Gotland’s Picture Stones have long evoked people’s fascination, whether this has been prompted by an interest in life in Scandinavia in the first millennium or an appreciation of the beauty of the stones. The Gotlandic picture stones offer glimpses into an enigmatic world, plentifully endowed with imagery, but they also arouse our curiosity. What was the purpose and significance of the picture stones in the world of their creators, and what underlying messages nestle beneath their imagery and broader context? As a step towards elucidating some of the points at issue and gaining an insight into current research, the Runic Research Group at the Swedish National Heritage Board, in cooperation with Gotland Museum, arranged an international interdisciplinary symposium in 2011, the first symposium ever to focus exclusively on Gotland’s picture stones. The articles presented in this publication are based on the lectures delivered at that symposium.
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The Gotlandic picture stones provide us with an insight into a unique universe of pictures which were actually unparalleled in the rest of Scandinavia in the Iron Age and Viking Period. What might be less known is that they are occasionally furnished with epigraphic messages by way of runic inscriptions. By and large, they have attracted little interest, probably due to the fact that they are often damaged and thus difficult to read and decipher. Moreover, these inscriptions rarely provide any additional information on the pictorial elements, but mainly comprise simple epitaphs, similar to those we know from the runestones in other parts of Scandinavia.

Nevertheless, runology and philology can find these inscriptions of interest in that several of them have been dated to the first two centuries of the Viking Period, i.e. the 9th and 10th centuries, a period of time from which we have very little extant writing. Roughly speaking, there are no more than some fifty runic inscriptions that can be presumed to emanate from this period within present day Swedish borders. About one third of these have been discovered on Gotland, the clear majority of which are to be found on picture stones.

As regards the writing system, the runes have undergone considerable changes throughout the centuries. They would seem to have come into use some time during the third century A.D., when the rune row comprised 24 characters. This variant, which is normally called the Primitive Norse futhark, is partly known from the famous kylver stone in Stånga parish on Gotland. Some time in the early 8th century, this rune row was superseded by a runic system with only 16 characters, known as the younger furthark. It would seem as if it appeared in two variants from the very beginning. One is known in modern terminology as ‘long-branch runes’ and they have a more decorative form, while the runes of the second variant are simpler in shape and are known as ‘short twig runes’. These two variants have had a quite clearly demarcated range of geographical distribution during the first two centuries of the Viking Period. The long branch runes are to be found in Danish territory, while the short twig runes were prevalent in Sweden and Norway.

Rune-Inscribed Picture Stones and Picture Stone-Shaped Runestones
At first sight, the Gotlandic rune-inscribed monuments from the Viking Period may seem to be uniform, particularly in view of the fact that most of them have the characteristic mushroom shape, which is so typical for the Gotlandic picture stones. A closer examination, focusing on the writing system that has been used, however, will lead to a crystallization of a number of distinct
Another characteristic group comprises picture stones which have been inscribed with long branch runes. These are also relatively few in number, just over ten, and many of them are mere fragments. An example of a reasonably complete stone is the one found in 1965 when Sproge parish church was undergoing restoration. The inscription has been enclosed in a runic ribbon, which runs along the edges of the stone, and the pictorial motifs have been limited to one or two scenes. The carvings have generally been made in deep relief, and the runes have been incised with a chisel. Another trait of these stones is that they are often of modest size, rarely exceeding one metre in height. This group should also include stones which have formed walls in sarcophagi, such as Sanga kyrka 1 (see facing page).

Apart from the stones mentioned above, there is quite a large group of runestones, which have retained their characteristic picture stone shape, but lack figural elements. Instead, the carved surfaces are covered with zoomorphic decoration resembling the late Viking Period runestones in Uppland. These stones make about thirty in all. The size also varies considerably from some half metre above the ground up to 2.5–3 metres. The famous stone Hogårn kyrka 1 G 203 is of the latter type, and bears a long inscription comprising over three hundred runes (see p. 21). The long branch runes are prevalent on these stones, although there are occasional short twig runes.

Finally there is a small number of runic monuments, which cannot be placed in any of the above-mentioned groups. They include the singular Grötlingbo roes 1 and the Pilgård stone from Boge. The latter, as opposed to other stones on Gotland, is a small erratic block, smoothed by ice, and the runes have been placed in uniform vertical rows. There have been two stones in Sanda parish; they had been used as door posts in a house at Stenhuse, and they bore remains of inscriptions with the typical short twig runes. Unfortunately, both inscriptions have been lost, and it is also unclear as to what type of monument they might have been originally.
Remarkably enough, the two groups of rune-inscribed picture stones would seem to have had different distribution patterns on the island. The stones with short twig runes mainly belong to the northern part, while picture stones with long branch runes often appear in the south. Strange as it may seem, this division also applies when the two variants appear in connections other than on picture stones. The above-mentioned PILGÅRD STONE, which bears an inscription with short twig runes, belongs to the northern territory, and the same thing applies to a spearhead, inscribed in the main in short twig runes from Svenskens in Endre. In the south of Gotland, on the other hand, we find two older inscriptions with long branch runes: the above mentioned ROES STONE from Grötlingbo parish and a runic amulet from Hallbjäns in Sundre.

At the same time, everything points to a fairly long difference in time between the two groups of rune-inscribed picture stones. Stones with long branch runes must be from the 11th century, judging from the decoration and language, making them contemporaneous with the larger group of picture stone-shaped runestones. Lindquist has combined these two types in his Group E. The picture stones bearing short twig runes should belong to an earlier period, and their age has been debated. Birger Nerman claims that they could be dated to about 650–700, based on the ornamentation. This would mean that the short twig variant of the younger futhark had been established as early as in the 7th century, and not around 800, as has been commonly propounded. The Norwegian runologist, Ingrid Sanness Johnsen, has tried to solve this discrepancy between pictorial and epigraphic elements by assuming that the two are not contemporaneous, and that the inscriptions were added at a later date. She goes on to suggest that the runic ribbons enclosing the inscriptions may originally have been painted with a decorative motif or inscriptions. She even goes so far as to suggest that the runic ribbon to the right of the ship on the above-mentioned ALSKOG TJÄNGVIDE I (see p. 113) is not contemporaneous with the decoration, but has been added after
the completion of the images and border panel. It must, however, be pointed out that this ribbon is in raised relief against the sunk surfaces, and there is no corresponding occurrence to the left of the ship, which would clearly support the theory that it was part of the original design of the carving. In all likelihood, it has been carved for a particular reason, namely to bear runes.

Based on an overall appraisal of ornamentation and linguistic features, Thorgunn Snædal has dated most of the picture stones with short twig runes to the 9th century, while the Alskog Tjängvide I stone has been placed in the late 10th century or around 1000 A.D.13 On the Swedish mainland, it would seem as if inscriptions cut exclusively in short twig runes, all emanate from the 9th or 10th centuries.14 That a similar dating could apply to Gotland is indicated by those objects bearing short twig runes that have been given an independent archaeological dating. At the museum Kulturen in Lund, for example, there is an animal-head shaped brooch with runes, which was found on Gotland and is of a type which, according to Anders Carlsson’s studies, can be dated to about 800–900.15 Another example is the above-mentioned spearhead from Svenskens, which apart from its runes, also bears a Jelling-style ornamentation, which means that it must have been created in the latter half of the 10th century.16

The Writing System
The term ‘short twig runes’ was coined in the 19th century by the Norwegian runologist Sophus Bugge, and alludes to the fact that this system has shorter branches than the other variant of the later rune series. This is particularly noticable in the runes Ó, Ñ and Å. This, however, is not the most distinguishing quality of this variant of the rune series, but it is rather the contrasting pairs of characters, which are particularly discernible when comparing the short twig runic series Ó and Æ b or Æ h and Æ m. As Bengt Loman has pointed out, it is actually the number, placing and direction of the branches which are the decisive factors in this system.17 Consequently, runes such as Ó, Ñ and Å may appear with branches on both sides of the stave (*, †, ‡), without necessarily being long branch runes.

This means that it is not always so easy to determine whether an inscription belongs to the one or the other system. As an illustrative example, the picture stone fragment, that was discovered in 1966 Stenkyrka parish church, can be mentioned (see facing page). Immediately on its first publication, the inscription was transliterated as if it was in long branch runes (…uarpuf- htni=i---…), which is incomprehensible.18 Both the r-rune and n-rune, however, have a one-sided branch, and a closer study reveals that the alleged h-rune (†) is actually an † i.e. a. The presumed o-rune (‡) later on in the inscription should not be read as such, since the direction of the branches – at a slant upwards to the right – indicates that this is the short twig futhark’s b-rune! The inscription then reads: …uarpuf-ati-nibi-… Not that this can be definitely interpreted either, but the inscription suddenly acquires a ‘regular’ dispersion between vowel and consonant runes, implying that there is some underlying sense, linguistically speaking.

In previous research it has been noted that many of the Gotlandic picture stones bearing short twig runes have runes where the cross-strokes cut through the main stave,19 which in all probability must be understood as a typical trait for Gotland at that time. This is not only the case regarding runes such as Ó, Ñ, Å and b but also the r-rune, which on several occasions takes on the † form. This type of r-rune is known from an earlier period from a number of runic inscriptions in Östergötland, but it has also occurred on several occasions in Norway.20 On the badly abraded picture stone Hangvar kyrka II,21 there are two occurrences of a long branch r-rune, where it would seem as if the upper part of the main stave is missing. An immediate and obvious explanation would be that this is due to weathering, but there is actually an instance of a corresponding variant of the r-rune on a rune-inscribed amulet which has been discovered in Staraja Ladoga in Russia.
Since an a-rune with a double-sided branch has already occurred on the above-mentioned 9th century brooch at the museum Kulturen in Lund, it is possible that these variants should be regarded as the oldest forms on Gotland, while corresponding runes with one-sided branches might belong to a somewhat later period.

It would seem likely that occurrences of runes from the older rune series are to be found on a couple of other stones. The first one is the large picture stone gothem kyrka 4 (see p. 124), where the large diagonal cross (x) character in the centre has been interpreted as an old Norse g-rune, which has this shape (X). It is much more likely, however, to be a division mark. The runes to the right of this character are actually inverted, and should be read from right to left, while those to the left of the same character probably read from left to right.

The second example is to be found on the small picture stone stenkyrka lillbärs iii (see p. 125), where a horizontal ribbon encloses a number of runes. A couple of these resemble the d-runes of the Primitive Norse type (ð), while the others have been presumed to be short twig runes. It has not been possible, however, to decipher the inscription. On the other hand it can be questioned whether all the lines, which can be observed,
are actually part of runes. It would appear that the two characters following the first d-rune could in fact be the continuation of the mast and rigging of the ship below. If this is the case, then some of the presumed short twig runes should be omitted and it is quite possible that this could be an inscription carved exclusively in older runes. In other words we are lacking sound evidence that the inscriptions on the Gotlandic picture stones could comprise a mixture of the earlier and later runic alphabets.

The Language
Not one single Gotlandic picture stone with short twig runes is complete, meaning that we only have fragments of runic inscriptions to read and interpret. The best preserved inscription is on the above-mentioned stone ALSKOG TJÄNGVIDE 1; it begins with the following sequence:

...raististainaftiurulfbrupursin !

Although the carver has no division marks between the words, it is quite simple to realize that it should be read as: ...raisti stain aft lórulf, brōður sinn, i.e. “...raised the stone after Jórulfr, his brother.” A division mark can be seen after sinn, after which follows another long sequence, which, according to the publishers of Gotlands runinskrifter, can be read as follows:

sikuifirtunsafefii

It goes without saying that these represent a linguistic intelligible message, but so far nobody has managed to present any completely convincing interpretation. Although the inscription cannot be interpreted as a whole, there are some interesting observations to be made, regarding the language in the first part. The carver, for example, has used the abbreviated form aft (not æfti) for the word “after”, which is extremely common in early Viking inscriptions from the mainland. This is reminiscent of the famous first words on the Rök stone in Östergötland: Aft Vamôð standa rûnaþrak “After Vamôðr stand these runes”. The occurrence of the form aft on the stone ALSKOG TJÄNGVIDE 1 indicates that it should belong to a relatively early stage of the Viking Period. On the other hand, the carver has used the form raisti
for “raised”, which is an indication of a much later date. In actual fact, the older variant raesp (with a p instead of a t) was still used on the Swedish mainland right up to the early 11th century. Yet another later trait might be traced in the rune sequence stainn, which might be an example of the use of the definite article (“stenen”= the stone). A possible contradiction of this is that the definite article would seem to be a practically unknown linguistic trait in the Viking Period runic inscriptions, and it can thus not be excluded that the wording on the Tjängvide stone could be the result of a mistake.

The inscription on the stone Alskog Tjängvide I thus contains one archaic and one (or possibly two) later linguistic features. Therefore it can hardly be regarded as belonging to the earliest phase of Gotlandic runestones with short twig runes. In other inscriptions, on the other hand, the archaic linguistic features are definitely in the majority. On the picture stone Alskog Ollaifs, the form aft “after” turns up again. When Otto von Friesen examined the stone in 1924, he was convinced that he could discern the words aft : ruaia : faður : ... Aft Rōalda, faður ... “After Hróaldi, father...”, but today only the first word is extant in its entirety. On the badly abraded pic-

The STENKYRKA LILLBJÄRS III picture stone from Stenkyrka parish church, where the cryptic inscription has been thought to be a mixture of short twig runes and the older 24-character Primitive Norse series. After Lindqvist 1941–42. Photo by the author.

For “raised”, which is an indication of a much later date. In actual fact, the older variant raesp (with a p instead of a t) was still used on the Swedish mainland right up to the early 11th century. Yet another later trait might be traced in the rune sequence stainn, which might be an example of the use of the definite article (“stenen”= the stone). A possible contradiction of this is that the definite article would seem to be a practically unknown linguistic trait in the Viking Period runic inscriptions, and it can thus not be excluded that the wording on the Tjängvide stone could be the result of a mistake.

The inscription on the stone Alskog Tjängvide I thus contains one archaic and one (or possibly two) later linguistic features. Therefore it can hardly be regarded as belonging to the earliest phase of Gotlandic runestones with short twig runes. In other inscriptions, on the other hand, the archaic linguistic features are definitely in the majority. On the picture stone Alskog Ollaifs, the form aft “after” turns up again. When Otto von Friesen examined the stone in 1924, he was convinced that he could discern the words aft : ruaia : faður : ... Aft Rōalda, faður ... “After Hróaldi, father...”, but today only the first word is extant in its entirety. On the badly abraded pic-
Here we can find a number of archaic linguistic features, including raisþu for the later raisti and the now well-known form aft. Moreover we meet the shorter form þau (in the neuter plural) instead of the extended (and later) variant þausi. Most remarkable of all, however, are the two words kublu kumblu and kupiu Guðviu, which both seem to include relict Primitive Norse stem-vowels. This is reminiscent of the stone Hangvar kyrka and sunu, but here we must take into consideration that the Primitive Norse stem-vowel has been unsyncopated following a long syllable, which is most unexpected in a Viking Period runic inscription. This feature must have become totally obsolete at a much earlier date.

All in all, the language in Brate’s reading of the stone Lokrume kyrka would appear to be extremely archaic, which should indicate that this stone would belong to the very earliest phase of Gotlandic picture stones with short twig runes.

A closer examination of Brate’s description of the runes reveals quite indisputably that the reading presented above is based largely on guesses and reconstruction, a point that can also be verified by an examination of the inscription itself. Where Brate reads raisþu, for example, it is not possible to trace any branch for þ. On the contrary, there are traces at the top of the rune, which suggest that it has been a t. The reading: þau aft must also
be challenged. Even Brate’s own text admits that this is a pure reconstruction (probably inspired by the inscription of the stone kälvstenstenen from Östergötland\(^{30}\)), and there is nothing on the stone to support it. The preserved traces would rather indicate that the inscription should read as pitat at (or possibly pisa at). The final part of the inscription is badly damaged, and it is not possible to corroborate the reading of the first rune in the presumed personal name kupulu. Since some of the previous and ensuing runes are also illegible, it is not possible to achieve any coherence in this part of the inscription.

Of the many examples of Brate’s presumed archaic spellings, one last word remains, namely kublu, but it is in no way conclusive that this should represent an example of an unsyncopated stem-vowel following a long syllable. The other u-rune could also be explained as an epenthic vowel in the long sequence of consonants: / kumblu \(\text{þ}ta://. Parallels can be found in inscriptions on runestones from Östergötland and Norway, where we meet wording such as kumlu : þisi and kumlu : pitat, respectively, where the concluding u-rune must be regarded as an epenthic vowel.\(^{31}\)

Judging from the incomplete pictorial element, it is quite evident that part of the inscription to the left, in front of the word suni is missing, and this is probably where the name of the father was inscribed. Thus, the inscription should preferably be read and interpreted as follows:

\[\ldots\text{suni} \text{raits} \text{u} \text{kumlu} \text{þet} \text{a} \text{a} \text{f} \text{a} \text{d} \text{ur} \ldots\]
\[\ldots\text{sunirai} \text{-} \text{tukublu} \text{pi} \text{taat} \text{a} \text{f} \text{u} \text{-} \ldots\]
\[“\ldots\text{s sons raised this memorial stone after (their) father} \ldots”\]

There are no linguistic features in the inscription that would warrant a particularly early dating. The language would rather correspond to the stone akskog tjängvide 1. The occurrence of the preposition at ‘after’ might even suggest a somewhat later date. This preposition does not actually appear in any other Gotlandic inscription with short twig runes, but first emerges on the late picture stone-shaped runestones, such as hogrān kyrka 1. The linguistic features on the lokrume kyrka stone also support a much later date than has been considered so far. At the same time, it is difficult to believe that it should have been made later than the second half of the 10th century. Wording such as rai[s]tu och at claim greater interest, since they imply that certain linguistic features may have been well-established on Gotland at an earlier date than on the mainland.

Conclusions

Even if some of the previously propounded linguistic archaisms on the Gotlandic picture stones with short twig runes must be challenged, it is still quite clear that this group of stones should be dated to pre-1000. The inscription tradition represented in this group differs strongly from the picture stones bearing long branch runes, both regarding the arrangement of inscriptions in straight rows and the sparing or non-existent use of division marks. Judging from the linguistic features, some of them might well emanate from the 9th century, but otherwise it is unfortunately difficult to date them more specifically on runological grounds.

Worthy of note is the range of distribution of the picture stones with short twig and long branch runes respectively, mentioned in my introduction. The former would only seem to occur in the north of the island, with an inclination towards the north east. That the pilgård stone is situated in the midst of this distribution area must be of some significance. The inscription records a long journey to the east, and even if we cannot determine its exact original location, it cannot be very far from the Viking Period harbour in Boge.\(^{32}\) Perhaps one might venture to suggest that this harbour area was the heart of the distribution centre of the early Viking Period rune traditions on the island?\(^{33}\)

Concurrently, there is a very early example of an inscription using long branch runes from the south of Gotland, namely the above-mentioned rune-inscribed amulet from Hallbjäns in Sundre. The amulet emanates from a female grave, which has been dated to the first
half of the 8th century.34 If we move twenty kilometers further to the north east to Grötlingbo, we find the baffling stone Grötlingbo Roes 1, with a short runic inscription, which many have interpreted as archaic runes, but which must actually also be regarded as a possible earlier variant of the Viking Period long branch runes. In the earliest phase, these are mainly found in Denmark, and it is very interesting to note that the oldest dateable find within present-day Swedish borders should turn up as early as at the beginning of the 8th century, and no less than in the very south of Gotland! Judging from the known inscriptions, however, it would take a further 250 years before this variant of the rune series became well entrenched on the island. It is thus uncertain as to whether there is any direct connection between these earlier occurrences of long branch runes and the later picture stones with the same writing system. As mentioned above, for some reason or another, these stones have been confined to the southern part of the island, while the picture stone-shaped runestones are known from practically the whole of Gotland.

Picture stones with long branch runes are often fragmented, but judging from the ornamentation, several of them should be dated to the first half of the 11th century. These include the Sproge kyrka stone (see p. 120) and the sarcophagus slab Sanda kyrka 1 (see p. 121), both of which demonstrate ornamental similarities with the so-called Ringerike style. The majority of the Gotlandic runestones, on the other hand, are decorated in the classic Runestone or Urness styles, which should place most of them in the latter half of the 11th century.

Even if the rune-inscribed picture stones are relatively few in number, it would seem as if there was some interruption in this tradition sometime around the turn of the first millennium, when the custom ceased in the north of the island. When the tradition enjoyed a renaissance in the early 11th century, this took place in the south of the island. The rune-inscribed picture stones were by then all rather small, and the pictorial element limited. Instead, the inscription ribbons, which follow the contours of the stones, was given a dominating role, and the runes became both larger and more distinct. The previous totally prevalent short twig runes were also abandoned and replaced by the decorative and more easily read long branch runes. It is also this variant that was used on the picture stone-shaped runestones, which were larger in size and furnished with long, eventful inscriptions.

Notes
2. G 110.
5. G 40 G 280 resp.
16. Gustavson & Snædal ms. (G 225, Endre parish, p. 25 with ref.). Re. dating, see Imer 2007:2 p. 79.
24. Gustavson & Snædal ms. (Stenkyrka parish, p. 8).
25. — cf. Imer in this volume, who has a different explanation of the character M.
27. See discussion in Snædal 2002 pp. 52–53.
30. Ög 8.
31. Ög N267, N 300.
34. G 361: Gustavson & Snædal ms. (Appendix to Sudertredingen p. 4).
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