

## HLEWAGASTIR EXPOSED<sup>1</sup>

THOMAS L. MARKEY

What created a new dawn for comparative linguistics, as has been repeatedly pointed out, was the equation, apparently almost incidental, of Rigvedic *áksiti śrávah* (1.40.4b, 8.103.5b, 96.7c), *śrávah . . . áksitam* (1.9.7bc) and Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον (*Il.* 9.413) by Franz Felix Adalbert Kuhn (1812–1881) in an article entitled “Ueber die durch nasale erweiterte verbalstämme” treating nasal presents in these two languages. The article appeared in 1853 in the second volume of the journal that Kuhn had founded.<sup>2</sup> This was the equation that launched a thousand speculations, attempting a map of the landscape of the parent language’s poetic arsenal, its formulas, one of which is arrestingly illustrated by Kuhn’s equation, its metaphors, similes, and other such ready-made surface structures, as well as its metrics; see the historical sketch by Watkins,<sup>3</sup> who effectively summarizes there as follows:

Instead of making an etymological equation of two words from cognate languages, he equated two bipartite noun phrases of noun plus adjective, both meaning “imperishable fame.” The comparability extended beyond the simple words to their suffixal constituents *śrav-as- a-kṣi-ta-m*, κλέF-εσ- ἄ-φθι-το-ν.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Once again we have benefitted from discussions, suggestions, and critiques on the part of Bernard Mees, as well as a critique nearly a decade ago now of *taujan*’s etymology by our old friend Eric P. Hamp. We, however, assume all responsibility for the results here.

<sup>2</sup> See Adalbert Kuhn, “Ueber die durch nasale erweiterte verbalstämme,” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 2 (1853): 455–71, at 467.

<sup>3</sup> Calvert Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford: OUP, 1995), 12–27.

<sup>4</sup> Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, 13.

Kuhn's equation moved etymology beyond atomistic taxonomies, always the initial stage of empirical wisdom, to a comparative anatomy of constituents, thereby opening a window on the evolution of their genealogy, a sequence of events clearly appreciated by none other than Friedrich von Schlegel (1772–1829), as cited by Michel Foucault:

... the structure or comparative grammar of languages furnishes as certain a key of their genealogy as the study of comparative anatomy has done to [for] the loftiest branch of natural science.<sup>5</sup>

In the archaeology of knowledge, then, comparative philology had moved from being a marginal player (atomistic taxonomies) to an insider in a group of nineteenth-century empiricities crowned by the natural sciences that culminated in producing Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory. Darwin's views were, of course, codified in his *On the Origin of Species*, which appeared on 22 November 1859, just six years after Kuhn had published his formidable equation.

Listing comparisons of cognates in isolation, like sequentially sighting Darwin's finches island-by-island in the Galapagos (. . . and they are indeed very ordinary birds for all who see them), provides a catalogue of knowledge, but does not establish significant relations of adjacency or kinship within a total organic structure, nor does it relate this structure to a highly meaningful mental function, namely the projection of a culture.<sup>6</sup> Making such a relationship was but one of the accomplishments of Adalbert Kuhn, who, in 1845, was the first to author a relatively thorough account of the history of Indo-European civilization in his *Zur ältesten Geschichte der indogermanischen Völker*. A full-blown linguistic paleontology had thereby entered the world stage. Throughout his latter life, Kuhn was to augment his ivory-tower, lexical paleontology with active field research along the lines of the brothers Grimm, whom he admired greatly, notably in his studies of the customs and superstitions among "the folk" of the Altmark (e.g., Stendal, Saxony-Anhalt), a remarkable *Reliktlandschaft*.

Despite his many notable accomplishments, Kuhn never obtained a university position, but remained instead at Berlin's Köllnisches Gymnasium, very much an upper-class establishment, from 1837 until his death in 1881, serving first as a *Proband* (1837–1841), then as a teacher (1841–1856), then as a professor (1856–1870), and finally as director (1870–1881). During his lifetime, he was an outsider on the playing field of German university academics and honors. In fact, it was only nine years before he died when, in 1872 at the age of sixty, he was finally named a member of the Prussian Academy of Sciences.

<sup>5</sup> Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), 280.

<sup>6</sup> See Foucault, *Order*, 250–302, for a provocative discussion of the maturation of philology in "the order of things."

The obvious question for the historian of science is why it was that Kuhn presented his equation in such an *en passant* manner, and the obvious answer presumably lies in how and by whom he was trained and/or with whom he associated and/or by whom he was deeply influenced, rather than simply inferring that Kuhn was modest and unassuming (which he seemingly was) or oblivious (highly unlikely) of the importance of his equation. Having been born in Königsberg and having learned Sanskrit while a student at the prestigious Joachimsthalsches Gymnasium in Berlin (1827–1833), he came relatively late to the University of Berlin where he studied (1833–1837) classical philology with the venerable Franz Bopp (1791–1867). There he met the post-doctoral student August Friederich Pott (1802–1887), just a decade Kuhn’s junior, who taught at Berlin as an unsalaried lecturer in general linguistics (1830–1833) before moving on to the University of Halle as Professor of General Linguistics. Some twenty-six letters to Pott from Kuhn spanning the years from 1846 to 1880, that is until just a year before Kuhn’s death, have been preserved.

Although this fact is often overlooked, it was Pott who was renowned, if not celebrated, for deft equations, generally *en passant*, of the kind Kuhn made. One example will suffice: σευ(ε)ται = Skt. *cyávatē* to *cyu* “to move, stir,”<sup>7</sup> < \**kye-w-*<sup>8</sup>; compare Skt. *cyautna-* n. = Av. *šyaoθna-* n. and *men-*stem *šyaoman-* “eager”:: ἔσσύμενος (pft. pass. part.) “eager, striving,” so *Od.* IV 416 and 733. Moreover, compare the use of *šīiaoθanā* nom. pl. n. “actions, deeds” in *Yasna* 50.10 and contextually similar *cyavanta* in *RV* 1.48.2. As an aside, we note that it was in Kuhn’s journal for the year that Kuhn died that Jakob Wackernagel (1853–1938) exclaimed that it was incomprehensible that anyone, including the august Karl Brugmann (1849–1919), should have remained ignorant of Pott’s equation.<sup>9</sup>

Supposedly, the most prominent Germanic attestation of the κλέος component of Kuhn’s equation is contained in the personal name *hlewagastiR* < \**klewo-ghostis*, traditionally glossed as a *babuwrihi* “having famous guests.”<sup>10</sup> This name reputedly occurred in the early fifth-century AD inscription that was on the long lost (since 1802) Gallehus Horn (B): *ek hlewagastiR holtijaR horna tarwido* “I, Hlewagastiz of Holt, dedicated (offered) the horn,” which obviously alliterates as a full poetic line with a stylistically significant sentence-final verb that does not participate in the alliterative scheme.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> August Friederich Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Lemgo: Meyer, 1833–1836), 2:693.

<sup>8</sup> Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern-Munich: Franke, 1959), 538–39; hereafter *IEW*.

<sup>9</sup> See Jacob Wackernagel, “Zum Zahlwort,” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 25 (1881): 260–91, at 277.

<sup>10</sup> So, for example, Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, at 23 and 246.

<sup>11</sup> See Wolfgang Krause and Herbert Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark* (Göttingen: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften [phil.-hist.

This gold horn was certainly a highly prized votive and *blewagastiR* was not its maker, though presumably the person who commissioned its production.<sup>12</sup> The horn's dedicatory nature is clearly demonstrated by selection of *tawido* as the line's highly focused verb. This verb is reflected in all Germanic dialects—North, East, and West—with six occurrences in runic inscriptions, including Gallehus,<sup>13</sup> and its pro-form was *\*taujan* < IE *\*dH<sub>3</sub> ew-yo-*, compare Lat. *duit* and the dedicatory sense of Venetic *dona.s.to* (32x), *doto* (17x) with the force of Etruscan *turuce*.

In Old Norse, *\*taujan* was replaced by the apophonic variant *\*tōjan* > *tæja* (*tæ*, *tæða*, *tæðr*) “to grant, bestow, help, assist”;<sup>14</sup> compare Goth. *ubil-tojis* “evil doer, evil-doing,” *fulla-tojis* “perfect, complete, done full well,” *tewai* “order,” *ga-tewips* “arranged (given just due, made suitable).” In addition to *tæja*, we have ON *týja* “to help, avail, be of use, assist.” Here, we may recall Eddic *fulltýðo* in formulaic *bendr mér fulltýðo*, “my hands assisted me” (*Fáfnismál* 6). Compare New Norwegian *tya*, Norwegian *ty* (with *ben*, *til*) “to take or seek refuge (with), to have recourse to, to resort to”; archaic and modern dialectal Swedish *ty* in the expression

---

Klasse, III. Reihe, Nr. 65, 2 vols., 2nd ed.], 1966), 97–103, for a survey of the older literature and a traditional interpretation, as well as the detailed analyses and histories by Carl J. S. Marstrand, “De nordiske runeinnskrifter i eldre alfabet: Skrift og språk i folkevandringstiden, I: Danske og svenske innskrifter,” *Viking* 16 (1972): 1–277, at 1–11 and 83; and the late Ottar Grønvik, “Runeinnskriften på gullhornet fra Gallehus,” *Maal og Minne* 1 (1999): 1–18, the latter two apparently being the most penetrating studies on this inscription to date.

<sup>12</sup> See Mindy MacLeod and Bernard Mees, *Runic Amulets and Magic Objects* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 176–77.

<sup>13</sup> The runic attestations and forms are as follows: (1) Gallehus (ca. 400 AD) *tawido* 1st sg. pret.; (2) Garbølle Yew Chest (ca. 400 AD) *tawide* 3rd sg. pret.; (3) Overhornbæk Bracteate (ca. 600 AD) *tauui* 1st sg. pres. indic. (?); and (4) Noleby (Västergötland, ca. 580–600 AD) *tojeka* < *\*tauju-eka* 1st sg. pres. indicative with enclitic “I”; (5) *tawide* on the Illerup silver shield mount; and (6) *tau* (or *lau*) for *tauju* (apparently) on the Selvik bracteate; again see Krause-Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, for discussion and interpretation, and on Illerup see Marie Stoklund, “De nye runefund fra Illerup Ådal og en nyfundet runeindskrift fra Vimose,” *Danske Studier* 80 (1985): 5–24, and eadem, “Neue Rune-funde in Illerup und Vimose (Ostjütland und Fünen. Dänemark),” *Germania* 64 (1986): 75–89. Consider also *tuwatuwa* as “offer, offer” to Skt. *dūvas* n. (on which see below) on the Vadstena bracteate; see the discussion by Einar Lundebj and Henrik Williams, “Om Vadstena-brakteatens *tuwa* med et tillegg om Lellingebrakteatens *salu*,” *Maal of Minne* 1–2 (1992): 11–26, and, more saliently, that by Grønvik, “Runeinnskriften,” 16.

<sup>14</sup> So, for example, Adolf Noreen, *Altnordische Grammatik*, I: *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*, 5th ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1970), Art. 68.4.

*ty* (*sig*) *till* “to seek protection with,” lit. “to give one’s self over to someone,” that is, “to avail oneself of someone (or something).”<sup>15</sup>

Superficially, *taujan* appears to be a synonym of Older Futhark *\*wurkjan* (cf. Goth. *waurkjan* “to make, do, perform”) > ON *yrkja* “to effect, make, prepare, produce.”<sup>16</sup> The five runic attestations are: (1) Tune (ca. 400 AD) *worah̄to* (for *worhto*, cf. Goth. *waurhta*), 1st sg. pret.; (2) Etelhem Clasp (late fifth/early sixth century AD) *w(o)rta*, 3rd sg. pret.; (3) Tjurkö (ca. 500 AD) *wurte* (in: *wurter-unoR*), 3rd sg. pret.; (4) By (ca. 550–600 AD) *orte*, 3rd sg. pret.; (5) Sölvesberg (ca. 750–800 AD) *urti*, 3rd sg. pret.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless, contextual scrutiny indicates that Germanic *taujan* and *wurkjan* were not synonymous. Use of *taujan* in a dedicatory (“grant, offer, reward, venerate”) context is reflected in Gothic by formulaic *armaion taujan* “to give alms” (ἐλεμóσσυνον ποιεῖν = *iustitiam facere*) at Matthew 6:1, 2, 3, but there is no *\*armaion waurkjan*. Recall Goth. *þaurban* + *sis* (*ga*)*taujan*, and note that Gothic lacks *\*þaurban* + *sis waurkjan*.<sup>18</sup>

The immediate analog of *taujan* is the archaic Italic subjunctive aorist theme *dou-* < *\*deH<sub>3</sub>u-*, which builds the relic futurum exactum *duim* (*duis*, *duit*, etc., treated like *statuo*, 3rd sg. subj. *statuit*) that is found in conservative prayers, curses, and legal texts. We find, for example, *duisque* (*du*)*onam* in what is surely one of the oldest portions of Cato’s (ca. 234–149 BC) *Lustration of the Fields* (*De Agr.* 141.3):

<sup>15</sup> Some (such as Olof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok* [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups förlag, Berlingska boktryckeriet, 1922], 1038b) have derived *týja* as a back-formation to the 2nd and 3rd sg. *\*tiuhiz* to the *\*teuhan* that supplied *tjóa* “to help, to be of use.” We consider this interpretation uninformed, the mistaking of a result for a cause, the details of which are reserved for another discussion.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Anders Bæksted, “The Stenmagle Rune-box and the Golden Horn Inscription,” *Acta Archaeologica* 18 (1947): 202–10, who conflates their semantics in runic Norse and assigns “made” to *tarwide*.

<sup>17</sup> Again, see Krause-Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, for discussion and interpretation.

<sup>18</sup> Note Luke 9:25, “hwo allis þaurfte **gataujþ** sis manna, gageigands þo manased alla, iþ sis silbin fraqistjands aiþþau gasleipjands?” (For what is a man **advantaged**, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself or be cast away?) (King James). The literal sense of the Gothic is: “for what needed a man (who) bestowed upon himself, . . .” A reading of “for what needed a man (who) made upon himself” would be inane. In lieu of a Gothic equivalent of Latin *prodesset* and presumably faced with a reflexive middle in his Greek original, Wulfila utilized the older, more original, but even by his time probably residual, *give* (*offer*)-semantics inherent to a *taujan* “avail”-metaphor = “to give, to bestow . . . on oneself (the use, advantage of something)” = “to avail oneself of”: Goth. *sis* (*ga*)*taujan* = Sw. *ty sig* (*till*). Here, the existential auxiliary of necessity, *þaurfte*, in Wulfila’s Gothic is problematic unless one assumes that he (or his successor redactors) read ὀφείλεται “ought” (epic imperfects or aorists of which were typically followed by infinitives to express an unattainable wish) for ὠφελεῖται “advantaged” (ὠφελέω “to help, aid, succor, to be of use, to avail one’s self of something.”

“duisque (du)onam salutem ualetudinemque” (and give good health and soundness), a later redaction of an earlier “and give the gift (of) health and soundness” with the figure *dōnum dō* and not *bonam*.<sup>19</sup> Compare Umbr. *pur-dou-itu* (*purtuuetu*) 3rd sg. imper. “he shall offer (to the gods),” the Cyprian aorist infin. *δοF-ε-vaί*, and Lat. *perduint* < \**pér-douint* “to give away utterly.” But preservation of a digamma from the root would be isolated in Greek, and the *-wenai* type of infinitive is therefore recessive here, and, as Markus Egetmeyer kindly points out,<sup>20</sup> this may have given rise to the new “Aeolian-Ionian” *-menai* type. Moreover, Mottausch promisingly suggests derivation from \**deH<sub>3</sub>* with a set-enlargment \**dou- H<sub>3</sub>-* as an archaic aorist stem for Italic \**doui*-forms and the Baltic pret. Lith. *Daviaũ*.<sup>21</sup> Now recall the Plautine pres. subj. (opt.) *dem* (< \**da-ie-m*) as a replacement for *duim* (< \**dou-i-m*) with opt. *-i-*. A Gothic 3rd sg. pres. subj. (optative!) \**taujaí* < \**tau-ja-i-t* < \**dou-yo-i-t* would correspond to the Faliscan (ca. 600 BC) Ceres inscription’s (Vetter Nr. 241) 3rd sg. pres. *ā*-subjunctive (earlier optative) *douiad* for *douiat* < \**dou-y-ā-t(i)*.<sup>22</sup> Compare, with dialectal lexical replacement, Osc. *fakiiad* and Umbr. *fačia* = Lat. *faciat*. Compare, further, Ved. *deyát* (3rd sg. root aorist optative [precative] active of *dā-*) and *διδοίη* (3rd sg. present optative active) from \**διδοFīη* < \**dou-yē-t* of *διδωμι*; recall that the 3rd sg. aorist optative active of *διδωμι* (*θείη* = Sanskrit *dhēyāt*) was suppletively supplied by *τιθήμι*.

We contend that *tauja*n reflects a State II *o*-grade causative/iterative apophonically related to a State II *e*-grade stative with a dental enlargement (= *CwéC(C)-*), manifested by OS *twithōn* “to grant, give” (*Heliand* only), MLG *twidēn*, MHG *zwiden* “idem,” compare OE *lang-twidig* “long granted, lasting” and thus “assured” (1x, *Beowulf* 1708) versus Umbr. *purdito(m)* < \**por-dwit-om* nom. sg. n. “divine offering”:<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, 197–213.

<sup>20</sup> Private communication.

<sup>21</sup> Karl-Heinz Mottausch, “Die indogermanischen Laryngale im Lichte der nostratischen Theorie,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 113 (2008): 1–28, at 15–17. See further Martin Peters, “Zur Frage einer ‘archaischer’ Phase des griechischen Epos,” in *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 303–19; and José Luis García Ramón, “Correspondencias y ecuables en la reconstrucción indoeuropea: chip. *to-we-na-i* / downai / véd. *dāvāne*, ie. \**d<sub>3</sub>-yén*,” in *Quid ultra faciam? Trabajos . . . en conmemoración de los 25 años de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*, ed. L. M. Macía Aparicio et al. (Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma, 1994), 45–55.

<sup>22</sup> We find it highly significant that the Ceres inscription’s *douiad* occurs in privileged verse-final position, thereby capping the inscription as a verse of dedication and transforming both verse and object into an *étrenne*. The underlying sense of *douiad* in the Ceres inscription is clearly iterative (*-yo-*), a verbal gift to be given (read) repeatedly, so too for Goth. *tauja*n in *armaion tauja*n.

<sup>23</sup> See Jürgen Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2000), 613–15.



State II: Gothic *taujan*  
*dH<sub>3</sub>éw-y-*

State II: Old Saxon *twithōn*  
*dwé-y-t- (dwéi-t-)*

The above matrix defines an *elo*-grade relationship between *\*tweipōn* and *\*taujan* respectively and provides a network for comparing related Skt. *du-/duv-* and its derivatives: *dúvas* n. *s*-stem (as a collective) “offerings” (originally oxytonal in oblique cases): *duvās-* adj. “worshipping (with offerings),” *duvoyú* adj. “eager to make offerings,” with the reduced grade as an enlarged root noun from *\*du-* “donor (?)” Perhaps *dúvas* was originally the plural of *\*du-*, as Ved. *dúvas-* occurs with plural verbs.<sup>24</sup> Compare Skt. *davāne* and the remade Lith. *dovanà* “gift, present” (Lithuanian *duoti* “to give”) and Latv. *davana* versus Classical Lat. *bonus* < Old Lat. *dvonos: dvenos* (versus Classical Lat. *bene* < *\*dvened*) “the one honored (by gifts, offerings),” formed as a participle in *-eno-*, such that *bonus* is to *dw-e-no-* as OS *twithōn* is to *dwéi-t-ō-*.<sup>25</sup> Skt. *duvasyāti* “honors, venerates with gifts or service” is a secondary causative to *dúvas* “offerings.” Compare Skt. pft. part. *dadivans* and the Latv. iterative *davinat* “to give frequently” > “to present, offer,” OCS *-davati* “to offer.”

Given *taujan*’s primordial significance of “to give (frequently)” > “to offer” as reconstructed above, we conclude that a ((*N (nom.)*)+ *N (acc.)* + (*N (dat.)*) + *taujan*)-cartouche defined a Germanic offertory blueprint, one that was clearly employed in the Gallehus inscription. This blueprint was also employed, along with a formulaic *rūna tawidē*, in the initial line of the late sixth-century AD Noleby inscription (Stora Noleby, Fyrunga Parish, Västergötland):<sup>26</sup>

	<b>runofahiraginakudotojeka</b>
Germanic	<i>*rūnōn faihjō raginōn-kundōn taujō eka</i>
Gothic	<i>*rūna faihja   ragina-kunþa    tauja ik</i>
Proto-Norse	<i>*rūnu fābiu ragina-kundu tauiu eka</i>
Old Norse	<i>rūnar fā ragna-kunnar tœ</i>
	[rune I adorn of gods beknownst I offer]

The Germanic, Gothic, and Proto-Norse reconstructions provide restorative amplification, while the Gothic reconstruction furnishes a laboratory text.

<sup>24</sup> See Louis Renou, *Grammaire de la langue védique* (Lyon: I.A.C., 1952), 153 and 336.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Latin *beatus* < *\*dw-ey-o-to-* and see Hermann Osthoff, “Die Tiefstufe in indogermanischen Vocalismen,” in idem, *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 4 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1881), 1–406, at 370–72.

<sup>26</sup> See Krause-Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, 148–51.

The line is obviously an epigraphic squish, an inscriptional abbreviation, and therefore its basic, underlying formula must have been well known, certainly so if one assumes repertoires of formulaic orality.<sup>27</sup>

A Gothic *\*ragina-kunþa* is justified by *himinakunda* “heavenly” (*Skeireins* 4.23), presumably a conventional replacement in conversion literature for a distinctly pagan *\*ragina-kunþ-*; compare OE *heofoncund* and note acc. pl. *runaR þaR rēgi[n]kundu* on Side C of the Sparlösa Stone (Västergötland Vg 119) with *þaR* “there” presumably metrical and meaning “in Uppsala” and *rúnum . . . reginkunnum . . . fäði* in *Hávamál* 80.<sup>28</sup>

*runo* is the *koinon* here, and *apo koinou* constructions are frequent in Germanic, and indeed well known throughout the Indo-European community. Compare the alliterating chiasmic *apo koinou* on the sepulchral stele from Loro Piceno.<sup>29</sup>

A Gothic *\*faihja* (Class I wk. *\*faihjan*) is supported by the hapax *-faiho* in *flu-faiho* “much adorned, variegated, manifold, πολυποίκιλος (wisdom of god)” in *Ephesians* 3:10 [A]), where, perhaps not coincidentally, it stands in collocation with a stranded (headless, without antecedent) *himinakundam*: there is no congruent nominal. We infer that *himinakundam*, and by extension *ragina-kunþa*, could also be read as a noun. Perhaps *faihjan* began as *faciendi* translationese (calquing) for Mediterranean *faciō* (Venetic *vha.g.s.to*) in artisan signatures on inscriptional ornamentation.

Scansion alone shows the line to be verse: trochaic hexameter as primordial *fornyrðislag*. The initial syllables of *ragina-* are resolved (*ragna-*). Poetic suffixation of enclitic “I” (*eka* vs. *ek*) to the privileged line final verb was required for the terminal trochee. The descending rhythm focused on the dedicatory final (*\*tauþō eka*), also a canonical practice in Mediterranean votives. The constituents of an initial accusative NP have been distracted to straddle the left-shifted verb: “*rūna ragina-kunþa faihja*” > “*rūna faihja ragina-kunþa*.” Each of the distracted constituents thereby adjoins a metrical boundary: caesura (|) and verse (||). The straddling permits concatenating stressed syllable alliterative linking of half line

<sup>27</sup> On which see Joseph Harris, “Myth and Meaning in the Rök Inscription,” *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 2 (2006): 45–109; Lars Lönnroth, “The Riddle of the Rök Stone: A Structural Approach,” *ANF* 91 (1977): 1–57. With reference to the Rök Stone, and, for a relevant discussion of orality, see Stefan Brink, “*Verba volant, scripta manent?* Aspects of Early Scandinavian Oral Society,” in *Literacy in Medieval and Early Modern Scandinavian Culture*, ed. Pernille Hermann, Viking Collection 16 (Odense: UP of Southern Denmark, 2005), 59–117, at 85–86 and 99 et passim.

<sup>28</sup> See further Wolfgang Meid, “Gotisch (*ufar*)*himina- lairþa-kunds und airþens*,” in *Studien zum Altgermanischen: Festschrift für Heinrich Beck*, ed. Heiko Uecker, *RGÄ Ergänzungsband* 11 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 477–79, who also cites OI *godkunnigr* “of the kith of gods.”

<sup>29</sup> See Anna Marinetti, *Le iscrizioni sudpicene: I testi*, *Lingue e iscrizioni dell'Italia antica* a cura di Aldo Prosdocimi 5 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1985), 106–7, 161–64.



pairs: *runa* :: *ragina*-. Both of these devices are abundant in our earliest Indo-European poetic diction and may be reliably assumed to have been part of the poetic arsenal of the proto-language.<sup>30</sup> The straddling distraction moves *ragina-kunpa* to the metrical center of the line, thereby creating a metrically highlighted point of convergence between adornment (*fahi*) on the one hand and dedication (*tojeka*) on the other, while simultaneously underscoring an association between runes and the divine, an echo of the sort of alphabet worship that we find in the Atestinian *vdan*-votives; *pace* Antonsen's insistence that "rune" must mean "inscription, message" or the like.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, *ragina-kunpa* is thereby chiasmically flanked by the vocalic alliteration of the line's only verbs (*faiħja* # *ragina-kunpa* # *tauja*). The result is an iconic palindrome of visual speech. Such flanking was but another of the Indo-European poet's devices, one that was frequently employed in Mediterranean votives and therefore surely archaic.

Watch how Homer (Il. 1.108) deftly centers a pivotal, Janus-like double object in a *figura etymologica* with chiasmic flanking (οὔτε . . . οὔτ'), and on the semantics of ἐσθλόν as "genuine," rather than "good":<sup>32</sup>

ἐσθλόν δ' οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ' ἐτέλεσσας .

genuine [but *never* yet you [worded] word [nor you completed (word)]

[But you never yet said a genuine word, nor even brought one to pass.]

Just so, *\*e-weik<sup>w</sup>-e-t* (Skt. *āvocat/vocat*) *wek<sup>w</sup>-es-si* = Toch. B *rekaunasa wessām* < *\*rek-emno-so wek<sup>w</sup>-sk-e-t-na*. Compare Kuchean (XVI.51)<sup>33</sup> *tane ñake brah[ma]ni Uttarem māñcuskem scirona rekaunasa skārramane weskem-ne*, "here (and) now the Brahmanas address Prince Uttara with words, harsh scolding."

Consider the nominative and accusative singular isomorphism of Homer's ἔπος in the Homeric line (Il. 1.108) cited above and then note that runic selection of the accusative singular feminine *rūna*, instead of the plural, which at first appears aberrant, permits embedding for ring composition (yet another device of the Indo-European poet): the accusative singular feminine (*rūna*) and the nominative and accusative plural neuter (*ragina-kunpa*) were isomorphic. Recall the presumed bifunctionality (adjective/noun) of headless *himinakundam* in Ephesians 3:10.

<sup>30</sup> See Campanile's admirable survey: Enrico Campanile, *La ricostruzione della cultura indoeuropea*, Testi linguistici 16 (Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori, 1990), 142–69.

<sup>31</sup> E.g., Elmer H. Antonsen, *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 140 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002), 180–82.

<sup>32</sup> See now Calvert Watkins, "An Indo-European Word for 'Dream'," in *Studies for Einar Haugen, Presented by Friends and Colleagues*, ed. Evelyn Firchow-Coleman et al. (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972), 554–61, on Homeric artifices; and Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, 131–32, for an account of the South Picene Bellante stele which features both straddling and alliteration.

<sup>33</sup> In Werner Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1964).

*rūna faihja # ragina-kunþa # tauja ik*  
 rune ornament I # (things) of gods bekownst # offer I

Nothing is arbitrary. Nothing is left to chance. The resulting economy yet complexity of multiple expression is breathtaking. Chiastic framing, concatenating alliteration, prospective ring composition, terminal metrical (and acoustic) focus, straddling and epigrammatic parataxis—the line is a superb example of the Iron Age poet’s refinement and arduous training, and it certainly deserved the longevity its inscription conferred. This verbal cameo is so tightly composed that it commands citation intact. Its fragmentation would signal a severe violation of poetic intent.

At the core of the line is the bare-bones dedicatory formula, *rūna taujan*, which the poet pulled apart as a frame to display his craft. The line is certainly much older than the stone it ennobled, and its nuclear formula much older still. In fact, the line has every appearance of being a learned quotation. It apparently has nothing to do with the remainder of the stone’s inscription, which has never been satisfactorily interpreted and which evidences but rudimentary epigraphic and linguistic knowledge. Carver and poet were many generations and levels of accomplishment apart. Oblivious of the line as verse, as a masterly nugget of archaic poetic construction, the ever pedestrian Krause and Jankuhn doggedly attempted to connect it with the remainder of the inscription.<sup>34</sup>

Reading *blewagastiR* as “having famous guests” is, we contend, a vacuous assumption based on merely mechanically projecting the (partial) semantics of κλέος (*IEW* 606–7) “news, report, good report, fame, glory” onto *blewa-*. This is atomistic root comparison of presumed cognates devoid of context, cultural or linguistic, and, hence, as we shall see, misleading. With respect to inferring its semantics, the Gallehus name is unfortunately a hapax. In fact, a simplex *blew-* “fame” (or the like) is not attested anywhere in Germanic. There is, of course, *hliu-* < Gmc. *\*hleu-* < IE *\*klew-* contained in Goth. *hliuma* “hearing,” masc. *n*-stem = YAv. *šraoman* “idem”; compare OI *hljómr* masc. “sound, tune.” And so, to reiterate, we infer that reading *blewa-* as “fame, famous” in *blewagastiR* is tenuous at best.

The singular literary contexts in which we might well anticipate an archaic Germanic equivalent of “imperishable fame” with a reflex of *blew-* are, of course, *Hávamál* 76 and 77, but here we find *orðstírr* “fame, renown, good report,” literally “word splendor” (76) and *dómr* “opinion, judgment” (77):

76 Deyr fé, deya frændr,  
 deyr siálfr it sama;  
 enn orðstírr, deyr aldregi:  
 hveim er sér góðan getr.

<sup>34</sup> Krause and Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, 148–51.

[Cattle die, kinsmen die,  
One also dies oneself;  
But fame never dies  
For whomsoever is able to achieve it.]

77 Deyr fê, deya frændr,  
deyr siálfr it sama;  
ec veit einn, at aldri deyr:  
dómr um dauðan hvern.

[Cattle die, kinsmen die,  
One also dies oneself;  
One thing I know that never dies:  
The opinion (judgment) of every dead person]

Imperishable (everlasting) *orðstírr* and *dómr* are contextualized by the perishable material security afforded by cattle (= *fê*) and kinsmen (= *frændr*) in much the same way as *śrávab* . . . *áksitam* in *RV* 1.9.7 is manifested in the context of strength (booty = *vājavat*) in general and cattle (material wealth) in particular:

|| sám gómad indra vājavat asmé prthú śrávo brhát | viśvāyur<sup>35</sup> dhehy ák-sitam ||

[Confer on us, O Indra, accompanied with cattle and strength (booty), imperishable fame, abundant and great, life-lasting (eternal)]<sup>36</sup>

Interestingly, as Gregory Nagy points out,<sup>37</sup> Edwin Floyd has argued that “the Vedic pattern may actually be closer to the original meaning of the formula.”<sup>38</sup> Thus, imperishable *\*klewos* may originally have been keyed to material security and the protection afforded by kinsmen or patrons. If so, then *\*klewos* in Germanic may well have generalized “security/protection,” rather than “fame,” as its dominant semantic strands; hence possible replacement of a reflex of *\*hlew-* by *dómr* in *Hávamál* 77. There is, indeed, cogent evidence that *\*hlew-* underwent a

<sup>35</sup> Here, we agree with Gregory Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990), 124, n. 9, in seeing *viśvāyu-* “life-lasting” as an *s*-stem adj. modifying *śrávas*, rather than agreeing with Indra. Nagy’s appeal to Jacob Wackernagel and Albert Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik, Band III: Nominalflexion, Zahlwort, Pronomen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929–1930; repr. 1975), 3.2: 291, is convincing; just so cf. *RV* 1.68.5c.

<sup>36</sup> Now see Nagy, *Greek Mythology*, 122–42, and his discussion of this contextualization with respect to the uniqueness of κλέος ἄφθιτον.

<sup>37</sup> Nagy, *Greek Mythology*, 124.

<sup>38</sup> Edwin D. Floyd, “ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry,” *Glotta* 58 (1980): 133–57, at 139.

major semantic shift to “(material) security/protection (by patronage and/or kinsmen or clan)” in Germanic.

We contend that, in Germanic, there was a narrowing of a sector of the semantics of a general aristocratic notion of “fame” in the parent language to specific, concrete results of such fame (security/protection), a narrowing that occurred in applications within particular cultural contexts, notably funerary practices and the politics of (military) client protection.<sup>39</sup>

The runic inscription on the Strand Brooch (Strand, Norway, ca. 700 AD, Krause-Jankuhn, No. 18), presumably not a funerary offering (which would be unparalleled), contains what is traditionally and correctly interpreted as a compound: **nAhli** = *náhlé* < Proto-Gmc. *\*nawi-blewa-*, literally “corpse-protection” with *\*nawi-* reflected in Gothic as *naus* (nom. pl. *naŕweis*, acc. pl. *naŕwins*) and in Old Icelandic as *nár* < *\*nawiR* < *\*nawis* “corpse,” masc. *i*-stem < State II *\*nH<sub>2</sub>-éw-i-* (IEW 756) with immediate cognates elsewhere only in Baltic and Slavic. Compare Goth. *\*ga-nawistrôn* “to bury” (only in the past part. *ga-nawistrôþs* “buried”) and OI *nábjargir* fem. pl. “the last service to the dead (closing the nostrils, eyes and mouth),” which points to an underlying *\*nawi-bergō* with *bergō* (< IE *\*bhergh-* [IEW 145]) > OI *björg* fem. “protection, help, deliverance.” OI *nábjargir* is an archaic nominalization of formulaic *bjarga nám* “to render the last service to the dead (dead bodies)” in which *bjarga* requires the dative as does its Gothic cognate *baigan* (Class III, strong) “to hide, keep, preserve, protect,” with but two occurrences: John 12:25, “in libaina aiweinon baigip izai,” “. . . shall keep it [the soul = *saiwala*] unto life eternal” (King James); and John 17:15 “ak ei baigais im faura þamma unseljinn,” “but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil” (King James).

What we have seemingly uncovered are equivalent merisms:

*\*nawi-blewa-* (< *-klew-os*) = *\*nawi-bergō* (*nábjargir*)

in which the former set was replaced by the latter.

From this it is clear that *blewa-* must primarily, if not solely, have meant “security/protection” in early Germanic, particularly in funerary (celebratory) contexts.

We now note OE *beorgan* “to save, deliver, preserve, protect” < IE *\*bhergh-* to Goth. *baigan*, the zero grade of which is reflected in OE *byrgan* “to bury” and OE *byrgen* “grave, sepulcher” < *\*burgiznō* < *\*bhrgh-es-nā*, which is derivationally comparable to Goth. *hlaiwasnōs* (plural only: 3x = Mark 8:28 and 27:53, and Luke 8:27) “graves, tombs” < *\*kloiw-os-nās*, fashioned as a collective from an *o*-grade *s*-stem *\*kloiw-os* built to *klew-os* (like Lat. *toga* to *tego*) such that:

*hlaiwasnōs* (< *kloiw-os-nā-*) = *byrgen* (< *\*burgiznō* < *\*bhrgh-es-nā*)

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the use of *anextlo-* in Celtic; see T. L. Markey, “Gaulish *Anextlomārus* Revisited,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 116.2 (2003): 295–301.

in which the *e*-grade of the oblique stem replaced the *o*-grade of the nominative-accusative; compare, likewise, the replacement in Goth. *riqis*, *riqizis* < PIE *\*reg<sup>w</sup>-e/os-*.

The pivotal form in this constellation appears to be *\*hlaiwas* n. “grave, tomb” (Goth. *hlaiw*; OE *hlāw*; OS *hlēo*; OHG *hlēo*, pl. [*h*]lēwir, [*Zweites Reichenauer Glossar* dat. pl.] *lēirum* < *\*hlaiwizum* < *\*kloiw-es-*; OI *hlē*; Runic *hlaiwa* [e.g., Bø, Rogaland, Norway, ca. 550–600 AD]) < *\*kloiw-os*:

*nawi-hlewa		*nawi-bergō
*hlaiwas > hlaiwasnōs	=	byrgen (< burgiznō), cf. OE byrgels > NE burial

Runic *hlaiwa* “grave, tomb (that which protects the dead)” > OI *hlē* “shelter” = NE *lee*, which entered maritime terminology as in, for example, *lee side*, and *lee-ward*.

It is the runic reflexes of *\*hlew-* / *\*hlaiw-* that are of interest here, particularly the derivative (causative) verb *hlaiwido* (Kjølevik, Strand Parish, Rogaland, Norway, ca. 500 AD), 1st sg. pret. to a Gmc. *\*hlaiwian* “to bury, to place in a tomb (grave mound),” the past participle of which is runically attested in the nom. sg. masc. as *h[l]aiwidaR* “buried” on the (grave memorial, stele) stone from Amla (Kaupanger, Sogn og Fjordane, Norway, ca. 450–500 AD). From this we may seemingly retrieve a culturally significant *figura etymologica*: *\*hlaiwa hlaiwian* “to tomb a tomb (*vel similia*).” We might then search for a suitable agent noun (*nomen agentis*) subject denoting he who officiates in erecting the tomb as a place of protection (and security) for the dead.

In the essentially cryptic early third-century AD two-line inscription on the Vimose plane (as now catalogued by Christensen)<sup>40</sup> or for some a sheath plate (Krause-Jankuhn, No. 25), *hleuno* (Line B) is clearly legible, seemingly as a phrase-initial nominative singular followed by line-final *an[x]: regu*, probably *anaregu* (1st pers. sg. pres. indic. active, strong verb), a Verner variant to Goth. *rahnjan* “to count, reckon, number,” Compare Goth. *ga-rēhsns* < *\*-rēk-sni-* (IEW 863) fem. “plan, decision, determination” and note OE *regnian* “to decide, arrange” and Goth. *raginōn* “to be ruler”; so perhaps “I counsel,” as suggested by MacLeod and Mees.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Arne Emil Christensen, “The Roman Iron Age Tools from Vimose,” *Acta Archaeologica* 76 (2005): 59–86, at 65–66 and 74–75.

<sup>41</sup> MacLeod and Mees, *Runic Amulets*, 77. IE *\*re/ok-* is reflected in Germanic, Baltic, Slavic, and Tocharian; e.g., Toch. A *rake* (pl. *rakeyäntu*)/Toch. B *reki* (pl. *rekauna*

**hleuno** has never received an entirely satisfactory interpretation. Krause-Jankuhn generate a *lautgesetzlich* OI *\*hljóna* and suggest relationship with Gmc. *\*hlewa* “protection.”<sup>42</sup> The initial line (A) above Line B concludes with **hlaosxx** (so Moltke, evidently after autopsy),<sup>43</sup> which MacLeod and Mees contend is probably to be restored as *\*hlaoisai*, which we suggest represents *\*hlaiwisai* < *\*kloiwesēi*, dat. sg. of the *s*-stem *\*hlaiwas*.<sup>44</sup> Given a funerary context and what we can infer from the syntax, **hleuno** < *\*klew-nō(n)* (via *samprasārana*) < *\*klew-no-on-* to *\*klew-o-* would seem to be a *nomen agentis* (subject) denoting he who officiates in erecting the tomb, namely, “he who provides protection, the protector” < *\*hleunō(n)*, like Lat. *agō*, *agōnis* “the priest (who kills the offering)”; compare Goth. *wardja*, *wardjins* “guard, watchman” < *\*wor-dh-y-ō(n)*, *\*wor-dh-y-en-os* (IEW 1164).<sup>45</sup>

< *\*rekamna*) “word, word as bond, a person’s word,” presumably from *\*rek-* (rather than *\*rok-*), but cf. Toch. A *wak*, Toch. B *wek*, and Lat. *vox*, *voxis*; OCS *resti* “to speak,” *reci* “word,” ORus. *roku* “fate”; Lith. *rekti* “to cry, scream, shout” = Latv. *rekt* “to roar”; and note, particularly, OCS *recenu* “said” pret. part. = OI *regin* (< *ragin-*), *rōgn* n. pl. “the gods, the advising, ordaining ones” from a deverbative adjective (Proto-Norse *\*raginā-*, cf. OI *ragna-rōk* “Götterdämmerung,” OS *reginogiskapu* “fate,” *ragino* “decisions of divine powers”) based on a past participle *\*raginā-* of an otherwise unattested, but perfectly plausible, Class VI strong verb (*\*rában-* : *rábo* : *rō’ho* : *rōgumí* : *raginā-*). IE *\*rok-* > Gmc. *\*rāb-/rag-* was highly productive, e.g., OI *ragna* “imprecate, invoke upon,” OE *regnian* “decide, arrange.” Post-Verner Gmc. *\*rag-ina-* was borrowed by post-palatalization Baltic, viz. as Latv., Lith. *ragana* “witch, sorceress.” Lith. *raganauti* “to practice sorcery,” Lith. *raganius* “sorcerer, magician.” The Baltic evidence is precious for ascertaining threads of the early, though not the original, semantics of OI *Regin* (etc.).

<sup>42</sup> Krause-Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, 63.

<sup>43</sup> Erik Moltke, *Runes and their Origin: Denmark and Elsewhere*, trans. Peter Foote (Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark, 1985), 89.

<sup>44</sup> MacLeod and Mees, *Runic Amulets*, 77.

<sup>45</sup> Obviously, charting the *ō/o* -*e*-development of *n*-stems (strong cases with *ō/o*-grade vs. weak/oblique cases with *e*-grade predesenential apophony) depends on recognition of paradigm internal leveling with reference to some specific semantactic target, as Eric Hamp (p.c.) once counseled. They originally formed *nomina agentis* (e.g., Lat. *edō*, *edōnis* “glutton” and attributive nouns (*Catō*, *Catōnis* “the sly one” to *catus* adj. “sly, smart”), which, when “individualized,” formed the basis of the weak adjectives. These were more “definite” than the so-called strong, pronominalized adjectives that were not preceded by definite articles in Germanic. Leveling in Greek, Italic (partially), and Celtic was in favor of *ō/o*, while Baltic, Slavic, and Germanic were conservative in generally preserving the original strong *ō/o* vs. weak *e* pattern; but cf. Goth. *himins* “heaven” < *\*H<sub>2</sub>ké-men-* (State II): Goth. *ahma* “spirit” < *\*H<sub>2</sub>ek-mōn* (State I) vs. *namō* (perhaps rebuilt from *\*nomn-* < *\*nōmn-* via Osthoff’s Law): Lat. *nōmen*, *nōminis* (IEW 321); see Miles C. Beckwith, “The ‘Hanging of Hera’ and the Meaning of Greek ἄκμων,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998): 91–102, at 95–97; Jay H. Jasanoff, “The Nom. sg. of Germanic *n*-stems,” in *Verba et Litterae: Explorations in Germanic Languages and Germanic Literature. Essays in Honor of Albert L. Lloyd*, ed. Alfred R. Wedel and Hans-Jörg Busch (Newark,



Compare **hleuno** and κλε(ι)νος adj. “famous, renowned, illustrious,” and recall that formations in archaic *\*-no-* for heads of social units are both well known and richly documented in Germanic, Italic, and Celtic (at the least).<sup>46</sup>

For a sequence *hleuno ana-regu* with pro-drop, one could read “I, the protector, counsel (invoke upon?)” or an epicletic “O, protector, I counsel (invoke upon?).” In line with the above discussion, however, we seem justified in reconstructing a formulaic: *\*(ek) hleuno hlaiwa hlaiwido* “(I) the protector tombed (the) tomb”; compare *ek hlewagastiR holtijaR horna tarwido*.

The four lines prefacing the protective *defixio* (or conditional curse, or *Schutzvorschrift*) on the Stentofen Stone (Sölvesborg church weapon house, Blekinge, Sweden, DR 357 U, ca. 600–620 AD) may now be read as follows:<sup>47</sup>

- I: **niuhAborumR** = *niuha-būrumR* = OI *nȳ-būrum* “to the new dwellers”
- II: **niuhagestumR** = *niuha-gestumR* = OI *nȳ-gestum* “to the new guests (clients)”
- III: **hAþuwolAfRgAfj** = *HafuwolafR gafj(?)* = OI *Hölfir gaf ár* “Hathuwolf gave booty (plenty) (?)”
- IV: **hAriwolAfRmAgiusnuhle** = *HariwolafR magiusnu hlē* = OI *Herjólfir mögu (?) hlē*, “Hariwolf the warrior band protection”

The crux of this text has long been *magiusnu* which we see as the nom. pl. of OI *mōgr* “son, youth, servant, warrior, male kinsman” < *maguz* (= Goth. *magus*) < *\*magh-* (IEW 696) + *nu*; that is, OI *megir* nom. pl. < *magius* (= Goth. *\*magjus*) < *\*magiwiz* < *\*magh-ewes* + the collective/attributive suffix *-nu* (acc./voc. sg. *u-stem*). The derivation is akin to that for Goth. *hlaiwasnōs*.<sup>48</sup> For a kindred derivational history and a window on the attributive semantics, compare Skt. *vādh-as*

DE: Linguatext, 2002), 31–46, at 39–40; Donald Ringe, *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic: A Linguistic History of English* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 74; Karin Stüber, “Urindogermanisch *\*h<sub>1</sub>nóm-n* ‘Name’, *h<sub>2</sub>óng<sup>w</sup>-n* ‘Salbe’ and der Ablaut der neutralen *n*-Stämme,” *Die Sprache* 39 (1997): 74–88; and, axiomatically and lucidly, Frederik Kortlandt, “The Inflection of the Germanic *n*-Stems,” *NOWELE* 48 (2006): 3–7, esp. 5. The relationship of Gmc. *-ōn-* < IE *-ōn-* to Gmc. *-ō-* < IE *-ā-* conferred femininity, so Goth. *wardja* masc. versus *daura-wardō* “door-keeper” fem. vs. *daura-wards* masc. “idem.” In Indic, derivative agent nouns could be distinguished from their founding forms by oxytonal versus barytonal stress respectively; e.g., Skt. *dharmān-* (agent noun) masc. “supporter” versus *dhárman-* n. “support (law)” (IEW 252).

<sup>46</sup> See Eric P. Hamp, “Old English *lēod-*,” *English Studies* 58 (1977): 97–100, at 97–98, n. 3; and, by way of example, note Goth. *þiudans* masc. “king (head of the people)” < *\*teuto-no-s* (IEW 1084): Goth. *þiudanōn* “to rule (the people).”

<sup>47</sup> For a survey of the older literature and a detailed interpretation of this and the related Blekinge patronage stones (Gummarp, Björketorp, Istaby), see Krause and Jankuhn, *Die Runeninschriften*, 203–20; cf. Sven B. F. Jansson, *Runinskrifter i Sverige* (Stockholm-Gothenburg-Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963), 20–25.

<sup>48</sup> See MacLeod and Mees, *Runic Amulets*, 113 and n. 21.

n. “missile, bolt, weapon” (= Av. *vaδō*) > *vadh-as-ná*, pl. only, specifically “Indra’s cudgel” (e.g., *RV* 1.165.6c); *vadh-as-nú* “armed with weapons” in *RV* 9.52.3c; “*carúr ná yás tám iñkhayéndo ná dánam iñkhaya | vadhaír vadhasnav iñkhaya ||*” (he who is like a cauldron, shake, O Indu, the gift for us, shake [it] with [your] weapons, O one armed with weapons, shake it).<sup>49</sup> For the semantics of *magiusnu*, we suggest “warrior band (as an attribute of a leader),” here specifically the band of warriors (cf. OE *magodryht* fem. “band of warriors”) headed by Hariwolf, lit. the “wolf = leader of the host,” with *hari-* to Goth. *harjis* “army, host.” Indeed, the name Hariwolf is reflected throughout Germanic; compare Langobardian *Ariulfus* (*Ariolfus*), which attests to its early diffusion in West Germanic. On the other hand, *Hathuwolf* etymologizes as “battle-wolf” with *hapu-* = Celtic *catu-*, so *Hadumār* = *Catumāros*.

In the Stentoften lines above, we see an interlocking associative pattern of lines I-III versus lines II-IV: it is Hathuwolf as the warrior who provides what we assume to be booty for the new inhabitants and Hariwolf as the head of the host, the *comitatus* (*magiusnu*), who provides protection for the new guests = clients. Functioning as a *koinon*, the single pivotal verb *gaf* applies in both III and IV.

The guests-as-clients theme is indeed a hallmark of the Iron Age poet; just so in the remarkable Prestino inscription (ca. 480–450 BC):<sup>50</sup>

UVAMOKOZIS:PLIALEΘU:UULTIAUIOPOS:ARIUONEPOS:SITES'TETU

*Uwamó-gòtsis* : *Plial-edū* : *Uwltí-āwyobos* : *Āri-wònebos* : *sìdess* : *dedū*

[*Uwamogotsis* (the one having supreme guests, i.e., the great protective fosterer) *Plialedu* (he of the *Plī-* clan) gave this seat/dominion/territory to the fostered (protected) one's grandsons (remote descendants), the *Ariwones*]

<sup>49</sup> On Indo-Aryan formations in *-(s)nu*; see, initially, Karl Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd ed. (Strassburg: Trübner, 1906), art. 206; and Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*, 3.2: 741–43, where the particular frequency of such formations in Avestan is noted. Consider, further, Goth. *filusna*, *arhwazna*; Lat. *aēneus* “bronze” versus Umbr. *abesnes*. Throughout, Hermann Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, 4th ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1872; repr. 1964), maintained that *-snu* derived from *-snā* (*-snō*). Cf. formation of Goth. *blaiwasnōs* and Skt. *kraviṣṇu* “craving raw flesh” to *kravīṣ* “flesh” n. *s*-stem. Similarly, note Skt. *vr̥dhasnū* “dripping with blessings” to *vr̥dhas* fem. “claim, challenge, blessing,” specifically in *RV* 4.2.3a with obvious Vāmadeva word-play: *ātyā vr̥dhasnū rōhitā ghṛtasnū ṛtāsya manye mānasā javiṣṭhā* (ruddy steeds dripping blessings, dripping fat, swiftest by the thought of Order). Skt. not only has such derivative adjectives from roots, but also from causative stems, e.g., those in *-ayisnu* such as *kopayisnu* (Epic Skt.) to *kup*, *kupyati* “be angry.”

<sup>50</sup> For details and an in-depth discussion of the Golaseccan Celtic (II B-III A 1–2 horizons) Prestino inscription and its Indo-European heritage, especially comparison with Vedic poetic practices, see T. L. Markey and Bernard Mees, “Prestino, Patrimony and the Plinys,” *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53 (2003): 116–67.

It is within the context of this millennial tradition and our interpretation of *hlewa-* as protection that *hlewagastiR* (Stentoften's **hle** < hlewa IV + **gest-** < gast-II) is finally correctly exposed as “having protected clients (in a comitatus)” as he who dedicated the gold horn of Gallehus.

