Leeds Studies in English

New Series XLII

2011

Edited by

Alaric Hall

Editorial assistants
Helen Price and Victoria Cooper

Leeds Studies in English

The Yew Rune, Yogh and *Yew*

Bernard Mees

The problem of the thirteenth rune of the older and Anglo-Saxon futharks (ᛇ~ᛇ) has a long and divergent historiography.[1] A number of values such as *eu* or close or open *e* were accepted by earlier generations of runologists.[2] Indeed even in the medieval period there seems to have been little consensus as to its phonological purpose. Various values are assigned to this staff in the English manuscript tradition: *i, eo, h* and *k*; and similarly, its use in Old English inscriptions varies from an earlier employment as *i* to a later *h*. There is somewhat less ambivalence among the attested rune names, however. The *Codex Salisburgensis* and the *Isruna Tracts* designate this rune *ih*, and the *Runic Poem* names it *eoh* mirroring Old English vocalic development. Therefore, the original rune name has traditionally been constructed as meaning 'yew' (OE *ēo, ēow, īw*), as a similar name, *ýr*, is recorded for one of the Nordic runes that represented *r* (ᛦ), as if when the old value *z* was surrendered, that of the lost thirteenth rune was assumed.[3]

---

[1] The following abbreviations are used in this paper: *IEW* = Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Bern: Francke, 1959–69); *IK* = *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit*, ed. by Karl Hauck and others, Münster Mittelalter-Schriften, 24 (Münster: Fink, 1985–), I.2–III.2 (*Ikonographischer Katalog*, 1–3); *KJ* = Wolfgang Krause and Herbert Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark*, Akadamie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen, III. Reihe, 65, 2nd edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); *NIæR* = *Norges indskrifter med de ældre runer*, ed. by Sophus Bugge and Magnus Olsen, Norges indskrifter indtil reformationen, 1/Norske historiske Kildeskriftfondsskrifter, 22, 4 vols (Christiania: Brøgger, 1891–1924).

[2] Cf. Peter Andreas Munch, 'Om indskriften paa det i Sønder-Jylland 1734 fundne guldhorn', *Annaler for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie* (1847), pp. 389–91 [repr. in Peter Andreas Munch*, Samlede afhandlinger*, ed. by Gustav Storm, 4 vols (Christiania: Cammermeyer, 1873-76), I, 399]; Julius Zacher, *Das gothische Alphabet, Vulfilas, und das Runenalphabet: Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1855), p. 25; Ludvig F. A. Wimmer, 'Runeskriftens oprindelse og udvikling i norden', *Aarbøger for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie,* 1 (1874), 1–270 (p. 120) (though cf. Ludvig F. A. Wimmer, *Die Runenschrift*, trans. by Ferdinand Holthausen, rev. edn. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1887), pp. 134–35); Rudolph Henning, *Die deutsche Runendenkmäler* (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1889), p. 67; *NIæR*, pp. 117–48; Carl J. S Marstrander, 'Om runenene og runenavnes oprindelse', *Norsk tidskrift for sprogvidenskap,* 1 (1928), 85–188 (pp. 118–19); Arthur G. Brodeur, 'The Riddle of the Runes', *University of California Publications in English*, 3 (1932), 1–15 (pp. 10–13); Otto von Friesen, *De germanska, anglofrisiska och tyska runorna*, ed. by Otto von Friesen, Nordisk kultur, 6 (Stockholm: Bonnier, 1933), pp. 3–79 (p. 9).

[3] Raymond I. Page, 'The Old English Rune *eoh*, *íh*, "Yew Tree" ', *Medium Ævum*, 37 (1968), 125–36 [repr. in *Runes and Runic Inscriptions: Collected Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Viking Runes*, ed. by David Parsons (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 133–44]. In two of the manuscripts, British Library, Cotton Galba A.ii and St John's College, Oxford, 17, the names of the thirteenth and fifteenth runes have been exchanged, and as in the Nordic tradition, it is the old fifteenth rune which has received the name 'yew' (or actually *eth*, corrected to *eoh*).

Thus runologists have generally assumed a vocalic value for the thirteenth runes, a value clearly shown in some of the oldest inscriptions. Formerly represented in the grammars as *ė* (i.e. close *e*), Wolfgang Krause's transliteration ï has now found favour in most studies.[4] Yet doubt remains as to the rune's original value. Elmer Antonsen proposes to read /æ:/ (i.e. $\bar{e}_1$), Leo Connolly has reconstructed /ɨ(:)/, Ottar Grønvik and Elmar Seebold prefer [ç], Tineke Looijenga has mooted an original value /i(:)j/ or /ji(:)/ and Heinrich Beck, reviving an older interpretation, now sees the rune as representing an /i(:)/ not fully lowered to /e(:)/.[5]

Antonsen's reading /æ:/ is largely predicated on structural concerns — i.e. the notion that there was an imbalance between the inventory of Proto-Germanic short (*/i, e, a, u/) and long (*/iː, æː, ɔː, uː/) vowel phonemes. Yet of all the contributions it is Connolly's which is the most intriguing and the most original.[6] Following Antonsen's principle that the yew rune must have represented a phoneme lost during the Proto-Germanic period, but still attempting to reconcile its employment in both the early inscriptions and in the rune names (the chief failing of Antonsen's theory), he has reconstructed a Proto-Germanic vowel created through the influence of a Proto-Germanic laryngeal. This laryngeal, he proposes, retracted neighbouring Proto-Germanic *i* to a high central vowel that he transcribes as *ɨ*. He arrived at this theory after a number of studies on the inconsistent fate of inherited IE **e*, **ei* and **i* in the descendant dialects.[7] Nonetheless he is unable to provide proof of the use of the yew rune to represent this **ɨ*.

---

[4] KJ, p. 5.

[5] Elmer H. Antonsen, *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*, Sprachstrukturen, Reihe A: Historische Sprachstrukturen, 3 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1975), pp. 3–6; Elmer H. Antonsen, *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 140 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 44–45; Leo A. Connolly, 'The Rune ᛇ and the Germanic Vowel System', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 14 (1979), pp. 1–32; Ottar Grønvik, *Runene på Tunesteinen: Alfabet — språkform — budskap* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1981), pp. 29–32; Elmar Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen der Überlieferung des älteren Fuþark', in *Old English Runes and their Continental Background*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Anglistische Forschungen, 217 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1991), pp. 439–569 (pp. 469–70); Tineke Looijenga, 'The Yew-Rune in the Pforzen Inscription', in *Pforzen und Bergakker*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Historische Sprachforschung Ergänzungsheft, 41 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), pp. 80–87 (pp. 81–82); Tineke Looijenga, *Texts and Contexts of the Oldest Runic Inscriptions*, The Northern World, 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 138–42; Heinrick Beck, 'Runen und Schriftlichkeit', in *Von Thorsberg nach Schleswig: Sprache und Schriftlichkeit eines Grenzgebietes im Wandel eines Jahrtausends. Internationales Kolloquium im Wikinger Museum Haithabau vom 29. September–3. Oktober 1994*, ed. by Klaus Düwel, Edith Marold and Christiane Zimmermann, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, 25 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001), pp. 1–23 (pp. 1–6); Heinrick Beck, 'Zum Problem der 13. Rune (ᛇ)', in *Runica, Germanica, Mediaevalia*, ed. by Wilhelm Heizmann and Astrid von Nahl, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, 37 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), pp. 77–83; and cf. Wolfgang Krause, *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften*, Germanische Bibliothek Reihe 3: Untersuchungen und Einzeldarstellungen (Heidelberg: Winter, 1971), pp. 25–26; Heinrich Beck, 'Sprachliche Argumente zum Problem des Runenaufkommens', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 101 (1972), 1–15; Richard Schrodt, 'Die Eibenrune und Idg. *ei* in Germanischen', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 104 (1975), 171–79; Bernard Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic', *North-Western European Language Evolution (NOWELE)*, 49 (2006), 13–49 (p. 35).

[6] Connolly, 'The Rune ᛇ and the Germanic Vowel System'.

[7] Leo A. Connolly, 'Indo-European *i* > Germanic *e*: An Explanation by the Laryngeal Theory', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Tübingen)*, 99 (1977), 173–205, 333–58; Leo A. Connolly, '$\bar{e}_2$ and the Laryngeal Theory', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Tübingen)*, 101 (1979), 1–29; Leo A. Connolly, 'Altnordisch *e* < indogermanisch *i*', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 97 (1894), 267–80; Leo A. Connolly, 'On Identifying Laryngeal Reflexes in Germanic', *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 11 (1999), 205–22.

Bernard Mees

Connolly's linkage of the yew rune to the development of *e, *ei and *i is reminiscent of the theory that first led to the transcription *ė*. This transcription derives from the positing that the thirteenth rune represented a Germanic non-low front vowel, intermediate between *e* and *i*. Indeed when long, this vowel is often proposed to have derived from an intermediate value (i.e. *ē̄*) suggested to have been produced by the monophthongisation of *ei before it developed to *ī*,[8] bearing in mind that such a development occurred in both pre-classical Latin and Hellenistic Greek.[9] Yet the few inscriptions in the older futhark that employ the yew rune lexically show a value /i(ː)/, and when long not necessarily one derived from *ei*.[10] The thirteenth rune only appears in inscriptions where it seems to be orthographically redundant. Thus some philologists have claimed that it was redundant from the time of the inception of the futhark, a redundancy that occurs in alphabetic scripts found throughout the Mediterranean (as witnessed by their abecedaria).[11] Yet the thirteenth rune does not clearly formally derive from any single Mediterranean letter. Indeed it has been claimed by some to have been especially created for the Germanic script, as if it represented a sound unknown in the tradition from which it was borrowed. Antonsen's theory seems conclusive: the yew rune probably represented a phone later lost from Germanic.[12]

[8] Friedrich Ranke *apud* Wolfgang Jungandreas, 'Die germanische Runenreihe und ihre Bedeutung', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 40 (1935), 105–21 (p. 106).

[9] The old theory is perhaps best summarised in an article contemporary to that of Connolly by Karl Schneider, 'Zum gemeingermanischen runischen Schriftsystem (Älter, Runennamen, Struktur der 24er-Reihe, kimbrische Schöpfung)', in *Integrale Linguistik: Festschrift für Helmut Gipper*, ed. by Edeltrud Bülow and Peter Schmitter (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1979), pp. 541–71. Antonsen and others seem to (mis)understand this theory as proposing that the yew rune represents the diphthong itself. Antonsen reaffirms his view in Schneider's *Festschrift*, but others, such as Alfred Bammesberger, are still inclined to link the thirteenth rune with IE *ei: Elmer H. Antonsen, 'Zum Ursprung und Älter des germanischen Fuþarks', in *Festschrift für Karl Schneider zum 70. Geburtstag am 18. April 1982*, ed. by Kurt R. Jankowsky and Ernst S. Dick (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1982), 3–15 (pp. 10–12); Alfred Bammesberger, 'The Development of the Runic Script and its Relationship to Germanic Phonological History', in *Language Change and Language Structure: Older Germanic Languages in a Comparative Perspective*, ed. by Torvil Swan, Endre Mørck, Olaf Jansen Westvik, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 73 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), pp. 1–25 (pp. 6–8). Another similar approach is that of Helmut Birkhan who posits the influence of a neighbouring East Celtic dialect (Celtic usually monophthongises IE *ei to *ē): Helmut R. J. Birkhan, *Germanen und Kelten bis zum Ausgang der Römerzeit: Der Aussagewert von Wörtern und Sachen für die frühesten keltisch-germanischen Kulturbeziehungen*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 272 (Vienna: Böhlau, 1970), pp. 178–80.

[10] In addition, as Krause points out, the name of the ice rune is also usually derived from a form with IE *ei- (see *IEW* 301). According to Connolly, however, the only sure Continental attestation of the thirteenth rune with a value *i* in Krause's corpus, on the Freilaubersheim fibula, may represent *ī < *eH₁i*. Wolfgang Krause, 'Untersuchungen zu den Runennamen II', *Nachrichten der Akadamie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, *Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 2 (1948) 93–108; KJ, p. 5; Connolly, 'The Rune ᛇ and the Germanic Vowel System', p. 28.

[11] e.g. Михаил Иванович Стеблин-Каменский (Mikhail Ivanovich Steblin-Kamenskiĭ), 'Какую систему гласных выражал первоначально рунический алфавит?', Скандинавский Сборник, 4 (1959), 153–58; 'Noen fonologiske betrakninger over de eldre runer', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 77 (1962), 1–6 (pp. 5–6).

[12] The only other option would seem to be to assume some magico-religious reason for the creation of this staff. Despite the appearance of pairings in the rune-row similar to those sometimes used in alphabetic magic, such solutions are usually overly speculative. The most voluminous example of this type of analysis is the gematric theory of Heinz Klingenberg based around the number thirteen, one that most runologists have treated with circumspection: Heinz Klingenberg, *Runenschrift — Schriftdenken — Runenschriften*, Germanische Bibliothek, Reihe: Untersuchungen und Einzeldarstellungen, 3 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1973). Similarly, others have pointed to the magical and religious significance of the yew tree and its connection with the ON Yggrdrasil and Ullr; see Karl Schneider, *Die germanischen Runennamen: Versuch einer Gesamtdeutung; ein Beitrag zur idg./germ. Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte* (Meisenheim a G.: Hain, 1956), p. 285; Harry Andersen, 'Three Controversial Runes in the Older Futhark', *North-Western European Language Evolution (NOWELE)*, 4 (1984), 97–110 and 5 (1985),

Rather than beginning with theoretical concerns, however, a more grounded approach would surely be to start with a survey of how the rune is actually used in early epigraphy before bringing in other considerations. The earliest attestation of the thirteenth rune is in the Kylver stone rune-row (KJ 1), for example, and it appears in all of the elder rune-row inscriptions save the short partial rows of Aquincum (KJ 7), Beuchte (KJ 8) and the Gudme II bracteate (*IK* 392). It also has the same orientation as has Latin S (i.e. ∫) in each of these inscriptions. This includes the example on the Vadstena bracteate (*IK* 337, 1) where as an anticlockwise (i.e. sinistroverse) inscription, this makes the character retrograde to the rest of the text. Similarly, the character is generally direct (∫) in the body of inscriptions collected by Krause: the only other retrograde example is one of the two yew runes on the Krogsta stone where this staff is (apparently mistakenly) employed for the graphically similar **t** (↑; KJ 100). This is also the case in most of the English inscriptions. Yet in the four examples on English coins and the two English rune-rows, the yew rune is always inscribed as a retrograde (⌐), a practice also to be noted on a non-provenanced Danish bracteate (*IK* 197).[13] A doubtful example of a retrograde form has also emerged on a find on a strap-end from Long Buckby, Northamptonshire, that dates from the late eighth century; although the top of the rune is missing, Ray Page plausibly read ']ɨ h ‖ t' — i.e. a partial, perhaps of the common anthroponymic element *briht*.[14] On the other hand, the manuscripts containing runes usually feature the direct form, although an apparent formal confusion with Latin Z is evident in the Codex Cotton Otho B.x.[15]

The thirteenth rune also hardly varies its shape throughout the centuries of its employment.[16] In the Lindkær/Over Hornbæk III bracteate rune-row (*IK* 110) it has been reduced to the shape of an **l**-rune (i.e. ⎰), a reduction which also appears to have occurred on an Anglian coin[17] and possibly on the Broholm bracteate (*IK* 225). These variants, however, seem to be mistakes on the behalf of the craftsmen so concerned. The yew rune is thus very stable in form, if not in orientation or in phonological value.

Of the rune-row inscriptions, only that from Charnay (KJ 6) gives us any clue as to the phonological value of this rune, in the graphically isolated sequence ∫**ia**. Seebold reads [aiç] here, yet this is unlikely as this assumes that both the **a** and ∫ are retrograde to this sinistroverse

---

3–22. Cf. Ralph W. V. Elliot, 'Runes, Yews and Magic', *Speculum*, 32 (1957), 250–61; Robert Bevan-Jones, *The Ancient Yew: A History of 'Taxus Baccata'* (Macclesfield: Windgather, 2002). It should be noted that in the very inscription that appears to invoke the power of the yew, however, this rune does not appear, although the ice rune does: Tineke Looijenga, 'Yew Wood and Runic Inscriptions in the Frisian *Terp*-Area', in *Old English Runes and their Continental Background*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Anglistische Forschungen, 217 (Hedelberg: Winter, 1991), pp. 335–42. Nor does it appear in what is often taken to be the only runic testament to Ullr, the inscription on the Thorsberg chape.

13 For the coins see Mark Blackburn, 'A Survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian Coins with Runic Inscriptions', in *Old English Runes and their Continental Background*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Anglistiche Forschungen, 217 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1991), pp. 137–89 (pp. 155–56, 159); Raymond I. Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), pp. 123, 125–26; for the rune-rows see Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 79–80.

14 Raymond I. Page, 'New Anglo-Saxon Rune Finds', *Nytt om runer*, 15 (2000), 10–11 (p. 11).

15 This is a quite different picture to that expounded by Bengt Odenstedt, who claims the distribution of retrograde versus direct is about even: *On the Origin and Early History of the Runic Script: Typology and Graphic Variation in the Older Futhark*, Acta Academiae Regiae Gustavi Adolphi, 59 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), pp. 75–77. Cf. the reviews of Odenstedt by Düwel and Williams: Klaus Düwel's in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 224 (1992), 234–41 and Henrik Williams, 'Which Came First, Π or ⋈?', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 107 (1992), 192–205.

16 Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen', p. 470 may have found a late variant similar to the **n** or **g** runes in the unclear inscriptions on the Lundeborg (*IK* 295) and Gudme I bracteates (*IK* 391).

17 Blackburn, 'A Survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian Coins', p. 155; Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, p. 123.

reading (note too that the main Charnay inscription is clearly dextroverse as is standard in Continental inscriptions).[18] I have suggested that the sequence (which is found along with another isolated sequence **kr**) may be an abbreviation for the common early Christian *nomen sacrum* Iaô (and **kr** likewise Christus) much as Ute Schwab sought to interpret many of the shorter sequences in German inscriptions as typically Christian forms.[19] Considering that it is graphically separated from the main inscription, however, ∫**ia** may not represent a lexeme at all.[20]

With the form on the Charnay fibula may be grouped a number of other inscriptions in the older futhark. The By stone's final sequence **rmþ**∫(KJ 71), the Denmark X bracteate legend ∫**lwl** (*IK* 39), the Kitnæs III-C bracteate's **l**∫**t** (*IK* 94.1), and the anticlockwise Nebenstedt II bracteate inscription **llet × oʀ·r**∫ **iḷ**∫·**aþʀmtl** and the similar Darum IV bracteate legend **lae:t** ⸙**oʀʀ**∫**ll**∫**aþʀet** (*IK* 129.1–2) are all of disputable value for the present purpose. Krause (KJ 55, nn. 1–2) has remarked on two similarly problematic Norwegian inscriptions from Hammeren and Oppauran that read **alf**∫∫(*NIæR* I.373–82: sinistroverse; perhaps an anthroponym *Alfi*) and **ea**∫**u** (*NIæR* II.732–40). To this category also belongs the Krogsta stone, side A of which bears the uninterpreted **mws**ᒷ**eij**, along with a second attestation which, as has already been mentioned, shows that the thirteenth rune seems to have been confused with the **t** rune in **s**∫**ainaʀ** [stainaz].

More evidence is forthcoming from the Nebenstedt I bracteate which bears the inscription **gl**∫**augiʀu** ∫**urṇrl** (*IK* 128). Krause (KJ 133) has related the first element to ON *gljá* 'glitter', and thus reconstructs a value /i/. Seebold prefers to see a cognate form of OIr. *glicc* 'clever, skilful' here and so is able to accommodate a value [iç].[21] The third element is ambiguous for although a strong *wīhu* 'I consecrate' (cf. Goth *weihan* 'sanctify, make holy') is a possible form, the Kragehul spear shaft (KJ 27) spells this verb as **wiju** and the Vimose buckle (KJ 24) has **wija**, suggesting an Early Nordic **wīhju* with the loss of medial -*h*-; compare the Nydam axe haft's **wịhgu**.[22] Seebold also brings to attention the scrambled Broholm (*IK* 225) form that he reconstructs as **wlho** and which he suggests is probably [wi:ço] with a deformed yew rune.[23] Moreover, a Danish bracteate of unknown provenance features a spelling **wi**ᒷ**u**

18 Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen', p. 498.

19 Ute Schwab, 'Runen der Merowingerzeit als Quelle für das Weiterleben der spätantiken christlichen und nichtchristlichen Schriftmagie?', in *Runische Schriftkultur in kontinental-skandinavischer und -angelsächsischer Wechselbeziehung: Internationales Symposium in der Werner-Reimars-Stiftung vom 24.–27. Juni 1992 in Bad Homburg*, ed. by Klaus Düwel, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, 10 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996), pp. 376–433; Mindy MacLeod and Bernard Mees, *Runic Amulets and Magic Objects* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006), p. 42.

20 Cf. Robert Nedoma, who eschews any attempt to interpret the sequence: 'Schrift und Sprache in den ostgermanischen Runendenkmälern', *North-Western European Language Evolution (NOWELE)*, 58/59 (2010), 1–70 (p. 39).

21 Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen', p. 487. Antonsen reads **glæaugizu æurgz**, and links the first element to OE *glær*, ON *glæsa*, Lat. *glēsum* 'amber'. He is unable to offer an interpretation for the third element, nor has he for the Kragehul spearshaft's **wiju** (whereas he interprets the Vimose buckle's **wija** as belonging to the sequence **auwija**, i.e. *auja* with West Germanic development). Antonsen's value *æ* has obviously hampered his attempt to offer an interpretation. Antonsen, *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*, no. 63; Elmer H. Antonsen, *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 140 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 44–45.

22 Marie Stoklund, 'Runer 1993', *Arkæologiske udgravninger i Danmark* (1993), 259–74 (pp. 269–70). Cf. Adolf Noreen, *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte 4: Altnordische Grammatik, 1, 4th edn (Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1923), p. 167; Grønvik, *Runene på Tunesteinen*, p. 195, n. 28.

23 Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen', p. 470.

which could indicate an employment as [ç] (KJ 133, *IK* 197).[24] The use of the thirteenth rune elsewhere on the bracteate, however (in **jjjwˡa** and possibly in **dwude͡lwwna**), suggests that, despite the appearance of the **j**-rune putatively employed here as a logograph, ˡ is being used as an alternative to **i** to represent the associated semivowel.[25] Thus, despite the plausibility of Seebold's interpretation, his reading of ˡ here as [ç] is far from indisputable.

Grønvik proposes that the troublesome last character in the legend **awaleubwiniʃ** on the Nordendorf I fibula be read [ç] in order to discover an enclitic pre-OHG -*h* 'and' (i.e. 'Awa and Leubwini'), citing the Gothic form -*h* (-*uh*) < IE *-k^we.[26] A plausible interpretation, nonetheless it can hardly represent proof of the value of the thirteenth rune, although it is clearly preferable to interpreting the last rune as an ideograph as does Krause.[27] More recently an unclear graph in the inscription on the Pforzen buckle has been promoted by Klaus Düwel as comprising an apparent ligature of **a** + ʃ, representing the diphthong *ai*.[28] The first line of the inscription does seem to read **aigilandia͡ ʃlrun**, i.e. *Aigil andi Ailrūn*. Given the peculiar nature of the ligaturing and the lack of expected -*a* in the putative second anthroponym, however, this inscription might be open to other interpretations both lexical and phonological.[29]

A value *ē$_2$* has been assumed for the Rubring stone's **kˡndo** (perhaps for an early High German *kēn dō(ē)*).[30] Yet this interpretation was clearly made on *a priori* grounds. Indeed despite its inclusion in Stefan Opitz's catalogue, given its irregular and (Lower) Austrian provenance it is probably of modern authorship — i.e. a Nazi-era forgery.[31] More categorical is the sequence **daþʃna** on the Freilaubersheim fibula (KJ 144) which is generally held to represent the anthroponym *Daþina*.[32] Clearly there is no hint of a consonantal value here. By this date (c. 575), however, English examples of the thirteenth rune have appeared.

[24] Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen', pp. 474–77; Elmar Seebold, 'Völker und Sprache in Dänemark zur Zeit der germanischen Wanderungen', in *Nordwestgermanisch*, ed. by Edith Marold and Christiane Zimmermann, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, 13 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), pp. 155–86 (pp. 169, 173, 182).

[25] Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen', pp. 474–77; Seebold, 'Völker und Sprache in Dänemark', pp. 169, 173, 182 reads **jjjwˡadwude͡lwwnaé͡kwwd wiˡuhu??** which he interprets as 'GUTES JAHR (x3) weiht X, durch dieses Pferd weihe, weihe, weihe ich'.

[26] Ottar Grønvik, 'Die Runeninschrift der Nordendorfer Bügelfibel I', in *Runor och ABC: Elva föreläsningar från ett symposium i Stockholm våren 1995*, ed. by Staffan Nyström, Runica et Mediævalia, 4 (Stockholm: Stockholms Medeltidsmuseum, 1987), pp. 111–29.

[27] KJ 151; cf. Robert Nedoma, *Personennamen in südgermanischen Runeninschriften: Studien zur altgermanischen Namenkunde I,1,1*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Reihe: Untersuchungen, 3 (Heidelberg: Winter, 2004), pp. 361–62.

[28] Klaus Düwel, 'Die Runenschnalle von Pforzen (Allgäu) — Aspekte der Deutung, 3, Lesung und Deutung', in *Pforzen und Bergakker*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Historische Sprachforschung Ergänzungsheft, 41 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), pp. 36–54 (pp. 38–39).

[29] Ute Schwab, 'Die Runenschnalle von Pforzen (Allgäu) — Aspekte der Deutung, 4, Diskussion', in *Pforzen und Bergakker*, pp. 55–79 (p. 57); Elmar Seebold, 'Bemerkungen zur Runenschrift von Pforzen', in *Pforzen und Bergakker*, pp. 88–90 (p. 88); Nedoma, *Personennamen in südgermanischen Runeninschriften*, pp. 167–71.

[30] Otto Haas, 'Ein problematischer Fund', *Archaeologia Austriaca*, 24 (1958), 71–73; Walter Steinhauser, 'Die Runenschrift von Rubring an der Enns und der Eisriese Iring', *Archaeologia Austriaca*, 44 (1968), 1–20.

[31] Stefan Opitz, *Südgermanische Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark aus der Merowingerzeit*, 2nd edn (Kirchzarten: Burg, 1981), no. 37; see further Robert Nedoma, 'Zur Inschrift auf dem Stein von Rubring', in *Runica, Germanica, Mediaevalia*, ed. by Wilhelm Heizmann and Astrid von Nahl, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, 37 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), pp. 481–95.

[32] Nedoma, *Personennamen in südgermanischen Runeninschriften*, pp. 279–80.

Bernard Mees

Yet there are English inscriptions that support the value *h*, although of these some probably represent [x] rather than [ç]. The Great Urswick stone bears the anthroponym **toroʃtredæ**, *Torhtred(æ)*[33] and although *h* is usually counted a palatal before final *t* in Old English, this development that had begun in West Saxon by the ninth century is only evident when *h* before *t* begins to have a palatalising effect on *eo* and *io*,[34] and the svarabhakti **o** in this inscription hardly warrants a value [ç] for ʃ here. Somewhat more probably palatal, however, is the example in **almeʃttig** for *almehtig* on the Ruthwell cross.[35] There are also three examples in coin legends, one from the eighth and two from the ninth century, that similarly show the yew rune with a value *h*: **tilberlt**, *Tilberht* (also **tilberlt**), **dEBelt** (a contraction of *Dægberht*) and **wiltred**, *Wihtred*.[36] These though as can be seen by the occasional penetration of Roman letters are all quite late; yet again clear evidence for a palatal value in the element *-berht* is lacking (we might expect *-**byrlt** or *-**birlt**). And a further extension of this rune to represent *k* is indicated in another late coin legend where Latin *rēx* is spelt as **rEls**,[37] an innovation perhaps influenced by the Old English development *-*hs* > -*ks* (cf. PG *sehs > OE *siex*, *syx*, *six*).[38]

The earliest Anglo-Frisian example of the yew rune is on the Caistor-by-Norwich gaming piece which bears the inscription **raʃhan** that is usually interpreted now as /raihan/.[39] And such a reading would seem to support Düwel's interpretation of the Pforzen inscription's **aʃlrun**. Seebold sees the Caistor employment, however, as a natural extension of the usage [iç] to represent /i/ before /h/: after all, the Ing rune appears to be used as [iŋ] (instead of the usual [iŋg]) before a seemingly redundant **g** on the Opedal stone (KJ 76).[40] Yet such an interpretation assumes that Proto-Germanic *ai here is still unmonophthongised (we might expect, rather, [raːxan], cf. OE *rāha*, *rā*), and the palatalisation of *h* is usually held to postdate the relevant monophthongisation in proto-English.[41] Another English example of this rune is in the Thames silver mount legend **sb͡erædhtʃbcai ͡erhad͡æbs** which appears to be an

33 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 150–51.

34 Karl Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik: Nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, A: Hauptreihe, 3, 3rd edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1965), §122, §206, 6; Richard M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English, Volume 1: Phonology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 167–70.

35 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 147–48; Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune', pp. 393–96.

36 Blackburn, 'A Survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian Coins with Runic Inscriptions', pp. 155–56; Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 123, 125.

37 Blackburn, 'A Survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian Coins with Runic Inscriptions', p. 159; Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, p. 126.

38 Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, p. 144, prefers to read a malformed RE**ss**, as appears in the other Beonna legends: surely, however, given the value *k* for the thirteenth rune in some manuscripts the otherwise inexplicable form RE**ss** is actually a corruption of **rEʃs**.

39 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 19, 179–80.

40 Seebold, 'Die Stellung der englischen Runen im Rahmen', p. 469. Cf. Grønvik, *Runene på Tunesteinen*, pp. 196–97, n. 28, who proffers the development *i* (_*ç*) > *i* (_*ç) or (_*ʃ*) > *i*, citing this inscription and the similarly early examples from Nebenstedt (in **uʃu** and **gliʃa-**).

41 Ingrid Sanness Johnsen, 'Den runologiske plassering av innskriften fra Caistor-by-Norwich', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 89 (1974), 30–43 (pp. 39–41); Richard M. Hogg, 'Old English Palatalization', *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1979), pp. 89–113 (pp. 90–91); Bengt Odenstedt, 'On the Transliteration of the ᛁ-Rune in Early English and Frisian Inscriptions', in *Festskrift til Ottar Grønvik på 75-årsdagen den 21. oktober 1991*, ed. by John Ole Askedal, Harald Bjorvand and Eyvind Fjeld Halvorsen (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1991), pp. 53–65 (p. 58); Gaby Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune and the Runes ᚻ, ᚷ, ᛡ and ᛁ in the Old English Corpus (Epigraphical Material)', in *Runes and their Secrets: Studies in Runology*, ed. by Marie Stoklund and others (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 2006), pp. 385–414 (pp. 390–91).

attempt to produce a palindrome.[42] The central portion is alphabetic (**a**, **b**, **c**), it is then flanked by the yew and ice runes, and flanked again by what may be a name encrypted in pairs: **sb/er/æd/ht = s[æd]b[er][ht]**, *Sædberht*.[43] The Northamptonshire find probably also evidences a vocalic value for the yew rune as it precedes an **h** and then a **t** rotated 90 degrees clockwise. Similarly, the two Anglo-Saxon rune-row inscriptions, on the Thames scramasax and the partial row on the Brandon pin (both from the eighth–ninth centuries) provide no help phonologically, although both examples are retrograde (ᛁ).[44] The value *i*, however, is more obviously betrayed in the Loveden Hill urn inscription's **sʃþæbad**, representing the anthroponym *Sīþæbad*, and the Dover stone legend **+jʃslheard** which can only represent the anthroponym *Gīs(i)lheard*.[45] Similarly, the Thornhill II stone bears the legend **eateʃnne**, i.e. *Ēadþegn(e)*, where the thirteenth rune represents [j̟] if not yet [j] which, as the use of **j** for this allophone in the late Dover stone inscription suggests, probably derives from an identification with *i* by way of *j*.[46] More examples with a clear value of *i* separate from a following *h* include the **hælʃj** and the **hʃræ** of the Gandersheim (Brunswick) casket inscription whose authenticity is doubted by Page[47] and the title **iosePʃ** for the expected genitive *Josep(h)i* (where, as Klaus Düwel points out to me, the rune exhibits horizontal rather than oblique branches) that appears twice on the cover of the *Hegesippus Codex*, a Latin translation of Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum*.

It thus seems that the earliest value of the yew rune known to us is *i*. It is also clear that in English sources this rune later came to represent *h*. This may have been part of a process of development from a high front vowel > palatal semivowel > palatalised voiced spirant > voiceless palatal spirant > voiceless velar spirant > voiceless velar stop (i.e. [i] > [j] > [j̟] > [ç] > [x] > [k]), which may correspond to the suggested development of the name **īha-* > OE *īh* [i:ç] > *ēoh* [eox]. Yet it may equally have been suggested by the manuscript tradition as the alternate values (*i* or *h*) of the *Codex Salisburgensis* suggest. The late (ninth–tenth-century) date offered for the Dover stone inscription, which retains a value *i*, also points to the latter interpretation. It is similarly possible that the consonantal values stem from the time when the runes *calc* (ᛣ) and *gar* (ᚸ) were introduced to (somewhat inconsistently) distinguish allophones of OE /k/ and /g/, the yew rune signifying a similar distinction from **h**;[48] and indeed the northern English provenance (Thornhill, Great Urswick, Ruthwell and the Wihtred and Dægberht stycas) of the instances of the use of the thirteenth rune with a velar value seen alongside the presence of *calc* and *gar* in the northern lapidary inscriptions might seem supportive of this suggestion were it not for the analysis of the coins of the East Anglian moneyers Tilberht and Werferth offered by Mark Blackburn.[49] Alternatively, as the rune name for **h** began with [h], the otherwise redundant ʃ~ᛁ may, under the influence of its name, have been thought better to represent [ç] and [x] (irrespective of palatalisation), the

42 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, p. 182.

43 Cf. Raymond I. Page, 'Anglo-Saxon Runes and Magic', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 3rd series, 27 (1964), 14–31 (p. 29) [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, p. 121]; MacLeod and Mees, *Runic Amulets and Magic Objects*, pp. 82–83.

44 Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune', pp. 396–97.

45 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, pp. 47, 115, 137, 180–81; Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune', p. 391–92.

46 Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune', pp. 394–96.

47 Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, p. 14; cf. Waxenberger, 'The Yew-Rune', p. 392.

48 Cf. David N. Parsons, *Recasting the Runes: The Reform of the Anglo-Saxon Futhorc*, Runrön, 14 (Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk, Uppsala universitet, 1999), p. 84.

49 Blackburn, 'A Survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian Coins with Runic Inscriptions', pp. 155–56; cf. Raymond I. Page, 'Language and Dating in OE Inscriptions', *Anglia*, 77 (1959), 385–406, (pp. 388, 398–99) [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, pp. 31, 38].

medial allophones of /h/.[50] Nevertheless, when representing *i* it often appears near an **h**-rune or where one might be expected, possibly indicating that the spirant in its name influenced its employment from an early period.

A second consideration traditionally brought to bear in discussions of the purpose of the yew rune relates to its origin. Jens Jensen, for example, assuming a vocalic value for the thirteenth rune, has noticed that each *ætt* of the futhark contains two vowels.[51] His theory that the futhark is grouped by a tradition of the classical grammarians (e.g. Donatus, *Ars gram.* 1, 1) as the Irish Ogams are usually held to be is flawed by an attempt to use modern phonological categorisations, however, not those of antiquity (such as the *semivocales* and *mutae*).[52] The runes are clearly based on the Mediterranean alphabetic tradition and proponents of a Roman origin for the futhark have tended to link the yew rune with the similarly shaped Roman letter Z.[53] Yet as /z/ was clearly served by another character (ᛦ, putatively descended from Roman Y), a Roman thesis either points to a novel creation or perhaps a replacement for Greek ϒ (i.e. [y]), even if Greek words which feature upsilon are typically written with I in Roman inscriptions — e.g. NIMPHIS 'to the nymphs' (*CIL* XII 1092, XIII 8522 etc.). Richard Morris has proposed a link instead with the rare epichoric Greek variant of iota that has an identical form to the yew rune,[54] which may have a reflection in Etruscan.[55] From a North Etruscan perspective, however, the thirteenth rune seems closest in shape to a character from the Camunic tradition which is extremely rare and appears in inscriptions where its phonological value, ancestry and arguably even graphemic status are unclear.[56] Moreover, similar forms appear in two Rhaetic inscriptions, both of which have usually been interpreted in the past as defective forms of North Etruscan lambda (ᛚ). Nonetheless, they appear to represent labial values: i.e. Rhaetic ∫**AŚUNU** seems to represent the Italic hieronym

---

[50] Page, 'The Old English Rune *eoh*, *íh*, "Yew Tree" ', p. 129 [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, p. 138].

[51] Jens J. Jensen, 'The Problem of the Runes in the Light of Some Other Alphabets', *Norsk tidskrift for sprogvidenskap*, 23 (1969), 128–46.

[52] For the ogams see Wolfgang Keller's review of Helmut Arnzt, *Das Ogom* (Leipzig 1935) in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 47 (1936), 33–35; Wolfgang Keller, 'Die Entstehung des Ogom', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 62 (1938), 121–32 (pp. 125–26); Rudolf Thurneysen, 'Zum Ogom', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 61 (1937), 188–208 (pp. 203–4).

[53] Wimmer, *Die Runenschrift*, p. 134; Sigurd Agrell, 'Der Urprung der Runenschrift und die Magie', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 43 (1927), 97–107 (pp. 105–6); Fritz Askeberg, *Norden och kontinenten i gammal tid: Studier i forngermansk kulturhistoria* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1944), p. 83; Odenstedt, *On the Origin and Early History of the Runic Script*, p. 164; Henrik Williams, 'The Origin of the Runes', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 45 (1996), 211–18.

[54] Richard L. Morris, *Runic and Mediterranean Epigraphy*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 4 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1988). For the iota variant itself see Margherita Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, 4 vols (Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1967–78), I 102, 181, 183, 194.

[55] Guilio Buonamici, *Epigrafia etrusca* (Florence: Rinascimento del libro, 1932), p. 122.

[56] Thomas L. Markey, 'A Tale of Two Helmets: The Negau A and B Inscriptions', *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 29 (2001), 69–172 (p. 92). All the inscriptions seem to be a potter's marks, i.e. anthroponymic abbreviations: cf. ∫-**S-U** (*Museo Archeologico Nationale delle Valle Camonica: Guida dai materiali al territorio*, ed. by Filli Rossi (Milan: ET, 1989), p. 16) and **U**ᛚ, Museo Archeologico Nationale della Valle Camonica, inv. no. ST 79011 (as autopsied by Thomas L. Markey, to whom we are grateful for the reference).

Vesuna[57] and ⌐**AUSPE**[58] is probably an anthroponym comparable in the first instance to Rhaetic **ΦAUSUT**,[59] and then Etruscan *Haspa* and the commoner *Hasti*, *Hastia*, *Hausti*, *Fasti*, *Fastia* 'Fausta'. The development of this character may represent a response to the 'pernicious homography' noted by Markey whereby the frequent development of North Etruscan alpha to an 'open' form (i.e. ↑, much as has obviously occurred with runic **a**) provoked either the loss, functional replacement or a distinguishing variation in the inherited form of digamma (also ↑), the ancestor of Roman F (hence, presumably, the upturned branches of runic **f**, ⊬).[60] In fact the proclivity for Etruscoid characters to show a variation of labial and velar fricative values is well known.[61] Hence an identification with this North Etruscan ↲~⌐ may indicate that the later consonantal value was closer to the original sound represented by the yew rune than the vocalic. Yet this value is clearly shared by the **h**-rune, a fact that once again implies that the yew rune was phonologically superfluous from the time of the inception of the futhark.

A similar redundancy has also been proposed for the Ing rune (◇, ↑, ⟡), a character whose presence among the Old Germanic letters seems similarly idiosyncratic. After all, the Mediterranean scripts did not employ a separate character (*figura*) for the sound usually associated with this staff — hence Antonsen's demand that the rune be connected with Greek agma,[62] the name given to gamma by ancient grammarians when it served to indicate velar nasals.[63] Yet the Ing rune seems to be unnecessary in the futhark. Although often thought to be employed for [ŋ] or [ŋg], it is frequently omitted when expected: in fact, except for in the Årstad inscription's **uŋwinaʀ** (which was read by Krause as a late form of a genitive *Jungawinaiz*) and in the unclear Leţcani find's **raŋo** (where the rune has also been read as a **z** or a mirror rune), in elder inscriptions the Ing rune seems merely to be used as shorthand for ⟨iŋg⟩, the first syllable of its Proto-Germanic name.[64] Gerd Høst, after an inspection of the Årstad stone *in situ*, however, has declared that Krause's reading is incorrect, and as Antonsen had divined, the apparent **ŋ** is in fact a **k** (Krause's **uŋ** better to be read as **ek**).[65] As there

[57] Stefan Schumacher, *Die rätischen Inschriften. Geschichte und heutiger Stand der Forschung*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft, 79 (Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1992), no. SZ-15; Markey, 'An *interpretatio Italica* among the Casalini (Sanzeno) votives and another Helbig hoax', in *L'Umbro e le altri lingue dell'Italia mediana antica: Atti del I Convegno Internazionale sugli Antichi Umbri, Gubbio, 20–22 settembre 2001*, ed. by Augusto Ancillotti and Alberto Calderini (Perugia: Jama, 2009), 97–136 (pp. 102–8).

[58] Stefan Schumacher, 'Neufunde "rätischer" Inschriften', *Studi etruschi*, 59 (1994), 307–20 (no. HI-5).

[59] Schumacher, *Die rätischen Inschriften*, no. NO-7.

[60] Markey, 'A Tale of Two Helmets', pp. 99ff.

[61] Bernard Mees, 'The North Etruscan Thesis of the Origin of the Runes', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 115 (2000), 33–82 (pp. 64–65); Markey, 'A Tale of Two Helmets', p. 95; Thomas L. Markey, 'Early Celticity in Slovenia and at Rhaetic Magrè (Schio)', *Linguistica*, 46 (2006), 145–72.

[62] Antonsen, *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, pp. 102–3.

[63] Edgar H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: Linguistics Society of America / University of Pennsylvania, 1940), pp. 35–39; W. Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 35–39.

[64] KJ 58; Wolfgang Krause, 'Die gotische Runeninschrift von Letcani', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 83 (1969), 53–61; Mindy MacLeod, *Bind-Runes: An Investigation of Ligatures in Runic Epigraphy*, Runrön, 15 (Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk, Uppsala universitet, 2002), pp. 44–46. This excepts the **iriŋg**[of the doubtful Rubring inscription; see also Bernard Mees, 'Runo-Gothica: The Runes and the Origin of Wulfila's Script', *Die Sprache*, 43 (2002), 55–79 (p. 74) for a re-reading of the apparent **ŋ** of the Leţcani inscription as a mirror-rune **þ**.

[65] Gerd Høst, 'Die Årstad-Inschrift — eine Neuwertung', in *Runor och ABC: Elva föreläsningar från ett symposium i Stockholm våren 1995*, ed. by Staffan Nyström, Runica et Mediævalia, 4 (Stockholm: Stockholms

is no other example in a lexical employment in Krause's corpus where **ŋ** clearly does not also represent a vocalic value, it seems that, with the exception of the English inscriptions, this staff always bears a syllabic value, and thus the notion that the 'lantern' variant of the form (ᛜ, ᛝ) is a bind-rune of **i** and **ŋ** (ᛁ and ◇) must be false.[66] Gerhard Alexander, following William Moulton's reconstruction of the Proto-Germanic obstruents, maintains that the Ing rune was required to distinguish the plosive allophone of PG */g/ that appeared after */n/ from the usual fricative realisation, implying that it was not originally redundant, but became confused with [ŋ] — a theory consistent with its reconstructed rune name *Ingwaz.[67] Yet runic inscriptions usually omit nasals before homo-organic obstruents. In modern Germanic dialects, the /ŋ/ phoneme only develops from */ng/ (not */nk/ or */nh/), and the timeframe for the development of */ng/ > /ŋ/ is unclear in Germanic. The apparently trustworthy evidence of the sixteenth-century English orthoepists for retention of [ŋg] pronunciations might be called into question given the appearance of fourteenth-century spellings such as *lenth* and *strenth*.[68] And despite the confident assertions of some handbooks, neither is the evidence of the manuscript languages categorical. Middle High German alternations such as *dinc* : *dinges* might merely reveal a reinterpretation of [ŋ] (if not [ŋg]) as [ŋk]. Similarly, Old Norse verbal forms such as *ganga*, *gakk*, *gengu*, *gekk* surely represent a historical development (as the geminate *kk* continues the *nk* of an earlier time), and once again may show an *[ŋ] (if not [ŋg]) devoicing to an *[ŋk]. Much of this behaviour is consistent with the generativist theory that reinterprets modern /ŋ/ as an abstract morphophonemic /ng/ cluster (with synchronic *n* → *ŋ* and *g*, *ɣ* → *k*, Ø rules) which explains similar behaviour in modern languages today, such as in some dialects of Dutch and German (and compare the non-standard English pronunciations [ɛniθiŋk] and [ɛniθən], *anything*).[69] Moreover, not only is the status of traditional /ŋ/ quite unlike that of other Germanic phonemes (both in its positional distribution and in its variation

Medeltidsmuseum, 1987), pp. 155–61; Antonsen, *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*, pp. 12, 34; cf. Elmer H. Antonsen, 'What Kind of Science is Runology?', *Det Konglige Norske Videnskapers Selskabs Forhandlinger* (1995), 125–39 (pp. 127–29); Antonsen, *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, pp. 4–5.

[66] The 'lantern' form clearly cannot be a bind-rune in the Grumpan rune-row, and the inscription on the Årstad stone was the only example in a lexical employment where the staffless form was interpreted by Krause as only [ŋg]. As this rune presumably derives from a reflex of archaic Greek qoppa (ϙ), and as Etruscan inscriptions preserve forms both with and without a *hasta* (and, as in runic, favour the former), this cannot be the case; cf. Kai-Erik Westergaard, *Skrifttegn og symboler: Noen studier over tegnformer i det eldre rune-alfabet*, Osloer Beiträge zur Germanistik, 6 (Oslo: Germanistisches Institut der Universität Oslo, 1981), pp. 136–88; Michael P. Barnes, 'The New Runic Finds from Illerup and the Question of the Twenty-Second Rune', *Saga og sed* (1984), 59–76; Bengt Odenstedt, 'Om typologi och grafisk variation i den äldre futharken', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 100 (1985), 1–15; Ottar Grønvik, 'Über den Lautwert der Ing-Rune und die Auslassung von Vokal in den älteren Runeninschriften', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 90 (1985), 168–95.

[67] Gerhard Alexander, 'Die Herkunft der Ing-Rune', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 104 (1975), 1–11; William G. Moulton, 'The Stops and Spirants of Early Germanic', *Language*, 30 (1954), 1–46 (pp. 31–32, 42); William G. Moulton, 'The Proto-Germanic Non-syllabics (Consonants)', in *Toward a Grammar of Proto-Germanic*, ed. by Frans van Coetsem and Herbert L. Kufner (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), pp. 141–73 (p. 173). In fact this is the only place in which PG */g/ was clearly a plosive as geminate Proto-Germanic mediae were at the very least rare; Louis L. Hammerich, 'Die germanische und die hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 77 (1955), 1–30, 165–203 (p. 175), and a recent Lepontic find witnesses North Etruscan qoppa representing Celtic /gʷ/; Francisco Rubat Borel, 'Lingue e scritture delle Alpi occidentali prima della romanizzazione: stato della questione e nuove ricerche', *Bulletin d'études préhistoriques et archéologiques alpines*, 16 (2005), 9–50 (pp. 15–19).

[68] Eric J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500–1700*, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), II, 971–73.

[69] Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle, *The Sound Pattern of English*, Studies in Language (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 85; Theo Vennemann, 'The German Velar Nasal: A Case for Abstract Phonology', *Phonetica*, 22 (1970), 65–82; Pierre Swiggers, 'On the Underlying "Velar Nasal" in Dutch', *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 74 (1985), 185–92.

with [ŋg]), in some modern dialects (e.g. the West Midlands and Northern English dialects, where *sing* is [siŋg], not [siŋ] and in some southern Norwegian dialects where *lange* is [laŋgə], not [laŋə]) it is absent (as a discrete structural unit) altogether.[70] Hence as the Ing rune only represents the nasal before */g/ in the older inscriptions, runic **ŋ** may well have been required for a PG */ŋ/.[71] In fact its absence when expected, e.g. in Reistad's **iuþingaʀ/idringaʀ** (KJ 74) might stem from a dialectal variation in the development of */ng/ such as still exists today. Clearly, the use of the **ŋ**-rune had broadened by the Old English period (e.g. the Ruthwell Cross's **uŋket**). Yet as the velar nasal was recognised by the classical grammarians (it had a *nomen*, agma, and *potestas*, but no separate *figura*), the extension of the use of the rune also to allophonic [ŋ] in Old English inscriptions (considering that late inscriptions such as that of the Ruthwell cross show a connection with the manuscript tradition) may have been due to the influence of classical grammatical learning, much as seems to be the case with a number of the values given to the Ogam signs in Irish manuscripts.[72] But can a similar innovation be detected in the case of the thirteenth rune?

The rune names of the futhark are mainly acrophonic and so their names can be used to assess the phonological values of the corresponding staves. It is also clear that the rune names change when the values of the staves change. This is most obviously the case with the rune name **ansuz* that in Old English became *os*, just as the associated fourth rune changed in value from *a* to *o*. The putative change in value of the thirteenth rune in the English tradition from *i* to *h* (or [ç]), however, did not necessitate a similar change in the rune name. This may indicate that the name *īh* suggested a new value for the yew rune.

The reconstruction of the name *yew* for the thirteenth rune seems to be corroborated by the Nordic name (mentioned above) and a Gothic name *uuaer* (< **hwair* 'cauldron') from the *Codex Salisburgensis* that similarly refers to a newly designated sound (in this case *hw*). In Gothic the acrophonic principle seems to have provoked a change in the inherited letter name — from **eihws* 'yew' to **hwair* (*uuaer*). Why this change occurred precisely is not clear, but the equation of *uuaer* with **eihws* and thus the thirteenth rune is supported by the correspondence of every other Gothic letter name to one from the older futhark (except that of ⟨q⟩ which is modelled, as in the English tradition, upon that of ⟨p⟩).[73]

The Proto-Germanic reconstruction of the runic letter name, however, is not so clear. Many different forms have been proffered, most runologists accepting an ambivalent **ī(h)waz*. Alfred Bammesberger has reconstructed two separate lexemes, **īwa-* and **īha-*, but evidence from outside Germanic suggests a different explanation.[74] Clearly the Indo-European root is

[70] Grønvik, *Runene på Tunesteinen*, pp. 27–29; Helge Sandøy, *Norsk dialektkunnskap* (Oslo: Novus, 1985), p. 75; Peter Ladefoged and Ian Maddieson, *The Sounds of the World's Languages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 2–3; Heinz J. Giegerich, *English Phonology: An Introduction*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 36.

[71] Cf. Alfred Bammesberger, 'Frisian and Anglo-Saxon Runes: From the Linguistic Angle', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 45 (1996), 15–23 (p. 21, n. 8); Frederick W. Schwink, 'The Velar Nasal in the Adaptation of the Runic Alphabet', *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 12 (2000), 235–49.

[72] Damien McManus, *A Guide to Ogam*, Maynooth Monographs, 4 (Maynooth: An Saggart, 1991), pp. 34–41.

[73] Mees, 'Runo-Gothica: The Runes and the Origin of Wulfila's Script', pp. 61–63; Elmar Seebold, 'Fuþark, Beith-Luis-Nion, He Lamedh, Abgad und Alphabet: Über die Systematik der Zeichenaufzählung bei Buchstaben-Schriften', in *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums: Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Frank Heidermanns, Helmut Rix and Elmar Seebold, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 78 (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1993), pp. 411–44 (pp. 419–20).

[74] Alfred Bammesberger, 'The Development of the Runic Script and its Relationship to Germanic Phonological

*ei- and the Old English names $ēoh$ and $īh$ suggest a voiceless velar enlargement. Yet this seems to appear only in Germanic; with the extension *-w-, the term already means 'yew' (or at least 'red plant') in other Indo-European languages: cf. OE $īh$, $ēoh$, $īw$, $ēow$, $ēo$, OHG $īha$, $īwa$, $īga$, OS (pl.) $īchas$, ON $ýr$; Gaulish ivo-, Old Irish $eó$, $í$, Middle Welsh $ywen$, Old Cornish $hiuin$, Breton $ivin$ (< *iwo-); Old Prussian $iuwis$ 'yew', Lithuanian $ievà$ 'black alder', Latvian $ieva$ 'bird-cherry', Old Czech $jíva$, Russian iva, Serbo-Croatian $ïva$ 'willow' (< *$īwa$); Latin $īva$ 'bunch of grapes, vine', Greek οἴη, ὄη, ὄα 'mountain ash' (< *$oiwa$); and Armenian $aygi$ 'grapevine' (< *$oiwiyā$). In fact Sanskrit $eito$ 'coloured' and Hittite $GIŠe(y)a(n)$- 'sacred evergreen' (< the Sumerogram for 'tree' + *eyo-) suggest that *-wo- produces the meaning 'yew, red plant' from the root *ei- 'red, mottled, yellow'.[75] These cognate forms indicate a late Indo-European formation *ei-wo- (with o-grade ablaut in Armenian and Greek, zero grade in Celtic) or as Connolly proposes perhaps a laryngealised reconstruction *$H(e)Hi$-wo-.[76] As there are in fact three attested Germanic forms, *$īwa$-, *$īga$- and *$īha$-, it has been suggested (Walde and Pokorny 1927–32:I. 165) that -g- and -h- derived from a strengthening of original -w- similar to that seen in $Jugend$ (vs. Latin $juventus$). The two velar extensions (the Old High German lenis velar is supported by an Old English toponymic element *$īg$),[77] however, suggest a lenition (of -h- > -g-) typical of that produced by Verner's law.

An Indo-European *$H(e)Hi$- might be used to justify both the old theory that the thirteenth rune represented some sort of /e(ː)/ as well as Connolly's laryngealist value /ɨ(ː)/ (but not Antonsen's structuralist /æː/). Yet the reconstruction of this name is not at all unproblematic. Did the rune name only ever show the velar extension? We have no sure employment of the rune as shorthand for its name which might confirm its name as we have for the Ing rune, and the comparative Gothic and Nordic evidence is unclear. In fact the Gothic names might not even be authentic, although they do seem to show specifically Gothic characteristics.[78] Only the Old English evidence is categorical: the English name is $ēoh$ or $īh$, whereas the usual Anglo-Saxon name for the yew was $ēo$, $ēow$ or $īw$.

History', in *Language Change and Language Structure: Older Germanic Languages in a Comparative Perspective*, ed. by Torvil Swan, Endre Mørck, Olaf Jansen Westvik, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 73 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), pp. 1–25 (p. 8).

[75] Cf. Franz Specht, *Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1944 [1947]), p. 63; *IEW*; Page, 'Anglo-Saxon Runes and Magic', p. 127 [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, pp. 135–36]; Paul Friedrich, *Proto-Indo-European Trees: The Arboreal System of a Prehistoric People* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 121–25; Т. В. Гамкрелидзе (T'amaz Gamqreliże) and Вяч. Вс. Иванов (Viacheslav Vsevolodovich Ivanov), Индоевропейский язык и Индоевропейцы: реконструкция и историко-типологический анализ праязыка и протокультуры, 2 vols (Tbilisi: Издательство Тбилисского университета, 1984), II, 628–30 (Thomas V. Gamkrelidze and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture,* trans. by Johanna Nichols, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 80, 2 vols (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), I, 540–41).

[76] Connolly, 'The Rune ⌇⌇ and the Germanic Vowel System', p. 15, n. 28.

[77] Albert Hugh Smith, *English Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Society, 25–26, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), I, 305.

[78] Cf. Theodor von Grienberger, 'Die germanischen Runennamen, 1. Die gotischen Buchstabennamen', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 21 (1896), 185–224; James W. Marchand, 'Les Gots ont-ils vraiment connu l'écriture runique?', in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie, Fernand Mossé in memoriam* (Paris: Didier, 1959), pp. 277–91; Wolfgang Krause, *Handbuch des Gotischen*, Handbücher für das Studium der Germanistik, 3rd edn (Munich: Beck, 1968), pp. 63–66; Norbert Wagner, 'Zu den Gotica der Salzburg-Wiener Alcuin-Handschrift', *Historische Sprachforschung*, 107 (1994), 262–83; Mees, 'The North Etruscan Thesis of the Origin of the Runes', pp. 56–63.

As we have already seen, the runic letter name probably influenced the phonological value given to ʃ~ʅ in Old English manuscripts. The original name of the rune cannot be reconstructed without some ambiguity, but given the evidence of at least two Continental inscriptions with a value of *i*, the name **īhaz* is eminently plausible. Indeed, as the lexeme *īh* only seems to have survived into Old English to represent the name of this rune, the fact that this rune is not signified by the usual Old English term for 'yew' points to both the importance and antiquity of this name.

Yet the name *īh* is but one of a number of rune names beginning with *i*. The other two are that of the ice rune (|), clearly (ultimately) a reflex of archaic Greek iota (also the ancestor of Roman I) and the Ing rune (◇, ↑, ⏀), ultimately derived (it is usually argued) from archaic Greek qoppa (ϙ; cf. Roman Q). If the thirteenth rune bore an acrophonic name then its original value would have been similar in sound to *i*. But if it, like the Ing rune, did not have an acrophonic name, it would surely have originally had the extension which survives in the Old English tradition. The survival of the medial velar value in the name recorded in English manuscripts may have been ensured by a cognisance of the consonantal value allowed for this rune, even though it seems only to appear at a later date than the vocalic. The fact that the thirteenth rune never appears in initial position in clearly lexical inscriptions is also suggestive of the fricative interpretation of Grønvik and Seebold. Yet although [ç] sometimes appears in opposition to [x] in modern German, few theorists would accept the existence of a PG */ç/ phoneme separate to */h/. In fact the evidence for a comparatively late palatalisation of *h* in English even puts the Proto-Germanic *[ç] assumed by Seebold in doubt. Thus this value, like most of the vocalic values promoted for ʃ~ʅ, is merely an allophonic variant of a phoneme more typically represented by a separate staff (i.e. ᚺ, ᚻ) and is, moreover, a doubtful one at that. After all, the employment of a separate character for an allophone of /h/ is unparalleled among the Mediterranean scripts. Rather, we would expect the thirteenth rune to have represented a phoneme.

Connolly's theory has the strength of reconciling the value suggested by the rune name with a phoneme later lost to Germanic. This */ɨ(:)/ he derives from the influence of a laryngeal, represented as *X* after its vowel-colouring effect had become phonemic (in fact he uses *X* to signify any laryngeal whose description is uncertain). This Germanic laryngeal he suggests was the result of the merger of the proposed Indo-European non-, *a*- and most of the *o*-colouring laryngeals, the vocalic effects of which had already become phonemic before the Proto-Germanic period (thus IE **eH₂i-* > PG **aXi-*). He detected the putative presence of this laryngeal while attempting to explain the vagaries of descent of inherited IE **e*, **ei* and **i* among the different Germanic dialects. Indeed similar arguments have been proffered to explain other features such as the irregular velarisation of IE **-w-* in a group of Germanic terms first assembled by Sophus Bugge and the *Verschärfung* of semivowels in North and East Germanic first identified by Adolf Holtzmann.[79] In fact the influence of at least some laryngeals in early Proto-Germanic, at least where Holtzmann's law is concerned, seems to have been accepted by a majority of theorists.[80] Connolly's value for the thirteenth rune derives

[79] Sophus Bugge, 'Zur altgermanischen Sprachgeschichte. Germanisch *ug* aus *uw*', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 13 (1888), 504–15; Adolf Holtzmann, *Altdeutsche Grammatik: Umfassend die gotische, altnordische, altsächsische und althochdeutsche Sprache*, I (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1870–75), pp. 108–9.

[80] Cf. Henry Lee Smith, 'The *Verschärfung* in Germanic', *Language*, 17 (1941), 93–98; William M. Austin, 'A Corollary to the Germanic *Verschärfung*', *Language*, 22 (1946), 109–11; 'Germanic Reflexes of Indo-European *-Hy-* and *-Hw-*', *Language*, 34 (1958), 103–11; Edgar C. Polomé, 'A West Germanic Reflex of

from an Indo-European element containing a laryngeal we might reconstruct as $*H_1(e)H_1i$-, one that probably served as the root of the Indo-European lexeme *yew*.[81] All of this, however, assumes that the thirteenth rune is to be derived from some Mediterranean ⟨i⟩ (or Z substituting for Y). Yet what if it was in origin an ⟨h⟩?

As noted before, the vocalic sound which is the earliest surely attested value for this staff supports Connolly's reconstruction of the thirteenth rune as representing a Proto-Germanic $*i$ created by the influence of an intervocalic Proto-Germanic laryngeal (the colourless laryngeal surviving into Proto-Germanic only in intervocalic positions).[82] Connolly could not prove the existence of this value, however, through an analysis of the inscriptions. This is quite possibly because the use of the thirteenth rune had already changed by the time of its first lexical attestation (i.e. the fourth/fifth century). Connolly also postulates that this Proto-Germanic laryngeal had been lost some time prior to the first attestation of the yew rune. Indeed he proposes that the laryngeal probably disappeared soon after the fixing of Germanic stress on the initial syllable, a development suggested by some investigators not to have been completed until as late as the second century A.D.[83] Moreover, Connolly has also sought to demonstrate that a retained laryngeal affected the outcome of Verner's law in some classes of Germanic strong verbs.[84] Many laryngealist solutions merely equate the uncertain with the effect of these rather difficult to isolate phones. Yet granted the indeterminacy of attested values and the evidence of the development of the rune name, the thirteenth rune is not implausibly to be associated with the Proto-Germanic laryngeal proposed as the cause of the developments first delineated by Bugge and Holtzmann that was lost early in the Proto-Germanic period.

The comparatively late appearance of the yew rune in a lexical employment suggests that the sound that it originally represented had already been lost by the time of the provenance of

the *Verschärfung*', *Language*, 25 (1949), 182–89; 'Laryngaaltheorie en Germaanse Verscherping', *Handelingen der Zuid-Nederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis*, 4 (1950), 61–75; 'Theorie "laryngeale" et germanique', in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie, Fernand Mossé in memoriam* (Paris: Didier, 1959), pp. 387–402; 'Are there Traces of Laryngeals in Germanic?', in *Die Laryngealtheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Reihe: Untersuchungen, 3 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1988), I, 383–414; Winfred P. Lehmann, *Proto-Indo-European Phonology* (Austin: Univerity of Texas Press, 1955), pp. 36–52; *Germanic Evidence: Evidence for Laryngeals*, ed. by Werner Winter; Series maior; Janua linguarum; Series maior, 11 (The Hague: Mouton, 1965), pp. 212–23; Rosemarie Lühr, 'Germanische Resonantengemination durch Laryngal', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 35 (1976), 73–92; Jay Jasanoff, 'Observations on the Germanic *Verschärfung*', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 37 (1978), 77–90; Neville Edgar Collinge, *The Laws of Indo-European*, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 35 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1985), pp. 93–101; Seiichi Suzuki, 'The Germanic *Verschärfung*: A Syllabic Perspective', *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 19 (1991), 163–90; Garry W. Davis and Gregory K. Iverson, 'The *Verschärfung* as Feature Spread', in *Germanic Linguistics: Syntactic and Diachronic*, ed. by Rosina Lippi-Green and Joseph C. Salmons, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 137 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1996), pp. 103–20; Laura C. Smith, 'What's All the Fuss with Sixteen Words? A New Approach to Holtzmann's Law', *Göttinger Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft,* 1 (1998), 75–100.

[81] The precise value and position of the laryngeals in Indo-European *yew*, however, are difficult to determine. Connolly posits two, one initially, one intervocalically, i.e. $*H_eHiwo$-, and considers that at least one was H_3. Heiner Eichner, 'Die urindogermanische Wurzel $*H_2reu$ "hell machen" ', *Die Sprache*, 24 (1978), 144–62 (p. 151), instead suggests up to three, one after the diphthong, one in the extension, and possibly a third initially, claiming H_1 or H_3 as the likely candidates for the first two laryngeals, i.e. $*(H_{1/3})eiH_{1/3}$-*we*-H_2-.

[82] Connolly, 'ē₂ and the Laryngeal Theory', p. 27.

[83] e.g. Robert Woodhouse, 'Verner's and Thurneysen's laws in Gothic as Evidence for Obstruent Development in Early Germanic', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 120 (1998), 194–222.

[84] Connolly, ' "Grammatischer Wechsel" and the Laryngeal Theory'.

most of the early inscriptions and that its attested values may all be secondary. Our only clear evidence for its original value is its name, a name that seems to have suggested its attested values, and the possibility (if not likelihood) that the yew rune continues either an archaic Greek iota, Roman Z substituting for Y or a North Etruscan reflex of digamma in the Germanic script. When it betrays a consonantal value, it is a velar, as is the usual description of a laryngeal (thus the transcriptions *H* and *X*), and a similar value is often thought to have resulted upon the hardening of a laryngeal in Germanic.[85] As the Indo-European laryngeals in initial position are usually considered to be the first to have been lost, and as laryngeals probably only survived into Germanic in word-medial positions, a rune denoting a laryngeal is not likely to have had an acrophonic name. According to Edward Sapir (1938 = 1990–94:V.126–31), a laryngeal is often absorbed when in a cluster with a sonorant consonant. Consequently, he used a typological comparison with similar developments in some American Indian languages to explain the development of Gk. *he-* < IE **we-* as an assimilation of voicelessness from a proximate laryngeal — i.e. IE **Hwe-* > **u̯e-* > *he-*. And as has long been suspected, a similar assimilation may have occurred in Holtzmann's *Verschärfung* when *-Hw-* and *-wH-* developed to *-ggw-* in North and East Germanic.[86] Moreover, the development of IE **-w-* to *-g-* or *-k-* first noted by Bugge may also have been influenced by the close presence of a laryngeal. A similar velarisation of the extension *-w-* to *-h-* has occurred in some forms of the Germanic term for 'yew', and in fact in some dialects it seems under Verner's law to have further developed to *-g-*. Indeed the reconstruction of the Gothic name with a totally unexpected medial *-hw-* appears to confirm the presence of a laryngeal preceding the semivocalic extension in the Proto-Germanic form of the rune name. The effect of laryngeals on semivowels in Germanic might well vary between dialects (and even within them) as the Gothic rune name *sugil* (cf. OE *sygel*) versus Wulfilian *sauil* (< IE **sH₂uel-*, **seH₂ul-*) has been suggested to show by Winfred Lehmann.[87] And so when this sound was lost, if it had a corresponding rune, this staff would probably at first have been associated with *h*.[88] Thus the phonological redundancy of the thirteenth rune would soon have become apparent, only its name remaining (as the pairs of names were probably learned as a mnemonic),[89] and a new value, *i*, might well have become associated with this rune, a value derived from its name.

---

[85] And this laryngeal would most probably be H_3, perhaps a pharyngealised voiceless velar fricative, possibly with some labial quality. Indeed, in Connolly's reconstruction H_1 and H_2 seem to have already been lost or had merged with H_3 by this time, and so his *X* would probably have had a description similar to H_3.

[86] See Henry Lee Smith, 'The *Verschärfung* in Germanic'; Austin, 'A Corollary to the Germanic *Verschärfung*'; Austin, 'Germanic Reflexes of Indo-European *-Hy-* and *-Hw-*'; Polomé, 'A West Germanic Reflex of the *Verschärfung*'; Polomé, 'Laryngaaltheorie en Germaanse Verscherping'; Polomé, 'Theorie "laryngeale" et germanique'; and Lehmann, *Proto-Indo-European Phonology*, pp. 36–52; Lehmann, 'Germanic Evidence', pp. 212–23.

[87] Lehmann, *Proto-Indo-European Phonology*, p. 49; cf. Eric P. Hamp, 'Indo-European **au* before Consonant in British and Indo-European "Sun" ', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 26 (1975), 97–102; Mees, 'Runo-Gothica: The Runes and the Origin of Wulfila's Script', p. 60.

[88] Cf. Armenian, where inherited initial H_2 and H_3 produce *h-*, and Hittite, where the reflex of H_2 (and occasionally H_3) is represented by *h̬*, a character that usually describes a voiceless velar fricative, but in Akkadian represented values that continued various Proto-Semitic velar fricatives, laryngeals and pharyngeals: *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology*, ed. by Sabatino Moscati, Porta linguarum orientalium; Neue Serie, 6 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1964), p. 39; Robert S. P. Beekes, 'The Nature of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals', in *The New Sound of Indo-European: Essays in Phonological Reconstruction*, ed. by Theo Vennemann, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 41 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989), pp. 23–33.

[89] Williams, 'The Origin of the Runes', p. 217; Mees, 'The North Etruscan Thesis of the Origin of the Runes', p. 73.

The English manuscript tradition quite clearly indicates that two values were associated with the thirteenth rune and the evidence of the inscriptions seems to mirror this ambivalence. Evidently some inscribers remembered the association with *h* as recorded in the velarity of the medial consonant of the rune name; others derived a value *i* from the acrophonic principle of most of the other names. After the last Proto-Germanic laryngeal was lost, it is possible that its approximate value may have been retained in its runic letter name which in the English tradition always contains the velar as opposed to semivocalic extension that is exclusive to the Germanic terms for 'yew'.

Erik Brate was the first to posit that the medial value of the associated rune name may have been the original value of the thirteenth staff.[90] Eduard Sievers tentatively modified Brate's value *ç* to *hw*, clearly after considering the Gothic evidence. This solution was subsequently sponsored by Bruce Dickins and C. L. Wrenn.[91] Other investigations attempting to find a unique vocalic value for the yew rune have proved unsatisfactory, employing controversial descriptions of the vocalic system, or promoting values which are surely only allophonic realisations of one of the Proto-Germanic vowel phonemes usually accepted by theorists. A laryngeal value for this rune, however, reconciles the evidence of the rune name, the evidence suggested by a North Etruscan prototype for the runic script, and relies on an identity with a Proto-Germanic phoneme that was lost by the time of the dialectal period.

The major problem with such an identity, however, is that there is no clear evidence that the laryngeals reconstructed for Indo-European lasted long enough in Germanic to have required separate representation in the futhark. Not even a hint of a laryngeal has been detected so far in the earliest evidence from classical sources, the Negau (Žcnjak) B inscription (the form **TEIVA** perhaps being especially relevant to a consideration of an early Germanic **eiwaz*); or indeed the early runic inscriptions themselves. Moreover, as runic **t** and **b**, derived (ultimately) from archaic Greek tau and beta, still represent *t* and *b*, and the inherited archaic Greek heta has retained its value as the Germanic staff **h**, the Germanic adoption of these letters must post-date the first effecting of Grimm's law; and clearly, laryngeals have no effect on the operation of the Common Germanic sound shift (cf. esp. Greek κεφαλή, Lat. *caput*, ON *hǫfuð*, OE *heafod*, Goth. *haubiþ*, OS *hobid*, OHG *houbit* < IE **kepH-* 'head'). The variation between voiced and voiceless forms in the extension of the rune name where **-w-* was velarised, if not evidence for such velarisation occurring at different times in different dialects, may well derive from the different accentuation in the forms of the term that would have applied before the loss of nominal ablaut in Germanic: i.e. **H₁éi-(H)wo-/H₁(e)i-(H)wó- > *īga-/īha-*. As Bammesberger has suggested, there remains the possibility of the influence of a semantically separate vṛddhi formation (putatively meaning 'yew wood') in early Germanic as a lengthened-grade form of *yew* might well have existed in Proto-Germanic.[92] Yet not only are such formations rare in Germanic, vṛddhi constructions are not attested for this lexeme in other Indo-European dialects. Indeed, we might even expect formations influenced

[90] Erik Brate, 'Runologiska spörsmål', *Konglige Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens månadsblad*, 5 (1886), 1–25 (pp. 1–9); Erik Brate, 'Runradens ordningsföljd', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 36 (1920), 193–207 (p. 199).

[91] Eduard Sievers, 'Runen und Runeninschriften', in *Grundriß der germanischen Philologie. I*, ed. by Hermann Paul (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1891), pp. 238–50 (table after p. 250); Bruce Dickins, 'A System of Transliteration for Old English Runic Inscriptions', *Leeds Studies in English*, 1 (1932), 15–19; Charles Leslie Wrenn, 'Magic in an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery', in *English and Medieval Studies presented to J. R. R. Tolkein on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by Norman Davis and Charles Leslie Wrenn (London: Allen & Unwin, 1962), pp. 306–21.

[92] Bammesberger, 'The Development of the Runic Script and its Relationship to Germanic Phonological History', p. 8.

by an **ēigwa-* to show some variation between high and middle vowels in the root given the connection between **ēi* and the problematic *ē₂* promoted by some authors.[93] The laryngealist explanation of velarisation in some Germanic forms, given no evidence for a medial laryngeal in their Indo-European cognates, remains unconvincing. Moreover the *Verschärfung* and the velarisations of **-w-* to *-g-* and *-k-* first collected by Bugge might equally be explained as the result of an expressive process similar to the gemination of West Germanic.[94]

   A close *e* value was that which originally led to the transcription *ė*. Yet given the attestations as *i*, surely Krause's **ï** remains more practical wherever the thirteenth rune is attested as a vowel. And surely a transcription **ç** is quite inadequate for this rune when it represents a consonant as its palatal status is far from clear. Similarly, the less phonologically judgemental transcription preferred latterly by Page unfortunately bears the connotation of Connolly's (IPA) value /ɨ(ː)/ and there seems little point in adding to the already idiosyncratic inventory of Germanic phonological transcriptions by employing the well-established IPA symbol ɨ to refer to something quite different as would Page.[95] Yet Dickins's transcription 'ʒ' seems in part to represent a relationship of runic *ēoh* to Middle English *yogh*. Indeed the variable Middle English use of ⟨ʒ⟩ (for the palatal semivowel and both voiced, and finally and before *t*, also voiceless fricatives) appears somewhat to parallel that of the earlier runic sign. Moreover, the relationship between the two names proposed by Anna Paues, i.e. *ēoh* > **yoh* > *yogh* in parallel to the developments of the names of ME *thorn* and *wynn* from those of runic **þ** and **w**,[96] is quite possible when we consider that a similar vocalic development had occurred in some toponyms by the Middle English period,[97] and that the final *-h* might well have been re-interpreted as a devoiced final *-g*. Her contention that the shape of the yew rune can be seen reflected in ⟨ʒ⟩ is also strengthened by a preponderance of reversed (ᛡ) instances of the rune in the later English tradition as is represented by the two rune-row inscriptions and the coin legends, and the confusion of the thirteenth rune with ⟨z⟩ in the manuscript futhorc of the Codex Cotton Otho B.x. In fact given that ⟨þ⟩ clearly derives from runic **þ**, and ⟨ƿ⟩ equally from runic **w**, it seems rather unlikely that ⟨ʒ⟩ merely represents a variant of scribal ⟨g⟩ as was argued by Henry Bradley — *yogh* instead appears to represent a conflation of miniscule ⟨g⟩ and runic ᛡ.[98] So despite the inevitable confusion with the IPA value [ʒ] or Middle English *gh*, we might prefer to maintain the Old English transcription of Dickins whenever the rune

---

93   Grønvik, *Runene på Tunesteinen*, p. 203; Joseph B. Voyles, *Early Germanic Grammar: Pre-, Proto- and Post-Germanic Languages* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1992), pp. 72–74. Cf. Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic', pp. 34–36.

94   Jerzy Kuryłowicz, 'The Germanic *Verschärfung*', *Language*, 43 (1967), 445–51; Robert S. P. Beekes, 'Germanic "Verschärfung" and no Laryngeals', *Orbis*, 21 (1972), 326–36; Elmar Seebold, 'Die Übergang von idg. *-w-* zu germ. *-k-* und *-g-*', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 87 (1982), 172–94; Thomas L. Markey, 'The Laryngeal Theory and Aspects of Germanic Phonology', in *Die Laryngealtheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Reihe: Untersuchungen, 3 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1988), pp. 322–23 (pp. 322–23); Polomé, 'Are there Traces of Laryngeals in Germanic?', pp. 69–70; Joseph B. Voyles, 'Laryngeals in Germanic', *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literature*, 1 (1989), 17–53; Voyles, *Early Germanic Grammar*, pp. 27–28; and Bernard Mees, 'The Stentoften Dedication and Sacral Kingship', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 140 (2011), 281–305.

95   Raymond I. Page, 'On the Transliteration of English Runes', *Medieval Archaeology*, 28 (1984), 22–45 (pp. 31–32) [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, pp. 256–57]; Page, *An Introduction to English Runes*, p. 40.

96   Anna C. Paues, 'The name of the letter ʒ', *Modern Language Review*, 6 (1911), 441–54.

97   Jürgen Giffhorn, *Phonologische Untersuchungen zu den altenglischen Kurzdiphthongen* (Munich: Fink, 1974), pp. 117–19.

98   Henry Bradley, 'Discussion of Paues', *Modern Language Review*, 7 (1912), 520–21.

can be shown to represent a consonant and Krause's **ï** elsewhere, rather than Page's somewhat unfortunate 'ɨ'.[99]

In runic, a second inherited sign for *h* would appear to have been redundant. It seems likely that it would have been readily re-employed for another consonantal value if one was required to represent early Germanic. Yet there is no evidence of a palatal allophone of PG */h/ at such an early stage, let alone a */ç/ phoneme. Moreover, as Markey has pointed out, the North Etruscan alphabet used to record Venetic developed an additional iota which could well be the prototype of runic **ï**:[100] this punctuated iota (·**i**·) developed a graphemic independence from the usual Venetic iota as it had come to form the second part of the Venetic perigram for /f/; i.e. an earlier **vh** had been replaced by a spelling **v·i·** after **h** had become redundant phonologically in Venetic.[101] It may well, then, have come to be associated with the Rhaetic ʃ~ʅ as both were, in effect, secondary forms of digamma. The remarkable variation in inherited kappa in the North Etruscan alphabet used in the Val Camonica includes forms reminiscent of the Venetic **ii** perigram (many even reduced in size) and it is obvious that this doubling of iota (used to indicate palatal glides in Venetic) can explain the formation of runic **j**.[102] Indeed the few inscriptions where these Camunic 'kappas' appear also make much more sense phonologically if a semivocalic value is assumed for this runic **j**-like letter: compare Piancogno's **IIIIANOAŚ**,[103] i.e. **I{I}JANOAŚ** rather than **KKANOAŚ**, and perhaps Pla d'Ort's **ZEI×SIJAU** (**ZEI×SIIIAU**) rather than **ZEI×SIKAU**.[104] The letter transcribed as **Í**, the 'Claudian *i*' known from other epichoric Italian traditions, also appears in a Camunic inscription where it clearly indicates a glide, i.e. in **EŚUÍI**, 'to Esus' (?),[105] and some of the abecedaria from Foppe di Nadro suggest that **Í** may have gradually usurped the position of ksi in the Camunic ordering.[106] The appearance of both **Í** and **II** in Camunic, the North Etruscan tradition long considered to be closest to runic, suggests two new variants of iota were added to the prototype upon which the runes may have been based, one replacing a redundant sibilantic character, the other usurping the grapheme which had already come to serve in some Rhaetic centres as a disambiguating replacement for digamma in light of the development of an 'open' form of alpha. A comparatively late Camunic graph identical in form to the yew rune has of course been isolated and although it is both of unclear phonological value and origin, it may well be that it has replaced the earlier Camunic 'Claudian *i*' (i.e. **Í**), perhaps under Venetic influence. Both variant *i*-graphs (which under a North Etruscan thesis may have produced runic **j** and **ï**) ultimately seem to be modelled on orthographical developments in Venetic. Yet they still appear to have entered the prototype upon which the runes are based (given a North Etruscan derivation) as if it were that of the Val Camonica rather than a more easterly tradition.

[99] Cf. Looijenga, *Texts and Contexts of the Oldest Runic Inscriptions*, pp. 139–41.

[100] Markey, 'A Tale of Two Helmets', pp. 91–92.

[101] Michel Lejeune, *Manuel de la langue vénète*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, I. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher (Heidelberg: Winter, 1974), p. 23.

[102] Mees, 'The North Etruscan Thesis of the Origin of the Runes', pp. 63–64.

[103] Maria Grazia Tibiletti Bruno, 'Nuove iscrizioni camune', *Quaderni camuni*, 49–50 (1990), 29–169 (no. PC 35*a*, 47).

[104] Tibiletti Bruno, 'Nuove iscrizioni camune', no. Pl. 2*b*,64.

[105] Tibiletti Bruno, 'Nuove iscrizioni camune', no. CC 68; Alessandro Morandi, 'Epigrafia camuna. Osservazioni su alcuni aspetti della documentazione', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 79 (1998), 99–124 (p. 104); Alessandro Morandi, *Celti d'Italia, tomo II: Epigrafia e lingua dei Celti d'Italia* (Rome: Spazio Tre, 2004), no. 270.

[106] Tibiletti Bruno, 'Nuove iscrizioni camune', nos FN 4*d*,60; 5*e*,61; and 6*f*,62.

Yet few runologists support a North Etruscan origin for the runes today, so like a laryngeal explanation for the thirteenth rune, a derivation of the yew rune from an archaic *i/h* grapheme might seem rather speculative and hence unlikely. After all, the later English and Gothic velar values associated with the letter name *yew* may only have arisen after the redundancy of what had become a second rune for *i* was recognised, the medial values suggested by the rune name being adopted independently. Nonetheless there is something of a tradition of confluence between descendants of iota and heta and the values *i* and *h* in many Mediterranean orthographies: recall the orthographical heta~iota variation in Venetic (i.e. **vh~v·i·** for *f*), Messapic displays a similar bivalency for heta (i.e. Anlaut *h-*~Inlaut *-y-*)[107] and there is even a formal confusion between some forms of ⟨h⟩ and ⟨i⟩ both in epigraphical Latin (i.e. of half-H and Claudian *i*) and archaic Greek (heta/eta-cum-spiritus asper and iota). Indeed not only is half-H a particularly notable feature of Rhenish epigraphy, the appearance of a variation between -EI-, -I- and -E- attested in Germano-Roman material from the Rhineland is also reminiscent of what might be happening with the yew rune as this variation is usually concomitant with a following -H-.[108] Given the frequency of suffixal *-īg-* in Germanic, **īgaz/*īhaz* would also seem a likely name for a rune connected with this sequence.[109] Nevertheless the comparatively late emergence of velar values in Germanic use for the thirteenth rune suggest that the bivalency in runic was not inherited. In fact it may well have been that much as ŋ had come to represent /ing/, ï at one stage became a semi-ideographic way of writing /iːg/ (or rather /i̡ːg/).[110]

Yet despite the rejection here of a laryngealist approach to the problem of the origin of the rune itself, of all the explanations for the development of velarity in the three attested Northwest Germanic terms for 'yew', only the ones based in the laryngeal theory seem to offer much promise. Seebold's explanation for the terms assembled by Bugge can only explain the underlying *-w-* > *-g-* (and a further devoicing of *-g-* > *-h-* seems unparalleled; indeed surely the opposite development would be more likely in a language where fricatives were subject to positional voicing).[111] Similarly, Voyles's reliance on an IE **-g-* infix cannot apply to **īhaz* and Franz Specht's reliance on an alternation of **-w-* and **-k-* at the Indo-European level has no broadly accepted parallels.[112] Criticising Wren, Page even went so far as to dispute the reconstruction **īhwaz* completely, but offered no explanation for the crucial emergence of voiceless velarity.[113] It has long been recognised that Germanic alternations of *-w-*, *-g-* and *-h-* can be linked to the inconsistent development of inherited labiovelars, however,[114] a linkage which accords well with the connection often assumed between the thirteenth rune and Gothic ⟨ƕ⟩.

[107] Hans Krahe, *Die Sprache der Illyrier I: Die Quellen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1955), p. 14.

[108] Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic'.

[109] Hans Krahe and Wolfgang Meid, *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft, III: Wortbildungslehre*, Sammlung Göschen, 234, 7th edn (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), pp. 192–93.

[110] And in late Gothic the name **eihws* appears to have been surrendered in favour of a more suitably acrophonic **hwair > uuaer*. Indeed given developments such as **teiws > tyz, þiuþ > thyth* and **aihws > eyz* among the other *Codex Salisburgensis* names, **eihws* might well otherwise have produced a homonym to the name for Gothic ⟨e⟩; see Mees, 'Runo-Gothica: The Runes and the Origin of Wulfila's Script', pp. 60–62.

[111] Seebold, 'Die Übergang von idg. *-w-* zu germ. *-k-* und *-g-*'.

[112] Voyles, 'Laryngeals in Germanic', p. 41; Specht, *Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination*, pp. 63–65.

[113] Wren, 'Magic in an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery', p. 309; Page, 'The Old English Rune *eoh, íh*, "Yew Tree" ', p. 126 [repr. Page, *Runes and Runic Inscriptions*, p. 134].

[114] Cf. Thomas L. Markey, 'Delabialisation in Germanic', *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 1 (1980), 285–94.

Karl Brunner lists examples of this alternation such as West Saxon *bræw*, Anglian *brēg*, Gothic (dat.) *brahva* 'brew' (< IE **bhreu-*) and Old English *hweogol*, *hweowol*, *hwēol*, *hweohhol* 'wheel' (< IE **k^wek^wl-*) where delabialisation has occurred before what in Indo-European were accented back vowels (including PG **ō* < IE **ā*).[115] Nevertheless, the development in *yew* is also parallelled at least in part by occasional forms where velarity develops from a labial glide in strikingly similar variants such as OE *nīge* and *nīwe* 'new' (cf. OFris. *ny*, OS *nigi*, runic Norse *niuha*, PG **niujaz* < IE **newios*), OE *hīgan*, *hīgu* and *hīwan* 'family' (< IE **ĝeiwo-*) and OE *Tīg* for the usual *Tīw* (PG **Tīwaz* < IE **Deiwos*).[116] Yet it is also clear that glides (G) sometimes develop to obstruents (C — although still maintaining an articulatory feature developed from the glide) in some instances where syllable contacts of an unstable nature have arisen upon the loss of a laryngeal (H). Thus in cases of Holtzmann's *Verschärfung*, the loss of a laryngeal in structures such as VG$HV would have produced the unwieldy syllabification *VG$V; and so instead of merely resyllabifying, the glide has been geminated across the syllable boundary ($) and 'sharpened', producing VC$C^{G}V (e.g. IE **bheu\$H_2-eye* > PG **big\$g^w-ī* > ON *byggvi*).[117] Of course the sharpening of glides to obstruents is suggested in this model to be due to an assimilation from a proximate laryngeal. Yet whatever the merits of the putative laryngeal assimilation (and even the laryngealists admit that similar developments occur in modern Faroese long after the loss of the Indo-European laryngeals),[118] the syllable contact approach does seem to provide the key to the development of the medial variability of Germanic *yew*. Clearly, under this approach a Proto-Germanic **ei\$waz* might well develop to **ei\$h^waz*, the sharpening of the semivowel serving to lower the sonority of the onset of the second syllable (perhaps even under the influence of the loss of a putative laryngeal). And a Proto-Germanic **eih^waz* might well produce the later variants **īh^waz* (in Gothic, cf. *brahva*), **īhaz* (cf. OE *hweohhol*) and a Vernerised **īgaz* (cf. Angl. *brēg*, OE *hweogol*).[119]

Yet the best evidence for an additional phoneme in Proto-Germanic that is reminiscent of attested values of the yew rune is the second- and third-century EI spellings attested in Germano-Roman theonyms recorded on votive epigraphs from the Rhineland. After all, the earliest evidence for the value of the thirteenth rune unmistakably points to a high front vowel — its attestations as a fricative are all appreciably later. The attested values were probably influenced by the yew-rune's letter name, and although the term for 'yew' is itself somewhat problematic, it is far from clear that the medial value in its letter name is the original value of this rune. The resort to the laryngeal theory to explain the problem of the Germanic front vowels has produced results no more conclusive than have similar explanations for other unexpected variations in the phonological development of Germanic. And neither have investigations of putative model alphabets proved categorical in this regard. In contrast, the votive epigraphs from the Rhineland which are contemporary with the earliest runic inscriptions exhibit evidence for a variability in the representation of Germanic front vowels similar to that which has long been seen as the likely origin of the yew rune. The use of the digraph EI to signal a variation in timbre from those vowels typically represented by I and

[115] Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, §213, n. 1; cf. §234, n. 3, §250, n. 2.

[116] Mees, 'The Stentoften Dedication and Sacral Kingship'.

[117] Suzuki, 'The Germanic *Verschärfung*: A Syllabic Perspective'; Davis and Iverson, 'The *Verschärfung* as Feature Spread'; and Mees, 'The Stentoften Dedication and Sacral Kingship'.

[118] Markey, 'The Laryngeal Theory and Aspects of Germanic Phonology', pp. 322–23.

[119] Smith, *English Place-Name Elements*, II, 50.

E is the result of the monophthongisation of inherited *ei* in Greek and Latin. Nonetheless a monophthongisation cannot be the cause of all of the similar Rhenish spellings — Rhenish -EIH- clearly continues **-īg-* rather than **-eig-*.[120] Instead, this variation must stem from a varying description analogous to the Greek and Latin values, yet derived from some other development — presumably an *a*-umlaut that was restricted to secondarily stressed **ī*.[121] And if such variations do result from a third early Germanic high front vowel phoneme intermediate between /e:/ and /i:/ (perhaps also to be linked with the development of the controversial **ē₂*),[122] then surely this is the original value of the thirteenth rune.

   Indeed it is not difficult to see how a digraphic spelling might have been thought better replaced by a (slightly confused) reuse of one of the two Greek letters at the end of the Roman alphabet (i.e. Y or Z) by an early Germanic writer. The Germano-Roman EI spellings only occur medially, however, and they are only employed in a regular manner when they appear in the later parts of polysyllabic Germano-Roman forms. In fact there is no evidence from anywhere in early runic epigraphy that an additional vowel phoneme of this kind needs to be reconstructed for Early Nordic. Hence the reasonable suspicion remains that just as the medial -*w*- in the inherited Proto-Germanic form **eiwaz* underwent sharpening in some Germanic dialects to **īh(w)az* and **īg(w)az*, a similar development is attested by the phonological values associated with the yew rune in later texts.

   Much as it is only in the Old English tradition that the Ing rune has assumed an unambiguously agma-like role, it may well be that the Anglo-Saxon use of the yew rune represents some sort of standardisation of the function of this troublesome character. The name **eiwaz* 'yew' contains a syllable juncture of the type that can lead to sharpening in Germanic and such a value is reminiscent of those represented by the Middle English letter yogh. If the yew rune's original function was to indicate (relatively unsystematic) articulatory strengthenings of semivowels, then it would not be too surprising to witness its later attested phonological indeterminacy. In fact its association with [x] and [ç] suggests that it may originally have represented a lip-rounded laryngeal or glottal fricative (as 'sharpening' is most commonly associated with labiovelar environments) not too dissimilar to Connolly's -*X*- (or rather -*Xw*-), its use being confined to /i(:)/ in dialects which had lost this phonological segment. Given its name and the attested later values, it would seem not unwarranted to assume that the yew rune's original function was to indicate a (perhaps only preliminarily) sharpened glide of the type first studied by Holtzmann and Bugge.

---

[120] Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic', pp. 15–18, 30.

[121] Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic', pp. 32–36.

[122] Cf. Frans van Coetsem, *Das System der starken Verba und die Periodisierung im älteren Germanischen*, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks, 19.1 (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschapij, 1956), pp. 22–46; 'ē²-Perikelen', *Mededelingen van de Vereniging voor Naamkunde te Leuven en de Commissie voor Naamkunde te Amsterdam (Naamkunde)*, 38 (1962), 1–16; 'Proto-Germanic Morphophonemics', in *Toward a Grammar of Proto-Germanic*, ed. by Frans van Coetsem and Herbert L. Kufner (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), pp. 175–209; *The Vocalism of the Germanic Parent Language: Systemic Evolution and Sociohistorical Context*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, I. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. Untersuchungen zur vergleichende Grammatik der germanischen Sprachen, 4 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1994), pp. 94–119; Mees, 'Early Rhineland Germanic', pp. 35–37.