

## KRS comments (August 2005)

John D. Bengtson  
Savage, MN

I agree that the word often transcribed /illy/ is /illu/. If so, then the dotted rune does not necessarily represent umlaut, and not necessarily connected with the German umlaut letters.

This also brings up a feature of the KRS language that escaped me until recently. It has "vowel harmony," that is, unstressed vowels take on the feature (high [i,u] or non-high [a,e,o]) of the preceding stressed vowel:

Thus: /illu/ (high) vs. /peno/ (non-high)

Also non-high, /röpe/, /läger/, /optagelse/, /fräelse/, /havet/

/äptir/ constitutes an exception mentioned by Haugen (*The Scandinavian Languages*, 1976, p. 207, paragraph (1). Because /ä/ in this word comes from not from original Germanic \*e but from an umlaut product of \*a, the unstressed vowel remains high. \*äptir > \*äptir (äptir, äftir). In many Viking-age rune stones the word is written /aft/ but pronounced /äft/. /läger/ on the other hand comes from Germanic \*leg- (Gothic *ligrs*).

What about /fiske/? It appears to be a reduced (e-dialect) form of the verbal infinitive /fiska/, thus not subject to the rule that applies only to final /e,i,o,u/. The noun /fiski/ would have remained /fiski/ with vowel harmony. Other e-dialect forms (as you know) are /göter/, /wore/, /röpe/, /rise/.

In dialects without vowel harmony /illu/ and /peno/ would have the same final vowel, either *illu* and *pennu*, or *illo* and *penno*. Likewise *äptir* and *havit*, or *äpter* and *havet*. Modern Icelandic has generalized -u and -i.

According to Haugen (op. cit.) vowel harmony seemed to spread north from Scania into the Swedish dialects of Västergötland, Uppland, and Finland, and Eastern and Trönder Norwegian. (This was apparently the medieval distribution.) The presence of e-dialect (reduction of OSw unstressed -a > -e or -ä) points to a belt across the middle of Sweden from N. Bohuslän to the east coast from Östergötland north to Uppland.

So the presence of vowel harmony + "e-dialect" may allow us to narrow the dialectal range of the KRS language. It seems consistent with Östergötland or Västergötland (and /göter/ on the KRS).

In any case, I think the presence of vowel harmony gives the dialect of the KRS a ring of authenticity. Vowel harmony "is rarely found after 1400" (Haugen 1976, p. 260). The KRS writer could not have gotten this feature from Rosander, or, probably, from any other published source of the time (when the "hoax" was allegedly perpetrated). It could

John D. Bengtson  
314 604-7409

only be an innate dialect feature. The earliest reference Haugen gives for the subject of vowel harmony is Brøndum-Nielsen (1927).

Another feature is what I mentioned above: the high second vowel in /äptir/ as opposed to the non-high vowel in /läger/. The rule of vowel harmony reflects a very old opposition, originally of the first vowels, Germanic \*a (\*af-ter-) vs. \*e (\*leg-ar-az). Again, this is not characteristic of a faked language, but genuine dialect.

I think it is important to separate the language itself from the runes. If as you say the runes point to Gotland, it could very well have been a Gotlandic runemaster carving runes dictated by a man from elsewhere (one of the Götalands?). The language itself shows few if any Gotlandic characteristics, rather those of mainland dialects.

### Miscellaneous comments and typos

I assume you are both proof-reading the book, as well as an editor at the publisher. You have probably already corrected some of the things I list below. But I am listing everything I noticed just in case one of you didn't catch it.

I published an article in 1994 where I stated that anthropologist Edward Sapir (who died in 1939) was still discussing a certain subject with his students at Yale "as late as 1993" (a typo for 1933!). I have since regretted that mistake due to my poor proofreading.

"Language and Runes"

p. 50 par 4 line 2: boniR [s.b. böniR]

p. 51: araR ara aru fiabraR: [aru s.b. äru (or) æru]

p. 54: caption to Hemse inscription: Gairlf [Gairalf]

p. 65: par 1 line 8: ... and the dotted runes (R, R and R) [not dotted]

p. 66: line 1: Scandian Law [Scanian Law, also on p. 152]

"" "" middle: shouldn't the word for Vinland be WIN;ANJ ? At least the last consonant is J /p/

p. 68 middle: FRIJ UNtR The character for /m/ is missing in my copy

"" "" the caption mentions "Fri?muntr"

p. 69: gloss of **Botuiþr I Viku Peders arfi** (Botvid in Vikers [?]) ...

p. 76 line 3: 1<sup>st</sup> person plural of *fan(n)* is *fun(n)om*

"" "" par 2 line 2 **norrman** s.b. *norrmen*

p. 81 par 8. I question this since Gotlandic has monophthongs and diphthongs, but the monophthongs are in a different distribution from mainland Swedish. Gotl. /ai/ corresponds to /e/ on the KRS (G. /stain/, /haim/ = KRS /sten/, /hem/, etc.), but Gotl. also has /e/ in words that come from Germanic \*e.

p. 89, 6<sup>th</sup> line from bottom: ... *Svenska-Amerikansa* [*Amerikanska*]

p. 99 middle: ... Novgorod (Nyrod = New city) ... [I don't know "Nyrod". Do you mean *Ny-garðr* = *Nygaard* ?]

p. 99 par 4, 4<sup>th</sup> line from bottom: ... northern tip [of] Jutland ...

"" par 5 line 3: ... that were bailed ... [baled]

p. 100 last line: ... not wanting to be quest of the city ... {??}  
 p. 101 par 2 line 2 ... 27<sup>th</sup> July 1351 ... [1361?]  
 “” 4<sup>th</sup> to last line: sentence beginning “In 1408 the Danes ... [I could make no sense of this sentence]  
 p.117: a connection of GÄMW to *gömma* seems far-fetched, to me.  
 p. 123 par 2: St. Sulpice is in Paris is next ... [delete one *is*]  
 “”” viewied the La Venendrye Stone [viewed ... Vérendrye – is this reference explained elsewhere in the book?]

### “Scandals in Scholarship”

p. 133 par 3. line 5: has since been proven not to be a well known ...  
 p. 134 par 1. line 2 ... 1908 book, *De Norske Settlementers Historie*, he argued ...  
 “” line 5: ... the modern Swedish word *Opdagelse* ... [not a modern Swedish word (officially), only Danish and Norwegian]  
 p. 134 (middle graphic): ... = up taking up, ... [delete first “up”]  
 “” (caption to graphic, line 2) ... clear away, take procession [should be possession]  
 p. 135 par 2 line 7: ... *form* (from) and *fraam* ... [s.b. *from* ‘from’ and *fråm* ‘from’ ...]  
 p. 136 par 2 line 2: Norwegian linguist Tryggve Sköld [I thought he was Swed.]  
 “” par 3 line 5: ... ü which is a runic letter ... [better: ... ü corresponds to a runic character ...]  
 p. 138 par 1 line 6: ... many he knew ... [many of whom he knew ?]  
 “” par 2 line 1: Rasmus s.b. Rasmus  
 “” None of Andersen’s points ... [s.b. Anderson’s]+  
 “” par 2) at bottom: The sides of the retooled runes are old ... [could be unclear out of context; refer to geology section?]  
 p. 139 line 3: ... 1881 and 1990 ... [s.b. 1890]  
 “” line 8: Andersen s.b. Anderson  
 “” par 6 line 1: Rasmus s.b. Rasmus  
 p. 140 par 2 line 8: ... hoax theory of a fatal blow. [delete *of*]  
 p. 141 par 2 line 4: ... Flom, his owns words ... [own]  
 p. 144 par 3 line 2: Jansson was couldn’t ... [del. was]  
 p. 145 pars 3 and 6: opdagelsesfard ... efter ... [opdagelsefard ... äptir ... on KRS, or was this accurately quoted from Moltke?]  
 p. 151 par 1 line 6: ... runologist’s ... [del. apostrophe]  
 “” par 2 line 1: It is ironic that the University of Minnesota campus ... [on the University campus?]  
 p. 152 par 2 line 3: ... Scandia Law ... [Scania Law]  
 “” line 5: ... weathering was to [be ?]  
 p. 153 par 4 line 4: ... professionalism her title infers ... [implies]  
 p. 154 par 3 line 7: matters worse is the age ... [del. is]  
 p. 155 par 1 lines 4-5: It may have been a non-issue at all if ... [change to: It may not have been an issue at all if ... (or) It may have been a non-issue if ...]  
 “” par 3 line 3: ... 18<sup>th</sup> century ... [do you mean 19<sup>th</sup> c.?]  
 “” last line: ... his history ... [del. his]

p. 161 par 3 line 6: ... miss-led ... [misled]

I think that's all I have!

Thanks – a lot of fascinating stuff!