Read What's There: Interpreting Runestone Inscriptions

Henrik Williams

It is not difficult to find established interpretations of runestone texts that presuppose carving errors. Sometimes these are obvious, especially when we are dealing with common words like 'raise' or 'stone'. But less common words such as names are often assumed to be miscarved too. The following examples may be cited, taken from the national corpus editions or other recognised published sources.

Arbitrarily omitted runes:
U 519 **ᛁᚱᛒrn** *Gæiʀbiǫrn*
N 210 **hala** *helga*
U 838 **þufr** *Þōlfʀ*
Nä 12 **s-ukn** *s[t]ȳksun*
Tumbo church stone **faskr** *Fastgæiʀʀ/-gærðr* (as interpreted by Jansson 1965, 14)
U 729 **tekr** *drængʀ*
U 865 **...ulfas** *Īgulfastr*
Vs 11† [**k̇ufri**] *Guðfriðr*
Ög 91 **yuia** *Ōrǭkia*
Gs 13 **lanklans** *læiðangr lands*

Erroneous runes:
DR 298 **itinkil** *Stenkel*
Sm 69 **suil** *Svæinn*
Vs 4 **bʀkia** *biðia*
Sö 174 [**ub**]**lubʀ** *Ōblauðr* (as interpreted by Otterbjörk 1983, 40)
U 676 **kulua** *Kylfa*
Sö 82 **þuþʀ kʀkum** *dauðr ī Grikkum*

Williams, Henrik. "Read What's There: Interpreting Runestone Inscriptions." *Futhark: International Journal of Runic Studies* 1 (2010), 27–39.

© 2010 Henrik Williams
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.

Superfluous runes:
Fällbro stone **rauþkar** *Hrōðgæiʀʀ* (as interpreted by Jansson 1946, 259)
Sö 174 [**ub**]**lubʀ** *Ōlafʀ*
U 1022 **althrn** *Halfdan*

Why is it that none of the eminent runologists responsible for these interpretations seem to have any problem in assuming serious carving errors, sometimes in inscriptions that otherwise look orthographically perfect? A clue is offered by Magnus Olsen, who in his treatment of N 210 Oddernes 2 refers to the book *Upplands runstenar* by Otto von Friesen. In this work, von Friesen passed severe judgement on the trustworthiness of runestone orthography (1913, 86):

> Det är en allmänt gängse föreställning bland filologerna, en föreställning som också kan iakttagas hos åtskilliga af dem, som mer ingående studerat de nordiska runinskrifterna och äga en mer omfattande autopsi på området, att felristningar i runinskrifterna äro sällsynta. Man är t. o. m. i princip obenägen att antaga sådana och föredrar att bakom oväntade ristningsformer se verkliga språkformer, äfven om dessa endast med stor svårighet låta sig förlikas med fornspråkets grammatik och stilistik …. I själfva verket visar redan en tämligen flyktig granskning att felristningar äro vanliga äfven hos … mästarne.
>
> ('There is a notion prevalent among philologists, a notion which may also be observed among many of those who have studied the Scandinavian runic inscriptions more intimately and have extensive experience of personal observation in the field, that miscarvings in runic inscriptions are rare. There is even a reluctance in principle to assume such [miscarvings] and a preference for seeing real forms of language behind unexpected forms in inscriptions, even if they may only be reconciled with the grammar and style of the ancient language with great difficulty …. In reality, a casual inspection is enough to show that miscarvings are common even by the … masters.')

Von Friesen based his statement on an investigation of some forty runestone inscriptions from Uppland (1913, 86), among which he found between thirty and forty certain or probable miscarvings.

Another Uppsala professor, Bengt Hesselman, clearly influenced by von Friesen, later proclaimed (1945, 78): "Men runstensortografi är nu inte mycket att hålla sig till" ('But the orthography on runestones is not much to go by').

It is obvious that the condescending opinion expressed by several prominent scholars when runology was in its first bloom (in modern times) did severely affect attitudes towards the value of runic inscriptions as linguistic sources. This has also had an effect on non-runologists who often feel put off

by the supposed unreliability of runic texts, as well as being repelled by the very technical vocabulary of runic specialists and our strange preoccupation with seemingly trifling details.

In this paper I want to question whether the spelling on runestones really is as bad as von Friesen claims, but I would first like to speculate a bit on what caused his negative approach. It is my view that nineteenth-century scholars had ruined the reputation of runic inscriptions. Pioneers such as Carl Säve, Richard Dybeck and the infamous George Stephens did much good in publishing or at least illustrating many runestones, but also a great deal of damage to runic scholarship with their often undisciplined and fanciful interpretations.

Otto von Friesen's negativity towards his predecessors, and perhaps even some of his contemporaries, was however also due to a shift in the academic paradigm—a shift which is underlined by his mentioning the grammar and style of the ancient language, as if these are indisputable and unchanging. As early as the 1860s, Ludvig Wimmer had introduced the strict discipline of the neo-grammarians into runology, demanding structure and sound methodology. The inspired guesswork of Stephens became obsolete overnight, and to my mind it shows the greatness of the Norwegian Sophus Bugge that he was humble enough to admit this.

But even if runologists such as Wimmer, Bugge, and Magnus Olsen had a much higher scholarly standing than their predecessors, the discipline itself was still only in its infancy and the two Norwegians certainly had their share of unhealthy imagination. Not even the solid contributions of Adolf Noreen and Lis Jacobsen were enough to clean up the bad practices. Scientific runology only became properly established with the rise of such names as Elias Wessén and Aslak Liestøl, and the Danish quartet of Lis Jacobsen—now in her prime—Erik Moltke, Anders Bæksted, and Karl Martin Nielsen. Of these I would hold up in particular Elias Wessén, who combined the sober judgment of a brilliant field runologist, the thoroughness of a conscientious editor, and the profound learning of a leading language historian with a very high level of productivity.

The damage was already done, however, and none of the great names mentioned here made any real effort to establish runology as a recognised field of scholarship, as was demonstrated by Michael Barnes (1994) in his stern lecture at the Third International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions. (Perhaps there were simply too few good runologists. There have always been many more amateurs and even dilettantes within the field than fully trained philologists specialising in runes.) The exemplary corpus edition *Danmarks runeindskrifter* is something of an exception to this

rule. It presents a balanced account of miscarvings (s.v. 'Fejlristning', *DR*, *Text*, 802–05), for example, and even establishes two sound principles for accepting such occurrences: that incomprehensible or conspicuously spelled words are more likely to be miscarvings, and that the same is true of words occurring in otherwise more or less flawed texts; the percentage of error among established runographers is presumed to be quite small. Examples are presented; however, abbreviations and omissions are excluded and treated separately (cols. 1047–49, where there may be found a somewhat richer store of deviant forms).

The neo-grammarians did runology a tremendous service in demanding that the texts should conform to what we know about runic Scandinavian language/s. The haphazard variation taken for granted by Stephens (and still by his modern counterparts) was simply not accepted. But the new paradigm came with two drawbacks. The first is the fallacy that just as language developed according to sound laws, so all variation, all alternative forms, had to be explained by competing laws. Many silly sound laws with extremely limited scope have seen the light of day as a result. The problem, of course, was that the neo-grammarians were children of their age, as are we all. They believed in standards and norms and did not like the anarchy of living language all that much. "Label it and regulate it!" was the creed of the times. Hence, even scholars like Wessén view the variation in runic inscriptions with scepticism. Yet it is evident that there is a much greater range of competing forms on the runestones than in later medieval manuscripts, and far from all of the variation can be explained in chronological or dialectological terms.

The other fallacy of the neo-grammarian runologists affected all philologists of the old school. Scholarly philology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century felt itself to be at the apex of scientific accomplishment. The Old Norse text editions of the time contained a good deal of guesswork based on the assumption that the modern philologist knew better what these texts meant and what form they had originally taken than did the medieval copyist who had produced the only known record of the text. It is sufficient to refer once again to the quotation from von Friesen (1913, 86) in which he self-confidently identifies carving errors on the sole grounds that the runographers do not write a word the way they should have to satisfy the spelling rules set up by von Friesen himself; note also that it is he alone who has the privilege of determining what the word is supposed to be.

The key words within Old Philology were conjecture and emendation. This is only one example of the chronological colonialism in historical

scholarship so typical of a century ago. The presumption was that the modern scholar knew better what a runic inscription carved a thousand years before meant than the person who actually wrote it. Personally I find this quite preposterous.

Not until Svante Lagman published his important paper in defence of rune-carvers' orthography in 1988 (reprinted with minor corrections 1989) did anyone truly try to grapple with the question of miscarvings. Lagman sorted the aberrant forms ("avvikande skrivningar", 1989, 29–36) into two main groups. The first one consists of forms that are fully motivated phonologically or orthographically, while the second group is made up of forms that are not fully motivated. But in this second group there are many examples of what one might call less severe errors such as a transposition of runes or graphic confusion as in the mix-up of ᚾ and ᚿ. The innovative aspect of Lagman's paper is that it manifests a much more sophisticated approach to the concept of "miscarving". Just because something deviates from the expected, does not mean we may neglect to discuss which type of deviation we are dealing with and how it affects the linguistic evidence offered by the inscription. Lagman discovered that true errors are in fact very few, below one per cent in comparison with the expected forms. He also launched a seven-step programme for the interpretation of runic inscriptions.

In my doctoral dissertation I tried to follow up Lagman's findings. I also emphasised that words in runic texts are in principle written according to the way they were pronounced, an axiom which has been far from universally accepted. But it is not my purpose to discuss this matter now. What I want to consider is the extent to which we may trust the runic records in the shape we find them, regardless of why a certain form was chosen.

Is this really important? Is it not just another of those trifling details into which runologists, myself in particular, like to probe? On the contrary, I suggest that the question of the reliability of runic orthography lies at the very heart of runological scholarship. If we cannot trust what is there, how are we to know what a runic text is really intended to say? We have to deal with this question or suffer the consequences.

A major problem here is that most inscriptions are already published in scholarly editions by renowned runologists. The very authority of these giants in the runic field means that their understanding of an inscription often inhibits later researchers in arriving at a different view—not only of that particular text, but of the genre in general.

There are also at least two sides to the problem. The first is the less serious and has to do with the commonness or otherwise of errors. Initially, I presented almost a score of cases where miscarvings have been assumed.

Some of these have already been given other interpretations, presupposing no carving errors, and I will in future analyses try to do the same for the rest. But even if the actual number of errors were twice or thrice as high, or even twenty times higher, they would still constitute exceptions to the rule in the several thousands of well-published inscriptions, and are therefore statistically not highly significant. Most of the suspect interpretations furthermore affect personal names, and it may seem of little importance whether an otherwise unknown person a millennium ago was called one thing or another.

Now, this last objection happens to be wrong. The inventory of names in runic sources is not a question of importance only to onomastic scholars interested in formation types, regional distribution and so forth. The way the stock of personal names is made up gives us unique and invaluable information about mentality and social patterns in ancient times. This is why Sven B. F. Jansson's interpretation of **rauþkar** as *Hrōðgæiʀʀ* on the Fällbro stone must not be accepted uncritically. Jansson (1946, 259) claims: "Faderns namn Rodger bör väl, trots den egendomliga — folketymologiska(?) — stavningen uppfattas som *Hrōðgæiʀʀ*, ett välbekant germanskt mansnamn" ('The name of the father, *Rodger*, should, in spite of the strange spelling — a folk etymology? — probably be understood as *Hrōðgæiʀʀ*, a well-known Germanic man's name'). Evert Salberger (1978, 119–25) did not agree, and was able to show convincingly with orthographical and onomastic arguments that **rauþkar** must instead be interpreted as *Rauðkārr*, the name of a man with red, curly hair. Instead of a run-of-the mill two-element name that says little new about Viking Age naming patterns, we have a unique appellation that tells us something meaningful about the man in the inscription and what was considered a significant human trait when giving someone a name. I am convinced that behind quite a few runic sequences that are considered bad spellings of common names, there lie concealed rare and exciting name formations.

More important, however, is the second problem with misinterpretations of this kind. They trick us into misjudging the competence of runographers and their readers, and that has huge implications for our view of runic literacy and the very function of runic inscriptions.

As an example we may here take the interpretation of U 729 Ågersta's **tekr** as *drængʀ*. Sven B. F. Jansson writes (in *SRI*, 8: 264): "Trots de invändningar, som … ha gjorts mot förslaget att uppfatta **tekr** som felristning för **trekr**, förefaller denna lösning avgjort rimligast" ('Notwithstanding the objections which have … been made against the proposal that **tekr** should be regarded as a miscarving of **trekr**, this seems by far the most likely solution'). The

interpretation presented by Jansson originated with Otto von Friesen, and von Friesen's assumption of a miscarving here was included in the list he compiled which I referred to initially. Having received Jansson's support the interpretation has been universally accepted, even by Judith Jesch (1998), who presented a close analysis of the whole inscription at the Göttingen International Runic Symposium. She posits (p. 462) "two fundamental characteristics of memorial inscriptions from the late Viking Age", the first of which is "that the meaning of the inscriptions resides not only in the words of their texts, but also in the very materiality of the monuments that preserve those words". I have no difficulty with the second part of this claim, but I do want to point out that "the meaning of the inscriptions" does reside primarily in the words; it is therefore of utmost importance that these words have been interpreted convincingly. Jesch does indeed notice the deviant orthography of **tekr**. She writes (p. 465, note 10): "… one could question whether the sequence **tekr** actually represents the word *drængʀ* … If *drængʀ* was intended, then we have a rare example of a genuine carving error (Lagman 1989: 37). If not, then it is hard to imagine what word was intended." Jesch, however, obviously felt the interpretation *drængʀ* to be certain enough to keep its place in her discussion of the runic monument. She writes (1998, 468):

> Balli's readers will be members of a select group of those qualified to appreciate his text. To express this meaning, Balli carefully chose the word *drængʀ*; as it is not in an alliterating position, any one-syllable word (such as *maðr*) would have done. Instead, he chose a word that often has a strong connotation of the intimacy and exclusivity of an in-group …. In this inscription the word is used somewhat anomalously (as far as runic inscriptions go) to refer to a cultural in-group, rather that a military one, but the semantic link is clear enough.

Now, Jesch's article has many virtues and does not rely to any great extent on the interpretation of **tekr**. But her understanding of the word does play a role in her argumentation, and the claims she makes about this part of the text seem a little over-confident, given that the inscription does not actually contain the word *drængʀ*. Jesch admits her inability to suggest another meaning for this runic sequence. But Evert Salberger (2003) is not so lacking in imagination. He proposes (pp. 681–86) the attractive interpretation *tōkʀ* 'alert, adept', presupposing a delabialised form. I consider his explanation to be distinctly superior to von Friesen's and I have chosen this case to illustrate the dangers of accepting interpretations founded on the assumption of a carving error.

The heart of the matter is our attitude towards the recipients of runic

texts. It has been claimed by some that the ability to read runes was very limited and that the texts primarily had other than communicative purposes. I personally have no problem accepting this as long as we are dealing with periods or areas where runic inscriptions are scarce. There are extremely few runic texts from before A.D. 500, for example, and even if there must have been many, many more than the ones we happen to have found, the artefacts themselves with their laconic messages, sometimes placed out of sight, emphasise that writing in those days was an exclusive act with limited application and presumably mastered by few. That the inscriptions contain a fair number of errors is thus not an improbable assumption.

From later periods there may be an abundance of runic texts, yet by no means all have a clear communicative purpose. I am thinking of the many medieval carvings that lack obvious sense. But again, the genre of these texts indicates that they were not intended to be read by all and sundry. A large number probably consist of writing exercises or are simply aimless scribbles made for entertainment. Many may also have a hidden purpose. Again, I have no problem in accepting that inscriptions such as these contain runic sequences which do not contain intelligible words.

However, when we are dealing with the Viking Age runestones in the Scandinavian heartlands, it is a very different matter. Their number, their concentration, their location, their nature, their size, and the scope of their inscriptions all indicate that they were meant to be seen and presumably read by more than a few. And this is where we run into problems with the view that carving errors on these monuments not only abound but occur haphazardly. One illustrative example, mentioned initially, is Erik Brate's interpretation of Ög 91 **ᚢᚢᛁᛅ** as *Ōrøkia* (in *SRI*, 2:91): "Troligen är ock ristningen **ᚢᚢᛁᛅ** en sådan [ett förkortat skrivsätt], då någon direkt motsvarighet därtill svårligen skall anträffas, och mansnamnet *Ōrøkia* ligger då närmast till hands att tänka på" ('Probably the carving **ᚢᚢᛁᛅ** is one too [an abbreviation], given that there seems to be no direct parallel, and that being so, the male name *Ōrøkia* springs most readily to mind'). I beg to differ (see below). Even if we allow ourselves to assume for a moment that contemporary readers already knew what the first name of the inscription would be, and, should it have slipped their mind, only needed the most rudimentary orthographical representation to jog their memory, no more is implied than that the names and other words behind deficient spellings such as this are forever lost. Brate has absolutely no way of proving that his interpretation is more than a wild guess.

But is it really likely that contemporary readers would have been able to equate **ᚢᚢᛁᛅ** with *Ōrøkia*? Of course the carver would have known what this

sequence meant and presumably the putative Ōrǭkia, who commissioned the monument, was able to make it out, although he is unlikely to have been very pleased with the botched spelling unless, of course, it was his own work and he was unable to perform any better. Readers outside the group intimately concerned with the inscription were, however, at a disadvantage. One could perhaps argue that people in the neighbourhood may also have known to whom the text referred and thus been in a position to solve the puzzle. This would mean, though, that some runestones were only meant to be read locally, which may indeed be true of an unimpressive monument such as Ög 91 with its brief and unelaborated inscription and very simple design.

Yet, presumed carving errors are not, at least not in Sweden, restricted to substandard or even "middle-class" runestones. Many of the examples presented at the beginning of this paper stem from high status monuments, judging by the length and content of the texts: U 729 Ågersta, Sö 174 Aspö church and Gs 13 Söderby, for example, are all over two metres tall and have between 123 and 155 runes, yet inferior spellings have been identified on each of them.

Should we then accept the prevalent attitude that carving errors may occur on any type of runestone by any carver and in any textual position, and furthermore that we as modern runologists are in a position to perceive the true meaning behind the most garbled scribblings, confusing even to the readers of the time? That would suggest that not only runestone inscriptions but the scholarship of runology itself was in a sorry state. If many interpretations rely on no more than guesswork, the accuracy of which depends solely on the authority of the runologist doing the guessing, I very much doubt that other scholars in the humanities will be greatly impressed by the reliability of the sources we are investigating or the results we reach.

For my own part I refuse to be a defeatist. I would like to set up a competing hypothesis: runestone texts are with few exceptions well adapted to the purposes they were intended to serve. This compels me to take a closer look at the context and communicative situation of the Viking Age inscriptions. I would claim that we have a pretty poor understanding of these factors and lack answers to many of the most fundamental questions. Who could read and write runes, and how many such people were there? Was it critically important that all words were written unambiguously? What were the mental tools used to decode an inscription and precisely what orthographical rules were followed?

An important key to disentangling some of the apparent confusion in

runic orthography was offered in an article by Evert Salberger (2001). It is not published in one of the better-known journals and it is easy to miss this important contribution, which occurs in a brief passage in a rather lengthy text. Salberger's suggestion is that we should make a distinction between the writing of ordinary words on the one hand and names on the other, the "spelling" of the former being less important. This explains why even runic inscriptions with seemingly substandard writing may be decoded and interpreted with confidence—as long as the deviant orthography is restricted to words we understand anyway. Returning to the example of Ög 91 **yuia**: Brate's claim that it would be hard to find any direct parallels to this sequence and that the male name *Ōrøkia* springs most readily to mind (see above) is difficult to accept. Following Salberger's lead we are now forced to come up with a better solution. Fortunately, a straightforward interpretation of **yuia** as a Runic Swedish female name *Øyia* (cf. Old Norse *Eyja*) may be offered.

I believe Salberger has touched upon a most important principle behind runic orthography, and one we should have caught sight of long ago. It is simply a question of functional load: unexpected words need more clues to enable the reader to decipher them. But the distinction is not as Salberger suggested between names and non-names. Rather it is between formulaic and non-formulaic words. This means that formulas must be seen as a vital concept in runology. In fact, there are only four of these standard ingredients to worry about: memorial formulas, obituaries, prayers and signatures. The formulas were standardised to an amazing extent, allowing for little variation, and much of that restricted to the sequence of the elements included. It was by mastering and anticipating various elements in the formulas that the reader of a runestone text was able to crack its code. This is also what constitutes Viking Age literacy. Since every literate person knew what the text was going to say, it was mostly a matter of orientation: Where am I now, what is this word likely to be? Almost all elements could be predicted and the writing of the standardised ones only had to be explicit enough to enable you to distinguish between, say, 'stone' and 'staff'. But non-standardised words were quite a different matter. In dealing with names, at least you knew your solution had to reflect the established or possible stock of names. In the case of other words, however, you probably only had a general idea of what type of lexical item to expect. As to exactly which name and which unpredictable lexical item, you had to rely on the runic orthography alone. That is why the writing of these words is so important and why we have to trust what is there. There is simply no other way of determining what the text says. Thus the reader of U 729 Ågersta had no

clue to what the sequence **tekr** meant when s/he reached that part of the inscription, apart from the fact that it was a word denoting a person. If there had been reason to suspect a stock phrase containing the element *drængʀ* it would have been a different matter, but that does not seem to be the case. The reader had only the runes and a language shared with the carver as the means of deciphering this element. Some probably failed. That is what constitutes degrees of literacy and is why our Viking Age forebears found it no less challenging and presumably no less rewarding to grapple with a runestone than we do today.

It is quite common for editors of runestone inscriptions to refer to carving mistakes elsewhere in an inscription or on other stones by the same carver as evidence in favour of there being an error in a particular word they are discussing. This practice is without merit when the words compared do not have the same functional load.

There is nothing surprising about the concept of functional load in connection with runestone writing. It is rather that the nineteenth-century prejudice against non-standardised forms of language has made us blind to it. I suspect that young teenagers of today would find it much easier to relate to Viking Age orthographic practices than many of their elders. We must remember that we are dealing with the early stages of a writing technique, at least in terms of genre. Newspaper headlines offer a parallel: as they developed there was a need to adapt the somewhat cumbersome spelling of English, and forms such as *nite* for *night* appeared. The same tendency is evident in most if not all media where space is restricted. It is common, for example, to communicate in short form on car number plates ("4 u 2" = 'for you, too') or in personal ads ("SJF" = 'Single Jewish Female', "LTR" = 'Long Term Relationship'). The best modern parallel might be the Internet chat medium and especially the Short Message Service on mobile phones. Reading an SMS from my teenage daughter can present quite a challenge as it will abound in abbreviations, many of which are made up on the spot. When questioned about this, she declares that all words in frequent use are susceptible to abbreviation. Of course, I am not suggesting that runestone texts used standardised or prearranged abbreviations, or that they are exact counterparts to the modern SMS, since the latter, after all, belongs to a completely different textual universe. But the basic distinction made between regular and less predictable elements is a common denominator.

One major difference between runic and modern writing is the ambiguity of the former, due to the restricted number of runes available. This constitutes a separate problem, which I will not go into here, but which I believe is also capable of solution. The decisive factor is our attitude towards

runestone texts, which fundamentally affects our prospect of interpreting them correctly.

The basic point to keep in mind is that there is no key, no answer book, where one can look up the correct solutions to the textual puzzles one encounters. One simply has to exercise care in determining which interpretations are possible, and of these, which is the most likely. It may be a comforting thought that the original readers faced the same predicament as we do and ran the same risk of misinterpreting from time to time what they encountered. In New Philology this is not a problem: Every reader rewrites the text afresh. But our forbears did so, I think, firmly believing that each runic sequence in front of them meant what it said.

The first steps towards the understanding of these complex issues have been taken—I have already mentioned Svante Lagman's (1989) pioneering contribution. Many as yet undeciphered runic sequences need to be examined in the belief they can be properly understood, and many existing interpretations need to be re-examined insofar as they rest on the assumption of unmotivated carving errors. A tremendous amount of work remains to be done—entertaining and rewarding work.

To summarise: A number of runic sequences have been interpreted by assuming that the orthography is not to be trusted. Miscarvings or misspellings do indeed exist in the runic corpus. However, I have tried to show in this paper that the notion of carving errors is not one that should be appealed too lightly in the case of non-formulaic words.

Bibliography

Barnes, Michael P. 1994. "On Types of Argumentation in Runic Studies." In *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, Grindaheim, Norway, 8–12 August 1990*, ed. James E. Knirk, 11–29. Runrön 9. Uppsala.

DR + number = inscription published in *Danmarks runeindskrifter*, i.e. *DR*.

DR = *Danmarks runeindskrifter*. 3 vols.: *Text*; *Atlas*; *Registre*. By Lis Jacobsen and Erik Moltke. København 1941–42.

Friesen, Otto von. 1913. *Upplands runstenar: En allmänfattlig öfversikt*. Uppsala.

Gs + number = inscription published in *Gästriklands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 15.1.

Hesselman, Bengt. 1945. *Omljud och brytning i de nordiska språken: Förstudier till en nordisk språkhistoria*. Nordiska texter och undersökningar 15. Stockholm.

Jansson, Sven B. F. 1946. "Några okända uppländska runinskrifter." *Fornvännen* 41, 257–80.

—. 1965. "Några nyfunna sörmländska runristningar." *Sörmlandsbygden* 34, 9–22.

Jesch, Judith. 1998. "Still Standing in Ågersta: Textuality and Literacy in Late Viking-Age Rune Stone Inscriptions." In *Runeninschriften als Quellen interdisziplinärer Forschung: Abhandlungen des Vierten internationalen Symposiums über Runen und Runeninschriften in Göttingen vom 4.–9. August 1995*, ed. Klaus Düwel, 462–75. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 15. Berlin.

Lagman, Svante. 1989. "Till försvar för runristarnas ortografi." In *Projektet De vikingatida runinskrifternas kronologi: En presentation och några forskningsresultat*, 27–37. Runrön 1. Uppsala.

N + number = inscription published in *Norges innskrifter med de yngre runer*, i.e. *NIyR*.

NIyR = *Norges innskrifter med de yngre runer*. By Magnus Olsen et al. 6 vols. to date. Oslo 1941 ff.

Nä + number = inscription published in *Närkes runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 14.1.

Otterbjörk, Roland. 1983. "**faruki**, **kurʀ** och **ublubʀ**: Namnproblem i sörmländska runinskrifter." *Studia anthroponymica Scandinavica* 1, 21–44.

Salberger, Evert. 1978. *Runsvenska namnstudier*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology, n.s. 13. Stockholm.

—. 2001. "Eckersholm-stenen: Ett tydningsförsök." *Sydsvenska ortnamnssällskapets årsskrift* 2001, 61–102.

—. 2003. "Ågersta-stenens **tekr**." In *Runica—Germanica—Mediaevalia*, ed. Wilhelm Heizmann and Astrid van Nahl, 672–88. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 37. Berlin.

Sm + number = inscription published in *Smålands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 4.

SRI = *Sveriges runinskrifter*. Various authors; published by Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. 14 vols. to date. Stockholm 1900 ff.

Sö + number = inscription published in *Södermanlands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 3.

U + number = inscription published in *Upplands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 6–9.

Vs + number = inscription published in *Värmlands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 14.2.

Ög + number = inscription published in *Östergötlands runinskrifter*, i.e. *SRI*, 2.