Runrön

Runologiska bidrag utgivna av
Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet

24

Wicker, Nancy L., 2021: Bracteates and Beverages. An Image from Scalford (and Hoby) and the Inscription **alu**. In: Reading Runes. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, Nyköping, Sweden, 2–6 September 2014. Ed. by MacLeod, Mindy, Marco Bianchi and Henrik Williams. Uppsala. (Runrön 24.) Pp. 127–141.

DOI: 10.33063/diva-438872

© 2021 Nancy L. Wicker (CC BY)

NANCY L. WICKER

Bracteates and Beverages: An Image from Scalford (and Hoby) and the Inscription **alu**

Abstract

Recent metal-detector discoveries of two die-identical Migration Period bracteates from the parishes of Scalford and Hoby with Rotherby, both in Leicestershire in the East Midlands of England, may throw light on the use of these objects and the interpretation of the older runic inscription **alu**. These pieces display an imitation Latin inscription but no runes, along with an image interpreted as a man quaffing a drink from a glass beaker; a figure previously unknown on bracteates. The iconography reinforces a connection between bracteates and beverages and may be construed as a profane representation of hospitality and nourishment.

Keywords: Older runic inscriptions, bracteates, imagery, England, Migration Period, drink, women

The discoveries of two Migration Period (fifth-to-sixth century) gold bracteates in Leicestershire in the East Midlands of England bring attention to a region previously outside of any consideration for bracteate scholarship. According to Wendy Scott (2015: 145), the first example was found north of Melton in Scalford parish (Portable Antiquities Scheme LEIC-EDD980) and the second — a die duplicate of the first piece — was reportedly found west of Melton Mowbray in the parish of Hoby with Rotherby in Leicestershire (PAS LEIC-1E63A8). Although these bracteates do not have runic inscriptions, I bring them to the attention of runologists because they exhibit an intriguing image previously unknown on bracteates. I suggest that this pictorial composition of a man lifting a beaker to his mouth should be examined in relation to the runic inscription **alu**, which occurs on several bracteates, with the prospect that such an investigation may lead us to a fuller understanding of how these objects were used and how their texts may be interpreted.

The bracteates from Scalford (IK 635,1) and Hoby with Rotherby (IK 635,2)

The specimen now referred to as the Scalford bracteate was discovered by metal-detecting in the Melton area in July 2010, too late for Charlotte Behr (2010) to include it in her article on new bracteate finds in England. However,

Figure 1. Bracteate from Scalford (IK 635,1), Melton parish, Leicestershire. Portable Antiquities Scheme reference: LEIC-EDD980. Photo: Creative Commons.

she subsequently published it in a regional journal (Behr 2011a) as well as in a volume in honor of the late Martin Welch (Behr 2011b). It is included in the final volume of the corpus *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit – Auswertung und Neufunde*, where it is assigned the number IK 635 in the *Ikonomographischer Katalog* (Heizmann & Axboe 2011: 996–97).

The Scalford bracteate measures 2.4 centimeters in diameter and weighs 2.5 grams (Figure 1). The thin sheet of gold is bent, torn, and scratched in several places, and this damage leads to conjectures that were made in the published drawing of it (Figure 2). The main motif is a profile bust of a man with an elaborate diadem embellishing his hair. The features in front of his garment are presumed to be his arm with his hand holding a conical drinking vessel. In front of and behind his head stand several symbols and imitations of Roman letters. The pendant is one of only six Type A bracteates – which show a human head but no large animal – from early medieval England, and due to technical details of its undecorated loop and the absence of a wire edge rim, Behr asserts that it was most likely made in England (Behr 2011b: 2).

In November 2014, another bracteate was discovered by metal detecting, also in the Melton Mowbray region of Leicestershire. Initially, no specific find location was reported by the Portable Antiquities Scheme, but in her publication of 2015 Scott refers to the find place as Hoby. The disk is incomplete, with current dimensions of 3.4 by 2.8 centimeters and a weight of

Figure 2. Bracteate from Scaford (IK 635,1). Drawing by Jane Sandoe, from Behr, 2011.

3.59 grams. Although the object reveals significant damage – at least part of which is deemed to be post-depositional – the central image can be recognized as die-identical with the bracteate from Scaford, so it is designated as IK 635,2. The outer perimeter zone of the larger specimen from Hoby was punched with a stamp design previously unknown on bracteates, whereas the smaller Scaford example has no border. The Hoby find also differs from the Scaford piece with its beaded wire edge rim, a feature very common on Scandinavian bracteates. However, as Scott (2015: 125) notes, the die linkage of the two artifacts and certain technical details support local production rather than import from Scandinavia. Underneath the now-missing suspension loop of the Hoby pendant lies an irregularly shaped spiral of beaded gold wire soldered onto the punched outer concentric zone of decoration on the disk. This embellishment is similar to wire additions on several well-known bracteates from England (St. Giles' Field, Oxford, IK 323; Undley, Suffolk, IK 374; Unknown findplace, Kent, IK 554; Denton, Kent, IK 582); including three recently found bracteates from Binham in Norfolk (IK 604,2; 630,1; and 630,3, cf. Behr et al. 2014). Therefore, the wire spiral on the Hoby specimen bolsters the assessment that both objects under consideration here were more likely made in England than imported.

Although the bracteate from Hoby is bent and incomplete (Figure 3), it confirms details of the die design that were ambiguous on the earlier find from

Figure 3. Bracteate from Hoby (IK 635,2), Hoby with Rotherby parish, Leicestershire. Portable Antiquities Scheme reference: LEIC-1E63A8. Photo: Creative Commons.

Scalford, particularly the cup raised to the man's mouth. After differentiating the physical condition and find circumstances of the two distinct objects, I refer to the identical images and texts on the two bracteates from Scalford and its die-twin from Hoby as the "Scalford model". Even before the Hoby discovery, Behr (2011a: 1) proposed that the Scalford scene was profane, not sacral, describing it in the abstract of her essay as an "attempt to visualize an important social and symbolic activity of a Germanic leader, the feasting and drinking in the hall, that has often been referred to in early medieval literature and through grave goods in princely graves". Accordingly, this image may be significant for an interpretation of the use of some bracteates.

The inscription **alu** and possible references to drink and drinking

On the Scalford model, symbols and imitation Roman letters are positioned around the perimeter where runic inscriptions often are located on bracteates. There are no runes on this model, but the absence of runes on bracteates is not unusual. Whereas all rune-stones by definition have runes carved on them, not all bracteates have runes or even inscriptions of any kind. By the end of 2010, a total of 1003 bracteates (from 622 distinct dies) were known, and 222 (from 153 dies) of those have runes; thus, approxi-

ately a quarter of all bracteates have runes (Axboe 2011: 296). Even though this is a relatively large data set of runic texts, I maintain that to gain an understanding of the function of bracteates, we should consider those both with and without inscriptions. In light of the image of a man with a drinking vessel on the Scaford model, the meaning and use of the oft-occurring inscription **alu** should be re-considered. As recently as 2014, T. L. Markey and Bernard Mees (2014: 2) unequivocally stated that “no imagery suggestive of drinking or libations appears on the bracteates,” but with these new finds, their assertion is no longer valid.

Runic inscriptions on bracteates are central to the entire corpus of texts in the early futhark since they represent approximately one-third of the total number of such texts on all types of artifacts (Wicker & Williams 2013: 183). In particular, the inscription **alu** is found on numerous Migration Period gold bracteates and on other objects as diverse as a rune-stone at Elgesem, Vestfold (KJ 57) and a ring from Karlino (formerly Körlin, East Pomerania, KJ 46, now lost). Gerd Høst Heyerdahl (1981) counted 23 items with **alu** and variants. A few additional examples have since come to light, notably a cremation urn from Spong Hill, Norfolk (Pieper 1986), an axe-shaft from Nydam, South Jutland (Stoklund 1994), two die-identical small, non-Scandinavian-type seventh-century bracteates from Hüfingen, Baden-Württemberg (Düwel in Fingerlin et al. 1998), and two sword pommels from Grenay and Saint-Dizier, France (Fischer et al. 2008, nos. 18, 23). The number of inscriptions counted depends upon whether one accepts:

- 1) shortened versions, for instance, **al** on a bracteate from Börringe, Scania (IK 26);
- 2) combinations of **alu** with other runes, including **alugod** on a rosette fibula from Værløse, Zealand (KJ 11) and **saralu** on a stone at Årstad, Rogaland (KJ 58);
- 3) and variants with runes in a different order and/or combined with additional runes, including **lua** on two arrow shafts from Nydam bog, South Jutland (Stoklund 1995); **foslau** on a bracteate from Fakse (IK 101); **uldaul** on a bracteate from the Tønder area, South Jutland (IK 353); **aalul** on a recently discovered bracteate from Stavnsager near Randers, Jutland (IK 649; Imer in Axboe 2017); and **aallu** on a bone fragment (possibly from a comb) from Horvnes, Nordland (Knirk 2006: 18).

In a study of runic formula words, Wilhelm Heizmann (2011: 533–38) enumerates a total of 54 discrete objects – revealing 34 unique texts – that are conceivably under consideration, including 27 bracteates from 21 dies. Among

these are recent discoveries of two die-identical pieces from Uppåkra, Scania (IK 591,1 and IK 591,2; Axboe & Stoklund 2003) and six die-identical bracteates from an unknown find place with the inscription **alulauwr** (IK 600; Heizmann & Axboe 2011: 959–61), but the recent find from Stavnsager (IK 649; Imer in Axboe 2017) was not included in his count. In short, **alu** texts on bracteates comprise over half of the corpus (34 objects from 21 dies) for this inscription and accordingly have attracted a great deal of attention.

Interpretations of **alu** are as diverse as ‘temple’, ‘magic’, ‘enchantment’, ‘bewitchment’, ‘protection’, ‘ale’ (or ‘beer’), ‘hale’, and ‘nourishment’. Ute Zimmermann (2015), in a paper presented at the 2010 International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, summarizes the vast literature on **alu**. Here I highlight only a few of the possibilities. Zimmermann favors an interpretation as the beverage ale or beer, following Anders Bæksted (1945: 88) and Høst Heyerdahl (1981). In contrast to the numerous interpretations of **alu** as a noun, Lennart Elmevik (1999: 25) supports Erik Rooth’s (1926: 9–10) proposal of a verbal form, ‘I give strength’ or ‘I give protection’, and considers its relationship to “the nourishing strength-giving beverage” (Elmevik 1999: 28). Furthermore, Markey and Mees (2014: 5) point to a “semantic strand of ***alu**(p)... i.e., as an etymologically ‘nourishing’ drink.” The concepts of drink and nourishment are not entirely unrelated since a drink can indeed be nourishing. Additional runic inscriptions on bracteates may also support a link between these pendants and beverages. John Hines (in Behr et al. 2014, pp. 50–52) points to the inscription **medu**, ‘mead’ (?) on the bracteate from Undley (IK 374), and in the same article proposes that **waat** on one of the bracteates from Binham (IK 604,1) is “a noun **wāt** standing for a drink”, related to modern English ‘wet’. Even though the Scalford model does not display a runic inscription referring to a drink, it is tempting to propose that its raised glass could contain ale (or mead, beer, etc.). Furthermore, it may shed light on a general intersection of bracteate texts with imagery, not as captions to pictures but as an intensification of related ideas.

The intersection of word and image

Previous efforts to equate word and image on bracteates have not met with great success. Detlev Ellmers (1972: 225–30) interprets the inscription **houar** on a bracteate from Funen (IK 58) as ‘the High One’, which he recognizes as a by-name for Óðinn, thus prompting him to identify the accompanying image as the god. This thesis is embraced by Karl Hauck (1992) who extends the

identification of Óðinn to the humanoid figure that is shown alone on Type A bracteates and with a horse-like animal on Type C bracteates. However, one of the critical but unexplained limitations of this proposition is that the inscription **houar** occurs on only one bracteate. In another attempt to equate word and image, Klaus Düwel and Wilhelm Heizmann (2006: 20) interpret the placement of **laukar** ('leek') along the horse's leg on the Type C bracteate from Børringe (IK 26), mentioned above. Because of the supposedly significant location of the text, they propose that this plant of reputed curative properties was used to heal the horse's leg, as described in the Second Merseburg Charm. Although I do not question the identification of **laukar** as 'leek', I contend that the positioning of the inscription along the horse's leg is simply fortuitous. The runes hug the perimeter of the disk, emulating where legends are normally placed on coins. Consequently, I maintain that the location of the runes so that **laukar** touches the side of the animal's leg is merely coincidental (Wicker & Williams 2013: 156). Bracteate inscriptions do not seem to serve as captions accompanying the images with which they occur. Although it would be audacious to insist that **alu**, **medu**, and **waat** on bracteates are directly associated with the image of the man raising his glass on the Scalford model, we should consider the larger context of bracteates, both with and without runes, to examine how images and runic inscriptions on bracteates may be connected to how the objects were used.

The contexts of **alu** bracteates in light of the Scalford and Hoby discoveries

Zimmerman (2015: 51–52) stresses the importance of bracteate find circumstances for interpreting the inscription **alu**. Markey and Mees (2014: 1–3) also call for an examination of amuletic, bog, and funerary contexts to aid the etymological interpretation of this text. The archaeological find circumstances of a bracteate can be examined at three different scales: the physical condition of the artifact; the circumstances in which it was discovered, and the geographic location of the deposit in relation to other similar finds. By examining all three contextual levels, we may reach a better understanding of how an object was used, which in turn may assist interpretation of the inscription.

Both exemplars of the Scalford model exhibit heavy wear or rough handling. The Scalford bracteate was rather lightly struck, yet the central area displaying the man's head was pressed more firmly than the rest of the piece.

Therefore, this part of the impression is visible in the mirror image of the design on the reverse of the object whereas the vessel held by the man is barely perceptible. The suspension loop is intact, and its attachment was reinforced and strengthened on the reverse with a lump of gold. There is no attached wire rim, and the edge of the gold disk shows a great deal of abrasion as it is cracked in two places and crushed in the middle of the left side. The Hoby bracteate apparently was subjected to some kind of violence resulting in serious damage to it since almost one-third of the object is now missing. The Portable Antiquities Scheme assessment noted that the disk had been folded over itself before deposition but that some damage may have been post-depositional. I conjecture that the loop may have been compromised and torn away after persistent stress from usage. A tear extends downward from the spot where one side of the loop would have been attached and then extends along the juncture of the boundary where the central area struck by the die meets the punched border zone. The interface of die area and border is typically a vulnerable part of a bracteate where accidentally scoring a surround too deeply risks cutting through the gold disk. The beaded edge wire of the Hoby pendant exhibits heavy abrasion and is worn completely smooth along its outside perimeter. The overall impression is that both bracteates were worn for a long time, not simply for an occasional ceremony but instead throughout a lifetime.

We assume that the find contexts of bracteates are linked in some way to activities with which these items were associated before deposition. The find circumstances in which we discover them include undocumented single finds, hoards, graves, and settlements (with the last in this list yielding only a few recent examples). Both the Scalford and Hoby bracteates were discovered with the use of metal-detectors; unfortunately, no find contexts were documented. All bracteates displaying **alu** have come from hoards, settlements, and single finds; none has been recovered from a burial. Similarly, other bracteates with inscriptions that may refer to drink and drinking stem from non-burial contexts; the piece from Undley was discovered as a single find by a farmer (West 1983), and the one from Binham is interpreted as part of a hoard (Behr et al. 2014). On the other hand, objects besides bracteates that have **alu** inscriptions have been unearthed from both hoards and graves. Høst Heyerdahl (1981: 49) suggests that **alu** was carved on grave markers such as the Elgesem stone (KJ 57) to commemorate the grave-ale drunk at the burial. She states that an interpretation of **alu** as a warning or taboo for ‘protection’ of the grave does not make sense in this context. Other examples of **alu** in burial contexts include the cremation urn from Spong Hill (Pieper

1986) and a bronze mount from Fosse, Rogaland (KJ 48) and the bone comb fragment from Horvnes (Knirk 2006: 18), which were both excavated from grave mounds. Hoard finds include the Karlino (Körlin) ring (KJ 46), which was inscribed with a bind-rune of **al** (possibly a shortened version of **alu**) and discovered with a bracteate. Also found in a hoard are two arrow shafts from Nydam bog inscribed with **lua** (Stoklund 1995). Zimmerman (2015) considers the contexts of all finds with **alu** and pinpoints two specific uses, one in connection with representations of the otherworld in burials and bog-offerings, and the other on objects given by military leaders to their followers. Recent finds of a few bracteates in settlement contexts, including a fragment found in the floor of the so-called ritual building at Uppåkra and a complete example in another structure there (Larsson 2007: 17, 21), have been explained as traces of ceremonies (perhaps including the presentation of bracteates) that took place in the hall of the leader (Andersson 2001: 77). Although bracteates may have been given to men by military leaders, bestowal to women may explain why these pendants were placed on the chests of women in burials rather than men. On the basis of such finds, Birgit Arrhenius (1992) proposes that elite women may have been given bracteates as part of their morning gifts of jewelry upon marriage. From finds of well-worn and pristine bracteates found together in burials, Sonia Hawkes (Hawkes & Pollard 1981: 350) conjectures that some bracteates were treasured for a long period of time, which leads to the proposal that some of these precious objects may have been passed on as heirlooms, eventually to be placed in graves or hoards, if not simply lost or melted down.

The geographic range of bracteates stemming from burials is nearly distinct from the distribution of those discovered in hoards (see map, Andrén 1991: 248). All bracteates with **alu** inscriptions, including from the Uppåkra settlement, are found in the zone of hoard finds located in southern Scandinavia and the northern margins of the Continent. On the other hand, female graves with bracteates are found in western Norway, in England, and across a broad swath of the Continent. (A few anomalous pieces that lack suspension loops and apparently served as Charon's coins have been found in male graves on Gotland; see Lamm and Axboe 1989.) The regions that contain female burials with bracteates are segregated from the areas where bracteates with **alu** inscriptions are found. The significance of this disjunction of find contexts and regional distribution invites speculation whether the inscription **alu** could have been an alternate way to signal a female connection with bracteates in regions where these objects were not placed in burials or where graves were not ostentatiously marked (and as a result not easily dis-

covered by archaeologists). Additionally, I propose that not only were bracteates worn and used by women but that some of these items were passed on to other women through inheritance and as a result rarely appear in graves.

A modest proposal concerning bracteates, women, ale, and nourishment

In *Beowulf*, Wealhþeow serves as hostess in a northern European hall building, bringing drink-filled vessels to the men (lines 620–22 and 2020–21). The image on the Scaford bracteate model may be interpreted as such a man lifting his glass to imbibe, corresponding to our stereotype of male drinking behavior. Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson (1998: 128–29) suggests that bracteates worn by women may have symbolized their role as hostesses serving drinks at ceremonies in such halls. However, we should not assume that Wealhþeow – and Scandinavian women, too – never consumed the beverage. The image of a drinking man displayed on a bracteate negates neither a woman's use of the pendant nor the vessel depicted on it. Høst-Heierdahl identifies **alu** as 'ale' (or beer) and points to its use as grave-ale in a ritual carried out beside a memorial stone; furthermore, she cites the prophylactic use of both **laukar** ('leek') and **alu**, mentioning in particular the use of warm ale to wash a newborn baby (Høst-Heierdahl 1981: 46). In light of this usage, I return to Elmevik's interpretation of **alu** as 'to nourish' and Düwel's (2008: 13) as 'protection' to relate this text to the use of bracteates by women. I previously have mentioned special properties of ale as a protective and nutritious drink for women during pregnancy, childbirth, and nursing (Wicker 2012: 116). Although women in our time are discouraged from drinking alcoholic beverages while pregnant or nursing, throughout pre-modern and early modern times, women were served wine or beer with nutritious foods for the benefit of the mother and the child, as reported by Louise Hagberg (1949: 15–25) and Grethe Jacobsen (1983: 98–99). Accordingly, an association of **alu** with women, in the sense of 'ale' as well as 'protection' and 'nourishing/nourishment', is compatible. The linkage of bracteates with women in their graves may reflect their protective aspect with the added connection with nourishment. Just as drink was distributed to men in the hall, perhaps bracteates also were given to women there – presented in the hall, but worn throughout life, including during childbirth. The contextual associations of beer or ale with nourishment, health, healing, and protection are myriad and can be understood in both mundane and sacral contexts, pertinent to both men and women.

Conclusion

The discovery of the Scalford bracteate and its die duplicate from Hoby has opened up new lines of thought concerning whether bracteate imagery is sacral or profane. Occasionally a new find brings significant changes to the corpus and to our understanding. For instance, it had been presumed that no Type D bracteates (those with only animal ornamentation) had runic inscriptions, but this supposition was refuted by the discovery of a Type D bracteate with runes from Stavnsager (IK 649; Imer in Axboe 2017). Similarly, an animated debate concerning whether dies used to stamp bracteates were composed of bronze (copper alloy), wood, or clay was quieted in 1990, when a copper alloy example was discovered at Postgården in northern Jutland (IK 572; Axboe 1993). Since then, three more metal dies have been found in England (Behr 2010, catalog nos. 8 and 10; Behr et al. 2014: 70), and the argument now seems moot. The discovery of the first known English bracteate hoard at Binham also forces us to question our assumptions about find contexts, since previously bracteates had been found only in graves and single finds – not hoards – in England. These examples are lessons to us that our interpretations can change in the light of a new discovery. Over one thousand bracteates constitute a large data set, yet there are many gaps in our knowledge and challenges for us to understand the information that is available. Interpretations made from the absence of finds or from non-representative data are especially vulnerable. Moreover, many explanations have been based on the assumption that the use of bracteates was sacral, leading to the hypothesis that the meaning of “charm words” must also be sacral. The Scalford image of a man preparing to quaff a beverage is one more piece of information about bracteates and possibly pertinent to **alu**, too. As an art historian and archaeologist, I pose questions about runic inscriptions on bracteates that differ from those asked by philologists and linguists. However, all who study these objects should be prepared to re-examine whether word and image sometimes may be linked, especially in light of new discoveries. When confronted with a multitude of possible interpretations of **alu**, we should heed the context of the inscription and remember that a word may indeed have several definitions.

Postscript

This paper has been revised to regularize find location names for the two new bracteates under consideration. Both pieces were found in the Melton Mowbray area of Leicestershire and have been referred to as the Melton bracteates. The first example (IK 635,1) was reportedly found “north of Melton” in Scalford civil parish and is now referred to as the Scalford bracteate. At the time of my 2014 oral presentation and my original manuscript, the find location of the second bracteate (IK 635,2) had not been disclosed by the Portable Antiquities Scheme, so I referred to it as the Leicestershire bracteate. It subsequently was reported to have been discovered “west of Melton Mowbray” in the civil parish named Hoby with Rotherby (Scott 2015); therefore, it is now referred to in the bracteate IK classification as the Hoby with Rotherby bracteate (personal communication, Charlotte Behr). I shorten the name to Hoby where repetition renders the longer appellation awkward.

Published references to the Scalford and Hoby bracteates (Scott 2015) and the Stavnsager Type D bracteate (Imer in Axboe 2017) now replace my original references to websites that were not stable.

Scott’s 2015 article had not yet been published when I presented my paper at the symposium in Nyköping nor when I submitted my manuscript. Upon reading her paper, I was pleased to find that she interprets bracteate use in the context of drinking rituals (Scott 2015: 150) similar to my proposal.

Works Cited

- Andersson, Maud Cecelia, 2001: Om problemet at lokalisera hallar. In: *Uppåkra: Centrum och sammanhang*. Ed. by Birgitta Hårdh. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. (Uppåkrastudier 3. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia, ser. in 8°, 34.) Pp. 71–86.
- Andrén, Anders, 1991: Guld och makt – en tolkning av de skandinaviska guldbrakteaternas funktion. In: *Samfundsorganisation og regional variation: Norden i romersk jernalder og folkevandringstid. Beretning fra 1. Nordiske jernaldersymposium på Sandbjerg Slot 11–15 april 1989*. Ed. by Charlotte Fabeck & Jytte Ringtved. Moesgård: Jysk Arkæologisk Selskab. (Jysk Arkæologisk Selskabs Skrifter 27.) Pp. 245–56.
- Arrhenius, Birgit, 1992: Smycken som diplomati. In: *Föremål som vittnesbörd: En festskrift till Gertrud Grenander Nyberg på 80-årsdagen den 26 juli 1992*. Ed. by Katarina Ågren. Stockholm: Nordiska Museet. Pp. 18–25.

- Axboe, Morten, 1993: A die for a gold bracteate. In: *Sources and Resources: Studies in Honour of Birgit Arrhenius*. Ed. by Greta Arwidsson et al. Rixensart: PACT Belgium. (PACT 38.) Pp. 379–94.
- 2011: Die Chronologie der Inschriften-Brakteaten. In: Heizmann & Axboe 2011. Pp. 279–96.
- 2017: Local innovations and far-reaching connections: Gold bracteates from North-East Zealand and East Jutland, with a runological note by Lisbeth Imer. In: *Life on the Edge: Social, Political and Religious Frontiers in Early Medieval Europe*. Ed. by Sarah Semple, Celia Orsini & Sian Mui. Wendeburg: Braunschweigisches Landesmuseum, 2017. (Neue Studien zur Sachsenforschung 6.) Pp. 143–56.
- & Stoklund, Marie, 2003: En runebrakteat fra Uppåkra. In: *Fler fynd i centrum: Materialstudier i och kring Uppåkra*. Ed. by Birgitta Hårdh. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. (Uppåkrastudier 9. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia, series in 8°, 45.) Pp. 81–87.
- Behr, Charlotte, 2010: New bracteate finds from early Anglo-Saxon England. In: *Medieval Archaeology* 54. Pp. 34–88.
- 2011a: The A-bracteate from Scalford, Leicestershire. In: *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* 85. Pp. 98–105.
- 2011b: An unusual new gold A-bracteate find from Scalford, Leicestershire. In: *Studies in Early Anglo-Saxon Art and Archaeology: Papers in Honour of Martin G. Welch*. Ed. by Stuart Brookes et al. Oxford: Archaeopress. (BAR British Series 527.) Pp. 1–6.
- & Pestell, Tim, with a contribution by John Hines, 2014: The bracteate hoard from Binham — An early Anglo-Saxon central place? In: *Medieval Archaeology* 58. Pp. 44–77.
- Beowulf = *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. 4th ed. Ed. by R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork & John D. Niles. 2008. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bæksted, Anders, 1945: Værløse runefibula. In: *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* 1945. Pp. 84–91.
- DR + number = inscription published in DR.
- DR = *Danmarks runeindskrifter*. By Lis Jacobsen and Erik Moltke. 3 vols.: *Text*, *Atlas*, *Registre*. 1941–42. København: Munksgaard.
- Düwel, Klaus, 2008: *Runenkunde*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler. (Sammlung Metzler 72.)
- & Heizmann, Wilhelm, 2006: Das ältere Fupark — Überlieferung und Wirkungsmöglichkeiten der Runenreihe. In: *Das fupark und seine einzelsprachlichen Weiterentwicklungen: Akten der Tagung in Eichstätt vom 20. bis 24. Juli 2003*. Ed. by Alfred Bammesberger & Gabriele Waxenberger. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (ERGA 51.) Pp. 3–60.
- Ellmers, Detlev, 1972: Zur Ikonographie Nordischer Goldbrakteaten. In *Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Jahrbuch* 1970, 17. Pp. 201–84.
- Elmevik, Lennart, 1999: De urnordiska runinskrifternas **alu**. In: *Runor och namn. Hyllningsskrift till Lena Peterson den 27 januari 1999*. Ed. by Lennart Elme-

- vik & Svante Strandberg. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet. (Namn och samhälle 10.) Pp. 21–28.
- ERGA = *Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fingerlin, Gerhard, Fischer, Josef F. & Düwel, Klaus, 1998: Alu und ota — Runenbeschriftete Münznachahmen der Merowingerzeit aus Hüfingen. In: *Germania* 76. Pp. 789–822.
- Fischer, Svante et al. 2008: *Les Seigneurs des Anneaux*. 2nd ed. Condé-sur-Noireau. Saint-Germain-en-Laye: l'Association française d'Archéologie mérovingienne. (Bulletin de liaison de l'Association française d'Archéologie mérovingienne. Hors série n° 2. Inscriptions runiques de France 1.)
- Hagberg, Louise, 1949: Seder och tro ved märkestillfällena i barnets liv. In: *Livets Högtider*. Ed. by K. Robert V. Wikman. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag. (Nordisk Kultur 20.) Pp. 14–40.
- Hauck, Karl, 1992: Frühmittelalterliche Bildüberlieferung und der organisierte Kult (Zur Ikonologie der Goldbrakteaten, XLIV). In: *Der historische Horizont der Götterbild-Amulette aus der Übergangsepoche von der Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter*. Ed. by Karl Hauck. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3rd ser. 200.) Pp. 433–574.
- Hawkes, Sonia Chadwick & Pollard, Mark, 1981: The gold bracteates from sixth-century Anglo-Saxon graves in Kent, in the light of a new find from Finglesham. In: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 15. Pp. 316–70.
- Hedenstierna-Jonson, Charlotte, 1998: Oden och kvinnorna: Spår av Odens kvinnliga aspekter i det folkvandringstida bildmaterialet. In: *Rökringar: Hyllningsskrift till Lennart Karlsson från elever och yngre forskare*. Ed. by Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson, Carina Jacobsson & Torsten Svensson. Visby: Segerdahls. Pp. 123–31.
- Heizmann, Wilhelm, 2011: Die Formelwörter der Goldbrakteaten. In: Heizmann & Axboe 2011. Pp. 525–601.
- & Axboe, Morten, eds., 2011: *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit – Auswertung und Neufunde* [= *IK*, 4.3]. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter. (ERGA 40.)
- Høst Heyerdahl, Gerd, 1981: Fellesmøte 13. mars. 'Trylleordet' **alu**. In: *Det norske Videnskaps-Akademis Årbok* 1980. Pp. 35–49.
- IK + number = bracteate published in *IK*; in Morten Axboe, Katalogbeschreibung der Neufunde in Heizmann and Axboe 2011 [= *IK*, 4.3], 891–999 and plates 1–102; see also Behr et al. 2014.
- IK* = *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit: Ikonographischer Katalog*, by Karl Hauck, Morten Axboe, Urs Clavadetscher, Klaus Düwel, Lutz von Padberg, Ulrike Smyra, Cajus Wypior & Herbert Lange. 3 parts = 7 vols.: 1.1, Einleitung; 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, Text; 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, Tafeln. 1985–89. München. (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 24.1.1–24.3.2.)

- Jacobsen, Grethe, 1983: Ændrede kvinders stilling sig ved overgangen til Kristendom i Norden? In: *Förändringar i kvinnors villkor under medeltiden. Uppsatser framlagda vid ett kvinnohistoriskt symposium i Skálholt, Island*. Ed. by Silja Aðalsteinsdóttir & Helgi Þorláksson. Reykjavík: Sagnfræðistofun háskóla Íslands. (Ritsafn Sagnfræðistofunnar 9.) Pp. 26–40.
- KJ + number = inscription published in Wolfgang Krause & Herbert Jankuhn, 1966: *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3rd ser. 6.)
- Knirk, James, 2006: Arbeidet ved Runearkivet, Oslo. Nyfunn og nyregistrering 2003. In: *Nytt om runer* 19 (2004). Pp. 16–18.
- Lamm, Jan Peder & Axboe, Morten, 1989: Neues zu Brakteaten und Anhängern in Schweden. In: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 23. Pp. 453–77.
- Larsson, Lars, 2007: The Iron Age ritual building at Uppåkra, southern Sweden. In: *Antiquity* 81. Pp. 11–25.
- Markey, T. L. & Mees, Bernard, 2014: Early Nordic *alu* and **al-* ‘to nourish’. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 42. Pp. 1–17.
- Pieper, Peter, 1986: Die Runenstempel von Spong Hill: Pseudorunen oder Runenformel? In: *Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Niedersachsen* 17. Pp. 181–200.
- Rooth, Erik, 1926: *Altgermanische Wortstudien*. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Scott, Wendy, 2015. The significance of a second important, and unique, ‘A-bracteate’ from the Melton Mowbray area. In: *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* 89. Pp. 145–51.
- Stoklund, Marie, 1994: Runer 1993. In: *Arkæologiske udgravninger i Danmark* 1993. Pp. 259–74.
- 1995: Runer 1994. In: *Arkæologiske udgravninger i Danmark* 1994. Pp. 266–73.
- West, Stanley E., 1983: Gold bracteate from Undley, Suffolk. In: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 17. P. 459.
- Wicker, Nancy L., 2012: Inspiring the Barbarians? The transformation from Roman medallions to Scandinavian bracteates. In: *Rome beyond its Frontiers: Imports, Attitudes and Practices*. Ed. by Peter S. Wells. Portsmouth, Rhode Island: Journal of Roman Archaeology. (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series 94.) Pp. 101–20.
- & Williams, Henrik, 2013: Bracteates and runes. In: *Futhark* 3 (2012). Pp. 151–213.
- Zimmerman, Ute, 2015: Bier, Runen und Macht — Ein Formelwort im Kontext (*alu*). In: *Futhark* 5 (2014). Pp. 45–64.