

Sprachstrukturen

Herausgegeben von
Herbert L. Kufner, Hugo Steger
und Otmar Werner

Reihe A

Historische Sprachstrukturen

3

Elmer H. Antonsen

A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions

Max Niemeyer Verlag
Tübingen



ISBN 3-484 60052-7

© Max Niemeyer Verlag Tübingen 1975

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es auch nicht gestattet, dieses Buch oder Teile daraus auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen. Printed in Germany.

Satz: Rothfuchs Dettenhausen

Contents

Foreword	VII
Abbreviations	XI
1. The runes, their phonological values and transliteration	1
2. Runic graphemes and their variations	6
3. Dating and relative chronology	10
4. Orthographic peculiarities	12
5. Phonology	14
6. Morphology	19
7. Syntax	24
8. Delimitation of languages/dialects represented in the Corpus .	26
Corpus of inscriptions	29
1–93 Northwest Germanic	29
94–98 East Germanic	73
99–106 West Germanic	75
107–121 North Germanic	78
118 West Nordic	85
116–117, 119–121 East Nordic	83–85, 85–89
Index of forms	90
1. Germanic	90
1.1 Runic	90
1.2 Gothic	93
1.3 Scandinavian	94
1.4 English	96
1.5 Low German	98
1.6 High German	99
2. Greek	101
3. Italic	102
4. Slavic	103

5.	Baltic	103
6.	Celtic	104
7.	Indo-Iranian	104
8.	Others	105
List of works cited		106
Index of inscriptions treated		110

For inclusion in the present series, it has been necessary to reduce considerably the original scope of this grammar. As a result, much of the argumentation for the new readings and interpretations I propose in the Corpus of Inscriptions has had to be omitted. I hope to present that argumentation in detail elsewhere. It has also been necessary to reduce to a minimum the discussion of matters treated in the text and to restrict the bibliography to a listing of only works actually cited. Works of a general nature dealing with Germanic linguistics as well as etymological dictionaries have been excluded. In the revision, I have proceeded on the assumption that the reader will have had at least an elementary introduction to the study of the runes and will be familiar with Germanic linguistics. Under each inscription in the Corpus, I refer to the main handbooks in which it is treated and occasionally to individual treatments. An asterisk after the citation indicates that a reproduction of the inscription is to be found there. Further bibliographic references can be found in the works cited.

From the very beginning, it has been my intention to focus on the linguistic significance of the inscriptions, which in my opinion has not come sufficiently to the fore in runic studies over the past decade, in spite of considerable interest in the inscriptions (cf. the corpus edition by Krause 1966, the introductory and general presentations by Elliott 1963, Musset 1965, Düwel 1968, Krause 1970, and the discussions of the language of the inscriptions by Makaev 1965 and Krause 1971). Krause's corpus edition (1966) is indispensable, but despite this scholar's immense contributions to runic studies, it suffers from a lack of linguistic methodological rigor and from the author's convictions concerning the magical nature of the inscriptions, which often result in patently untenable interpretations and the assumption of linguistic forms and developments which are quite out of keeping with the evidence. Makaev (1965) has done yeoman service for the field by pointing out many of the shortcomings of previous work and issuing a clarion call for more rigorous methods, but he himself provides little in the way of reinterpretation and relies very heavily on the views of his

predecessors in his corpus. Krause's linguistic study (1971) is essentially a distillation and compilation of the views expressed in his corpus edition. There thus still remains the need for a work which looks to the inscriptions anew and attempts to interpret them from a strictly linguistic point of view. While other disciplines, such as archeology, mythology, prehistory, etc. are rightfully interested in the inscriptions, it seems to me to be beyond question that mythologists and prehistorians can make the best use of them only after a sober linguistic analysis has been presented. To tamper with the linguistic evidence by prematurely introducing unconfirmed assumptions concerning the social and religious milieu of the writers of the inscriptions is to condemn the entire field of runic studies to the status of conjecture. Unfortunately, this impression of runic studies, and particularly of the value of the linguistic evidence provided by the inscriptions, has become fairly well entrenched.

I have tried to follow a rigorous linguistic approach. In the Corpus of Inscriptions are included only those which lend themselves to linguistic interpretation (i.e. inscriptions consisting only of uninterpretable sequences of runes or of single runes which may or may not have been used as ideographs are excluded). All of the so-called 'Proto-Nordic' and 'Gothic' inscriptions which can be interpreted are included, as are the earliest 'West Germanic' ones. From a comparison of these, I attempt to delimit and describe the languages and/or dialects as attested in the earliest native Germanic monuments and to point out the significance of the evidence for the study of historical Germanic linguistics. Also included are those inscriptions which present (in whole or in part) the 24-letter futhorc itself.

For each inscription treated, I give the name, the geographic location of the find, and the approximate archeological and/or linguistic dating, followed by the text in transliteration, a discussion of peculiar or difficult readings, the text in separate words, an etymological discussion of each form, a translation, and a concise list of references. Since proper names play an important role in deciphering and interpreting the inscriptions, each one is listed with references to the same or similar names in other dialects before the constituent elements are analyzed. It should be strongly emphasized that the PIE etyma reconstructed are intended only to suggest the PIE elements which enter into the formation of the word and should not be interpreted to mean that the forms themselves were actually present in PIE. Similarly, the translations of proper names indicate only the probable basic meaning of their elements, which may very well have been no longer apparent to those giving or bearing the names, since in many instances these name-elements are very archaic (e.g. *bīdawarjaz* = 'defender of the covenant or oath').

The reader familiar with the inscriptions will find new readings, interpretations, and/or analyses of forms given in nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25, 27, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 57, 62, 69, 72, 73, 76, 94, 99, 101, 105, 107, 108, 111, 114, 115, 117, 119, 120. In the morphology, I find it preferable to use the IE designations for stems (e.g. *o-* and *ā-* stems, instead of Gmc. *a-* and *ō-* stems) and to speak of *y-* and *w-* stems instead of the traditional *i-* and *u-* stems, since at least in early PIE, [i] and [u] were allophones of /y/ and /w/, respectively, and the new designations reflect more accurately the state of affairs in the PIE stem formants (i.e. full grades /-ey-, -oy-/; zero grade /-y-/; etc.). In dividing the inscriptions into the various linguistic groups, I have included under North Germanic also West Nordic (no. 118) and East Nordic (nos. 116–117 and 119–121), since all three groups are specifically Scandinavian. Within the groupings, the inscriptions are presented in roughly chronological order in so far as such an ordering is determinable.

This book is dedicated to the memory of my grandfather, Anton Christian Antonsen, who aroused in me an abiding interest in things Scandinavian. To my wife, Hannelore, and to my daughter, Ingrid, I am indebted for help in the preparation of the Index of Forms and in proofreading. I also wish to express my appreciation to the publisher, Mr. R. Harsch-Niemeyer, and to the editors, Prof. Herbert L. Kufner, Prof. Hugo Steger, and Prof. Otmar Werner, for the kind understanding they have shown me.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
October, 1974

Elmer H. Antonsen

acc.	accusative	ind.	indicative
adj.	adjective	Ingv.	Ingveonic
adv.	adverb	Ion.	Ionic
Alb.	Albanian	Ir.	Irish
Arm.	Armenian	Jutl.	Jutlandic
attr.	attribute	Lat.	Latin
Av.	Avestan	Latv.	Latvian
Burg.	Burgundian	lit.	literature
Celt.	Celtic	Lith.	Lithuanian
cent.	century	masc.	masculine
cf.	compare	med.	medial
cons.	consonant	MHG	Middle High German
Da.	Danish	MIr.	Middle Irish
dat.	dative	MLG	Middle Low German
dem.	demonstrative	Moselfrk.	Moselfrankish
dial.	dialect	MW	Middle Welsh
Dor.	Doric	N	noun
E	English	neut.	neuter
EG	East Germanic	NG	North Germanic
EN	East Nordic	no(s).	number (s)
encl.	enclitic	nom.	nominative
eNG	early North Germanic	Nw.	Norwegian
ePG	early Proto-Germanic	NwG	Northwest Germanic
F	French	O	object
fem.	feminine	OB	Old Bulgarian
Finn.	Finnish	ODa.	Old Danish
G	German	ODu.	Old Dutch
Gall.	Gallic	OE	Old English
Gaul.	Gaulic	OF	Old Frankish
gen.	genitive	OFris.	Old Frisian
Gk.	Greek	OHG	Old High German
Gmc.	Germanic	Olc.	Old Icelandic
Go.	Gothic	OInd.	Old Indic
Hitt.	Hittite	OIr.	Old Irish
Hom.	Homeric	OLF	Old Low Frankish
Ic.	Icelandic	ONw.	Old Norwegian
imp.	imperative	OPers.	Old Persian
inanim.	inanimate	OPr.	Old Prussian

opt.	optative	Russ.	Russian
OS	Old Saxon	S	Subject
Osc.	Oscan	Scand.	Scandinavian
OSl.	Old Slavic	Serb.	Serbian
OSw.	Old Swedish	sg.	singular
OW	Old Welsh	SG	South Germanic
OWF	Old West Frankish	subst. vb.	substantive verb
part.	participle	Sw.	Swedish
Pers.	Persian	Thrac.	Thracian
PG	Proto-Germanic	Toch.	Tocharian
PIE	Proto-Indo-European	transl.	translation
pl.	plural	Umbr.	Umbrian
poss.	possessive	V	verb
pres.	present	Ved.	Vedic
pret.	preterite	vs.	versus
pron.	pronoun	W	Welsh
quant.	quantifier	WG	West Germanic
R.	rune	WN	West Nordic

1. The runes, their phonological values and transliteration

1.1 The earliest attestations of a Gmc. language are found in inscriptions in the so-called older or Gmc. futhorc. This alphabet, undeniably related to the Mediterranean alphabets, is known in complete form from three inscriptions: 30 Kylver, 90 Vadstena and Motala (both from the same stamp), and 91 Grumpan, and in incomplete form from 89 Lindkær and Overhornbæk (from the same Vorlage), 99 Aquincum, 104 Breza, 105 Charnay, and 106 Beuchte. These futhorcs display a unique and uniform order, except that Kylver has \mathfrak{K} before \mathfrak{J} and \mathfrak{M} before \mathfrak{X} , whereas Vadstena-Motala and Grumpan have these runes in reverse order. For purposes of comparison, we can establish the following standardized futhorc:

\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{N}	$\mathfrak{Þ}$	\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{R}	\mathfrak{C}	\mathfrak{X}	\mathfrak{P}	\mathfrak{N}	\mathfrak{T}	\mathfrak{I}	\mathfrak{S}	\mathfrak{J}	\mathfrak{K}	\mathfrak{Y}	\mathfrak{Z}	\mathfrak{T}	\mathfrak{B}	\mathfrak{M}	\mathfrak{M}	\mathfrak{T}	\mathfrak{D}	\mathfrak{M}	\mathfrak{X}
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
f	u	þ	a	r	k	g	w	h	n	i	j	æ	p	z	s	t	b	e	m	l	ng	d	o

1.2 The phonological values of most of the runes can be established with great certainty on the basis of their use in identifiable words, of comparative linguistic evidence, of their correspondence to letters in the Mediterranean alphabets (Marstrander 1928, Hammerström 1930, Arntz 1944, 30–64, Krause 1970, § 21–9), and of the rune-names recorded in medieval manuscripts (Arntz 1944, 167–233, Düwel 1968, 107–8, Krause 1970, § 15–20). The identification of R. 13 \mathfrak{J} and R. 15 \mathfrak{Y} has caused the greatest difficulties. R. 15 \mathfrak{Y} was long regarded as m (as in the younger futhorc) and then later as an orthographic variant of R. 5 \mathfrak{R} (Munch 1847, 333), since it corresponded to r in later Scand., e.g. $\mathfrak{R} \mathfrak{N} \mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{X} \mathfrak{Y}$ = Ic. *rúnar* ‘runes’. Not until the latter half of the 19th cent. was it recognized as corresponding to z alternating with s in Gothic (Bugge 1865, Wimmer 1867, 32–4) and therefore the reflex of PIE */s/ through Verner’s law. To distinguish \mathfrak{Y} from \mathfrak{R} , 19th cent. runologists devised the transliterations