

FIG. 98

1. Part of vessel with carinated shoulder above which two rows of stamps. Fine, hard grey-black ware with leathery surface of light to dark brown. Traces of grass tempering material.
2. Sherd with grid-like stamp and traces of incised lines where broken (see vertical edges in illustration). Grey ware with red-brown surface.
3. Sherd showing part of pendent triangle with dots. Fine, very hard grey ware.

FIG. 99

1. Hard grey ware with red-brown surface.
2. Fine, soft grey ware with dark grey leathery surfaces inside and out.
3. Light grey ware, red to dark brown surface, almost polished.
4. Hard grey ware, dark outside, light inside. Reminiscent of iron-age ware, but similar in fabric to most sherds from this site.
5. Hard grey ware, light brown, smooth outside, partly polished inside. Vessel probably had three very small delicate lugs. The perforations on the rim-sherd inserted in the drawing of section and elevation are probably repair-holes.
6. Thick, heavy grey-black ware tempered with small white grit. Smooth surfaces, black inside, light brown outside. Perhaps seventh century or later.
7. Fine hard grey ware with incised ornament. From the same layer are sherds of a very similar vessel, slightly larger and thicker.
8. Ware very coarse and crude in comparison with other illustrated sherds, but similar to no. 9. Dark grey fabric sandy in feel, probably tempered with sandy grit. These bowl-fragments were found apart from the remainder of those illustrated. They seem mostly sub-Roman in character but could well be pagan-Saxon in date. A large sherd similar to these has since been ploughed up in the field.
9. Fragment of pedestal-base, ware not unlike no. 8, and some others. If this base is Anglo-Saxon, which is very possible, it could be the earliest Anglo-Saxon piece in the group.

### Conclusion

This small investigation suggests that a pagan Anglo-Saxon hut-site of approximately sixth-seventh-century date existed on the top of the hill 50 ft. away from a small late-bronze-age urnfield. It may have been associated with the near-by site at Gestingthorpe (see above), where timber structures, possibly huts, have been found above fourth-century levels, and unstratified sub-Roman sherds have also been discovered. Only a narrow wooded valley would have separated this bleak grassy hill-top from the more sheltered south-facing slope.

It is possible, though not likely, that more sites, which future ploughing might reveal, exist on this part of the hill. The remaining part to the E. lies on the land of another farmer, where, despite search after ploughing, no finds were made.

BRYAN P. BLAKE

### AN EARLY DRAWING OF THE RUTHWELL CROSS (PL. XXVI)

The Ruthwell Cross, probably the most important of the Anglo-Saxon sculptured stones which have come down to us, also bears the most extensive of the Old English runic inscriptions, the poetic text closely related to parts of the *Dream of the Rood* of the Vercelli Book. It is well known that the cross as it now stands is a 19th-century rebuilding, made up of six fragments of the Anglo-Saxon monument with the shaft supplemented by a number of pieces of plain stone and a modern cross-beam added to the head. Originally the cross was built of two stones, an upper one forming the top of the shaft and the cross head, and a lower one comprising the base and the greater part of the shaft. The lower stone bore the *Dream of the Rood* text, cut in four sections: *a*, across the top and down the N. border of the present E. face; *b*, down the S. border of the E. face; *c*, across the top and down the S. border of the W. face; and *d*, down the N. border of the W. face.<sup>3</sup>

In the 17th century the two stones were thrown down and shattered, presumably as a result of the 'Act anent Idolatrous monuments in *Ruthwall*' known to have been

<sup>3</sup> Convenient for reference is the drawing of the inscription which forms the frontispiece to B. Dickin and A. S. C. Ross, *The Dream of the Rood* (London, 1934).

passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1642.<sup>4</sup> Thereby the lower stone, the base of which had already been severely defaced, was broken into two, roughly at right angles to the shaft axis. The two fragments remained within the parish church of Ruthwell for over 140 years after the passing of the 1642 act. The base fragment seems at first to have been almost completely buried in the earth floor, for reports up to and including A. Gordon, *Itinerarium septentrionale: or, a journey thro' most of the counties of Scotland, and those in the north of England* (London, 1727), pp. 160-1, describe only its S. face. From the late 17th century onwards, however, antiquaries describe all four faces of the top fragment which must, therefore, have been more readily accessible and regularly examined. In 1794 the cross fragments were in the churchyard, and in 1802 they were erected in the form of a pillar, perhaps with the addition of some plain stone to make up for the missing pieces, in the manse garden. In 1823 the new cross-beam was added, cut by a local mason to the design of the minister, Henry Duncan. The cross then remained in the manse garden until 1887, when it was transferred to the specially-built cross-chamber in the church, where it now stands.

The stone on which this important runic text was inscribed had, then, been defaced, fractured, allowed to stand about in the church where one piece at least could be turned over for examination, put out into the churchyard, joined with cement, and left exposed to the elements for over 80 years, before it reached its present protected site. Not surprisingly, much of the inscription has been lost. Most of this lost material is probably gone for ever, but, by studying drawings of the stone made by early antiquaries, scholars have been able to recover some letters destroyed by exposure and handling in more recent times. The earliest illustration yet used for this purpose seems to be pl. iv of G. Hickes, *Linguarum vet. septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus. Pars tertia, Grammaticæ islandicæ rudimenta* (Oxford, 1703), a figure based on the work of the antiquary William Nicolson of Carlisle, who examined the fragments in April, 1697.<sup>5</sup> Nicolson's drawing gives full texts for the four sides of the upper fragment of the lower stone, and is our only authority for some letters which were soon to disappear under the handling the stone received in the church, while of other runes which disappeared at a later date it is our earliest record. For all that, the drawing was made too late to be of the greatest use. It shows the state of the cross after it had been knocked down and broken, when a considerable amount of the text had already been destroyed.

Luckily there is an even earlier drawing (PL. xxvi) of the Ruthwell Cross, made while it was still standing, presumably complete and undamaged, in the parish church. It is unfortunate that this record gives only a small part of the runic text, but this includes a few runes which had disappeared by the time Nicolson was working and which were presumably destroyed when the cross was attacked. This early drawing is part of a short note by Reginald Bainbrigg of Appleby, which now forms MS. Cotton Julius F VI, fo. 352. Though its existence was noted as early as 1911,<sup>6</sup> the drawing does not yet seem to have been published, nor has its material been used, even in the latest editions of the runic text of the Ruthwell Cross.<sup>7</sup>

Bainbrigg, a northerner by birth, returned to Appleby from one of the universities in 1580 to become headmaster of the grammar school there. He interested himself in

<sup>4</sup> Only the title of this act survives. It appears in the *Index of the principal acts of the Assembly holden at St. Andrews, 27. July, 1642, not printed*, added to the edition of *The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, from the year 1638 to the year 1649, inclusive of 1691*.

<sup>5</sup> Used in G. Baldwin Brown (with A. B. Webster) *The Arts in early England*, v (London, 1921), 206 ff. It is not clear why Brown used the Hickes plate in preference to Nicolson's original drawings, some of which survive.

<sup>6</sup> F. Haverfield, 'Cotton Julius F. VI. Notes on Reginald Bainbrigg of Appleby, on William Camden and on some Roman inscriptions,' *Trans. Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquar. and Archaeol. Soc.*, n.s. xi (1911), 373-4.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, vi, London and New York, 1942), p. 204, where missing letters are supplied by conjecture only.

local antiquities, and in 1599 and 1601 made journeys into the north to collect material for a new edition of Camden's *Britannia*. Probably the Ruthwell drawing was made for the same work, though Camden did not use it. Bainbrigg died in 1606. His drawing can, then, be dated *c.* 1600.

The drawing shows the beginning of section *a* of the *Dream of the Rood* text, giving the runes of the top border, with above them the words 'literæ transversæ', and the first fourteen lines of runes (line 5 accidentally omitted) of the NE. border, the words 'literæ perpendiculares ab apice ad basim' accompanying them down the right-hand edge of the leaf. Below is added:

'Summo, hac hyeme, investigandi studio permotus, montes, valles vetusta templa in scotiæ finibus peragraui, quo non adiuui, non accessi, vt aliquid reperirem. ecce de improviso in crucem admirandæ altitudinis incidi, quæ est in templo de Revall,<sup>8</sup> pulchris imaginibus Christi historiam referentibus, vinetis, animalibus eleganter et splendide perpolitam, de duobus lateribus, a basi ascendendo ad apicem, et contra ab apice descendendo ad basim peregrinis literis, sed fugientibus, incisam. Inscriptio talis.'

In its present condition section *a* of the inscription begins:<sup>9</sup>

'[.] g e r e | d æ | h i | n æ | g̃ o | d a | l m | e ʒ | t t i | g ʒ | a h | e w | a l |  
                   5                  10                  15                  20                  25                  30  
 d e | o n | g̃ a | l g̃ | u g | i s t | i g̃ a '  
           35                  40                  45

corresponding loosely to the Vercelli text:<sup>10</sup>

*On ʒyrede hine ʒa ʒeon ʒ Hæled,  
 stran ʒ 7 stiðmod.*

(*ʒæt wæs ʒod ælmihtiz*),  
*ʒestah he on ʒealʒan heanne . . .*

Several letters are lost before rune 2, 'g'. The centre of this character is 5.3 in. from the left-hand edge of the stone, and to its left the surface is broken away and partly covered with a layer of cement, no traces of letters remaining. Bainbrigg gives runes 2-34 (omitting 14-15), and also shows the four lost characters that preceded 2. By Nicolson's time these four had already disappeared, and it is reasonable to assume that this top corner of the lower stone was broken away when the great cross was thrown down forty or so years after Bainbrigg's visit. Bainbrigg is thus our only authority for the beginning of the inscription at this point.

A comparison of the drawing with the runes that survive gives us some idea of Bainbrigg's accuracy. It turns out to be only fair. Apart from the complete omission of a line, there is a good deal of distortion of individual runic forms. So, 'ʒ' is made to look like S, 't' (20) like T, while 't' (21), 'l' (30) are also distorted. The Ruthwell 'd' form is the so-called younger form with the cross-staves touching the stems a good way from their ends. This is correctly reproduced in Bainbrigg's drawing of 31, but for 6 he gives the so-called older form in which the cross-staves meet the stems at their ends. For 'g̃' he draws a form similar to the usual manuscript variant of the rune, its two cross-staves having a circle surrounding their crossing. This treatment of 'd' and 'g̃'—replacing the forms on the stone by possible variants—might suggest that Bainbrigg had some knowledge of runes, but it is unlikely that he had, for, though he knew and drew the Bewcastle 'kyniburuḡ' text and the Bridekirk Font inscription, he did not recognize their runic nature. Moreover, he was unable to distinguish between

<sup>8</sup> A common early type of spelling for Ruthwell. Dickins-Ross (*op. cit.* in note 3, p. 1) note a pronunciation [rivl], though a spelling pronunciation is now common locally.

<sup>9</sup> This reading is the result of a number of examinations of the Ruthwell Cross between August, 1955, and July, 1958. Runes are transliterated according to the system described in B. Dickins, 'A system of transliteration for Old English runic inscriptions', *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, 1 (1932), 15 ff., and further in Dickins-Ross, *op. cit.* in note 3, p. 8, note 2.

<sup>10</sup> Dickins-Ross, *op. cit.* in note 3, p. 25.

the similar runes 'o', 'a' and 'æ'. He gives 'æ' for 'a' (25), 'o' for 'a' (29), and 'a' for 'o' (33), though the last is not a glaring mistake, for the outer stave of the lower arm of the rune is very faint, and it appears as 'a' in a number of later drawings. It is unlikely, then, that Bainbrigg's version was influenced by any previous knowledge of runes, and it can be looked upon as a rather fumbling attempt to represent what he actually saw.

Of the four characters indicated by Bainbrigg before 2, three can be readily identified. The first is a cross, the third 'n', the fourth 'd'. 'd' is here given the older form, but, as in the case of 6, this is probably a mistake. The second character cannot be identified with certainty. Formally it seems to be 'æ', but in view of Bainbrigg's difficulty with this type of letter it may have been 'o', 'a' or 'æ'. 'æ' is not possible in the context, but both 'o' and 'a' are. The text then began with '+ond' or '+and'. Either reading would fit into the space available on the stone.

The cross at the beginning is paralleled in a number of runic inscriptions—those, for example, of the Dover grave-stone, the Falstone 'hog-back' and the Great Urswick and Thornhill stones—while early drawings of section *c* of the Ruthwell *Dream of the Rood* text show that that too once began with a cross, which seems to have disappeared towards the end of the 18th century. The verbal prefix *and-* appears in OE as a doublet of the *on-*, found in the *on3 yrede* of the parallel Vercelli text. *And-* is properly a stressed form found in nominal and adjectival compounds, *on-* appearing as its unstressed equivalent proper to verbs. Confusion of use does, however, sometimes occur in Old English, with the result that *and-* is evidenced in verbal compounds.<sup>11</sup> *Ond-* is a common variant spelling of *and-*, produced by the partial rounding of earlier *a* before a nasal consonant. Both *o* and *a* are used as symbols for this sound in early Northumbrian texts, *o* spellings predominating.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately the sound does not occur again in the Ruthwell texts, so we do not know how the Ruthwell rune-master represented it. The first word of section *a* of the *Dream of the Rood* text must, then, be transcribed '[+<sub>nd</sub>]geredæ', where the second character is either 'o' or 'a'.

One other point deserves mention in connexion with Bainbrigg's drawing. o·4 in. to the right of the crossing of rune 23, 'g', and on the centre-line of the line of runes there now appears a small dot. This could be accidental, but section *b* of the text begins '[.]|icr|iicn|æky|niŋ|c' (*ahof ic ricne Cynin3* in the Vercelli text), after the last letter of which there is also a small dot, this time less likely, judging from its appearance, to be intentional. Accidental pitting of the surface at this part of the stone is, however, rare, and the two dots appear each at the end of the first verse line of its text. They could then be punctuation points. The lack of punctuation elsewhere in the runic texts of Ruthwell is not a significant objection, for Old English punctuation is irregular, both in written and in epigraphical material. The accidental appearance of two dots in such positions would be something of a coincidence, and strong evidence would be needed to reject them. Nicolson did not show them, but this may have been because he did not notice them or did not regard them as important. The *a* dot is first given in pl. 57 of Gordon's *Itinerarium septentrionale*, but Gordon does not show the *b* dot, which is first recorded in A. de Cardonnel's pl. lv in *Vetusta Monumenta*, II (London, 1789). The fact that Bainbrigg does not show the point after rune 23 of the *a* text may be thought further evidence for the belief that these dots are accidental. R. I. PAGE

#### CROSS-DATING OF ANGLO-SAXON TIMBERS AT OLD WINDSOR AND SOUTHAMPTON

Specimens of timber from the Saxon town of Old Windsor, excavated by B. Hope-Taylor, have been subjected to tree-ring analysis. The ring-patterns of the two specimens

<sup>11</sup> A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), p. 31 and note 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51, note 2.