



Erik Moltke: Runerne i Danmark og deres oprindelse.
København. Forum, 1976. 436 s.

Historisk Tidsskrift, Bind 13. række, 6 (1979)

Link til pdf:

http://img.kb.dk/tidsskriftdk/pdf/hto/hto_13rk_0006-PDF/hto_13rk_0006_79703.pdf

Link til webside:

<http://tidsskrift.dk/visning.jsp?markup=&print=no&id=79703>

pdf genereret den : 28/5-2008

Denne argumentation fører os imidlertid tilbage til Arnaldo Momiglianos (og Denys Hays) hovedtese. Fornemmelsen af eller bevidstheden om, at det 18. århundrede skabte den historiske videnskab i moderne forstand formuleres allerede i samtiden af den første Göttingergenerations disciple, Ludwig Wachler (1812–20) og Friederich Rehm (1850);¹⁶ at det skete ved symbiosen af analyse og syntese stod blot disse historikere mindre klart, men de er begge enige om at tillægge den engelsk-skotske skole en afgørende indflydelse, jævnsides med Göttingerskolen. Det er derimod næppe fuldt korrekt, når Denys Hays (på basis af Herbert Butterfields redegørelse) vil karakterisere Göttingerskolen (1760–) som en simpel videreudvikling, perfektionering og professionalisering af den engelsk-skotske historikerskoles nyvundne indsigt (s. 169 f. og 185). Det er rigtigt – og en forskningsmæssig begrænsning – at historievidenskabens akademiske professionalisering i det 19. århundrede Tyskland gav den tekniske analyse en altfor dominerende plads, men trods stærkere betoning af denne ene side af forskningen fastholdt Göttingerskolens første generationer netop kravet til skabelsen af 'det historiske kunstværk'. 1700-tallets muligheder for *cross-fertilization* må stadig holde de – under internationale perspektiver ganske vist mindre interessante – muligheder for prioriten åben; langt vigtigere er det, at de seneste års historiografiske studier komplicerer spørgsmålet om det middelalderlige og eftermiddelalderlige 'paradigmes' *decline and fall*, og om historismens og det 'historiske kunstværks' tilblivelse.

Med en måske noget håndfast simplificering gælder Denys Hays værk således en analyse af et videnskabeligt paradigmes – det middelalderliges – tilblivelse, funktioner og krise og den nye – moderne – videnskabs genesis, i store træk fra Beda Venerabilis til Edward Gibbon. Mest vellykket er utvivlsomt analysen af den middelalderlige historieskrivnings udformning, fordi den nødvendiggør inddragelse af providentielle elementer side om side med historieskrivningens former for teknik og virkelighedsbeskrivelse. Drøftelsen af krisefasen i 1600-tallets slutning og den moderne videnskabs tilblivelse er derimod næppe fuldt dækkende, netop fordi de samme elementer lades ude af betragtning, eller måske snarere undervurderes. Sammenfattende repræsenterer Denys Hays værk således et intelligent og tankevækkende forsøg på strukturering af et umådeligt stort og uoverskueligt stof; den gnistrer af fine udfald og indfald og af dyb indsigt. Dens største fortjeneste må og bør være den, at den provokerer til diskussion; dens teser trækkes fast op, men formentlig også for kategorisk, bl. a. fordi Denys Hays netop ved sin koncentration omkring de historiske genrer og sin bevidste abstraktion fra drøftelse af 'providential history' og historiefilosofiske spekulationer afskærer sig selv fra fuldt dækkende forklaringer, ikke mindst af den metamorfose, som fandt sted mellem 1680 og 1760.

E. Ladewig Petersen

Erik Moltke: Runerne i Danmark og deres oprindelse. København. Forum, 1976. 436 s.

This book has something important to say to many kinds of student and scholar: runologists – obviously – but also historians of language, names, society, religion and art, archaeologists, folklorists and anthropologists. It is also meant to appeal to the "common reader" and will undoubtedly do so, for Dr Moltke enjoys the sensational and anecdotal and writes with genial humour and in a trenchant style. One would not wish to lose the

¹⁶ L. Wachler, *Geschichte der historischen Forschung und Kunst*, Gött. 1812–20; Fr. Rehm, *Lehrbuch der historischen Propädeutik*, Marburg 1830, s. 88–100; jf. H. Butterfield, *Man on His Past*. Cambr. 1955, s. 8–11 og 32–61.

story of the circumstances in which the Hemdrup peg came to light, for example, and the succinct account of the Arup-Jacobsen controversy, which sprang from Wimmer's adventurous reading of the Sønder Vinge inscription, ought to be worked in cross-stitch runes over all our beds. The book is superbly illustrated, with photographs taken by the author or under his supervision, and with many line drawings by Thora Fisker, whose contribution deserves high praise. It was not an easy book to design with its plain matter, tables, runic transcriptions and translations, pictures, captions and footnotes, but the parallel presentation is seldom confusing, cross-references are generous and well sited, and the general lay-out perspicuous. The captions, often lengthy, are perhaps unnecessarily repetitive of matter in the main text, and there are some slight discrepancies between the two descriptions thus offered (e.g. pp. 174, 176; 135, 199; 182, 184; 259; 288, 289; 295, 296). There is an error in the reproduction of an inscription on p. 310, and something wrong with captions on pp. 323 and 359. One must be careful to note the amendment in note 13 on p. 300. Translation of *tofana* as Anne Tuesøn seems an odd anachronism, and why *saka iutis* (so p. 240) is rendered *Saga-Juters* is hard to see. But such things, along with the occasional proof-reading failure, are rare blemishes in a book full of detail.

Moltke comes down on the side of certain major propositions with firm and generally plausible dogmatism. Though he shares a natural tendency to make a working hypothesis sound like an eternal truth, he is usually cautious and pragmatic. Thus, the rune series is an alphabet and must be judged as such, created for practical use, probably about the time of the birth of Christ and probably in the Sjælland-Skåne region, inspired by and partly modelled on the Latin alphabet. Magic is not intrinsic to runic letters and "talmagi" is a figment of runologists' imaginations (he makes no reference to early West Norse literary evidence which suggests runes could have particular supernatural associations). Objects do not speak in their own person before the Middle Ages (Period 3). The 16-letter *futhark* is a natural systematisation based on those forms of the 24-letter series that were in commonest use at the end of the Migration Age. The so-called "short runes" were an immediate development from the new 16-letter series; they were quite possibly invented in Hedeby, then under Swedish control. Rune-writers did not archaïse: what we get to know from inscriptions is a written language which – just like other written languages – was inevitably conservative. He is sure that many craftsmen in metal and stone were illiterate and quite capable of making a mess of the copy they were supposed to follow; though in the case of many confused or impossible sequences on bracteates and some later medieval objects, he would rather think of the inscriber as a fraud palming off the meaningless on credulous customers. He is also convinced that pictorial decoration on runestones never bears any direct relation to the verbal content of the inscription (he does not even deign to remark that the finest wolf-figure preserved in runestone art, that at Tullstorp, is on a stone commemorating a man called Ulfr).

Some of these points are made in the first 60 pages or so, which are devoted to a definition and description of runes and discussion of their origin and development. They are supplemented and reinforced in Part 2, the inscriptions, which takes the reader through the Roman and Migration Age (Period 1, from the birth of Christ to the mid-seventh century; pp. 64–116); the Viking Age (Period 2, about 650 to 1025; pp. 117–325); and the Middle Ages (Period 3, c. 1075 to c. 1350; pp. 326–399, with a couple more pages on "Vore yngste runeindskrifter"). The book is completed by a brief and amusing survey of the history of runic studies in Denmark, with a bibliography, and then an index-list of inscriptions – all that are known to the author save for a number of bracteates. Most of the inscriptions are cited in the main text but those not given there are repro-

duced (transliterated) in this final catalogue. It is important to note that some 75 inscriptions (with the Slesvig finds as perhaps the most significant) have come to light since Lis Jacobsen and Moltke published their "standard" *Danmarks runeindskrifter* in 1942; and in a number of cases Moltke now emends the interpretations of that publication. These additions and corrections alone are enough to make his new book indispensable.

It will be seen that the largest part of the book is devoted to the Viking Age. The author writes with verve on the runestones of the period, dividing this long chapter into sections on *Konger, stormænd og krigere; Konger og dronninger; Jelling; Hedenskab og kristendom; Hedenske og kristne billeder* (supplemented by welcome pages on *Billedkunst og ornamenter*); *Runeindskrifternes samfund; Bornholm*; and finally personal names and eke-names. Inscriptions on objects and "short-rune" inscriptions are then dealt with separately. All of this presents primary source-material of unique interest but inevitably scrappy and often tantalising. Moltke writes cogently and soundly on a good many topics that have been debated in the past (and doubtless will be in the future): the meaning of *kumbl, drengr, þegn* and *landmaðr*; the significant place of women in the "runestone" society; Swedish rule in Hedeby; the dating of the Jelling-type inscriptions. On the Jelling monument itself, of course, there is an on-going argument, and it is a pity that the book came out before the author could take into account the contribution by Aksel E. Christensen in *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 8 (1975), 7-20, and Aslak Liestøl's recent contention (*Maal og minne* 1977, 171) that the band Moltke detects connecting the "Christ" side and the "text" side of the great Jelling stone is a natural formation and has no place in discussion of the composition of the whole grand piece. Moltke will not be Moltke if he has not some rejoinder to make to these criticisms.

The "religious" material seems of particular, and neglected, significance. Moltke shows us runestones of decided heathen import, in decoration or inscription or both, that he says must have been carved one or two generations after Harald "made the Danes Christian". Of especial note are those with the formula, "Thor consecrate this monument (these runes)", found on the Glavendrup stone, c. 900, and Virring, N. Jutland, and Sønder Kirkeby, Falster, both of which "gør indtryk af at ligge mellem den store Jellingsten og år 1000". (I am prepared to take Moltke's word for this, but one might prudently recall his words elsewhere (p. 217): "Datering er en usikker og vanskelig ting. Meget vanskelig". Only one Swedish stone with *Pórr vígi* on it is known, at Velandá, Västergötland; it also "torde tillhöra tiden omkring år 1000", according to Sven B. F. Jansson, *Runinskrifter i Sverige*², 1977, 121). In discussing the import of the formula, Moltke refrains from embarking on the interpretation of the verb *vígja* (which is understandable because it is complicated, but the reader might have been guided by a reference, say to Baetke and C. E. Thors). He does however quote the description of Baldr's funeral in *Snorra Edda*, a source written some 250 years later and half an Atlantic away, undeniably picturesque but whose own significance also requires separate assessment against the whole background of the history of *vígja* and its semantic variety and of Snorri's possible sources. In referring also to the Canterbury charm and the Sigtuna amulet, Moltke leaves his innocent reader in the dark as to why *þur vígi þik þ(u)rsa trutin* in the one is translated "Thor vie dig . . . tursernes . . . drot" and *þur x sarriþu x þursa trutin* in the other is translated "Sårfeberens . . . thurs, thursernes drot". It may be crystal clear to him but will hardly be to the reader, and it is perhaps a little too lighthearted to ignore the problems that remain even after profiting from Gerd Høst's and Anne Holtsmark's contributions on the subject, to which Moltke provides the barest of footnote references. The possibility that Thor has been "demonised", for example, cannot perhaps be wholly ruled out. That was common early Christian practice and an aspect of the encounter of ideas

in the missionary age – some scholars have supposed the *Pórr vígi* formula itself to be evidence of pagan response to Christian advance. Heathen inscriptions do not seem to have caused scandal, however (only one “crossed” Danish stone is known, at Holmby, Skåne), though other stones may have been discretely incorporated in church foundations and walls with a view to purifying them and their associations. It is interesting to speculate on the use of “samstavsruner” for the Thor invocation under the ship-picture on the Sønder Kirkeby stone – “der let opfattes som de bølger, dødsskibet sejler på”. They cannot have done much to keep the formula arcane – and why should the carver want that? Were they perhaps rather regarded as a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the invocation? Moltke also refers to the “samstavsruner” used on “den unge, men hedenske” Korpbro stone in Södermanland to convey the words *sipi þur*. He goes on to say that neither of the verbs *siða* and *siða* makes much sense in the context. The latter is in fact hardly relevant, since it appears to be otherwise unattested in East Norse; and Moltke will not countenance the former because “var der noget, Thor ikke gav sig af med, var det sejd og trolldom . . .”. This may remind us that elsewhere Moltke reproaches Harry Andersen for wanting to explain away a runic form in order not to disturb preconceived ideas about phonological development. It is plain enough that Thor was not credited with precisely the same attributes everywhere in the world; neither can we know for sure that the verb *siða* did not retain, or regain, a general sense of “affect or fix by supernatural means” – like *vígja* in at least one of its literary contexts (Finnur Jónsson, *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning*, 1912–15, B II 267 [12]).

It has always been obvious that the Viking Age and early Middle Ages were times when Scandinavians stirred their stumps, but we tend to think more of their foreign ventures than of inter-nordic movement and mixture. But the latter are forcefully brought home to us by runic sources, emphasising the unreality of boundaries in those ages and the reality of the common tongue. Quite apart from early Swedish sway in Hedeby and the famous stones raised by Asfrid, Haddeby 4 with Danish runes and Haddeby 2 with Swedish runes, there is the Tillitse stone on Falster raised by a man in memory of himself in good Swedish fashion (the custom is otherwise unknown in Denmark); there are the stones Hobro 2, Jutland, and As, Västergötland, commemorating the same Swedish Karl; there are the Simris 1 and 2 stones with Danish runes and Swedish ornament; and there is the delightful inscription in Tornby church, N. Jutland, scratched by a twelfth-century Norwegian. As is well known, the Bornholm stones are in the Swedish tradition (especially from Östergötland and Södermanland) and correspondingly late in date; and the magnificent Akirkeby font there was brought in from Gotland, as the language of its inscription would make evident even if nothing else did.

Moltke has a quick eye for the significance, possible or probable, of this or that detail. Following Wimmer, he notes for example that *kobu : suain* on the late eleventh-century Ny Larsker stone 2, Bornholm, may represent “Kåbe-Svend” and if so, then “formodentlig” a descendant of Sigurðr kápa Vésetason who in *Jómsvíkinga saga* is said to return to settle on his family land in Bornholm after the Hjørundfjord battle. He comments on the otherwise unknown daughter of Sven Estridsson, with her name the one rune-written word in the Latin inscription of the lovely cross made by Liutger about 1100; and on the eke-name of a contemporary of hers, *harpere*, found with proper name and prayer on a well-used walking-stick dug up in Slesvig. Moltke says cautiously that *harpere* might be an inherited name, though it seems more likely to be an occupational name than a mere by-name (it is not apparently found as the latter in all the extensive West Norse records). He has other interesting comment on names. He now accepts the fact that the name *uþin* on the Ribe cranium fragment cannot be that of a person; and is also persuad-

ed by Kousgård Sørensen's demonstration that the first element in *Othinkar* is cognate with but not the same as the god's name (though whether people in the tenth century knew that is another matter). He is sometimes rather narrowly Danish in his observation. He notes that the names *Full(h)ugi* and *Thormar* on Øster Larsker stone 3, Bornholm (discovered 1955), are not preserved on other Danish runestones, but he might have added that, while the former seems quite unknown in Danish, it is found in Swedish (which fits the Bornholm situation), and that the latter is attested in Runic Swedish and in England as well as in later Danish sources. Elsewhere his "common reader" might seem tempted into the belief that there is some knowable correspondence between names like *Urokja* and *Upvagin* and the characteristics of the individuals who bore them in the Viking Age and are commemorated on our extant monuments. He might also have been told that some of the nicknames cited have common or notorious parallels elsewhere in the Norse world – obvious in the case of *haklangr*, *nef* and *hinn ráðspaki*, for instance.

There is much here to intrigue the student of Norse poetry. Moltke comments on *an-walhakurne* – "on foreign (or Gaulish) grain", i.e. "on gold" – on the Migration Age bracteate from Tjurkö, Blekinge (though said to be Skåne on p. 90) as an early example of kenning-like usage; but his compression deludes him when he goes on to say that we find a kenning such as "vogn-gud" for *skibskaptajn* on the Karlevi stone (his normalisation of this famous verse, p. 263, also leaves something to be desired). The medieval Lund bone-piece 4: *bondi x ris x ti x mal x runu x || arar x ara x æru x fiaþrar* might remind one of Þjóðólfr Arnórsson's description (c. 1060) of a great dragon-ship, whose seventy oars in motion appeared to him *sem innan líti arnar væng*; but it is doubtless just as likely, or more so, that it goes back through some schoolmasterly succession to Ovid's *super fluctus alarum insistere remis* and is "måske en 'stilleøvelse'", as Moltke says. He finds the term *mal x runu* rather odd – perhaps it should be taken as *málrúnir* would be in later Icelandic, i.e. to mean ordinary (or "plain language"?) runes and not mystifying (or "coded"?) runes. Elsewhere Moltke is sensibly dubious of the claim that there is intentional verse at the end of the Jelling 2 inscription, and he is wary of accepting all Niels Age Nielsen's "metrical" discoveries. On the other hand, he does not point out the verse formula on the eleventh-century Tillitse stone (doubtless Swedish, as noted above), which was apparently repeated on the defective Sandby stone 3, Sjælland, of the same period. There is also now thought-provoking testimony to the continued existence in Denmark of distinctively Norse metrical practice in the inscription on the rune stick from Slesvig, dated on runological evidence to "o. 1075 ± 25 år", which contains a near perfect *ljóðaháttr* strophe. Two words in it are unintelligible and it may seem doubtful whether the stanza ever made continuous sense, but Moltke makes a bold attempt – of a fundamental Jutish kind, one may say – at interpreting it (though is there any justification for translating *mogR* as *måg*?). He goes on to an excellent discussion of the inscription of the Ribe "lyfstav", taken to be a Jutish copy c. 1300 of a Norwegian original, with its mixture of simple *fornyrðislag* and *málaháttr* and the wellknown opening formula, *Jorþ biþ ak uarþæ / ok uphimæn . .* This is a much more straightforward text, though not entirely problem-free, and with it Moltke ends his history of "de levende runer" in Denmark. And perhaps it is not a bad thing to end this notice of "denne levende bog" with a reminder of how much remains to be done and discovered in the runological field, and "hvor lidt vi forstår af vikingetidens sprog", as Moltke says at one point – faced with the Ribe cranium fragment, for example, the Hemdrup peg, the Viborg buckle, Haddeby sticks 1 and 2, or even the Latin letters that accompany the *dróttkvætt* stanza on the Karlevi stone. Moltke's book is a book to build on and no one interested in early Norse culture should neglect it. His immense practical experience, wide learn-

ing, questing intellect and incorrigible zest make him the most stimulating and entertaining of guides, even when his interpretations are not wholly persuasive. Of him as a runologist we can echo the Tryggvælde tag and say, *faiR uarþa nufutiR þaibatri*, or in a West Norse form that comes more natural to some of us, *Fáir verða nú fæddir þeim betri*.

Peter Foote

Kai Hørby: Status regni Dacie. Studier i Christofferlinjens ægteskabs- og alliancepolitik 1252-1319. København, Den danske historiske forening 1977. 207 s.; 97 kr.

Denne afhandling blev i 1976 antaget til forsvar for den filosofiske doktorgrad ved Københavns Universitet og forsvaret den 17. januar 1978.¹ Det sene forsvar skyldes, at doktoranden ved siden af sit normale universitetsarbejde var optaget af at bedømme og opponere ved andres doktorafhandlinger. Udsættelsen kom til at betyde, at han i mellemtiden blev erklæret kompetent til et professorat i historie, og jeg kan fuldt ud tiltræde de fem professorers enstemmige indstilling herom. Forf. er saaledes en moden historiker. Han har flere kvalificerende afhandlinger bag sig, har dertil skrevet en vægtig fremstilling af dansk senmiddelalder til 2. bind af Gyldendals Danmarkshistorie, udkommet 1979. Paa denne baggrund kunde en forsvarshandling synes overflødig; det mundtlige forsvar er imidlertid ogsaa en præsentation udadtil som indadtil, og det gælder en ældre forsker, naar han som i dag kan præsentere elite.

Min opposition i dag er derfor først og fremmest en præsentation og min kritik, der ikke skal mangle, vil forme sig som en kollegial diskussion. Jeg vil standse op og diskutere nogle dokumenter og situationer, hvor jeg er tilbøjelig til at vurdere anderledes eller gaa et skridt videre, og til sidst vil jeg gaa lidt ind paa et par punkter, hvor der er taget afstand fra eller forbehold overfor mine gamle positioner fra 1945 i *Kongemagt og Aristokrati*. Jeg skal ikke nægte, at det undertiden kan være tiltrængt, men paa de fremdragne punkter mener jeg, at jeg kan opretholde mine gamle meninger, og jeg vil hævde, at doktoranden paa et enkelt punkt har forbedret min argumentation.

I

I sin graa og noble dragt fremtræder bogen *Status Regni Dacie* mere uanselig end den i virkeligheden er. Af omfang hører den til de mindre doktorafhandlinger, men det er et værk med indre tyngde. Teksten er værdiladet, ikke saaledes at den i almindelighed er vanskelig at læse – men dog hist og her noget kringlet i formuleringen. Afgørende er det, at der ligger omfattende forskning bag hvert enkelt kort udtrykte resultat. Mens de fleste disputater – min egen inklusive – uden skade kunde nedskrives med tredjedelen eller maaske halvdelen, forholder det sig omvendt med dagens afhandling, der uden skade kunne være udvidet med 50 % eller mere uden derfor at virke langtrukken, og navnlig kunde nogle af de lange noter med fordel være indbygget i teksten, uden at det vilde forstyrre den logiske opbygning, navnlig da præses jo for hvert kapitel har samlet sine resultater i en meget instruktiv »Sammenfatning«.

Sagen er, at forf. ved sin afhandling har vist sig som en god og lovlydig samfundsborger, der har taget regeringens indskærpen af sparsommelighed til efterretning, og det er at haabe, at Forskningsraadet vil tildele ham en belønning for udvist samfundssind. Til gengæld har forf. vist ringe sans for genbrug. Man kan nok læse afhandlingen i sammenhæng og med godt udbytte, men vil man efterprøve den nedlagte forskning og studere

¹ Anmeldelsen gengiver med mindre ændringer manuskriptet til den officielle opposition.