

Proof that Runes are Arthurian, not Scandinavian.

First we establish the correct Rune sequence, by comparing three different sources.

1. Codex Sangallensis 878
2. Cotton Otho B.x, fol. 165a – 165b
3. Thames Scramasax (Seax of Beagnoth)

We assume, that Codex Sangallensis 878 contains the correct sequence, and then we place numbers on the runes. We notice that the last Rune is “ior”.



Illustration 1: Codex Sangallensis 878

Then we compare Codex Sangallensis to Cotton Otho, and observe, that the latter is garbled in two places.



Illustration 2: Cotton Otho B.x, fol. 165a – 165b

Then we compare Codex Sangallensis to Thames Scramasax, and observe, that the latter also has four Runes garbled. The last Rune “ior” is apparently missing. We assume, that “ior” is the sword itself.



Illustration 3: Thames Scramasax (Seax of Beagnoth)

Then we look at the last Runes verse, in the Anglo-Saxon rune poem, and there we find two words, that describe the Rune “ior”.

10		býþ ea fixa. and ðeah abruceþ. fodres onfalban. hafap fægerne eard. rætre beworpen. ðær he wynnnum leofap :.
† ior		býþ ea fixa. and ðeah abruceþ. fodres onfalban. hafap fægerne eard. rætre beworpen. ðær he wynnnum leofap :.
† ior		byþ ea fixa. and ðeah abruceþ. fodres onfalban. hafap fægerne eard. wætre beworpen. ðær he wynnnum leofap :.

The first word “fod[d]res” is singular substantive in genitive case. It attracts the succeeding verb, “onf[e]aldan”, that becomes substantive. Because “fodder” has dual meaning, as both grass and sheath, the expression has dual meaning: [source: <http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/011058>].

1. Straw’s unfold, i.e. the grass grows.
2. Sheath’s unfold, i.e. the sword is drawn.

Assuming, that a “standing stone” can be a metaphor for a tree, then it will start growing as a “pebble”, being a metaphor for a vegetative seed. Thus, the drawing of “straw sword” from a “seed stone”, becomes a vegetative conclusion to the last Rune verse.

Assuming, that one has unriddled all 29 Rune verses, then one has metaphorically **drawn the sword from the stone**. Solving riddles in general does include a distinct analogous thinking – in the capability to deduce and induce – that would be the trait of preferred wits, that would define the **plough boy as rightful king**.

For the sake of the argument, I do not exclude the possibility, that the Runic letters can have origin outside Britain, as a phonetic alphabet. Yet, the adaptation of it, into a vehicle containing ideology of Druidic origin, seems to have been done in Britain. Where else?

Julius Caesar's intelligence report to the senate does reveal, that Druidic curriculum was contained in verses. Four centuries later, the Rune system appears, cloaked in verses, that now are factually proven, to be decisive to the right to rule.

Assuming, that Christ did spend his formative, adolescent, missing eighteen years in Britain, then the same Druidic influence would define both Runes and Christianity alike. That suggests, that the Runes provide a key, to both kingship and original Christianity.

Scandinavia, as origin to the Runes, is out of the question, since the yew tree has no significant cultural roots there, only to be found as graveyard tree in Britain, and that is vital, to the correct interpretation of the Rune riddle.

The Viking Runes are a reduced system, that has limited function as an alphabet, and cannot be solved as a riddle. Therefore, it must be a falsification by papal agents, to defame the original system, providing an opportunity to persecute the Druids.

Our position is not academic. Our intention is to become king of Norway, just for fun. Once, Norwegian Freemasons took stranglehold on our person, and cursed us in public. Therefore, we could call it tit for tat.

