. pres. ind. ‘write’
wrót  Weingarten I  3 sg. pres. ind. ‘writes’
wurte  Tjurkö (I)-C  =  3 sg. pret. ind. ‘worked, made’
wusa*  Watchfield  PN g/dsf.  →  bu[r]sæ, þusæ

xps  St. Cuthbert  partly Romanized Greek nomen sacrum ‘Christos’

zzz  Lindholm  ←  assumingly three times z means three times *algiz ‘elk’
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<tr>
<td>Arlon</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Års (II)-C</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arum</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Gilton</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ásúm-C</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Ems</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balingen</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergakker</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernsterburen</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beuchete</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezenye</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björketorp</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjørnerud-A</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarley</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bopfingen</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Börringe-C</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britsum</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Büchel</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caistor-by-Norwich</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnay</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chéhéry</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chessel Down II</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chessel Down I</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleatham</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahmsdorf</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dänemark (I)?-C</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darum (I)-B</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darum (V)-C</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dischingen I</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dischingen II</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djupbrunns-C</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donzdorf</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichstetten</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engers</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskatorp-F, Väsby-F</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallward</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferwerd</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstone</td>
<td>æniwulufu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freilaubersheim</td>
<td>boso:wretraun  ṭkda?ïna:golda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedberg</td>
<td>ṭpuruþild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frøslev</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fünen (I)-C</td>
<td>horaz lαþu aeraalius alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallehus</td>
<td>ekhlewagastiz:holtijaz:horna:tawido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammertingen</td>
<td>ado a?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbølle</td>
<td>hagiradaz:tawide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gårdsøsa</td>
<td>ekunwodz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gräfelfing</td>
<td>d/m w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griesheim</td>
<td>kolo: agilaþruþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grumpan-C</td>
<td>fuþarkgw hnjþp?? tbemhrød</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudme (II)-C</td>
<td>fuþar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gummarp</td>
<td>(h)ÅpuwolAfA  sAte stAbA þria fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurfes (?)-C</td>
<td>lαþ/wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailfingen I</td>
<td>wkkrNkþdihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailfingen II</td>
<td>??daana/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halskov Overdrev-C</td>
<td>???eturfahidelaþom/ehlsiaiaugrsþnbkeiaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammenhøg-C</td>
<td>lkaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamwic</td>
<td>katæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanton</td>
<td>:a/aéha/a:e:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford Farm</td>
<td>luda:gibetæsisilæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen</td>
<td>hada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heide-B</td>
<td>alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilbronn-Böckingen</td>
<td>ðkarwì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbrechtingen</td>
<td>fðæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesselagergårds Skov-C, Himlingøje I</td>
<td>tedok luþa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himlingøje II</td>
<td>widuhudaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himlingøje II</td>
<td>hariso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitsum-A</td>
<td>fozo groba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjørlunde Mark-C</td>
<td>alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohenstadt</td>
<td>?g/dhjulgll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hojstrup Strand C</td>
<td>lαþu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogebeintum</td>
<td>ded nlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup I</td>
<td>swarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup II</td>
<td>nipijo tawide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup III</td>
<td>laguþewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup IV</td>
<td>wagniijo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup V</td>
<td>gauþz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup VI</td>
<td>fir?a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup VII</td>
<td>afila??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerup VIII</td>
<td>fu??z fra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaby</td>
<td>AfatzhAriwulafa hÅpuwulafz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hÅeruwulafz warAitrunAzþAiaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantens</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent I</td>
<td>ik wæfar gadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent II</td>
<td>pada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent III</td>
<td>æpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent IV</td>
<td>epa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchheim Teck</td>
<td>badagial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjellers Mose-C</td>
<td>li? uialu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kläggerod-C</td>
<td>alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Køng</td>
<td>(i)ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowel</td>
<td>tilarids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kragehul I</td>
<td>ekerilazasugisalasmuhahta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kragehul II</td>
<td>ga ga gadinuga??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lellinge Kohave,</td>
<td>salusalu or /alu/alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lečcani</td>
<td>rango/rawo adonsufhe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebenau</td>
<td>raziwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindholm</td>
<td>ekerilazsawilagzhateka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindkær-C</td>
<td>fu∫arkgwneal? sulao?u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveden Hill</td>
<td>s∫pæbæ/ld:pios/piuw:hlaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynge Gyde-C</td>
<td>laa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maglemose (II)-C</td>
<td>lakaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maglemose (III)-C</td>
<td>ho.z alu tk/lmhi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meldorf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlum</td>
<td>æpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Møllelagårdsmarken</td>
<td>hth shi?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mos, Gotland</td>
<td>gaōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München-Aubing I</td>
<td>segalo sigila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München-Aubing II</td>
<td>bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München-Aubing III</td>
<td>nm?u/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Næsbjerg</td>
<td>?ara??is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebenstedt (I)-B</td>
<td>glaugizu ürnzl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neudingen-Baar I</td>
<td>s?ud?? midu klefilpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neudingen-Baar II</td>
<td>li:umuba:hamale:bilipgu:uraitruna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niederstotzingen</td>
<td>big?s:?liub ?ud?d ?reuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordendorf I</td>
<td>logãbore wodan wiguponar awa (l)eubwinii??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordendorf II</td>
<td>birlnioelk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nøvling</td>
<td>bidawarijaz talgidai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nydam I</td>
<td>alu?:hi?husikijaz:aiπalataz wagagastiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nydam II</td>
<td>harkilaz ahti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nydam III</td>
<td>lua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberflacht</td>
<td>gba:dulpfad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oettingen</td>
<td>auijabròg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ølst-C</td>
<td>hag alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oostum</td>
<td>aib kabu deda habuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osthofen</td>
<td>go furadi di le+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhornbek (III)-C</td>
<td>ρrkgwagelaalaasulo?h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øvre Stabu</td>
<td>raunijaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peigen</td>
<td>?? - hd ?kh-h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pforzen</td>
<td>.aigil.and.ailrun l.tahu.gasokun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietroassa</td>
<td>gutani ? wihailag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasquert</td>
<td>ekumæditoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raum Køge-C</td>
<td>hariuhahaitika:farauisa:gibuauja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raum Trollhättan-A</td>
<td>tawol  afodu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozwadów</td>
<td>jkrul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich/Richborough</td>
<td>?ahabu?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schonen (II)-C</td>
<td>fuji/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schretzheim I</td>
<td>alagupleuba:dedun arogisd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schretzheim II</td>
<td>sipwagadin leubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schretzheim III</td>
<td>gabar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwangau</td>
<td>aebi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweindorf</td>
<td>weladu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeland (I)-C</td>
<td>lka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey</td>
<td>brrnr  anmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sievern-A</td>
<td>rwrilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanomodu</td>
<td>skanomodu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skodborghus-B</td>
<td>aujaalawinaujaalawinaujaalawinjalawid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skonager (III)-C</td>
<td>niuwila lpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skrydstrup-B</td>
<td>laukaz alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slemminge</td>
<td>witring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soest</td>
<td>rada:daþpa gatano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sønder Rind-B</td>
<td>iunizik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sønderby-C</td>
<td>ekfakazf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spong Hill</td>
<td>alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cuthbert</td>
<td>ih xs mat(t)<a href="eus">h</a> marcus iohann(i)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUCAS (R)(A)(P)(H)AEL (M)A(RI)(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steindorf</td>
<td>huisi?ald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stentoften</td>
<td>niuhAbroranz niuhagestumz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hÅpuwolAfzgAfj hÅriwolAfzma??usnuh?e hidezrunonofelAhekAhed erAginoronoz herAmAlAsAz ArAgeuweAdudsÅþAtbAriutiş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strårup</td>
<td>leþro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>desaiona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svarteborg-M</td>
<td>sigaduz l/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabadbattyán</td>
<td>marings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannheim</td>
<td>??dui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsberg I</td>
<td>owlpþewaz niwajemariz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsberg II</td>
<td>aigzh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirup Heide</td>
<td>ehwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjurkö (I)-C</td>
<td>wurterunozanwalhakurne..heldazkunimudiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toornwerd</td>
<td>koubu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trossingen II</td>
<td>maisd? hj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trossingen I</td>
<td>fl/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddy</td>
<td>talgida lamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFO-B, Schonen (I)-B</td>
<td>laþulauka:ga:kaalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undley</td>
<td>gæ go gæ maga medu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Thames Valley</td>
<td>benu:ti:goi and benu:+:tidi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>