

TOWARDS AN EDITION OF THE SCANDINAVIAN RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS OF THE BRITISH ISLES: SOME THOUGHTS

Michael P. Barnes

In 1954 the sixth volume of *Viking Antiquities in Great Britain and Ireland* was published. It contained, *inter alia*, a chapter by Magnus Olsen entitled 'Runic Inscriptions in Great Britain, Ireland and the Isle of Man'. This chapter represented then, and has represented since, the only attempt to give anything like a comprehensive account of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions of the British Isles. For those interested in completeness, however, it suffered from several drawbacks even at the time it was published. It contains only those inscriptions Olsen considered to belong to the Viking Age, and even though that seems to have been a somewhat elastic concept, a number of inscriptions are omitted on the grounds that they are too young, for example all bar two (SC 5 and 12 – see the list on pp. 40–1) of those in St Molaise's Cave on Holy Island in the Firth of Clyde and the complete Maeshowe corpus. Also omitted are inscriptions which do not have 'a distinctively O[ld] Norse stamp' (Olsen 1954, 154) – which seems to include all the then known runic artefacts from England with a possible or probable Scandinavian background. 'Distinctively O[ld] Norse' is not defined, but from the tenor of Olsen's remarks it appears to mean 'runologically and linguistically Old West Scandinavian'. A further problem attaches to this chapter. Although Olsen does not say so outright, it is clear enough that his account is based on investigations he made in 1911 (cf. Olsen 1954, 158). That is to say, over forty years elapsed from the time he examined the inscriptions to the time he published his results – long enough, one would think, for more than the odd error to creep in. Whatever the merits and drawbacks of Olsen's work may have been when it appeared, it now suffers – like most runic corpora of a similar age – from a certain obsolescence. Many new inscriptions have come to light, and conversely a number which are included or mentioned in his survey have (or had already long prior to 1954) been shown to be non-runic or of recent origin (e.g., Barnspike (cf. Collingwood 1901, 279), Knockando (cf. Liestøl 1984, 225–6)).

Olsen's is not the only comprehensive approach to the subject. Hertha Marquardt's 1961 bibliography lists all the runic and quasi-runic inscriptions from the British Isles known to her, Scandinavian and other. This work is not an edition, though, merely a bibliographical list. Nor is it entirely free of error; and, of course, much has appeared since its publication over thirty years ago.

Of more recent origin is Benno Bruggink's Amsterdam University dissertation *Runes in and from the British Isles* (1987). This work takes the form of an index to the inscriptions and records such details as 'place of find', 'date of find', 'language', 'present location', etc., as well as providing a transliteration, text, English translation, and bibliographical references. A major disadvantage is the secondary, not to say tertiary nature of the information provided, and the limited number of source works consulted. Thus, on p. 17 under 'Birsay, Orkney' we find, instead of the expected details, a large number of blank spaces and the quaint note: 'Nothing is known about this inscription, except that it was found.' The 'inscription' appears to be OR 8 and 9, both of which are dealt with in some detail by Liestøl (Liestøl 1984, 225–7). Considerable carelessness is also evident. The Orkney Steatite Whorl (OR 3) has its 'place of find' given as Shetland, while a note on the same page announces: 'This object was found in Orkney'. These examples, not untypical, show that Bruggink's work is of use only at the most basic level, and can sometimes be positively misleading.

Important accounts which aim at complete coverage of a selected group of Scandinavian runic inscriptions from the British Isles are by Page (Page 1971; Page 1983) and Liestøl (Liestøl 1984). Each has the advantage that it is reasonably up to date and is written by a 'field runologist' – a scholar who has subjected the artefacts he describes to recent examination. Page's approach is rigorous and critical. In his 1971 paper he presents and discusses the inscriptions from England, and assesses them as evidence for the survival of Scandinavian speech in that country. His conclusion is that their evidential value is slight. The 1983 paper represents the provisional culmination of Page's work on the Manx inscriptions, and contains both a discussion of the corpus and transliterations of the bulk of the inscriptions. Liestøl's account is more popular and, as suggested by the title of the work in which it appears – *The Northern and Western Isles in the Viking World* – geographically more limited than Page's earlier study and chronologically more limited than both of the English scholar's contributions. In fact, 'Viking' can – as usual – be taken with a pinch of salt: neither author nor editors baulk at the inclusion of the Holy Island inscriptions, some of which, at least, seem to be from the 1260s. But 'Northern and Western Isles' is, I think, meant seriously, even though both a supposed inscription from Moray (Knockando – see above) and a certain one from Thurso put in an appearance.

Because of the various defects that attach to existing treatments of Scandinavian runic inscriptions from the British Isles, or their limited scope, there is clearly a need for a modern, scholarly edition of the whole corpus. Over the last five years or so I have been working towards the production of such an edition. The first stage in the process, an account of the Maeshowe inscriptions from Orkney, is now complete (cf. Barnes forthcoming). The Manx corpus can, I think, be left in the competent hands of Raymond Page. What remains, then, is the widely scattered material to be found outside these two centres of runic activity, and it is with this material that the remainder of the present article will be concerned. I want to review some of the problems involved in editing such diverse inscriptions for publication and to make a brief presentation of the corpus.

First, all the inscriptions must naturally be examined, or re-examined, and photographed. Here, it is perhaps worth stressing, the runologist working in the British Isles is in a different position from his Scandinavian counterpart. In Scandinavia, inscriptions are almost always in the custody of some arm of the State – however extended the arm – and access for the runologist normally poses few problems. A number of British inscriptions, especially those on precious metals, have found their way to public museums, but many are the property of churches, private museums or even individuals. This not only makes access more difficult, but means that it is sometimes hard to keep track of the artefacts. To take a recent example. E 5 was until a few years ago to be found in the Pig Yard Club Museum, Settle. When I was last in Settle, I learnt that the museum no longer existed. What had happened to its exhibits? No one I spoke to during my brief visit knew. The tenacity of my fellow runologist, David Parsons, has fortunately shed a little more light on the matter. He learnt from the curator of another Settle museum (he tells me in a private communication) that the finds from Victoria Cave – of which E 5 is one – were the property of a private individual ‘whose whereabouts she had never discovered’. It was only ‘by plying the local residents with drink’ that Parsons eventually obtained the owner’s address. This useful piece of detective work amply illustrates one of the many skills needed by runologists working in the British Isles.

Supposing, however, that the corpus has been examined and the details assembled. How is it to be edited? This question assumes added importance because it is proposed to include the Scandinavian Viking-Age inscriptions from the British Isles in the Uppsala runic data-base, which it is hoped will ultimately form the material for a hand-book of all Viking-Age runic inscriptions. The editors of the Uppsala project will require, it seems, a transliteration, an edited, normalised text and an English translation. This may at first sight appear straightforward, but the path of the potential editor is littered with snares.

Proper transliteration means replacing characters of one alphabet with those of another, on a one-to-one basis, without (overdue) regard to the presumed phonological system which underlies the written form. Thus – to exemplify – it is not entirely unproblematical that *þ* is transliterated *E* in Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–2 in the four cases in which it is assumed to denote a mid front unrounded vowel – given that the rendering of *þ* in this work is otherwise *R* and that *E* is also used to transliterate *J*; the practice in Jungner and Svärdström 1940–70 seems preferable, according to which *þ* is consistently rendered *R* whatever its presumed sound value. How, though, do we tackle an inscription like E 1, the Bridekirk Font? Here the manuscript characters ‘*D*’, ‘*z*’, ‘*P*’ and ‘*7*’ supplement the Norse runes. No obvious transliteration suggests itself. We might, I suppose, substitute ‘*th*’ for ‘*D*’, ‘*g*’ for ‘*z*’ and ‘*w*’ for ‘*P*’ (with single inverted commas – or some other device – indicating the book-hand origin of the relevant characters on the font), but ‘*th*’ violates the principle of one-for-one representation, and in none of the three cases will the metamorphosis give the reader a clear idea of what he can expect to see on the font itself, in the way that the customary transliteration of runes is meant to indicate the runic graphemes employed. The solution may be to print ‘ideal’ versions of the original forms – and it

is hard to see how else '7' can be dealt with – but then of course we no longer have a pure transliteration and the way to ambiguity and uncertainty is open.

The production of normalised texts of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions of the British Isles also poses problems. For the projected hand-book of Viking-Age runic inscriptions normalised Old Icelandic has been chosen as the form likely to be most accessible to interested non-runologist scholars. While some of the British-Isles material can be made to conform to this standard (I am, for example, tolerably happy about the normalisation of most of the inscriptions from Scotland, see p. 40), much cannot. What, to take a specific instance, of OR 6, Birsay I? In transliteration, that part of it which can be read runs: *filibusrānru*. The text offered by Olsen (1954, 164): *Philippus r(eist) enn rú(nar)* is thus not a normalisation, but a very uncertain guess. The English inscriptions bristle with difficulties. E 3, Carlisle, and E 9, Pennington, for example, are in a kind of Old Norse, but one that undergraduate students might feel more at home with than contemporary native speakers from Norway or Iceland. The morphology is all over the place. As editor, I can naturally clothe these inscriptions in respectable grammatical garb, but in doing so, I will have robbed them of their chief interest. For it is by no means impossible that they give an accurate representation of Scandinavian speech as it had developed in north-west England in the twelfth century, after a long period of intimate contact between speakers of a dominant Old English and an increasingly marginal Old Norse (on the loss of features associated with language death, see, e.g., Dorian 1981, 114–56). E 1, from the same area, is presumably symptomatic of this contact too. Here, we not only have English manuscript forms supplementing Norse runes, but a message in Middle English. Plainly this cannot be normalised as Old Icelandic. But then, perhaps, it should not count as a Scandinavian inscription at all.

I have already touched on the problem of dating and the Viking Age. Clearly, an edition like the projected Uppsala hand-book which seeks to use evidence of Viking activity to delimit its corpus must be fairly rigorous in setting dates for the beginning and end of the Age, and in adhering to them. But in the context of an edition of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions of the British Isles, of course, such questions are neither here nor there. Interest in dating lies solely in the possibilities of establishing the ages of any or all of the inscriptions that confront us. In attempting to date runic inscriptions we rely principally on four broad criteria: (1) the archaeological context (in the widest sense), (2) the forms of the runes and the orthography, (3) the language, and (4) the type of message. Seldom are all four criteria applicable. The nearest we come is perhaps E 2, the St Paul's Gravestone. Its detailed ornament, which shows affinities to that on the greater Jelling Stone, its rune forms and orthography (sporadic use of ɻ; ñ for /o:/), its language (the mixture of monophthongal and diphthongal spellings: *stin v. auk*), and its stereotype message (with *let lekia* for the usual *lit raisa*) combine strongly to suggest an early eleventh-century date.

The archaeological context becomes more important the closer the find-date approaches our own time, since archaeological methods have improved greatly over the last one hundred and fifty years. Thus, the recently excavated Dublin inscriptions

(IR 4–13) can be dated tentatively to various parts of the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth centuries on the basis of the layers in which they were found.

Historical rather than archaeological context can probably help us in the case of SC 7, Holy Island VIII. Provided *Vígleikr stallari* is the same Vígleikr who, according to *Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar*, accompanied King Hákon on his ill-fated military expedition to Scotland (Vigfusson and Unger 1860–8, iii, 221–4), it is likely that 1263 is the year in which SC 7 was carved. The saga makes clear that Vígleikr was in that part of Hákon's fleet which sailed down the west coast of Scotland as far as Kintyre. The other people who recorded their names in the same cave (SC 3–6, 9, 12) may also have been part of the 1263 expedition, but equally, they may not. Magnus Olsen, who edited these graffiti in 1912 and discussed two of them briefly in his 1954 chapter, claimed that they were from different periods, the oldest being SC 12, whose rune forms and orthography placed it in 'the 11th century' (Olsen 1912, 12–13, 23), and SC 5 (for reasons that are not clear to me). The rune forms and orthography of OR 14, Tuquoy, with þ for /o/, þ for /a/ and þ and þ for /ɛ/, seem to parallel those of Maeshowe, and for that reason this inscription is unlikely to be older, one would think, than the early twelfth century, though it might be somewhat younger. The form *hiartar* in IR 12, Fishamble Street IV, suggests either a very early date or East Scandinavian influence, since the use of þ for spirant or so-called palatal 'r' ceased in western Scandinavia in or before the tenth century. The Danish runologist, Erik Moltke, was quick to declare this inscription 'Danish' (Moltke 1985, 364–5), but it is far from clear what it means to say that a piece of runic writing from Viking-Age Dublin is Danish. The runes could well have been carved by someone from the geographical area which now comprises Denmark and extreme southern Sweden, but it is equally possible that the author hailed from elsewhere and had merely learnt his runic skills in that area, or perhaps even had been taught them in Ireland by a native of Denmark. One could also look further afield. There is no reason why IR 12 cannot have runological connections with Götaland, Svealand, or yet some other part of Viking-Age Sweden. For the record, it is worth noting that the inscription was found in a layer dated c. 1000.

Linguistic hints that would help in dating are few and imprecise. We have the older -s- forms of the verb *vera* 'be' in OR 15, Orphir II, and SC 8, Kilbar, but such forms existed as late as the oldest Icelandic and Norwegian manuscripts dated about 1150–1200. They are not, however, found in Maeshowe (Barnes 1991, 81), and therefore in a runological context may well belong to the first half of the twelfth century or earlier.

Looking at the types and structure of the messages on British-Isles inscriptions as criteria of age, we may note SC 8, which has a text reminiscent of those on the oldest Viking-Age memorial stones in Scandinavia – cf. the beginning of Rök (Nielsen 1969, 24): *Aft Væmoð standa runaR þar*. This is different from the later, mainly eleventh-century stereotype formula: 'NN raised/placed/laid etc. this stone/cross etc. in memory of NN' – examples of which we have in SC 11 and 14 and E 2, probably have in SH 3 and 4, SC 15 and IR 2, and may have in OR 8–9 and IR 3 (on OR 8–9, cf. Liestøl 1984, 225–7).

When all possible criteria have been considered, however, there still remain a good many inscriptions for which no dating other than a rough estimate within several centuries can be given. This will often apply to fragments unsupported by a proper archaeological find report, e.g., SH 1–2, 5, or to casual graffiti which exhibit no diagnostic runological or linguistic features, e.g., some of those in St Molaise's Cave on Holy Island. Lack of comparative material makes a number of the inscriptions from England hard to date on internal evidence. Sometimes external factors can help. E 3, for example, scratched on a wall within the south transept of Carlisle Cathedral, is likely to post-date the building of the cathedral, which was started in the late eleventh century. We thus have a probable *terminus a quo*, but no clear *terminus ante quem*. Of E 1, Raymond Page writes (1973, 195): 'The language is English, but nearer Middle than Old, which fits well with the art historians' twelfth century date for the piece [the Bridekirk Font].' E 9 is likewise dated on art-historical grounds to the twelfth century. But regarding E 5, for example, and seemingly E 6 as well, we are completely in the dark.

Dating possibilities thus vary enormously. SC 7, as suggested above, can perhaps be narrowed down to the very year in which it was carved; at the other end of the scale SH 1–2, for example, could be from any period after Norsemen reached Shetland until at least the high Middle Ages.

There is a fundamental question attaching to the establishment of a corpus of Scandinavian inscriptions from the British Isles which I have not so far raised – and yet it is one that really needs to be tackled at the outset: by what criteria can a piece of runic writing be judged eligible for inclusion? In making my list of items I have adopted two basic criteria. (1) The runes should be inscribed. (2) It should be possible but not necessary to assume that the inscribing took place somewhere in the British Isles (hence the inclusion of the Lincoln Comb-Case, E 4, which may have been manufactured and inscribed in Scandinavia, cf. Page 1973, 194–5). These criteria exclude runic coins of Scandinavian provenance and manuscript runes (thus the so-called Canterbury Formula in British Museum Cottonianum Caligula A XV 4to is omitted, notwithstanding the fact that it contains substantially the same text as the Sigtuna Amulet, cf. Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–2, cols. 488–90).

The exclusion of coins and manuscript runes does not deal with all the difficulties involved in establishing the corpus. It is, for example, possible that some of what I have listed as separate inscriptions are in reality parts of one and the same, and that there are therefore fewer in total than I reckon with. This could, perhaps, apply to SH 1–2 or OR 8–9. There is also the problem of sorting out the Viking-Age and medieval runic inscriptions from the modern, and the runic from the merely 'rune-like'. I use the term 'modern' deliberately. By no means all carvings of recent date are false, in the sense that they were made with intent to deceive. The Skye inscription mentioned by Liestøl (1984, 224–5) is a case in point. In late Viking-Age runes it proclaims the name 'George Young', but it can hardly have been thought by the carver that anyone was likely to attribute it to the late Viking Age. The Barnspike inscription from Cumberland, on the other hand (cf. p. 32), does seem to have been a deliberate fake. Often records will go back far enough for us to be confident that no

one around at the time an inscription first came to notice can have had sufficient knowledge successfully to imitate the genuine article. And where indications of this sort are unavailable, both the fun-loving rune-carver and the forger will usually leave *some* evidence that their handiwork is of recent origin – especially in a message of any length. There is a particular problem with some of the Orkney twig-rune inscriptions, however. Several of them are found on loose objects for which there is no proper find report, and they lack the kind of diagnostic features that can usually help to determine age (see further below).

It is easier to distinguish runes from rune-like symbols. Here it is largely a question of studying an inscription to see whether it contains anything the modern scholar would regard as runic. The Hunterston Brooch (SC 2) provides an example in which the distinction between runic and rune-like is abundantly clear. Familiar symbols which transmit a plain message are followed by a sequence of shapes, a few of which are runic but the majority of which seem to be free variations on the runic theme incised for decorative purposes. The Knockando stone from Moray is a rather different case. It was long considered to bear runes and features in Olsen 1954. It was dismissed as runic by Liestøl, who declared its supposed characters to be ‘the remains of an ornament’ (Liestøl 1984, 225). Katherine Forsyth, following a recent inspection, raises strong doubts about Liestøl’s conclusion. I have not yet had a chance to examine the stone myself and am therefore very uncertain what the somewhat worn incisions on it represent. However, judging from the various photographs I have seen, these marks are not runes, whatever else they may be. How, then, did the Knockando stone come to figure as a runic inscription? The answer lies in the changing approach of runologists. Many of our predecessors, being anxious to identify runes wherever possible, allowed a much greater degree of latitude to the characters than we would do today, to the extent that they would often accept as runic a shape so far removed from the ideal that it had to all intents and purposes lost its distinctive features. Nowadays serious runologists display a greater degree of caution. One cannot of course deny that an inscription like Knockando might have been intended as runic – but such intention is impossible to demonstrate. All the runologist has to go on are marks on an object, and he must decide whether or not they conform to what is otherwise known of runic writing.

Having now surveyed editorial problems at some length – of necessity a primarily negative exercise – it is only reasonable to consider briefly what positive insights a study of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions of the British Isles might offer. A striking feature is the marked regional variation. How much this is due to the chance of preservation and how much it reflects genuine regional differences in runic activity and practice is hard to say. Shetland, like its northerly neighbour Faroe, is rather poor in material. What we have seems mostly to be the remains of memorial inscriptions of common Viking-Age type. Orkney is considerably richer, even if we ignore the massive collection in Maeshowe. It is also characterised by an unusually high proportion of twig-rune inscriptions (most, if not all of which, appear to be uninterpretable). Since Maeshowe itself contains twig and other cryptic runes, we cannot, I think, exclude the possibility that a number of such inscriptions from

elsewhere in Orkney are of recent origin, inspired by visits to the cairn. (In the summer of 1991 my wife, Kirsten, found six very fresh twig-runes carved onto a small piece of Orkney flagstone lying by the roadside near the Stones of Stenness; and in the same year Judith Jesch reports her discovery in 1989 of four twig-runes in Cuween Hill Cairn, which, prior to its excavation in the 1880s, does not appear to have been entered since the Stone Age.)

In Scotland we have people (a) raising commemorative crosses, and (b) *laying* crosses or stones *over* the dead. These phenomena are rare in Scandinavia (although rune-inscribed gravestones do become common in the high and late Middle Ages), and it has been suggested in connection with the runic crosses in Scotland and the large number on Man that they represent a coming together of Celtic and Norse culture. In Ireland, too, we have the Killaloe Cross, IR 2, which in addition has an ogham inscription apparently referring to the same *Porgrímr* who the runes tell us raised the cross. Many of the Dublin inscriptions are marked by their incomprehensibility, and in addition to those included in the corpus there are two or three consisting solely of 'rune-like' symbols. Those who carved runes onto portable objects in Viking-Age and early medieval Dublin seem, on the whole, to have had a different purpose from their medieval counterparts in Bergen, Trondheim and other Scandinavian towns, where much of the runic material consists of clearly linguistic messages and a straightforward interpretation is often possible. England has a relatively small number of inscriptions that appear to be purely Norse – presumably a reflection of the greater integration of the Scandinavians into the indigenous culture.

Apart from these interesting regional variations, can we deduce anything from the corpus as a whole? Perhaps that runes, although exported to the Scandinavian colonies in the west, were not used as widely as in Scandinavia itself. And yet runic tradition (possibly re-imported) was clearly strong enough in some parts of England for those writing in English or in hybrid Anglo-Norse to employ Scandinavian runes some fifty to one hundred years after the Norman conquest.

I conclude this article with a schematic presentation of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions of the British Isles outside Maeshowe and Man (very doubtful cases are omitted, including two from Wales which I have not yet had an opportunity to investigate). For each inscription are given: (1) A letter or letters denoting the country (or assumed country) of origin (SH = Shetland; OR = Orkney; SC = Scotland; E = England; IR = Ireland). (2) A number based on the relative age of the find. (3) The name of the inscription (normally taken from the place where it was or is found). (4) A brief description of the object on which the runes are incised. (5) A text and/or a transliteration and/or a description of the runes, as appropriate. (In the texts, as a rule, the spelling has been normalised, but not the linguistic forms; a question mark indicates that the word before which it is placed is uncertain. In the transliterations the following conventions apply: () = uncertain character, * = unreadable but countable character, . . . = unreadable and uncountable characters, — = bind-rune; line division or other types of break are indicated by a space.)

- SH 1 Cunningsburgh I (stone fragment): **krimr+**
- SH 2 Cunningsburgh II (stone fragment): **(kt)+(tk)**
- SH 3 Cunningsburgh III (stone): . . . *efir fôður sinn Porbjörn.*
- SH 4 Papil (stone fragment): **r:rais(t)i:s(t)**
- SH 5 Eshaness (stone fragment): ****.*(kku)***
- OR 1 Stackrue (steatite disc): **kop r** (and some bind or twig-runes that are difficult to interpret).
- OR 2 Unstan (scratched on slab): a twig-rune, some rune-like symbols, and **ukf**
- OR 3 Orkney (spinning whorl of steatite): *Gautr reist rúnar.*
- OR 4 Ring of Brogar I (scratched on raised stone): **?Björn** (four twig-runes surrounding a possible **r**, and a cross).
- OR 5 Ring of Brogar II (scratched on boulder): a twig-rune and a cross.
- OR 6 Birsay I (stone): . . . **filibusrāñru**
- OR 7 Brogar Farm (stone): three twig-runes.
- OR 8 Birsay II (stone fragment): the lower halves of about twelve runes, one of which is **u** or **r**, plus two dividers.
- OR 9 Birsay III (stone fragment): the lower parts (a third to a half is visible) of about ten runes, one of which is probably **r**.
- OR 10 Orphir I (stone): **ikergirgi(a)k(a)b(us)ufs(u)**
- OR 11 Birsay IV (seal's tooth): **fuþork**
- OR 12 Westness (bone pin): **aaa**
- OR 13 Skara Brae (stone): three twig-runes and two or three **rs**.
- OR 14 Tuquoy (stone): *Porsteinn Einarssonr reist rúnar þessar.*
- OR 15 Orphir II (cattle rib): **?Petta bein vas ?í ?þvesti.**
- SC 1 Laws (bronze plate): **mkitil:þa**
- SC 2 Hunterston (silver brooch): *Melbrigða á stilki*, plus some rune-like decoration.
- SC 3 Holy Island I (scratched on wall of cave): *Nikolás á Hæni reist.*
- SC 4 Holy Island II (scratched on wall of cave): *Sveinn.*
- SC 5 Holy Island III (scratched on wall of cave): *Qnundr reist rúnar.*
- SC 6 Holy Island IV (scratched on wall of cave): *Ámundar.*
- SC 7 Holy Island VIII (scratched on wall of cave): *Vígleikr stallari reist.*
- SC 8 Kilbar (stone cross): **?Eftir Þorgerðu Steinars ?dóttur es kors sjá reistr.**
- SC 9 Holy Island VI (scratched on wall of cave): *Jónan.*
- SC 10 Inchmarnock (stone cross): . . . **kross þenna til Guðl . . .** Remains of what are probably further runes can also be seen.
- SC 11 Thurso I (stone cross): . . . **?gerði yfirlag þetta aft Ingólf fôður sinn.**
- SC 12 Holy Island V (scratched on wall of cave): *Ólafr.*
- SC 13 Holy Island VII (scratched on wall of cave): **m**
- SC 14 Iona (cross-slab): *Kali Qlvissonr lagði stein þensi yfir Fogl, bróður ?sinn.*
- SC 15 Thurso II (stone): . . . **?Gunnhildi konu ?sína.**
- E 1 Bridekirk (stone font): *Ricarb he me iwopte and to bis merð . . . me brocte.*
- E 2 St Paul's (gravestone): **?Ginna lét leggja stein þensi aust Tóki.**
- E 3 Carlisle (scratched on wall of cathedral): *Dólfinn vreit þessi rúnar á þessi stein.*

- E 4 Lincoln (bone comb-case): *Kamb góðan gjarði Pórfastr.*
 E 5 Settle (slate): *afr(a)fr*
 E 6 Dearham (graveslab): *.hnirm*
 E 7 Rochester (head or footstone fragment): **ki:**
 E 8 Skelton (stone sundial): . . . *iebel.ok.*
 E 9 Pennington (stone tympanum): *kml:*et*:þena:kirk:hub*rt:m*sun:u**:m . . .*
 E 10 Canterbury (stone(?) fragment): *anu**
 E 11 Conishead (stone from altar): *dotbrt*
 E 12 Winchester (stone fragment): *(R:)auk(o)l(:)* *usk***
 E 13 St Albans I (bone): **þ:þu:uur:ur risti run(aR): tr*
 E 14 St Albans II (bone): *wufr(ik)*
 E 15 Penrith (silver brooch): *fuforkhniastbmm fu*
 IR 1 Greenmount (bronze strip from a sword): *Dufnall selshqfuð á sverð þetta.*
 IR 2 Killaloe (stone cross): *Porgrím reisti kross þenna.*
 IR 3 Beginish (stone): *lir.r(is)ti.sti(n).**n**munu*(k)*risti . . .*
 IR 4 Dublin Christchurch Place I (wooden implement): *kirlak**
 IR 5 Dublin Christchurch Place II (cattle rib bone): *onaa*su***
 IR 6 Dublin Christchurch Place III (wooden plane): *so*rmipfris um*ópsisis****
 IR 7 Dublin Christchurch Place IV (wooden handle): *stilinr* ka . . . stixl . . .*
 IR 8 Dublin Fishamble Street I (cattle rib bone): *nubRnubþi**
 IR 9 Dublin Christchurch Place V (cattle scapula): *teli ** sua:sua i**ir ehhe tal*
 IR 10 Dublin Fishamble Street II (sheep(?) scapula): *sa* ritisanatkaoluamn* aikuaitu*
 IR 11 Dublin Fishamble Street III (wooden stick): *fuforkhniastbmlr fuforkxhniastbmlr*
 IR 12 Dublin Fishamble Street IV (antler): *hurn:hiartaR.la:aysaR*
 IR 13 Dublin Fishamble Street V (cattle rib bone): *nrþ***

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M.P. Barnes, 'Norwegian, Norn, Icelandic or West Norse? The Language of the Maeshowe Inscriptions', in J.O. Askedal, H. Bjorvand and E.F. Halvorsen (eds.), *Festskrift til Ottar Grønvik* (Oslo, 1991).
- M.P. Barnes, *The Runic Inscriptions of Maeshowe, Orkney* (Runrön 8) (forthcoming, Uppsala).
- B. Bruggink, *Runes in and from the British Isles* (University of Amsterdam dissertation, 1987).
- W.G. Collingwood, 'Remains of the Pre-Norman Period', in J. Wilson (ed.), *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*. Cumberland I (London, 1901).
- N. Dorian, *Language Death* (Philadelphia, 1981).
- L. Jacobsen and E. Moltke, *Danmarks runeindskrifter* (Copenhagen, 1941–2).
- J. Jesch, 'New Finds from Orkney', *Nytt om runer* 5 (1991), 13–14.

- H. Jungner and E. Svärdström, *Västergötlands runinskrifter* (Stockholm, 1940–70).
- A. Liestøl, ‘Runes’, in A. Fenton and Hermann Pálsson (eds.), *The Northern and Western Isles in the Viking World* (Edinburgh, 1984).
- H. Marquardt, *Bibliographie der Runeninschriften nach Fundorten* (Göttingen, 1961).
- E. Moltke, *Runes and Their Origin. Denmark and Elsewhere* (Copenhagen, 1985).
- N. Å. Nielsen, *Runerne på Rökstenen* (Odense, 1969).
- M. Olsen, *Runerne i St. Molaise's celle paa Holy Island, Arran, Skotland* (Kristiania, 1912).
- M. Olsen, ‘Runic Inscriptions in Great Britain, Ireland and the Isle of Man’, in H. Shetelig (ed.), *Viking Antiquities in Great Britain and Ireland*, vi (Oslo, 1954).
- R.I. Page, ‘How Long did the Scandinavian Language Survive in England? The Epigraphical Evidence’, in P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (eds.), *England before the Conquest* (Cambridge, 1971).
- R.I. Page, *An Introduction to English Runes* (London, 1973).
- R.I. Page, ‘The Manx Rune-Stones’, in C. Fell and others (eds.), *The Viking Age in the Isle of Man* (London, 1983).
- Guðbrandr Vigfusson and C.R. Unger, *Flateyjarbok* (Christiania, 1860–8).