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Abstract
This paper contains a new analysis of the runic inscription on the Tune stone, made on the basis of autopsies and various earlier proposals. While I agree with the view that there is a word missing at the top of side A (contra Grønvik 1981 and others), probably r<unoz>, I depart from the current communis opinio in proposing that side B consists of two independent subject-initial clauses. I argue that the first word in B1 is likely to be a personal name ending in -z and the subject of a verb meaning something like ‘erect’, of which staina ‘stone’ is the object. Moreover, I reject the analysis of dalidun in B2 as ‘made (nice), prepared’ (Seip 1929), presenting arguments supporting the emendation da(i)lidun (Bugge 1891, in NlæR), thus giving prijoz dohtriz da(i)lidun arbijja ‘three daughters shared the inheritance’. Finally, I resuscitate the old idea of Läffler (1892, 1896a, 1896b) concerning sijostez, taking it at face value and considering the phrase sijostez arbijano to reflect an archaic legal term meaning ‘the closest family heirs’. Following Läffler I assume that the form is derived from a reflexive (rather than a root meaning ‘bind’, Bjorvand 2008), an analysis supported by a parallel in archaic Latin (suus heres ‘family heir, self-successor’). I conclude that the three daughters of Wōdurīdaz shared the inheritance as the closest family heirs, while some other person (perhaps Wīwaz) erected the stone.
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Introduction

Much controversy has surrounded the reading and interpretation of the best known of the older runic inscriptions from Norway, the one on the stone from Tune in Østfold, southeast of Oslo, traditionally dated to
A.D. c. 400. According to a recent study based on the typology of rune forms and the archeological dates of comparative material, a dating from A.D. c. 375/400 to 520/530 is possible (Imer 2011, 205). The stone was built into the graveyard wall by Tune church until 1850 when it was moved just outside the wall. In 1857 the stone was sent to Oslo (then Christiania), where it stood in the university yard for over eighty years. After that it was kept in a storage room for half a century, but in 1991 it was put on exhibition in the Historical Museum in Oslo. The stone, of reddish granite, is over two meters high and quite impressive. The runes are carved on two sides, called A and B. The Tune inscription has been studied and discussed intensively ever since P. A. Munch (1857) was able to read the first words. The major contributions to the study of this runic document include Bugge (1891, in *NlæR*), Marstrander (1930), Krause (1966, 1971), Antonsen (1975) and Grønvik (1981). In addition, various aspects of it have been discussed in a number of minor studies, some of which have yielded important insights. The history of the reading and interpretation of the Tune inscription is an interesting subject in itself, and is documented in detail in Grønvik’s 1981 monograph (to which Grønvik 1987, 1994 and 1998 are supplementary). The whole debate confirms the First Law of Runo-dynamics, attributed to David M. Wilson (Page 1987, 10), that “for every inscription there shall be as many interpretations as there are scholars working on it”. Even so, it is clear that some readings and interpretations can be shown to be more plausible than others, and this is the justification for the analysis advanced in the present paper. My analysis was made on the basis both of autopsy of the stone itself on a number of occasions between 1996 and 2009, and of proposals by earlier scholars, in particular Bugge, Läffler, Noreen and Jónsson.2

The paper begins with a discussion of side A, the reading of which is rather uncontroversial. The core of the paper, however, contains a detailed investigation of the text on side B, on which most of the controversy has focused. Here I first address the question whether the sequence *dálidun arbija* (B2–3) should be taken to mean ‘prepared the funeral feast’, as is now the standard view, or be emended to *dál(i)idun arbija* ‘shared the inheritance’, as earlier scholarship would have it. There follows an analysis

---

1 This article was originally delivered as a paper at the Fifth International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions in Jelling, Denmark, in 2000, but was too voluminous for publication in the proceedings (Stoklund et al. 2006). I would like to thank James Knirk and two anonymous reviewers for their extensive and invaluable critical comments in connection with publication in *Futhark*. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for all remaining errors.

2 The existing literature on, and interpretations of, the Tune inscription are conveniently cataloged on the website of the Kiel Rune Project (http://www.runenprojekt.uni-kiel.de).
of the much discussed sequence *sijostez* (variously emended) in B3. Finally, I attempt to provide answers to the central questions concerning the content of side B: Who shared the inheritance? Who erected the stone? The conclusion contains a new overall interpretation of the entire Tune inscription.

**Side A**

The text of the inscription on side A begins at the top, going down from left to right in A1 and then up again from right to left in A2, according to the boustrophedon mode of writing. The standard reading of this side, codified in the handbooks of Krause (1966, no. 72; cf. 1971, 169), is as follows:3

A1: *ekwiwazafter·woduri*  \(\rightarrow\)
A2: *dewitadahalaiban·worahto·r(…)*  \(\leftarrow\)

This reading is due to Bugge (1891, 6–21), who proposed that the trace of the rune at the end of A2 was *r*, the missing word being *rūnōz* ‘runes’. Divided into words, the inscription on side A can be rendered as follows:

*ek wiwaz after woduride witadahalaiban worahto r(unoz)*

‘I Wīwaz wrought the r(unes) in memory of Wōdurīdaz, the breadward.’

The text contains a clause beginning with a complex subject noun phrase, an *ek*-formula consisting of the pronoun *ek* ‘I’ and the personal name *wiwaz* (*Wīwaz*), a masculine *a*-stem in the nominative case, cf. *wiz* (ON4 *Vír*) on the Eikeland clasp (Krause 1966, no. 17a; Antonsen 1975, no. 53). The predicate of this clause is *worahto*, first singular past tense, to PGmc. *wurkijana* (ON *yrkja*, past tense *orta*), whose basic meaning is ‘make’. This form represents *worhtō*, with an epenthetic vowel *a* breaking up the cluster *-rht-*. The direct object of this verb is the missing word at the end of A1, apparently beginning in *r*, which suggests that it is *rūnōz* (for different views, see below). The phrase ‘make runes’ has a parallel in the inscription on the Tjurkö bracteate: *wurte runoz* ‘wrought runes’ (Krause 1966, no. 136; Antonsen 1975, no. 109).

The form *woduride* is generally taken to be dative of a masculine *a*-stem *Wōdurīdaz*, and I will take that for granted here. This name is not attested

---

3 In this article, *z* is used as the transliteration for *TAIL* (z for the normalization), and for the sake of consistency here and elsewhere *z* is tacitly substituted for the transliteration *r* employed by many other scholars. Bind-runes are not indicated.
4 Old Norse is used for Old West Nordic, i.e. Old Norwegian and Old Icelandic; see the bibliography for abbreviations of languages.
elsewhere, but had it survived into Old Norse it would have appeared as *Óðríðr. The name occurs with the epithet witadahalaiban, dative of a masculine n-stem. It is to be read witandahaiban, according to a rule that the nasal dental n may be omitted before the dentals þ and d in runic spelling (Krause 1971, 35). The standard analysis of this word is due to von Friesen (1900). According to this analysis, the form is a compound whose first member is a present participle to PGmc. *"witana", evidenced in Goth. witan ‘keep watch over, make secure’, ON vita in vitaðr ‘allotted’ (cf. sá er þeim vollr of vitaðr ‘that field is marked out for them’, Vafþrúðnismál 18). The second member is a weak (n-stem) noun to PGmc. *"hlaibaz(Goth. hlaifs, ON hleifr etc.) ‘bread’; the n-stem form is conditioned by its occurrence in this particular type of compound. In Old Norse a corresponding form to the one in the Tune inscription would be *vitandhleifi. Following this analysis the meaning of witandahaiba is ‘the one watching the loaf, breadward’ (comparable to OE hlæford ‘[literally] breadward, i.e. lord’), or maybe rather ‘the distributor of bread’. Poetic compounds with a present participle as the first element are attested in the archaic Old Norse compound type sløngvandbaugi ‘ring-slinger’ (Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957, 570), which is parallel to Indo-Iranian forms like vidádvasu ‘gaining houses’ (Krause 1971, 48). The prepositional phrase after woduride witadahalaiban is an adjunct in the clause. The dative noun phrase is governed by the preposition after. Whereas the corresponding preposition in Old Norse (eftir, eptir) in the meaning ‘in memory of’ is only attested with the accusative, the dative occurs with Old English æfter in this meaning (Bosworth and Toller 1898, 10 f.; Page 1958, 149–52). It is likely that the dative with this preposition is an archaic feature, while the accusative is an innovation within Old Norse (Grønvik 1981, 146; Syrett 1994, 85). There are word separators before woduride, and before and after worahto. On the other hand, as in other instances of the ek-formula, there is no word separator splitting up the complex noun phrase ekwiwaz. Note, finally, the alliteration exhibited by the words wiwaz—woduride—witadahalaiban—worah, and the placement of the finite verb in non-second position (see Eythórsson 2001, 44–46; 2012, 38–40).

As mentioned above, the question whether there is a word missing at the end of A2, and if so what it may be, has been debated in the literature on the Tune inscription. While the reading r(Únoz) is now generally accepted,

---

5 A different analysis has been proposed by Dishington (2010), according to which witadahalaiban means ‘whose estate is planned and certain’. In my view the arguments on which this analysis is based cannot be accepted.
it may be mentioned, for the sake of completeness, that a different reading was proposed by Marstrander (1930, 325–27). Pointing out that the rune in question could just as well be $w$, Marstrander suggested that the missing word might be $w^{aru}$ ‘grave’ (cf. ON $vǫrr$). Side A would then contain a statement by Wīwaz that he ‘made the grave’ ($worahtō waru$) for Wōdurīdaz the breadward. This reading, however, is less satisfying than the traditional one because of the lack of parallels to such an expression in the runic corpus, as well as in other Germanic languages. Neither the preposition after (or similar forms) nor reflexes of the Proto-Germanic verb *$wurkijana$ are attested in a comparable context elsewhere.

A radically different view was taken by Antonsen (1975, no. 27) and Grønvik (1981, 125–27, 148–52), according to which there is no rune at all
at the end of line A2, hence no addition is required here. Arguing at length against the traditional assumption that there is a missing piece at the top, contemptuously dubbed the “top-piece hypothesis” (toppstykkehypotesen), Grønvik claimed that the verb worhtō is here used absolutely as ON yrkja can be used, and that the Tune stone then is not a “runological torso”.

The epigraphic facts, however, do not support the assumption that the inscription has been preserved intact. Based on personal inspection of the stone on several occasions (as mentioned), I can confirm, along with most other runologists, that there is unquestionably a trace of a rune at the end of line A2. In view of parallels in other inscriptions it seems most likely that the missing word begins in r, and therefore Bugge’s 1891 reading worhto r⟨unoz⟩ should be upheld. In fact, Grønvik himself later changed his mind about the reading of side A (1984, 54; 1994, 45–50), conceding that there is a trace of a rune after the form worhto and that there would have been room for the word rūnōz on the lost top-piece if it were about a foot long (“og det kan det såvidt ha vært plass til på det tapte toppstykket, hvis dette har hatt en lengde på 30–40 cm (sml. Knirk 1991, 106)”; Grønvik 1994, 47 f.).

In conclusion, side A contains a statement by Wīwaz that he made (“wrought”) the runic inscription in memory of Wōdurīdaz, whose epithet is witandahlaiba ‘breadward’. While this conclusion is rather uncontroversial, it is necessary to re-iterate it here as the correct assessment of the text on side A will be of importance for the discussion of side B. Most of the controversy surrounding the Tune inscription involves the reading and interpretation of side B, to which I turn next.

**Side B**

The text in line B1 begins at the bottom, going up to the top, which, as is now generally agreed, is broken off. The word staina, followed by a word separator, stands immediately before an even ledge at the top. This is also at the level where the first word, prijoz, in line B2 begins. The direction of the text here is first downward, and then boustrophedon up again in B3 (see Grønvik 1981, 127–37, concerning the various boustrophedon patterns):

```
B1: ⟨…⟩zwoduride:staina-⟨?⟩ ←
B2: prijozdohtrizidalidun ←
B3: arbijasijostezarbijano →
```

The main problems concerning side B can be summarized as follows. Initially, how much of the inscription is lost? There is clearly a lacuna at the beginning of B1, where there are traces of four (possibly five) staves
before a rune which is generally read as \( z \). I will return to this matter below. The question whether there is also a lacuna at the end of B1 is more difficult to answer. It was assumed in earlier scholarship that a word is missing there, but this assumption has been disfavored ever since Marstrander’s (1930) seminal paper on the Tune inscription. The issue remains open, however, given that there is now almost universal agreement that the top is broken off (containing the word \( rūnōz \) ‘runes’ at end of A). The answer depends to some extent on whether it can be determined that the even ledge at the top of side B was made before or after the runes were carved. If the ledge was already there when the runes were carved, then it would seem less likely — although not inconceivable — that the text would have continued after \( \text{staina} \). In addition, the analysis of two forms is of crucial importance for the interpretation of the inscription. In the one case, the question is whether the form \( \text{dalidun} \) (B2) is to be taken at face value, as has been the standard view since Seip (1929), or to be emended to \( \text{da(í)lidun} \), as Bugge proposed (1891). In the other, it must be determined whether the sequence given above as \( \text{sijostez} \) actually contains the runes \( \text{si} \), as most runologists would maintain, or a retrograde \( r \), as Krause (1934, 1937, 1966, 1971) proposed, reading \( \text{arjostez} \) ‘the noblest’ or \( \text{ar(ð)jostez} \) ‘die zum Erbe Nächstberechtigten’ (cf. also Antonsen’s 1975 reading \( \text{arbiarjostez} \) ‘the most legitimate to inherit’). Finally, it must be established whether there are graphic indications that some lines belong more closely together. In this respect, it is important to note the use of word separators in B1 and not in B2–3. This may suggest that B1 belongs more closely with A1–2 than with B2–3 (Grønvik 1981, 137, and elsewhere). This point leads to a further question, namely whether it is possible to determine the order in which the lines are to be read. It is usually taken for granted that the order is A1–2 and B1–2–3. There are reasons to believe, however, that lines B2–3 may just as well be read before B1, as discussed further below (Jónsson 1931, Sanness Johnsen 1969, Moltke 1984). On the other hand, it is unlikely that B1 is a continuation of A2 (Bugge 1903 in \( \text{NIæR} \), Grønvik 1981, 1984, 1994). Additionally, it has repeatedly been observed that there is a noticeable difference in the shapes of the runes on the two sides of the inscription. The runes on side A are clearly more carefully carved than the ones on side B. The question therefore arises whether the different shapes of the runes in A and B point to two carvers. Despite many attempts, this matter seems to be indeterminable. The undeniable difference in the ductus of the writing appears not to be so significant that it is necessary to assume two carvers; there is also variation within A2.
Sharing the inheritance or preparing the funeral feast?

There is only one finite verb form preserved on side B. This is \textit{dalidun} (B2), evidently third person plural past tense of a weak verb, implying a plural subject. This form has been taken either at face value as \textit{dālidun} ‘made (nice), prepared’, or emended to \textit{da(ð)lidun} ‘shared’. The former is unattested elsewhere in Germanic; the latter corresponds to Goth. \textit{dailjan}, ON \textit{deila}, OE \textit{dælan}, OS \textit{dēlian}, OFr. \textit{dēla}, OHG \textit{teilan} (‘divide, separate, distribute, share’), reflecting a verb PGmc. \textit{*dailijana} derived from a noun \textit{*daili-}, \textit{*daila-} ‘part’ (the former seen in Goth. \textit{dails}, and the latter in ON \textit{deill}, OE \textit{dæl}, OS, OFr. \textit{dēl}, OHG \textit{teil}). Depending on the interpretation, its object would be either \textit{staina} or \textit{arbija}, or both. The form \textit{arbija}, reflecting a neuter \textit{ija-} stem \textit{*arbija}, is ambiguous in that it may mean either ‘inheritance’ or ‘funeral feast’. The meaning ‘inheritance’ of the word \textit{arbija} has parallels in related words in other Germanic and Indo-European languages: Goth. \textit{arbi}, OHG \textit{erbi}, OE \textit{ierfe}, OFr. \textit{erve}, ODutch \textit{er(e)ve}, OSwed. and ODan. \textit{ærfwe}, Norw. (Bergen dialect) \textit{erve} ‘inheritance’. In Old Norse this word occurs only in the compounds \textit{erfivǫrðr}, \textit{erfinyti} ‘heir, son’, cf. OS \textit{erbiuuard}, OE \textit{yrfeweard} ‘heir’. Outside Germanic a corresponding form is found in Old Irish \textit{orb(b)e} ‘inheritance’ (cf. Grønvik 1982, 10 f.). The meaning ‘funeral feast’, on the other hand, is only attested in ON \textit{erf} and not in any other language (Grønvik 1981, 177–80, 1982, 5 f.; Antonsen 1986, 329 f.).

Bugge proposed the reading \textit{da(ð)lidun arbija}, meaning ‘shared the inheritance, got a portion of the inheritance’ (1891, 27 f., 33). The reading \textit{da(ð)lidun} presupposes that the diphthong \textit{ai} is spelled \textit{a}, presumably by mistake on the part of the carver. This has parallels in other inscriptions, in older runes \textit{hateka} for \textit{haietka} (cf. ON \textit{heiti-k}) ‘I am called’ (Lindholmen, Krause 1966, no. 29; Antonsen 1975, no. 17).

As already noted, the form \textit{arbija} is ambiguous. It could correspond to forms meaning ‘inheritance’, or to forms meaning ‘funeral feast’. It was von Friesen (1918, 14) who first proposed that \textit{arbija} must have the latter meaning on the Tune inscription. In accordance with this analysis, von Friesen argued, the verb \textit{da(ð)lidun} must mean ‘shared among themselves’ (cf. ON \textit{deila e-u á milli sín}). So the phrase \textit{dalidun arbija} was taken to mean ‘shared (the expenses for) the funeral feast [verteilen unter sich (die Kosten für) den Erbschmaus]’.

This proposal was considered by Noreen (1923, 390) as an alternative to the one by Bugge; he translates ‘teilten das erbe [oder vielleicht eher die kosten für den erbschmaus]’. Moreover, evaluating von Friesen’s translation, Krause (1926, 235 f.) accepted the analysis of \textit{arbija} as ‘funeral feast’, but
took dalidun to mean ‘distribute, hold [austeilen, ausrichten]’, comparing it to ON deila mat, dagurð ‘distribute food, breakfast’ (Fritzner 1883–96, 1: 241 s.v. deila). Taking the subject to be ‘three daughters’, Krause translated þrijoz dohtriz da(i)lidun arbija as ‘three daughters held the funeral feast [Drei Töchter richteten das Erbmahl aus].’

A crucial step in the development of the alternative account was taken by Seip (1929). Accepting the validity of von Friesens’s suggestion of arbija as ‘funeral feast’ rather than ‘inheritance’, Seip was nevertheless uncomfortable with the notion of ‘sharing the expenses for the funeral feast’, as he seems to have believed that ON deila was not attested in the sense ‘share [dele mellem sig]’. He rejected Krause’s translation ‘ausrichten’ on the grounds that it seemed “artificial [kunstig]”, surmising that the context of a funeral feast required the meaning ‘make, perform, hold’ (cf. ON gera erfi ‘hold a funeral feast’). Accordingly, Seip proposed that dalidun was not to be emended, but was rather the past tense of an unattested verb PGmc. *đēlijanan (as if ON *dæla, 3 pl. past tense *dældu) ‘do, make’, from which the Old Norse adjective dæll ‘gentle, familiar, forbearing’ was derived. He further suggested that these forms were related to Old Church Slavic dělo ‘work’, dělajǫ ‘I work (on)’. Accordingly, the translation of þrijoz dohtriz dalidun arbija was: ‘Three daughters did (i.e. prepared, held) a funeral feast [tre døtre gjorde arveøl].’

Seip’s proposal was embraced by Neckel (1929), who, however, suggested that the putative verb *dělijana was formed to the adjective attested as ON dæll, rather than the other way around, interpreting the relevant passage thus: ‘The three daughters prepared the funeral feast so that people ate and celebrated; they made it dælt for relatives and guests [die drei Töchter machten das Erbmal zurecht, so daß es verspeist und gefeiert wurde, sie machten es dælt für Gesippen und Gäste].’

In his classic paper on the Tune inscription, Marstrander (1930, 308–10) adopted Seip’s basic idea. Similarly to Neckel, Marstrander assumed that *dalihana was derived within North Germanic from an unattested noun *dāla (related to the adj. dæll). In other respects, he departed radically from previous interpretations, proposing that the object of dalidun was not only arbija ‘funeral feast’, but also staina ‘stone’. This part of the inscription was taken to consist of two asyndetic clauses, the finite verb being omitted in the second one. Moreover, the daughters were considered to be the subject of the first clause only whereas the subject of the second clause would be the (male) heirs (read by Marstrander as (a)sijostez arbijano). Further details of this interpretation will be given shortly, but the gist of it is this: ‘The daughters “made” (i.e. erected) the stone but the male heirs “made” (i.e. held)
the funeral feast [(døttrene) reiste denne sten ..., men arveøllet holdt de mannlige arvinger ...]’ (p. 342).

Marstrander’s reading and interpretation of the Tune inscription have become very influential, recurring (with some modifications) in the handbooks of Krause (1966, 1971) (‘... bereitet den Stein drei Töchter, das Erbmal (aber) die ... Erben’). Antonsen (1975, no. 27) and Grønvik (1981, 180) also accept the interpretation of dalidun as ‘make, prepare’. Antonsen, however, takes the object of this verb to be staina ‘stone’ only (‘three daughters ... prepared the stone’). Grønvik, on the other hand, assumes that the object is only arbijia ‘funeral feast’ (‘three daughters made the funeral feast nice [tre døtre gjorde gravølet hyggelig]’), while staina is the object of a different verb (see below).

There are several problems concerning the alternative view taking dalidun to mean ‘make, prepare’, as was pointed out already by Western (1930). Aside from the fact that there is no evidence for a verb PGmc. *đēlijanan ‘do, make’ in Old Norse or in any other Germanic language, there is the more general question, also raised by Western, whether the successful hosting of a funeral feast is of such importance that it would deserve to be immortalized in a runic inscription. Apart from the fact that no parallels for such an activity are found in the runic material, the answer to this question must in the end depend more on one’s common sense than on strict scientific “proof”.

It should be borne in mind that Seip’s premise was that if arbijia means ‘funeral feast’, the context requires that the form dalidun has the sense ‘make, prepare, hold’. What seems to have been lost sight of in the ensuing discussion is the simple fact that arbijia can just as well mean ‘inheritance’, as in Bugge’s reading. Given the problems with the alternative view, the consequences of the original idea should be explored again. In this case, the verb obviously cannot have a meaning ‘make (nice), prepare’, whereas ‘divide, share’ would make perfect sense. Thus we must go back to square one, accepting the validity of Bugge’s proposal that dalidun is to be emended to da<i>lidun ‘shared’. The phrase da<i>lidun arbijia would mean ‘shared the inheritance, got a portion of the inheritance’.

The two main objections which have been raised against the emendation da<i>lidun ‘share’ are, first, that it requires the assumption of a misspelling of a for ai in an otherwise carefully carved inscription (Marstrander 1930, 307; Grønvik 1981, 92), and second, that the Old Norse verb deila with an object in the accusative does not normally have the meaning ‘share’ but rather ‘divide up, distribute’ (Seip 1929, 22; Grønvik 1981, 88, 209 n. 68). Neither of these objections carries much weight, however. On the one hand, as mentioned above, the writing of a for ai has parallels in other
inscriptions; the omission of the i is probably just a spelling error (cf. Krause 1966, 70). On the other hand, there is evidence that the verb *dailijana* originally governed accusative rather than dative case. In fact, in Old Norse deila is attested with the accusative (as well as with the dative), as in the following passage from “Tryggðamál” in the law-book Grágás (Grágás, 1: 206; cf. Fritznr 1883–96, 1: 241 s.v. deila, Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957, 98):

Dit scolot deila kníf oc kiotstycke. oc alla lute yckar imille sem frændr en eigi sem fiandr.

‘You (two) shall share a knife and a piece of meat and all things among yourselves as friends and not as foes.’

In this passage alla lute ‘all things’ can only be accusative. The occurrence with accusative can be assumed to be the older usage with deila ‘share’. Already in early Old Norse, however, accusative gives way to dative with this verb in accordance with a more general diachronic tendency in the language to expand the domain of dative as the case of the direct object of verbs (Heusler 1932, 115). Moreover, phrases combining reflexes of *dailijana* ‘divide, share’ and *arbija* ‘inheritance’ are widely attested in old Germanic languages. The following examples are from Old English: næfre Ismael wið Isāce, wið min āgen bearn, yrfe dǣleð ‘never shall Ishmael share the inheritance with Isaac, with my own child’ (Caedmon 2781f.); ierfe-gedāl ‘share of inheritance’. Even in Old Norse there is indirect evidence for this combination, although deila here has the meaning ‘share in, get a portion of’. Thus, for example, in the Poetic Edda the verb occurs with the object fé ‘property, money’: deila fé foður ‘get a portion of the property of one’s father’ (Skírnismál, st. 22).

It appears then that problems concerning the emendation of dalidun to da(i)lidun are only apparent. It is, in fact, perfectly reasonable to assume that on the Tune inscription the verb means ‘shared’. In this case, arbija cannot mean ‘funeral feast’, for needless to say ‘to share a funeral feast’ does not make any sense. After almost a century of scholarly debate we have now come back to Bugge’s original proposal to read da(i)lidun arbija ‘shared the inheritance’. With this interpretation the word staina ‘stone’ is unlikely to be the object of the verb da(i)lidun. On the other hand, it would be plausible to assume that staina is the object of a missing verb meaning ‘erect (vel sim.).”

---

6 The possibility that the writing of a for ai is due to a sporadic monophthongization cannot be ruled out entirely, although it is not very likely in view of the occurrence of the form staina in B1.
A likely candidate is the verb PGmc. *satjana* ‘erect’, suggested already by Läffler (1892, 5 n. 1), Noreen (1903, 345; 1923, 390), and Bugge (1903, 521–23). This verb occurs with ‘stone’ in the inscription from Rö, Bohuslän (Krause 1966, no. 73; Antonsen 1975, no. 26): satido (s)tain(a) ‘I erected the stone’. Several other possibilities have been entertained, in particular by Grønvik (1981, 1994), as will be discussed further below. An analysis along these lines entails that side B consists of two clauses, each containing a finite verb. In view of this conclusion, the following two questions arise: First, who shared the inheritance? And second, who erected the stone? In order to be able to answer these questions we must try to find out what the subject of the verb da(i)lidun ‘shared’ is. But before trying to answer these questions, it is in order to shed some light on the murky sequence sijostezarbijano in line B3.

The sequence sijostezarbijano: related, divine or lovely heirs?

The sequence sijostezarbijano (B3), following da(i)lidun arbija, is evidently a phrase consisting of two words. The first is sijostez, which has been read in various ways: si(b)jostez, (a)sijostez, (a)rjostez, (a)r(b)jostez (see Syrett 1994, 89, for some discussion). The second is arbijano, genitive plural of a masculine n-stem noun *arƀijan-* ‘heir’ (cf. Goth. arbja, OHG erbo, OE ierfe; ON arfi < *arban-, Grønvik 1982, 5).

The form sijostez is undoubtedly the most mysterious word in this inscription, besides the ones that are missing. It appears to be an adjective in the superlative with the masculine plural ending *-ēz. To be sure, it is likely that the phrase sijostez arbijano denotes ‘the closest heirs’ or something similar, and therefore the approximate meaning of sijostez can be deduced from the context. But as the analysis of this form is not immediately obvious, most scholars assume that an emendation is needed.

Reading si(b)jostez ‘the ones most closely related, the next of kin [de nærmest beslægtede]’, Bugge (1891, 34) suggested that the rune b had been left out by mistake. This form would be derived from PGmc. *sibja-* ‘related’ (cf. ON sif, pl. sifjar ‘affinity, connection, by marriage’, Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957, 526). Accordingly, the meaning of the phrase would be ‘the next of kin of the heirs’, referring to the daughters, which of course is quite

---

To be sure, Läffler assumed that the form was third plural (satidun), presumably referring to the heirs, but Noreen and Bugge posit a singular form. See the discussion further below.
natural in the context. Marstrander (1930, 310), however, rejected Bugge’s reading, mainly on the grounds that an omission of b in an otherwise carefully carved inscription was unlikely. Instead, he proposed (pp. 320 f.) that the initial vowel of this form coincided with the final vowel of the preceding word, arbija, and that it should therefore be read (a)sijostez. This was supposed to be the superlative to an adjective *ansija- (*āsija-) derived from *ansu- (*āsu-) ‘god’ (ON Æss), meaning ‘the ones closest to the god [som stod Åsen nærmest]’ (p. 342).

While the emendation to si(b)jostez may be doubtful, although not demonstrably false, various problems are inherent in Marstrander’s own proposal, as illustrated by Grønvik (1976, 159–163; 1981, 111; 1994, 46 f.). In particular, the semantics of the alleged form is forced. In fact, such a form would be more likely to mean ‘the most divine’. This, however, would be quite peculiar in this context, given that the superlative would imply that the heirs mentioned in the inscription were in some sense “more divine” than some other party of heirs, not mentioned in the document. Moreover, the word formation would be unusual in Germanic, where such secondary adjective formations are rare (cf. Grønvik 1981, 111; Krahe and Meid 1969, § 74,4). In view of these difficulties, Grønvik (1981, 182 f.) rejects Marstrander’s analysis of the form, but retains the reading (a)sijostez, claiming that it is the superlative to an otherwise unattested verbal adjective *āsija- ‘lovely [elskelig]’, made to the root *ans- (*ās-), cf. ON unna (1 sg. ann) ‘love’, ást (fem.) ‘love’ (< *ansti-, cf. Goth. ansts ‘grace’). Accordingly, the meaning of (a)sijostez would be ‘the loveliest [de mest elskelige]’.

While Grønvik’s criticism of Marstrander’s analysis is justified, his own proposal fares no better. The main problem has to do with the formation of an adjective *āsija- ‘lovely [elskelig]’ to the root *ans- ‘love’, for which there is no other evidence.

More generally, the idea that the text contains information about three daughters, “the loveliest of the heirs”, hosting a “nice” funeral feast, suggests a sentimental atmosphere of coziness (hyggelighet) which may be appropriate in the setting of a modern Scandinavian welfare state, but seems peculiarly out of place in a pre-Viking runic inscription. In fact, Grønvik

---

6 Grønvik (1981, 118–21, with further references) discusses PGmc. *sibja- at some length, arguing that it originally only applied to those who are married into the family, not to blood relations, and therefore it could not refer to the daughters (p. 120). This appears to be valid for Old Norse sifjar, but in the earliest West Germanic sources the cognate forms are attested with a reference to blood relations (pp. 119 f.). Despite Grønvik’s conclusion to the contrary, it seems possible that the West Germanic meaning is the original one and that there has been a semantic narrowing in Old Norse.
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(2010, 120–25) himself abandoned his earlier proposal, reverting instead to Marstrander’s earlier assumption that the form *åsiya- is to be related to *ansu- ‘god’, conjecturing that it could mean ‘connected/associated to (a) god; devoted to (a) god’. This new conjecture is prone to the same objections as Marstrander’s analysis, discussed above.9

A further problem with the alleged form (a)sijostez—whatever its meaning—has to do with the assumption that it shares the initial vowel with the immediately preceding form, arbija. As admitted by Grønvik (1981, 182), there are no certain cases of a double vowel written single in the runic inscriptions, although no counterexamples either. In short, the form (a)sijostez appears to be a mirage.10

The ‘most Aryan’ of the heirs?

A drastic new reading was proposed by Krause (1934). Like Marstrander, Krause assumed a double value for the final a of arbija, but he interpreted the sequence read by others as si as a retrograde r. Krause’s reading of B3 is as follows:

B3:  arbijarjostezarbijano →

The form, as read by Krause, was (a)jostez, a superlative of the word reflected in Aryan (German Arier), Sanskrit aryá- ‘lord’, and allegedly also Old Irish aire ‘free man, prince’ (on which see below). The supposed meaning here is ‘the noblest [die vornehmsten]’. Krause surmised that in the Tune inscription it had a “racial flavor” (1934, 218):

... so mag das altnorwegische arjostez des Tunesteins auch einen rassischen Beigeschmack haben.

Jedenfalls beweist der Tunestein, daß das Wort, auf dem unser „Arier“ beruht, nicht nur indo-iranisch und keltisch, sondern auch altgermanisch ist.

This was “political correctness” in the Third Reich. Interestingly, this passage does not occur in Krause’s handbook of 1937, nor is it found in the later, standard edition (Krause 1966), or in his book on the language of

---

9 This is also emphasized by Bjørvand (2008), who provides further criticism of the proposed word formation of *åsiya-, to be discussed in another connection below.

10 The reviewers assert that there are in fact instances of double vowels (Rö, Wremen) written single. However, in my view, the evidence is not entirely clear, and the same goes for other such cases. In fact, despite common claims to the contrary (e.g. Grønvik 1981, 182), there are also few if any certain instances of double consonants in word-final and word-initial position written single either (cf. Antonsen 1975, 242; 1986, 330).
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the runic inscriptions (Krause 1971), but the reading and the interpretation are retained. Krause’s reading has been criticized by several scholars, in particular Norwegian runologists, who have examined the inscription carefully, with the means of modern technology (cf. Grønvik 1981, 114–16; Knirk 2006, 334). The results of this examination show that the reading arjostez is unfounded, and that it can be considered certain that the text shows the sequence si and not a retrograde r (which would be the only one in the inscription). Independently of the epigraphic facts, the etymology and linguistic distribution of the word Aryan have been revised in subsequent scholarship. It is now mostly assumed that the root of Aryan is confined to Indo-Iranian (Mayrhofer 1992–2001, i: 111 f. s.v. arí-, 174 f. s.v. árya-).

Accordingly, the Celtic word aire ‘free man, prince’, mentioned by Krause in the passage quoted above, must have a different etymology (to Old Irish air ‘before’, cf. OHG furí, fora ‘before’).11 For a well-balanced discussion, see Grønvik (1981, 116).

It is clear that neither the epigraphic nor the linguistic evidence supports Krause’s proposal. In view of the fact that it recurs in recent scholarly literature (e.g. Heidermanns 1993, 103; Boutkan 1995, 101; Nielsen 1998, 546 f.; Bammesberger 1999; Imer 2011, 205), it must be emphasized that it is most implausible and should be put ad acta as an unfortunate example of scholarship misguided by opportunistic political considerations. Interestingly, Krause himself seems to have become somewhat doubtful about the existence of the proposed word. In the second edition of his handbook (Krause 1966, 166), he suggested an alternative emendation (a)r(bi)jestez ‘die zum Erbe Nächsberechtigten’. This was probably meant to be formed to an alleged adj. *arbijā- ‘entitled to inheritance’, possibly attested in OSw. iammærþi ‘equally entitled to inheritance [lika arvsberättigad]’ (cf. Grønvik 1981, 116). Finally, Antonsen’s (1975, no. 27) proposal arbijarjestez ‘the most legitimate-to-inherit’, a form claimed to be a compound made to *arbijār ‘inheritance’ and *arjōstēz, not only retains Krause’s unsubstantiated reading, but would also be unparalleled in Germanic, both in regard to its word formation and its semantics.

Indo-European legal language in the Tune inscription

None of the proposals to emend the form sijestez discussed above can be considered plausible. Fortunately, however, there is a further possibility,

11 Note, however, that the connection between Indo-Iranian and Celtic is upheld by Delamarre (2003, s.v. arios).
which is simply to take sijostez at face value. As such it can be analyzed as the superlative to an adjective *sī-ja- based on the stem of the reflexive *se- ‘self, own’ (seen in the reflexive pronoun ON sik ‘self’ etc.). This analysis was, in fact, suggested more than a century ago by Läffler (1892, 2–4), translating the form sijostez as ‘the ones most closely related [de mäst eller närmast besläktade]’. Läffler suggested that this adjective was also contained in the Old Frisian masculine noun sīa (sīa), which means ‘descendant [Sprosse, Nachkomme, Grad der Verwandtschaft]’). Plausible as it is, this idea has been virtually ignored in the discussion of the Tune inscription ever since it was subjected to a critical evaluation, and dismissed, by Marstrander (1930, 310–15; see also Syrett 1994, 89). Recently, Bjorvand (2008) has reopened the discussion; while accepting the reading sijostez and the meaning ‘the ones most closely related’, he rejects the association with the reflexive *se-, connecting it instead to PGmc. *sī- (PIE *siH-) ‘bind’, *sī-man- (masc.) found in OE sīma, OS sīmo, OFris. sīm, ON sīma ‘rope, cord’ (and also Modern Icelandic sími ‘telephone’); in fact, for Bjorvand the Old Frisian form sīa also belongs here. Although possible, this proposal has the drawback that such an adjective is hard to motivate on independent grounds since forms derived from PIE *siH- appear not to figure in kinship terms in Indo-European.

Despite the objections by Marstrander and Bjorvand, I believe that Läffler’s analysis can be maintained. The form sijostez can plausibly be taken as the superlative of an archaic form of the reflexive possessive adjective *sī-ja-z, reflecting pre-Gmc. *sei-yo-s.12 This is a *-yo-derivation which would have co-existed alongside *sei-no-s, formed with the suffix *-no-, giving the Proto-Germanic form *sī-na-z. In other Indo-European languages possessive adjectives are formed in a similar way as in Germanic, but generally with a different suffix, notably *-yo- in Old Church Slavic (svoju ‘self’s, own’ < *swo-yo-). The possessive adjectives are derived from the locative case formed to the Proto-Indo-European pronominal stems *me-, *te-, *se- with the addition of various suffixes, which in Germanic is regularly *-no-. This gives the pre-Germanic forms *mei-no-s, *tei-no-s, *sei-no-s, yielding PGmc. *mī-na-z, *þī-na-z, *sī-na-z (ON mínn, þínn, sinn, etc.). The semantic development of a locative construction (‘with me’) to a possessive (‘belongs to me’) is straightforward and has typological parallels in various languages, including Celtic, Slavic, and Hungarian. A superlative to a pronominal adjective, comparable to the form *sīyōstēz posited on the basis of the Tune inscription, is found, for example, in Latin ipsissimus.

12 Läffler (1892, 3) suggested that the form was derived from the reflexive stem PIE *se- (as *se-yo-), or alternatively a locative stem PIE *sei- (as *sei-o-; Läffler 1892, 226).
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‘his very own self’ (Plautus, Trin. 4, 2, 14), presumably a sociolinguistically conditioned nonce formation to *ipse ‘self, himself’.

A further issue is addressed by Bjorvand (2008), according to whom the superlative suffix *-ōsta- was confined to a-stems in the earliest Germanic, whereas the suffix *-ista- occurred elsewhere, including ja/ija-stems. Thus, for example, with an a-stem adjective like PGmc. leuba- ‘dear’ we find ON ljúfr, ljúfari, ljúfastr and comparable forms in other old Germanic languages (with *-ōsta-), but with a ija-stem like PGmc. *rikija- ‘mighty’ we get early ON ríkstr (with *-ista-). Later on, however, the suffix *-ōsta- was gradually expanded beyond its original domain, as in ON ríkastr for ríkstr. In this light, Bjorvand claims, a form such as sījōstēz (or sijōstēz, with a short -i-, with Läffler’s alternative reading, or āsijōstēz, for that matter) could in any case not be considered as an inherited, non-analogical form in Germanic. The expected form in the Tune inscription would in fact be *siistēz (or *siistēz or *āsistēz). As mentioned above, Bjorvand assumes the reading sījōstēz ‘next of kin’, to the root *sī- ‘cord’, which is hard to substantiate. In order to account for the -j- in the form, Bjorvand proposes that it is a glide in a hiatus after the long -i-, rather than part of the stem.

There are two main objections to this proposal. First, although the handbooks of Germanic historical linguistics present the case as it is referred by Bjorvand, the evidence for the distribution of the two superlative suffixes in the earliest Germanic is tenuous, and it is not certain that the distribution of the variants was as rigid as claimed. Thus, it is conceivable that even already at an early stage PGmc. *-ōsta- could, at least occasionally, occur with ja/ija-stems, as it did later. Second, the assumption of a glide is not compelling for the language of the early runic inscriptions, and certainly not for Old Norse, as Bjorvand himself remarks. To be sure, he suggests, as a parallel, that there is a glide in the form þrijōz ‘three (fem.)’ in the Tune inscription itself as against ON þrjár (from *þrjar) which does not contain a glide. The -j-, however, can just as well be taken to be part of the stem, with þrijōz reflecting PGmc. *pre-jō-z, and it is possible that ON þrjár (*þrjar) and OS thrīa do so as well (cf. also OHG druvi, OE dēō which point to *pre-jō-; see e.g. Antonsen 1975, 45). To conclude, despite Bjorvand’s objections, the form *sijōstēz can probably be taken to be a superlative to a PGmc. ja-stem *sī-ja-.

An additional problem with the above analysis for the form sijōstēz in the Tune inscription is the apparent lack of supporting evidence in Germanic for a possessive adjective with the suffix *-yo- rather than *-no-. As was pointed out by Läffler (1892, 3), however, Old Frisian sīa ‘descendant’ may reflect an n-stem noun *sijan- (masc.) ‘relative’, to an adjective *sīja- ‘own, related’ which would be a *-yo-derivative from the reflexive stem *se-.
It must be kept in mind, however, that Old Frisian is not an archaic dialect within Germanic; in fact, it has been called “an Eldorado for etymologists” (Marstrander 1930, 312). Discussing Läffler’s account, Bugge (1903, in *NLæR*, 2: 515) rejected it on the grounds that OFris. siā, which can mean ‘companion [Gefährte, Genosse]’ (as well as ‘descendant’), was to be derived from *sīþa*- (PGmc. *sinþa*) ‘trip, way’. In his study of the Tune inscription, however, Marstrander (1930, 310–12) examined the evidence in great detail, concluding against Bugge that OFris. siā ‘descendant’ was unlikely to have lost an intervocalic *-þ-*, and was thus not derived from *sīþa-. The reason is that the form only occurs in Old East Frisian documents, where loss of intervocalic *-þ-* is not attested. Therefore, the Old East Frisian form siā ‘descendant’ must be etymologically different from *sinþa*. As to Läffler’s suggestion, Marstrander (p. 312) admitted that “Seldom in the history of runology has a combination been proposed that objectively and formally holds up better [der sjelden i runologiens historie har vært fremlagt en kombinasjon som saklig og formelt står bedre]”. Nevertheless, Marstrander was unable to accept its validity, mainly because it was based on evidence outside North Germanic, concluding that sijostez was a *vox nihili*. Instead, Marstrander (p. 320) suggested the reading (a)sijostez, discussed and dismissed above.

Shortly after Läffler published his analysis, Kauffmann in a review (1894) proposed a different etymology for the forms sijostez on the Tune stone and OFris. sīa, comparing them to Lat. sequi ‘follow’ and socius ‘companion’ (reflecting *sehwō, to the PIE root *sekʷ-e/o-). Kauffman’s hypothesis recurs in Holthausen (1925, 92) and Lloyd and Springer (1988, 518 s.v. OHG bein-segga [fem. n-stem] ‘pedi-sequa, Dienerin’), although its shortcomings were demonstrated already by Läffler (1896a, 98; 1896b, 215). According to established sound laws, a Proto-Indo-European form *sekʷ-i-o-* would have given PGmc. *sīgja- or *siwja-, not *sija-. This etymology was justly dismissed by Marstrander (1930, 313–15), whose own proposal, however, was completely unmotivated, connecting sīa ‘descendant’ with ON sýja (< *siuþon-) ‘round of planking of a ship’s side [omfaret i bordkledningen, bordgangen]’. Bjorvand’s recent proposal (2008) has been discussed above.

It should go without saying that none of the alternative accounts is any more convincing than that of Läffler. In conclusion, OFris. sīa can be derived from the stem of the reflexive, and so can the form sijostez on the

---

13 A reviewer states that it is unnecessary to posit *-i* in the preform of OFris. siā ‘descendant’, given the derivation of OFris. siā ‘see’ from PIE *sekʷ-e/o. The reviewer further suggests a connection between the Old Frisian words—“so the descendant is the one the ancestor can see”. Given the lack of parallels, I find this suggestion implausible.
Tune stone. The *-yo-form of the possessive adjective could have existed in the earliest Germanic alongside the *-no-formation which subsequently replaced it.

The original meaning of the reflexive stem *se- was ‘own, belonging to the family’. PIE *swo- is the reflexive and possessive pronoun equally applicable to all persons, as in Russian svoj ‘(my, your, his, our, their) own’. This original meaning is also seen in Goth. swes ‘own (adj.); property (noun)’, ON sváss ‘dear, beloved’, OFris. swēs ‘related’, OE swēs, OS, OHG swās ‘dear, one’s own’, OHG gi-swāso ‘familiar, secret’, Middle Dutch swāselinc ‘related by marriage’ (cf. Benveniste 1973 [1969], 269; Szemerényi 1996, 220 f.; Lehmann 1986, 182 s.v. swes). Therefore, the phrase *sījaz arƀijan-, reconstructed for Germanic on the basis of the Tune inscription, would mean ‘his own heir, family heir’.

In fact, a close parallel to this expression occurs in archaic Latin. This is the phrase suus heres ‘his own heir, family heir, self-successor’, which is found in the Law of the Twelve Tables (Leg. xii tab., V 4; Warmington 1979, 448 f.):

\[ \text{Si intestato moritur, cui suus heres nec escit, adgnatus proximus familiam habeto.} \]

‘If person dies intestate, and has no self-successor, nearest agnate male kinsman shall have possession of deceased’s household.’

In early Roman times a suus heres was an heir who had been in paternal power of the testator until his death, and was regarded as having held the father’s property in common with him by dormant right which became active automatically upon the father’s death (Warmington 1979, 444, 448). Later the term was used of first successors to an intestate, as stated by Justinian: Intestatorum ... hereditates ex Lege XII Tabularum primum ad suos heredes pertinent ‘Inheritances of persons who die intestate fall first, by the Law of the Twelve Tables, to self-successors’ (Inst., III,1,1). Moreover, Justinian makes clear that both men and women could be sui heredes: Utraque persona in hominum procreatione similiter naturae officio fungitur, et Lege antiqua XII Tabularum omnes similiter ad successiones ab intestato vocabantur ‘Both sexes perform equally the function of nature in perpetuating mankind, and by the ancient Law of the Twelve Tables all were called equally to succession by an ancestor intestate on decease’ (Inst., II,13,5). If, however, there were no “self-successors” or blood-relations (consanguinei), the inheritance would belong to the nearest agnate relations (adgnati proximi), that is, male kinsmen by blood who traced their descent through males of the same family (Warmington 1979, 448).
The Latin legal term *suus heres* was discussed by Beneveniste (1973 [1969], 272) in the context of Indo-European. He notes that the occurrence of the reflexive in this expression is clearly an archaism which is only comprehensible in view of the original meaning of the reflexive stem, PIE *se-, *s(e)wo- ‘own, belonging to the family’. On the other hand, if *suus* had only possessive sense in this phrase, it would not be necessary. “A *heres* who is a *suus*,” Benveniste concludes, “this is what the provision intends: there is no transmission of property outside the *sui*, that is to say the closed group of immediate descendants; it remains within the group of collaterals”.

Together, the archaic Latin phrase *suus heres* and *sījaz arbijan-,* conjectured for Germanic on the basis of the Tune inscription, reflect a legal term which has its origins at a linguistic stage ancestral to the Germanic and Italic branches, that is to say Western Indo-European, if not Proto-Indo-European itself. To be sure, in Germanic the lexical item *arbijan-* occurs instead of *ģehh₁-ro-, the word for ‘heir’ manifested in Lat. *heres* (a compound of *ģehh₁-ro- plus the substantivizing suffix *-e/od-*) and Greek *kʰéros* ‘collateral heir’ (see also *kʰéra* ‘widow’). But the specific combination with the reflexive in the phrase ‘his own heir, family heir, self-successor’ is a *détail singulier* in the sense of Meillet, conclusively suggesting the survival of a formulaic construction which belongs to Indo-European legal language into the early Germanic period.14

In summary, as argued by Läffler (1892), the form *sijostez* in the Tune inscription can be taken at face value and analyzed as the superlative to a possessive adjective derived from the reflexive stem *se-*. The phrase *sijostez arbijano* ‘the closest family heirs’ is an ancient legal term which has a parallel in Archaic Latin, and arguably has its roots in Indo-European.

Who shared the inheritance? Who erected the stone?

We have seen above that there is a good case for emending *dalidun* to *da<ilidun* ‘shared’, whose object must be *arbij* ‘inheritance’, and that therefore the form *staina* ‘stone (acc. sg.)’ is likely to be the object of a different verb (*‘erect’ or something similar). On the basis of the results established so far, the following questions must now be re-iterated concerning the role of the three daughters (*prijoz dohtriz*) and the closest family heirs (*sijostez arbijano*). First, who shared the inheritance—the closest family

---

heirs excluding the daughters, or the daughters who are the closest family heirs? Second, who erected the stone—the daughters or somebody else?

The answer to the first question depends on the syntactic function of the phrase *sijostez arbijano* ‘the closest family heirs’. There are two possibilities. On the one hand, the masculine form of the adjective may indicate male heirs, the subject of *da(ð)lidun arbija*: ‘The closest male family heirs shared the inheritance.’ If this is the case, this phrase is not modifying *þrijoz dohtriz*, which would be the subject of a different clause (presumably involving the raising of the stone). On the other hand, *sijostez arbijano* may be in apposition to *þrijoz dohtriz*, the subject of *da(ð)lidun arbija*: ‘Three daughters shared the inheritance, the closest family heirs.’ This involves gender agreement in the appositional phrase between the nominalized adjective *sijostez* and the masculine partitive genitive *arbijano* (as if Icelandic *dætur, nánastir erfingja* ‘daughters, the closest heirs’; cf. Jónsson 1931, 149). If this latter possibility is the correct one, B1 must contain a separate clause from B2–3.

The answer to the question who erected the stone, in turn, depends on the answer to the first one. If it can be established that the family heirs are different from the daughters, then the former must have shared the inheritance, while the latter did something else, i.e. erected the stone. If, on the other hand, the three daughters shared the inheritance as the closest heirs, then either the daughters also erected the stone, or somebody else did, whose identity would remain to be established. The three possible interpretations can be summarized as follows:

1. Three daughters erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz, but his closest family heirs shared the inheritance.
2. Three daughters erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz and shared the inheritance, as the closest family heirs.
3. NN erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz. Three daughters shared the inheritance, as the closest family heirs.

In order to establish which of the three possible interpretations is to be preferred, we must try to locate the position of the missing verb (‘erect’ *vel sim.*), of which *staina* is the object. Here there are only two possibilities: the verb in question must have been either at the beginning or the end of line B1. In the following section I seek to determine which of these two slots is more plausible as a position for the missing verb.
What is missing in line B1?

A relatively short word of four (possibly five) staves ending in z appears to be missing at the beginning of line B1. It seems impossible to narrow down the runic possibilities for the stave immediately preceding the first visible rune. Various proposals have been made concerning this missing word, some of which will be evaluated in the following.

Moreover, there is possibly a lacuna after staina (which is followed by a word separator) at the end of B1, despite claims to the contrary by many leading scholars, including Bugge (1903, 520), Marstrander (1930, 298–300, 309 n. 1), Krause (1966), Antonsen (1975), and Grønvik (1981, 117, 141, 168). As stated at the outset, at the end of line A2 there is a trace of a rune, in all probability r, indicating that the word rūnōz ‘runes’ is missing at the top of the stone, which is broken off. Therefore, a word could in fact be missing at the top on the other side as well, at the end of line B1.

As argued above, it seems a reasonable conjecture that staina is the object of a verb such as PGmc. *satjanan ‘erect’ and not of da(i)lidun. This verb could be either at beginning or the end of B1, although both assumptions involve some epigraphic difficulties.

The counterarguments to the assumption that the text continues after staina (and the word separator following it) mainly involve the presence of an even ledge at the top of side B. The main points can be summarized as follows. First, if the ledge had been made after the runes were carved, it would be a remarkable coincidence that staina ends immediately before the ledge, and þrijoz begins immediately after it. Rather, it would seem as though it was already there before the runes were carved; so the runemaster would not have gone any further than the ledge with line B1, and this is also where he began with B2. Second, if there was a verb after staina, why did the runemaster not begin the next line (B2) at the top; in other words, why does þrijoz start immediately after the ledge?

These questions, however, do not carry as much weight as they might seem given ample epigraphic evidence in favor of the view that the Tune stone is a “runological torso” (cf. the discussion in Johansen 1984, 41–45; Sanness Johnsen 1969, 41 f.; Moltke 1984, 24 f., 31 f.; see also Knirk’s 1991 report on the findings of the stonemason Halfdansen, at p. 106). As to the first point, there is at least a theoretical possibility that there was a crack after staina, where the top later broke off.15 Secondly, there are graphic indications that

---

15 However, it must be stressed that everything points to the presence of the ledge before the inscription was written. As reported by Knirk (1991, 106), in Halfdansen’s opinion, the ledge
lines B2–3 belong more closely together than B1 (Grønvik 1981, 137; 1998, 35f.). Among other things, the use of word separators in B1 (before and after *staina*), but not in B2–3, may suggest that this line belongs more closely with side A. Thus, lines B2–3 stand apart epigraphically and are not directly linked to B1, and arguably this is also the case with respect to the content. One possible account of this observation is that the text in B1 was written first, but the carver then chose to start with the text in B2 further below where there was more space. Another possibility, which in my view is more feasible, is that lines B2–3 were written before B1 (cf. Jónsson 1931, 143; Sanness Johnsen 1969, 41–44; Moltke 1984, 31f.). The direction of the writing on side A, beginning downwards from the top, supports this assumption. In this light, it is plausible to assume that lines B2–3 were written first, when there was enough space on the side, and line B1 written last.

Be that as it may, the assumption that the text in B1 continued after *staina* is not only possible but even perhaps plausible.

The lacuna at the beginning of B1

Many suggestions have been made as to the missing word at the beginning of B1. As already stated, this must be a relatively short word of four (possibly five) staves ending in *z*. In fact, items from a variety of word classes have been proposed: verb, preposition, pronoun, numeral, and noun. I now turn to a discussion of some of the proposals.

\(\langle \text{me}\rangle z \ 'me \ (dat.)'\)

Marstrander (1930, 304–07) believed that the inscription was complete, with the exception of a missing word at the beginning of B1. Marstrander’s reading \(\langle \text{me}\rangle z \ 'me \ (dat.)'\) was accepted by Krause (1966, 1971) and Antonsen (1975). This word consists of four staves before *z*, and could therefore fit into the space. The text presented in Krause (1966, no. 72) is as follows (with word division introduced):

\(\langle \text{me}\rangle z \ wodurid \ staina \ prioz \ dohtriz \ dalidun \ arbija \ (a)\text{rjostez} \ arbijano\)

‘Mir (?) dem Wodurid bereiteten den Stein drei Töchter, das Erbmal (aber) die vornehmsten ... der Erben.’
The validity of this reading depends on two conditions. The first is that dalidun means ‘made (nice)’, a possibility which I have already argued against at length. The second condition is that the subject of the alleged verb phrase ‘made (prepared) the stone’ is ‘three daughters’. This, however, is implausible for epigraphic reasons, as line B2 is unlikely to be a direct continuation of B1, hence it would be unclear why the first word in B2 (þrijoz ‘three’) did not begin at the top of side B, on the lost top-piece. A further problem with this proposal is that it would seem rather banal to say that the heirs prepared the funeral feast without mentioning their identity (cf. Grønvik 1981, 114). In addition, as pointed out by Finnur Jónsson (1931, 143 f.), this reading would involve the only example in the corpus of runic inscriptions where the deceased person “speaks”. Although this is usual in Greek and Roman tombstones, it does not seem to have been customary in the early Germanic world. In short, then, the commonly accepted reading of Marstrander and Krause cannot be upheld.

\[ \langle \text{afte}z \rangle \text{ ‘after’} \]

In his edition of the Tune stone, Bugge (1891, in \textit{NlæR}, 1: 28 f.) proposed that the missing word at the beginning of B1 was a preposition \textit{aftez} ‘after, in memory of’. He also assumed that there was a verb (such as ‘mark [mærke]’) whose subject was ‘three daughters’ missing at the end of B1.

\[ \langle \text{afte}z \rangle \text{ woduride staina } \langle \text{mærked} \rangle \text{ þrijoz dohtriz} \]

‘after Wōdurīdaz three daughters ‘marked’ the stone’

Following this reading, the persons who ‘marked’ the stone were the three daughters, but the identity of the ones sharing the inheritance was not stated. As this would be quite trivial, Bugge later revised his own view (1903, in \textit{NlæR}, 2: 520–23), thinking it unlikely that ‘three daughters’ were the subject of the clause in B1. Rather, he suggested, the subject was Wiwaz, the person speaking on side A, and the missing verb (\textit{*satidō ‘(I) erected’}) was placed at the end of A2.\footnote{Bugge (1903) assumed that the form of the missing verb was \textit{sato} (“\textit{sattō}”), but in the wake of the discovery of the Rō stone in 1919 scholars realized that the form must have been \textit{*satidō} (see Grønvik 1981, 84).} This assumption is quite implausible on epigraphic grounds, and it is particularly unlikely that there would have been space for any further words at the top of side A.

\footnote{Even more far-fetched is Lehmann’s (1956, 78) reading \textit{þe}z ‘you (dat.)’; his account involves further problems, as shown by Marold (2012, 77 f.).}
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A variation on this theme was proposed by von Grienberger (1906, 99 f.), who assumed that side B contains two conjunct clauses. ‘Three daughters’ is the subject of both clauses, and (according to his understanding) ‘the last surviving heirs’ is in apposition to it.

\[\langle \text{afte} \rangle z \text{ woduride staina} \langle \text{satun/satidun} \rangle \text{ prijoz dohtriz da(\text{\textit{lidun arbija}})} \\
\text{ sijostez arbijano} \]

‘(After) Wōdurīdaz three daughters the stone (erected), (they) shared the inheritance, the last surviving heirs [post Voduridum lapidem posuerunt tres filiae, partitae sunt haereditatem, postremi haeredum].’

In addition to ignoring the epigraphic distinction between lines B1 and B2–3, this proposal suffers from the same problem as the ones of Bugge, assuming a form *aftez* on side B *vis-à-vis* *after* on side A.

\[\langle \text{ee} \rangle z \text{'honored', and other proposals by Grønvik} \]

Grønvik (1981), following scholars such as Marstrander (1930), Krause (1966, 1971) and Antonsen (1975), became a staunch defender of the position which holds that nothing is missing at the end of B1. Claiming that *dalidun arbija* must mean ‘made the funeral feast nice’, he concluded that a finite verb, of which *staina* could be the object, had been located at the beginning of B1. The first visible rune, usually taken to be *z*, was read by Grønvik as *h* (1981, 169–73):

\[\langle \text{fal} \rangle h \text{ woduride staina} \]

‘(I) dedicated the stone to Wōdurīdaz’

In view of general criticism of his analysis, Grønvik (1984, 51–54) was forced to accept the validity of the “top-piece hypothesis”. He also modified the reading of the missing word to *\langle \text{bifal} \rangle hk* (containing an enclitic pronoun -\(k\) ‘I’, in a bind-rune with *h*) ‘I dedicated’, this time assuming that the first two runes (*bi*) were written at the top of side A, and that the word continued on side B. Later, however, he gave up the reading *h/hk* for the traditional *z*, proposing a completely different word (1994, 48 f.):

\[\langle \text{ee} \rangle z \text{ woduride staina} \]

‘(I Wiwaz) honored Wōduridaz with a stone [(Jeg Wiwař) forærte Wodurid stein, egentlig æret Wodurid med stein, ved å gi ham stein].’
On this assumption the missing verb is <ee>z, a strong past tense form of ON eira e-m 'spare someone [skåne en]', but here in a derived meaning ‘show respect, honor [vise respekt, ære; honorare, honorificare]’. It is true that if the missing word is a verb, it must be a strong one, in view of the ending -z. In Old Norse, however, eira is a weak verb (past tense eirða), but Grønvik suggests that earlier it may have been strong, according to class 7, with past tense *ēr (PGmc. *aizanda—eaiiz). Moreover, Grønvik assumes that an older expression *eēz Wōdurīdē staina, with an instrumental dative of the object (‘æret Wodurid med stein’), was “transformed” to one with the object in accusative.

This proposal is open to criticism on several accounts. First, the weak verb ON eira is a denominal derivation from eir (fem.) ‘protection, grace, peace’ (< *aizō-). There is no evidence for strong verb *aizanda—eaiiz in Germanic. Second, the meaning of eira ‘spare someone’ does not fit in the context; the derived meaning ‘show respect’ postulated by Grønvik is unattested. Third, the assumption that the dative was replaced by an accusative in this construction is ad hoc; the usual tendency in Old Norse has been in the opposite direction, with accusative being replaced by dative. Finally, this reading runs into the same epigraphic problems as other proposals to take line B1 as a continuation of side A; it would seem implausible that the carver continued with the text ending at the top of side A from the bottom of side B. In summary, none of the many valiant attempts made by Grønvik to fill the lacuna at the beginning of B1 can be deemed successful.

<we>z ‘we’

Western (1930, 291f.) proposed that the missing word at the beginning of B1 was wez ‘we’, modified by the appositional phrase þrijoz dohtriz. He suggested that the latter noun phrase was separated from the pronoun due to the metrical form of the inscription.

[B1:] <we>z woduride staina <sati[B2]-dum> þrijoz dohtriz da(i)lidun
[B3:] arbija sijostez arbijano

‘We three daughters erected the stone (in commemoration of) Wōduridaz; the closest male heirs controlled the inheritance [wir drei Töchter setzten den Stein (zum Andenken an) Wodurid; die nächsten männlichen Erben verfügten über (d. h. nahmen infolge der damaligen Rechtsauffassung) das Erbe].’

This reading is based on the conviction that the daughters were not entitled to inheritance: “Wie sie [scil. die Erben] dagegen das Erbe untereinander verteilten, davon hören wir nichts; die Hauptsache ist nämlich, daß die
Töchter nichts bekamen”. I will return to this issue below. This reading suffers from a number of problems, including the fact that the word *wez* has only three staves before *z* (oddly enough, Western himself admits the presence of four staves: “so wird man vor der Rune Ѕ vier kleine Spuren von Runen sehen”).

\[
\langle \text{pri}\rangle z \quad \text{‘three (masc.)’}
\]

Sanness Johnsen (1969, 42–44) proposed that the missing word at the beginning of B1 was the numeral *priz* ‘three’.

\[
\text{si(b)jostez arbijano} \quad \langle \text{pri}\rangle z \text{ woduride staina} \langle \text{satidun}\rangle
\]

‘The three closest male relatives of the heirs erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz [arvingenes tre nærmeste mannlige slektninger (satte stenen for Woduride)].’

While the word *priz* ‘three’ might fit in the lacuna, it requires the assumption of a part of line B3 (*si(b)jostez arbijano*) preceding B1. Dividing line B3 in two involves an *ad hoc* assumption, which does not seem justifiable on epigraphic grounds. In addition, the occurrence of the genitive before the numeral would be unusual in a Germanic language. The question is, moreover, who these three anonymous individuals might be. Sanness Johnsen wonders if they might be the husbands of the three daughters. However, it must be considered unlikely that the sons-in-law, and not their wives, would be referred to as ‘the closest relatives’.18

\[
\text{Noun ending in -z}
\]

Finally, it has been proposed that line B1 begins with noun ending in -z, which is of course a common ending in masculine nouns. The form *staina* would be the object of a verb *satjanan* ‘erect’ or something similar at the end of B1. The line then reads as follows.

\[
\ldots z \text{ woduride staina} \langle \text{satide}\rangle
\]

‘... (erected) the stone for Wōdurīdaz’

One possibility is that the missing word was a personal name in -z. In fact,

---

18 Consider also in this context Grønvik’s (1981, 120f.) critical discussion of the original meaning of PGmc. *sibja-* as applying only to blood relations, referred to in my footnote 8 above. I remain agnostic toward his conclusion, however.
this was suggested already by Noreen (1903, 345; 1923, 309; cf. also Jóhannesson 1920 [1923], no. 72; Jónsson 1931, 143). This would have a parallel elsewhere, most clearly in the inscription from Rö, Bohuslän: ek hrazaz satido ⟨s⟩tain⟨a⟩ ana... ‘I Hrazaz set the stone on ...’ (Krause 1966, no. 73; Antonsen 1975, no. 26). The question then becomes which name would fit in the space at the beginning of B1. For example, the name þaliz, which is attested in an inscription from Bratsberg, Sør-Trøndelag (Krause 1966, no. 93; cf. Western 1930, 289; Moltke 1984, 31), would fit in the lacuna. There is, however, no other motivation for assuming this name and not some other. In the above-mentioned response to Marstrander’s (1930) article on the Tune inscription, Jónsson (1931, 143) suggested that the name in question might be Wiwaz, presumably the same person as the one speaking on side A. In runic spelling this word consists of four staves before the final z, and could indeed fit in.19 As argued above, it seems a reasonable conjecture that staina is the object of a missing verb such as "satiana" ‘erect’. Given this analysis of the word at the beginning of B1, the only place where the verb would fit is at the end of the line, even though such an assumption may be paleographically tenuous. The placement of the verb at the end of a main clause was a possibility in Old Germanic, including the language of the early runic inscriptions (Eythórsson 2001, 17f., 22f., 45f.; 2012, 38).

In conclusion, the following reading of side B is the most plausible one:

B1: ⟨...⟩z woduride : staina * ⟨satide⟩

‘NN (Wiwaz?) erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz.’

B2–3: þrijoz dohtriz dalidun arbija sijostez arbijano

‘Three daughters shared the inheritance, the closest family heirs.’

It may seem odd that on one side of the stone Wiwaz himself speaks in the first person, but on the other side he is spoken of in the third person (there is hardly enough space in B1 for a pronoun ek ‘I’ preceding the name, even assuming some other, shorter name). This, however, may be due to the different contexts that the two sides of the inscription would involve. Thus side A contains a declaration, while side B polarizes two parties: the heirs as against the person who erected the stone. According to the reading defended here, therefore, on side A Wiwaz himself declares that he has

19 However, as James Knirk has pointed out for me, the space between the remains of the second and third staves would most likely imply a branch on the second stave, i.e. that it was not i.
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written the runes in memory of the deceased Wōdurīdaz, but on side B it is stated that Wiwaz erected the stone for Wōdurīdaz. Concerning the identity and status of Wiwaz, we can only venture an educated guess. He may have been Wōdurīdaz’s successor as a chieftain, either his son-in-law, or even his grandson, given the alliteration of the names, which may indicate blood relations. He could also have been an unrelated runemaster whose skill was required for this document.

It is unlikely, however, that Wiwaz was the son of Wōdurīdaz, as he—and not his three sisters—might then have been expected to be his heir. Although all of this is of course speculative, it nevertheless seems better motivated than Grønvik’s (1994, 50) view that the person who erected the stone is the main heir (“hovedarvingen”), while the three daughters of the deceased are complimented for a nice funeral feast (“et hyggelig gravøl”). To be sure, there is no reason to doubt that Wōdurīdaz received a decent funeral, a fact which the splendid granite stone amply corroborates. It seems undeniable, however, that the three daughters mentioned in the inscription were not merely in the role of hostesses at the funeral feast, but got their share of the inheritance.

### Daughters as heirs

Part of the reason why this almost self-evident interpretation, which used to be the prevailing one, was discredited may originally have had to do with reluctance by some scholars to accept the possibility that daughters could be legitimate heirs in ancient times, as the following passages suggest. In a letter to Läffler (1896), the legal historian Ebbe Hertzberg expressed support for the former’s opinion that þrjoz dohtriz ‘three daughters’ could not be the subject of da<i>lidun arbija ‘shared the inheritance’ because he considered out of the question that women in Scandinavia had the right to inherit already around A.D. 500. Hence sijostez arbijano would have to refer to the ‘the closest male heirs’ (Hertzberg, cited in Läffler 1896, 100):

> Naar jeg imidlertid dog er enig med Dig i, at arvingerner maa formodes kun at have været mandlige, saa er min grund, at jeg, som jeg allerede før har skrevet til Dig, ikke kan tænke mig, at kvinder heroppe i Norden allerede ere blevne stedte til arv saa tidligt som ca. 500.

This view recurs in the paper by Western, who considered it to be a “fact” that daughters were excluded from inheritance in the relevant time period. Therefore, he could not believe that þrjoz dohtriz was the subject of da<i>lidun arbija (1930, 289):
Aber eine Übersetzung: „drei Töchter teilten das Erbe“ widerstreitet dem, was wir wohl als eine Tatsache betrachten dürfen, daß zu jener Zeit die Töchter überhaupt nicht erb berechtigt waren. ... Das Subjekt für *dalidun* muß daher *sijoster arbijano* sein, das also, wie Läffler meint, ‘die nächsten männlichen Erben’ bedeuten muß.

Western concluded that the inscription is in effect a “desperate cry” for help by the three destitute girls, who were left only with the memory of their respected father, while some male collateral heirs, empowered by the law, seized the entire inheritance (s. 292):

... in meinen Ohren klingt sie [scil. die Inschrift] wie ein Notgeschrei der drei Mädchen, die mit nichts als der Erinnerung an einen angesehenen Vater hinterblieben sind, während einige männliche Seitenerben—kraft des Gesetzes—das ganze Erbe übernommen haben.

Contrary to this opinion, the investigation here reinforces the view that women were indeed entitled to inheritance in pre-Viking Scandinavia. The unbiased evaluation of the inscription leads to the conclusion that the three daughters mentioned in the text shared the inheritance left to them by Wōdurīdaz as his closest family heirs. It is possible that if there had been male heirs, only one of them would have been the designated *“sijaz arbijan-“*, who would not be sharing the inheritance with others. In any case, the fact that the heirs were three women must have been so unusual that it was thought important to make a specific mention of it in the inscription.

The writing on side B

In light of the results established here, it may seem worthwhile to have another look at the direction of the writing on side B. As I have argued, the text reports on two facts: first, who shared the inheritance, and secondly, who erected the stone in memory of Wōdurīdaz, the breadward commemorated by Wiwaz on side A. The first statement (in B2–3) is in a prominent place in the center, and hence more important than the second one (B1), which is at the edge. The positioning of the two statements on the stone is easily comprehensible on the assumption that B1 was written after B2–3. If, on the other hand, B1 would have been written first, it must seem strange that the carver started at the very edge of the stone, down below, given that he had enough space to fill. In view of this, it is plausible to assume that lines B2–3 were written first, when there was enough space on the side, and line B1 written last, as a kind of a “signature”. The direction of the writing on side A supports this assumption, as it starts at the top going downwards. Needless
to say, however, this idea remains speculative, and my account of the Tune inscription does not depend on it.

Finally, the question whether the different shapes of the runes point to one or two carvers must be briefly addressed. Despite the somewhat different ductus in side A and B, it cannot be excluded that the same carver was at work on both sides. For example, it could be that the text on side A was written while the stone was lying on the ground, but the text on side B was added later, after the stone was erected. This would explain the fact that the runes on side B seem to be less carefully carved than the ones on side A.

Conclusion

The interpretation of the inscription on the Tune stone advanced in this paper was made on the basis both of autopsy of the stone itself and of analyses by earlier scholars, in particular Bugge, Läffler, Noreen and Jónsson. On the other hand, it has been shown that some proposals in the more recent literature do not bear scrutiny. According to the reading defended here, there are lacunae at the end of line A2 and at the beginning and end of line B1. It is unlikely that there is anything missing at the beginning of B2. The order in which the lines are to be read is A1–2, B1–3 (although, as discussed above, B2–3–1 may also be a possibility).

A1: ek wiwaz after · woduri
A2: de witadahalaiban : worahto : r⟨unoz⟩
B1: ⟨...⟩z woduride : staina · ⟨satide⟩
B2: þrijoz dohtriz da⟨i⟩lidun
B3: arbijia sijostez arbijano

‘I Wiwaz wrought the runes in memory of Wōdurīdaz, the breadward. (NN)z (Wiwaz?) (erected) the stone for Wōdurīdaz. Three daughters shared the inheritance, the closest family heirs.’

The text on side A involves a subject-initial declarative clause, in which the finite verb is flanked by an adjunct prepositional phrase and a direct object. It is possible that this word order is due to the rhythm of the statement and its metrical structure, for which there is ample evidence (cf. the analysis in Marold 2012, 75–78, with further references). Side B consists of two independent subject-initial clauses, occurring in B1 and B2–3, respectively. The B1 clause has a verb-final word order while the B2–3 clause is verb-medial (or verb-second order); both word order patterns have parallels in other inscriptions and elsewhere in Old Germanic (Eyþórsson 2001, 14–18, 22 f., 33–36; 2012, 32–40).
The above reading of side A is rather uncontroversial, in that it assumes a missing word \( \text{r'unoz} \) at the top, in accordance with the “top-piece hypothesis” (as in Bugge 1891 and most other scholars, with the notable exceptions of Marstrander 1930, Antonsen 1975 and Grønvik 1981). The reading of side B defended here is perhaps less straightforward, although it is based on arguments which have been proposed by earlier scholars. In this reading, side B consists of two independent subject-initial clauses, occurring in B1 and B2–3, respectively. Despite some apparent epigraphic problems, the clause in B1 must end in a verb meaning ‘erect (vel sim.)’, of which \textit{staina} ‘stone’ is the accusative object (cf. Bugge 1891). The first word in B1 is likely to be a noun (a personal name) ending in -z (cf. Noreen 1903, Jónsson 1931, Moltke 1984). Moreover, the form \textit{dalidun} in B2 should not be analyzed as \textit{dālidun} ‘made (nice), prepared’, as has been standardly assumed since Seip (1929). Rather, it should be emended, giving \textit{þrijoz dohtriz da\text{i}lidun arbijja} ‘three daughters shared the inheritance’ (Bugge 1891). Finally, I presented arguments in favor of the reading \textit{sijostez} (cf. Läffler 1892), dismissing the readings \textit{si(b)jostez} (Bugge 1891), (a)\textit{sijostez} (Marstrander 1930, Grønvik 1981 etc.) and (a)\textit{rjostez} (Krause 1934, 1937, 1966, 1971, and others). Adopting a view which once was the prevailing one, I take the phrase \textit{sijostez arbijano} to reflect an archaic legal term meaning ‘the closest of the family heirs’ (Läffler 1892). In addition to the epigraphic evidence, this analysis is supported by historical-comparative linguistic evidence and by a hitherto overlooked parallel in archaic Latin legal terminology (\textit{suus heres} ‘family heir, self-successor’). I conclude that side B states that the three daughters of Wōdurīdaz shared the inheritance as the closest family heirs, while some other person (perhaps Wiwaz) erected the stone.

This conclusion reinforces the view that the inscription on the Tune stone bears witness to women’s rights to inheritance in the pre-Viking period, and that it is thus of even greater value for the earliest Scandinavian history than usually assumed (cf. Sawyer 2000, 111–16, on the role of women in Viking Age inscriptions). The reason why this interpretation, which used to be the prevailing one, was discredited may originally have had to do with the reluctance to accept the possibility that daughters could be legitimate heirs in ancient times.
Bibliography

Abbreviations for languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goth. = Gothic</td>
<td>OHG = Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat. = Latin</td>
<td>ON = Old Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norw. = Norwegian</td>
<td>OS = Old Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODan. = Old Danish</td>
<td>OSwed. = Old Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODutch = Old Dutch</td>
<td>PGmc. = Proto-Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE = Old English</td>
<td>pre-Gmc. = pre-Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFris. = Old Frisian</td>
<td>PIE = Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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