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Foreword

This book is the first of hopefully two eventually to be produced within the project The Late Iron Age in South Scandinavia – A Historical Anthropology, sponsored by The Swedish Research Council. As a point of departure for such a project, it may seem odd to start by writing a book about the seven or eight centuries that took society to the second part of the first millennium CE and the period focussed by the project. Nevertheless, so great is the need for synthesis in Scandinavian Archaeology that only on the basis of an overall understanding of EIA society can that of LIA and VA be properly understood.

In order to be able to draw what I believe to be the essential conclusion about the change in society during the middle of the first millennium CE, I have focussed on the understanding of the landscape, and the way landscape was used in prehistoric times. These conclusions are cardinal because the second book is supposed to discuss the mentality of the LIA and the way it brought acculturation and Christianity into society before the arrival of the Church, i.e. before the renaissance period of the Viking Age that brought back Roman influence to South Scandinavia. In my opinion, as well as in that of many others, understanding the mid millennium holds the key to understanding LIA and VA.

I have presented several smaller parts of the present work at conferences or seminars but also developed a couple of themes into freestanding post doctoral projects. In these projects I have discussed a number of points with a number of colleagues not least Drs Svante Fischer, John Ljungkvist, Svante Norr and Helena Victor and graves most of all not least with Anna Gatti. I relayed at an early stage on Birgit Arrhenius and Bo Gräslund as critical readers of the manuscript. Considering the number of not-quite-finished manuscript, they must have read during their professional careers, I am grateful for the effort they have made to point out the many things that could be improved. The English in this book is Scandinavian, but much less so after Elisabet Green’s revision of the text.

Visiting Egypt 2002 with a number of junior researchers in Egyptology Dr Sofia Häggman introduced me to the Siwa oasis and the Director of Schools and Chairman of the Heritage Committee Abdallah Baghi. When showed around in the Siwan landscape by Sofia Häggman its sites and the structural
similarities between peripheral Roman Period Siwa and the equally peripheral Roman Iron Age Öland became apparent. Eventually, thanks to Siwan hospitality this similarity structured an essential part of the research project behind this book.

In an archaeological synthesis, we expect the general outline to be correct or at least a fruitful generalisation. Detail, regional difference as well as lack of synchronous change may be as essential as the overall change, but similar to overriding cultural and epistemological concepts such as Christianity, which is by no means a coherent phenomenon, there is much to gain from a common perspective as well as a lot to depart from and refute. It is not obvious e.g. that modern science would have developed the way it did had it not been for the doubt and social order created by Christianity. This book therefore is a typical synthesis because it tries to find a common pattern where one might as well brace oneself with detailed observation, nullifying source criticism or a safely limited perspective. Writing a synthesis therefore, it can only be hoped that others too will find the explanatory force of the general perspective worthwhile.
CHAPTER I

THE HUMAN LANDSCAPE
Introduction

This book is about ordered space. It is based on a number of reconstructed cognitive Iron Age landscapes, i.e., spatial relations which display some general traits and changes in the *human geography* of Iron Age settlements in South Scandinavia, Fig.1A–C. In addition, it points out some trends in the way in which we can understand a landscape. One of the main issues, given the time space of the study, is the way landscape was influenced by the cultural sphere of the Roman World, i.e. a world culture and a system, not least in economic terms. Today, checking out this Roman influence is obviously more in vogue than ever, irrespective of the influence being understood as libertarian or oppressive or any balance, mixture or clash between these two opposing notions.

Building as well as analysing landscape involves both conscious and unconscious actions, simultaneously responding to and forming the environment. The unconscious structural elements are not the least interesting because they are related to an uncomplicated prehistoric understanding of a cultural order. Therefore contrasting widely separated peripheral landscapes, describing the way they were influenced by the Roman world and the way in which they stand out as similar, will be important—important because the similarities exemplify the intellectual preparedness triggered by a world culture and the way latent cultural vogues can be said to form or put their mark on societies. On the other hand, there is a point in presenting all these landscapes as case studies because they have a micro-level significance that forms the basis for different analytical approaches aiming at reconstructing these landscapes with a view to a conceptual understanding meant to be expressed as social order in past and present time frames.

It goes without saying that the analysis of monuments and their situation in time and space is at the centre of the discourse, archaeology being what it is, but grave goods, graves and monuments are not seen as representative of society in a general sense; instead they are primarily understood to be elements in the prehistoric construction of the historically rooted essence of landscape and society.

Next to spatial relations, literary landscapes will find their way into the text, reflecting a number of material elements such as lands, villages, farms, farm houses, rooms, places and spots. As durations, these elements can be said to be distributed somewhere between the everlasting monument and any never lasting place defined by being pointed out and thus brought into existence when
needed. In conclusion: landscapes are the frames of this book. Landscapes are seen as acted upon, but also as agents in the human world.

\textit{Fig. 1A-C.} (A) A Tentative map of the geographical division of the southern part of Scandinavia in the first half of the first millennium C.E. (B) The layout of the Central Scandinavian house. (C) The layout of the South Scandinavian house.

Mapping Central Scandinavia as a border zone is based on the layout and distribution of the Central Scandinavian House (B). This map therefore is still building up and we do not know if the Central Scandinavian house will be found between Närke, Ringerike and Halland/Bohuslän and we do not know for sure, although we may suspect it, that the outer parts of the Oslo Fjord are parts of South Scandinavia. Nor do we know what the South Scandinavian inland looked like.
Results from Östergötland may indicate that it has an identity of its own although there are Central Scandinavian Houses in Västergötland.

By following the waterways, the Central Scandinavian borderland penetrates the inner parts of Scandinavia, i.e., North Scandinavia, a region that reaches the coast outside the map, north of Ammanäs in Ångermanland and in Nordland/Troms in Norway.

The significance of the Central Scandinavian border zone stems from the fact that the South Scandinavian house with the central entrance room (C) was known in its southern parts, such as Jæren in Norway or the Mälar Valley in Sweden during the Pre Roman Iron Age (PRIA). However, in the beginning of the CE when the new house with diagonally placed entrances is created, South Scandinavia, the area of the old house, is being defined from a Central Scandinavian point of view, because the spatial organisation of daily life in Central Scandinavia takes a different turn from that of South Scandinavia.

After the introduction in the Late Roman Iron Age (LRIA) of the New Dwelling Quarters (NDQ), cf. Chapter IV, there is a consolidation of the South Scandinavian area. Moreover, in the Migration Period (MP) this affects the coastal lands of the North Atlantic as well as those just south of the Baltic. Needless to say, archaeology based on the settlement remains themselves still has a lot of ground to cover, but the source material is building up and its latent success, redrawing the map of the early history of Scandinavia and the Baltic, rests with the attitude of the antiquarian authorities and political will.

Methodologically speaking, all sources will be analysed along similar lines irrespective of their being material or literary. This means that contexts are seen as containing a broad spectrum of meaning which may conveniently be understood as ranging from a very conceptual level where people act with significance, overview and care in a time space perspective, to a highly normative one on which people tend to act without any deeper reflection, because they know their actions to be uncontroversial and indeed well within the frames of normalcy, whatever that may be.

This analytical spectrum can be said to range from the most conscious and conceptual prehistoric viewpoint, over the intentional, to the structural and unconscious position. Often the analysis will try to lay bare such levels as indeed discrete ones, despite the fact that formally speaking, there are no levels in a continuum stretching from the most conscious to the most unconscious. Moreover, a given context cannot be expected to be stable in terms of representing a certain state of consciousness. On the contrary, the stability of a certain level of understanding rests with its relation to other more or less conscious levels of understanding, i.e., other related contexts. Nevertheless, this stratifying methodology is worthwhile, because it makes it possible to point out that which is thought to be reconstructions of past actions and link them to a more analytical and meaningful discourse which does not reflect what was once an accepted notion, but rather a present one.

This methodological approach, bridging ancient and contemporary, goes beyond post modernism inasmuch as it aims at understanding rather than respecting the people of the past and, similar to many others who in the 1970s began to criticize the processual approach to explaining the historic, I happened to take this step and apply its non-processual approach in one of a number of
rather similar ways in writing at the beginning of the 1990s, eventually describing it as a methodology⁴.

This two-sided approach relies on understanding as well as analysis, and for that reason it also represents a two-sided critical relationship between an experienced, but past reality, i.e. the archaeological record perceived as meaningful, and the meaningful present understanding of the past. This two-sided relationship is the critical tension inherent to the historical research which grew out of the post-modern critique. The reason why we should nevertheless insist on pointing out a past reality must be anchored in the fact that this kind of reality represents the result of otherness, something distant and apparently unrelated to the present. Although it can be a fruitful undertaking to try to establish a relation where seemingly there is none, it is not unproblematic to seek out that which was lost in tradition and make it present as a way of broadening a cultural consciousness. There is something odd about this approach and these oddities, which constitute the predicaments of the approach, can be labelled ‘undecidedness’ and ‘stand-offishness’⁵.

Confined to a field in which one tries to reconstruct as well as understand in terms of the present as well as the past, ‘stand-offish’ and ‘undecided’, designate the fact that there will always be an element in one’s research, perhaps unwillingly, but still significant, of turning oneself away from the past, and likewise will there be situations in which we are unable to decide whether our understanding is actually related to a once experienced, but now inevitably past reality, i.e. a past so lost that it is hard to make interesting or even enigmatic. In the present book I have come to see this critical situation as a fundamental condition for historical research, defining the approach of the researcher himself as genuine ‘otherness’ in relation to the people of the past as well as the present. Such a researcher is in essence someone denied the possibility ever to be acknowledged by the past he seeks, but also, to a certain degree, present day acceptance. These researchers, compared to most of their contemporaries, tend to see the past and the lost, which they reckon for worthwhile, as significant and accordingly they see the present and the future as more complicated and less obvious. Their status may oscillate and they may be more or less in vogue, but they are never modern.

In addition to the methodological space created by the need to reconstruct and analyse as well as to explain and understand at different levels of consciousness, and in addition to the problems of ‘undecidedness’ and ‘stand-offishness’ in this space, as well as the latent otherness of the researcher, it must be stressed that the archaeological record is the result of ultimate expressions of power in the past, i.e. the result of the power that turned perfectly present accounts and material expressions, realities belonging to a simple presence, into a source material, into something lost, bygone and closed, albeit perhaps preserved. In short: turned something modern into history. Exercising this power is a matter of once and for all depriving material expressions of their right to interact with a present rooted in a past, i.e. their quality of being part of the present and of
living culture. When this material has been made part solely of the past, i.e. when the traditional chain of understanding is broken similar to a broken string of conceptual family resemblance, those who try to understand and interpret the material must logically speaking side with the past. And in effect, when we side with the past we become marginalised in the same way as any contemporary material expression is marginalised when it is turned into a source material, i.e. separated from the present. At the same time trying to analyse, reconstruct, explain or understand a source material happens in a scientific space where one has been deprived of one’s possibility to interact with someone representing a past or its unbroken and thus living tradition.

In order to use the past as a powerful instrument, rather than a context worthy of being understood, one shall have to side with the present while acting on the future. In this way the past, in terms of a source material, becomes a potential means for acting on a future similar to a political resource or a potential argument which may or may not be activated.

Today there is very little obvious need to activate any kind of history that would argue for an over-regional and non-national understanding of e.g. South Scandinavia, but there would seem to be an opening for a historical research if global warming is significantly linked to man’s incapability to cope with his own cultural expressions and manifestations such as urbanism and reproduction. There might i.e. be a point in trying to understand the pre-nation state, as well as landscape-related identities and thus, in the event, the dissolution of cultural identities and the stagnation which takes place e.g. during the MP. A similar dissolution and stagnation may be in store also for a future South Scandinavia rather than the nation states presently occupying the region.

Historians siding with the past as well as the present are forced to make a presently unknown or a sufficiently unknown and irrelevant past, as well as themselves, present in a narrative or in a plea that will make this past as well as the historians themselves respected—not good or bad or virtuous or appalling—just respected or counted with. However, because such things as terrorists as well as saints—similar forms of the incomprehensible as well as of the comprehensible—can be expected to have been straightforward parts of any past it is not always easy to create respect and acceptance. The Beowulfian terrorist, the Grendels, are not by definition the bad guys nor are the present day Meinhofs and Bin-Ladins or state terrorists. Luckily, there are some less offensive ways of using the past than understanding the positive qualities of an al-Qaeda group or a CIA task force, and we can expect these less offensive ways to be the more prolific not least while they need not bother with such short-lived phenomena as today’s al-Qaeda or CIA units.

That brings us back to the landscape, because landscapes are one way of taking an interest in phenomena and concepts that are still today intriguing. Today, ‘land’ is a concern of ours since we have difficulties understanding the character of our future relationship with land and the earth as well as the consequences of our actions. And when insecurity about some part of the future is a
reality, there is always a need for knowledge—even historical knowledge. In view of a future predicament, we wonder whether there were any unfortunate breaks in what was once living traditions. That is why the long-term development seen in Al Gore’s diagrams of temperature change is much more thought provoking and convincing than the obvious difference between a glazier 50 years ago and today. In the long term, the landscape happens to be a scene where our will to express ourselves and to act come into conflict with what we consider to be nature or the larger framework for our possibilities to act, irrespective of our being charmed by the irrationalities of ID, myths of creation or rational science.

We are very well aware of nature’s response to our stimuli or addictions, and for the moment we fear that the atmosphere will strike back. We are willing to make ourselves agents in this scenario, but we are also willing to see that there are phenomena in nature that we can only flee or hide from, hopefully after having been given an early warning. What then should we do about the global warming and the landscapes that reflect our culture?

Nature as an agent is connected with the earth as an erratic phenomenon, which means that although we like to speak of the dichotomy: human-kind/nature, we are nevertheless aware of ourselves interacting, as well as coping, with a world consisting of heaven and earth represented by the landscape in which we act. In one and the same landscape, what we see is a complementarity, the balance between on the one hand the cosmological spheres in which the world is ordered for better or for worse at any given point in time and space, and on the other, ourselves acting and being acted upon. This book therefore is about ordered space.

Once a Lasting Relation

Working with the Iron Age landscape in South Scandinavia we expect an upper, a lower and a middle world always to be present in front of us to see and live in. Landscapes represent the human, the natural and the supernatural in close connection. There is a vertical dimension to these worlds which together make up our cosmos, but at the same time, these vertically arranged worlds seem to be connected in one landscape. Moreover, the way in which we order and understand our landscapes will always reflect the complementary balance between the main categories of our cosmos. The emphasis on the different parts in the complementary balance is by no means evenly distributed over time. While phenomena with a link to the celestial or the upper world is present e.g. in Bronze Age preoccupation with orientations and phenomena such as the sun, RIA and LIA settlements would seem much more interested in ordering the middle world. However, lakes especially EIA lakes could reasonably be seen as openings connecting the middle world with the netherworld, inasmuch as persons buried in water, today preserved as bog corpses, are the ulti-
mate example of human beings in a borderline situation related to the netherworld. Because of the switch in cosmologic emphasis, burying people in ponds or lakes comes to a close in RIA.

In other words, we can conclude that material emphasis on the different kinds of worlds vary to such a degree that also the perception of the landscape would vary. Landscapes, however, never lose their position as major arenas for our actions and concerns. This is also the case today, when we expect ourselves to manage environmental change on a very large scale during the next 100 years, but may wonder how, because for the moment, we seem to be pushed into a gloomy future which can only be stopped by dynamic human actions of another kind than the ones we are used to. In this respect, our situation today resembles the one that characterised the Late Antiquity in the Mediterranean and European world. We can see the collapse coming because we believe a number of parameters to continue their linear, gradual or exponential change. We can think of many things to do about it, should our measurements be correct, but we do not know what will happen and we do not know how to define progress and cultural development. Moreover, used to prove the robust stability of Nature we are reluctant to accept fundamental change and thus likely to be wise in the event.

In South Scandinavia during the IA, the middle of the middle earth is the settlement, where human life is clearly seen to relate to almost any spatial position. In the settlement, there is a spatial human order which keeps things together in a diminutive model landscape. And yet this human and orderly room exists only inasmuch as it is balanced by its complement, the space where we do not feel that we are in our own right, although at the same time we try to order and occupy it. As long as society has not itself established any specific and formal borders, there is no point in making these relations to a place the paragon of a duality, or two different attitudes to place, a dichotomy or a binary opposition. In every place where we may find ourselves, both attitudes are present as a balance. Even in the middle of the hall, the IA emblem of civilised space and order, the untamed monster of the netherworld may make itself present. In *Beowulf*, where this horror enters into the hall and the middle of the most civilised room where we would have considered the uncivilised to be unthinkable, the complementarity is actually most uncanny. In fact, the monster Grendel is a minor problem since he is just an intruder and a sign of the dichotomy civilised/uncivilised. That is why killing him is no solution to the problems in King Hrothgar’s Denmark, since in that realm, the real problems are inherent to pagan culture itself which contains no good without a complementary evil—a heathen society with no absolute, i.e. Christian, guidelines.

Spatially, and thus in practice, no definite limit can be drawn between IA settlement and not-settlement. In the places where we feel that our own right carries little weight, it is because the middle world is neutralised by the upper and the lower or inner and outer parts of the cosmos.
Far away from the settlement, we are its only representatives, and sky as well as earth could well become dominant. Some phenomena, therefore, are easy to relate to these two worldly extremes. There is little doubt that trees exist in the sky as well as in the earth, feeding themselves by means of leafed branches or root threads from air and earth. There is little doubt that water is running out of the netherworld. And there is little doubt that mountains or hills take one into the thin air of heaven. If there is thus a great balance to which humans do not feel primary related, despite the fact that we are represented in this landscape between the extremes, we do however feel obliged to live in it and manage it. It is thus not surprising that we understand ourselves as representatives of the middle and as managers with more or less limited rights.

Consequently, when we work and manage, we do so at two scales: one characterized by the amount of order we create in the landscape, the other by the character of this landscape as a spatial position between heaven and netherworld. Therefore, when it comes to working, we can ask a number of relevant questions, e.g. about the amount of time we spend in the ordered settlement rather than in the open middle world.14

The Arbitrary Date

The chronology of man-made things is the backbone of archaeology as a craft and indeed the backbone of Thomsenian, artefact ordering, Archaeology15. This quest for chronology and linear order has had a long-lasting effect on the archaeological profession and it has created an enormous pressure on archaeologists to date whatever man-made they have understood to be a phenomenon contextually limited or anchored in time and space. For this reason, for quite a while, field archaeologists used to secure material for 14C tests in order to date settlement remains represented by pits and holes filled with soil which occasionally contained pieces of charcoal considered to be more or less contemporary with the hole, i.e. considered to be the result of work on a settlement. Digging a hole was simply something prehistoric man used to do for a large number of reasons, filling it up trapped some contemporary peaces of charred remains. Archaeologists date them.

The best test material, rather than the significance of the hole that trapped the charred plant remains, decided whether or not the material should be radiocarbon dated. Large excavations e.g. in connection with the construction of infrastructure would result in more than a hundred 14C dates which indicate the not too surprising, but still overwhelming probability that different periods were represented in the material. In some cases, it would seem that the only value of the date was the date itself16.

However, if we collect all the possible dates represented by such a large sample of 14C tests, i.e. if we add up all the probabilities within +/− 6 standard deviation for each central date, we can put together a diagram, a probability curve,
which shows us the relative possibilities that a certain year in prehistory can be dated by a piece of organic material from a hole on a settlement. In so doing it becomes obvious that although a series of excavations could be said to represent a long section through time and landscape, the chances that a certain year is dated varies considerably. Prehistoric man’s propensity to dig a hole is in other words not a constant one, on the contrary.

In a most systematic way, this kind of dating practice was applied in those excavations in South East Scania that accompanied the palaeo-botanical investigations in the Ystad area. The reason for this lay in the scope of the project, i.e. in a wish to link change in the settlement landscape with change in land use. A successful cooperation between archaeologists and palaeo-botanists, among others, allowed the project to fulfil its goals not least because the archaeological sites in themselves, rather than specific site features, such as houses, pits, fences or furnaces, were dated. Although the tests were not deliberately taken by chance in relation to the absolute number of features at a given site, the archaeologist conducting the settlement investigations came close to doing so.

The main deviations from a near-random sample stem from a slight imbalance: the wish to date also relatively small sites with relatively few features. This wish has resulted in one 14C test among as few as c. 75 features on a small site, but on a site with hundreds of features this proportion, 1 test in 75 features, is not applied. Therefore from a site with e.g. 600 features we may have five or six tests, or as much as one in 120 features rather than one in 75. This would mean that features at small sites are slightly over-represented, but on the other hand most sites were relatively similar in size and we can conclude that although the sample is not perfect it resulted in a good chronological connection between the main change in settlements and settlement structure on the one hand and change in the human landscape on the other, Fig. 2a.

It is this fact that allows us to conclude that if we put together all the year probabilities from the 126 14C tests from the Store Köpinge area in one diagram we get a picture—a graph—from which we can judge the relative possibility that a certain year can be dated on a Store Köpinge settlement. Or more precisely: judge the chances that someone should have bothered, and spent time, digging a hole or a pit in the ground, i.e. put him-or herself to work on the settlement. The graph is in other words a representation of labour invested in settlements at different points in time. Again, an interesting characteristic of this curve is the fact that the probability for dating a hole does not simply rise with the increasing population as it would, had the need for holes in subsistence economy been constant. It does indeed rise in general terms, Stone Age being on average less probable than Iron Age, but the ups and downs are much more characteristic and we can conclude that the bent of man to dig a hole varied considerably.
The possibility that a given year can be dated on a settlement in the Stora Köpinge area in Scania. Although the general tendency makes a Stone Age (SA) year less probable than an Late Iron Age (LIA) year, Stone Age people being a fraction of the latter, the sudden shifts between rising and falling possibilities is most characteristic. It meets the eye that the end of settlement archaeology begins with the Viking Age (VA) when the propensity to dig a hole in the ground at a site where archaeologists can make excavations decreases markedly for the last time. This means that there were periods when only few holes and thus little work was done on the settlement and vice versa, i.e. periods when digging a hole was felt very often to be just the right thing to do. A possible explanation for this pattern emerges when we add the results of the palaeo-botanic investigations to the diagram, namely the phases in which the landscape was opened up and exposed to grassing and clearing or generally speaking simply transformed into a somewhat more open landscape. It is during these periods that there is a distinct drop in the activities on the settlement, Fig. 2b.
Generally speaking, the drop in the probability for a year to be dated corresponds to the second, third, fourth and fifth opening of the landscape in the Store Köpinge area where the archaeology of the Ystad Project was carried out. However, the fourth opening of the landscape does not fit the 14C pattern, because already after 300 years, in the LRIA, the intensive use of settlements starts again and that is 400 odd years earlier than expected.

In theory, such a co-variation is not surprising, but since we can trace it way back in prehistory, it does show us a specific notion concerning the long-term balance in the use of the landscape. After a period of exploitation, there must follow a period of stabilisation, when the landscape becomes more closed.

In this part of Scania, the opening up and thus also the exploitation of the landscape happens four times in periods long enough to be designated eras, and during the fourth, society changes into a medieval one, characterised by a settlement pattern that we no longer can or will investigate solely by means of archaeological methods. The 14C dates therefore drop away completely. Nevertheless, each time an opening of the landscape occurs within a post-mesolithic prehistoric society, activities on the settlement or ‘at home’ drop. Instead, the landscape is used or exploited and thus, relatively speaking, kept ‘open’ for several hundred years—except for the first centuries of our era. Here in the RIA, an anomaly occurs: just before the start of the CE, the landscape is being opened up and consequently, we should be looking forward to a new stable period of open landscapes and less work at home in the settlement. Yet the activities on the settlements start to grow again just a couple of hundred years into the opening phase. This allows us to conclude that the exploitation of the landscape was not enough to meet the demands: work on the settlements had also to be intensified.
It is only fair to see the beginning of the Common Era, the period 0–400 CE in the diagram, in relation to the contacts with the Roman World. This contact happens to commence in a period where the possibilities for opening up the landscape were good, and so just that happened that would have happened anyway because it was possible. But the foreign contacts were probably so successful that they influenced the settlement situation and created a need for intensified work on the settlements. Probably there was something to gain from working more.

If we look at a slightly more peripheral area, the northern part of the Mälar Valley and the test taken in connection with a new railway, which runs as a section through the landscape, then we see the same characteristic pattern, the same interaction between settlement and environment, Fig. 3. Excavations in this area have showed that the expansion in settlements continues up to the fourth century CE, and this expansion is in all probability a result of the indirect contacts with the Roman world economy, and its peak is contemporary with the RIA anomaly in the Stora Köpinge diagram. Contacts with the Roman Empire, whether direct or indirect, speed up the economic activities beyond the long-term interaction with environment.

**Fig. 3.** The possibility that a given year should be dated on a settlement in a cross section of the landscape in the northern part of the Mälar Valley, the railway line between Enköping and Arboga.
When the stagnation and crisis of the Roman Empire becomes a fact there is little to be done. In the periphery, i.e. the Mälar Valley, human activity on the archaeological sites disappears and we suspect that perhaps the settlements of the LIA and VA are covered by the medieval settlements which are often still in use. The small raise in probabilities in the period 1400–1600 CE is a matter of an expansion which spread into the earlier sites because they were well situated in the landscape from a micro environmental point of view. This expansion does not automatically mean permanent settlement. It may as well be seen as a sign of seasonal exploitation. Reoccupation in some form or other is common on most agrarian settlement sites in the Mälar Valley.

In the Stora Köpinge area, the period 400–650 CE represents a crisis or stagnation inasmuch as the landscape cannot be opened up and exploited more than it already is; nor can occupation on the settlements be intensified. This situation changes a little later, c. 700 CE, when there is once again a point in working harder, i.e. digging more holes on the settlements. Then just before 800 CE it becomes possible once again to open up the landscape, but soon after, the possibility to conduct general settlement studies by means of archaeology comes to an end also in South Scandinavia.

The point of all this is to say that up and until the centuries around the beginning of the CE in South Scandinavia, there is a long-term balance between the use of settlement space and the use or environmental space, emphasising one or the other. However, within a millennium or so, this systematic fluctuation is shaken to pieces and one of the commonplace prehistoric ground patterns, the hole, the common archaeological pit, almost ceases to exist. In the peripheral Mälar Valley we cannot see any revival of the expansion pattern after 400 ce, but in Scania, prehistory strikes back with a characteristic built-up phase in the 8th century, before its great leap out of prehistory. In the Mälar Valley, on the other hand, transition to historic times would seem to be more like creeping than leaping.

There is something slightly comic about the commonplace occupation of digging a hole in the ground, when it turns out to be a significant cultural occupation in the sense of either being a correct thing to do or indeed a redundant one. It is easy to imagine the soap opera scene featuring a snug young South Scandinavian who in the year 50 BCE, much to the chagrin of his simpleminded father, refuses to dig his hole expressing instead the need to open up the landscape and bring light to society by herding cattle and making charcoal, eating well and earning real money, Republican denars, on iron production and tar, exploiting the assets of the environment for the benefit of the European market.

This odd pattern in the overall balance between landscape and settlement will govern the development of this book, inasmuch as the first part of the study will cover a period up until the opening of the landscape in the beginning of the CE. Then the discussion will centre on the expansion and transformation of the human landscape and the development of the settlements, i.e. the break away
from the traditional long-term pattern. Finally, the study will deal with the problems brought about by the decomposition of the Roman Empire. Since this latter period as well as the one leading up to the CE contains elements of equilibrium and/or stagnation, the centuries in the middle must be seen as a period in which society is engaged in dynamic change. This should not come as a surprise, since the opening up of a landscape is also an exploitation of the environment and that will have far-reaching effects on a society that used to be more closely tied to its settlements. However, in South Scandinavia, emphasising both exploitation of the landscape and enhancement of work on the settlement leads to a cultural contradiction which will cause society to stagnate and contract.

We can look upon the Roman world as the economic system behind this 500 year period, but it is equally essential to look at the Roman world as the source of a lasting social and mental influence, because that need not disappear with the holes or the Roman Empire, even if Romanitas is temporarily losing its high grounds.

The precondition for this intellectual influence, as well as its flimsiness, is the intellectual preparedness of people in South Scandinavia to manage, transform and adapt influence and change. Intellectual preparedness therefore is a notion that will be introduced as an undercurrent in a period when society copes with the dissolution of the old-fashioned PRIA balance between settlement and landscape and also when society carries on with the reconstruction of itself during the economic crisis in the middle of the 1st millennium CE. The question of intellectual preparedness is linked to the problem of how to respond to stimuli represented by the Roman world. The most immediate response seems to have been an irresistible wish to set out and plunder the Empire if possible, and if we believe Latin authors, already a century before the beginning of the CE such expeditions could be undertaken. Although the expansion of the Roman Empire put a temporary stop to plundering central parts of Europe, warfare did become an option and aggression could be said to become endemic in South Scandinavia during the first centuries CE, especially in southern Jutland where hopefully the last shots were fired 70 years ago.

Nevertheless, it is much more essential that there seems to have been a preparedness from the very beginning of the Roman contacts to nourish a concept of individuality in relation to a powerful and leading position in a stratified society. For those who live it, intellectual preparedness is a matter of finding differences and similarities between Roman and Germanian values and applying them in a turbulent economic situation inside South Scandinavian societies. The rise of this kind of potent individuality makes the whole period 0–500 CE turbulent as well as dynamic. Warfare no doubt has something to do with this intellectualisation of individuality, but so has the landscape-related transformation of the settlement structure and the burial practices. While ritual acts such as offerings in bogs would seem to fall back upon the identity of a community—making weapon offerings the right thing to do—and not on the indi-
viduals within or at the head of the community, burials offer a ritual scene much more open to change and adaptation because the *raison d’être* of this scene is the death of the individual and not death threatening society.

Within the framework of ordered space, i.e. in the human landscape, settlement pattern, burial themes and the reflections of warfare are cardinal. Settlements can be seen as the spine, burials and graves as the vogue and wars as the backdrop of the period.

**NOTES**

1 My definition of South Scandinavia falls back on my understanding of Roman Iron Age (RIA) gross regional geography. This in its turn is based on the distribution of the Central Scandinavian house which is a RIA invention (cf. Herschend 1998:Fig. 1b). This house can be found in Lofoten (Johansen & Stamso Munch 2003:11 pp.), along the Norwegian coast as far south as Jæren (Løken 1992a) in Ringerike (Gustafson 2001) in Hedmark (Pilø 2005:93 pp.; PI 1) in Västmanland (Sundkvist 1998) and Uppland (e.g. Ekund 2005:88 pp.) and along the Swedish east coast (Liedgren 1992) up and until Örnsköldsvik (Ramqvist 1983:Fig. 5:23). It is typical of this area that it penetrates the interior of Scandinavia along waterways such as the Trondhjem fjord (Løken 1992b:26 pp.), Sognefjord, the Lake Mälaren and river valleys such as Ljusnan, Ljungan and Indalsälven (cf. Ramqvist 2007:Fig 1; pp. 160 pp.). For this reason North Scandinavia is made up of the interior of the Scandinavian peninsular and its northernmost parts, south of the cordon of Central Scandinavian houses we find South Scandinavia which consists of parts of Jären, Denmark, probably Vestfold and Østfold in Norway as well as Bohuslän, Halland, Scania, Öland and Gotland. Halland (cf Carlle 1999:130 pp.; Streiffert 2003:202 pp.) is a border area and there is no doubt a South Swedish inland that is still difficult to define in terms of house types (cf Borna-Alhkvist 1998b; Maria Petersson 2006:94 pp.) However, House 2 from Vittene in Värstergötland (Fors 2008:33 pp.) is a Central Scandinavian house.

2 I do not consider that South Scandinavia is part of the Roman world economic system, at least not if we are to stick to Wallerstein’s definition presupposing a conscious insidership among those who take part in the system (Wallerstein 1974). But there is little doubt that Roman economy makes up a temptation for ambitious Scandinavian entrepreneurs engaged in external acquisition and that it inspires surplus production irrespective of the surplus being used in peaceful transactions ending up in Roman economy or more directly in funding expeditions in external acquisition (cf. Herschend 1980). Understanding the relation between Roman and South Scandinavian economy is a matter of first applying a definition similar to that of Chase-Dunn Hall that defines a world system as: ‘intersocietal networks in which the interactions (e.g., trade, warfare, intermarriage, information) are important for the reproduction of the internal structures of the composite units and importantly affect changes that occur in these local structures’. Furthermore, it sees South Scandinavia as a semiiphery in a core/ periphery relationship characterised more by differentiation than hierarchy (cf Chase-Dunn et Hall 1997:404 & 409 pp.). This view of the concept of semiiphery being a dyadic rather than a hierarchic relationship and a process rather than a state is in line with the development in Wallerstein argumentation (cf. 1978 & 1999).

3 The following can be said to testify to the popularity of the Late Antiquity: the popular exhibition ‘Sejrens Triumph’ and the volume with the same name (Jørgensen et al. 2003), general historical studies such as Cambridge Ancient History vol 13 & 14 (Cameron and Garnsey 1998; Cameron et al. 2000), historical studies such as Peter J. Heather ‘The Fall of the Roman Empire’ (2005), Bryan Ward-Perkins ‘The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilisation’ (2005) or archaeo-historical volumes such as Sebastian Brather ‘Zwischen Spätantike und Frümittelalter’ (2008); archaeological dissertations such as Svante Fischer ‘Roman imperialism and Runic literacy’ (2006). Early examples of this

5 This pair of concepts is discussed in (Herschend 1998:148).
7 There is no doubt something about the concept of preterite-present i.e. a verb which has gained its present tense form from an older preterite tense e.g. Proto-Indo-European *woida, ‘I have seen’, which becomes the Gothic wait meaning ‘I know’ or ‘he knows’. This simple formula – I have seen = I know – is a fundamental way of making an interpretation of the past a meaningful present.
8 In Al Gore’s book (2006) on global warming it is history, the development of the long-term temperature cure, not the postcards from Switzerland that convinces the reader.
9 In Stjernquist (1997:78) there are a number of relevant references to this kind of cosmology.
10 Nordic views on among other things cosmology are summarised in Hastrup (1991). There is a vertical as well as horizontal cosmology in Scandinavia and the world can be seen as a landscape leading to different spheres that are sometimes seen as separate. Ásgarðr, Miðgarðr and Utgarðr therefore designate farms in a landscape as well as separate worlds with a vertical relation to upper middle and lower. This doubleness goes all the way into the name of the world tree, the ash Yggdrasil, i.e. Oðinn’s horse, ygg meaning fear and being one of Oðinn’s names. The world therefore is stationary and vertical as well as moving and horizontal, (cf. Steinsland 1979:146 pp; 1997).
11 Heaven and the upper world is reflected in a number of BA phenomena such as the orientation of straight lines of stones in the landscape (Jensen, J Aa 1972), the orientations of graves (Randsborg & Nybo 1986; Herschend 1988) and depictions of the sky in symbolic form such as the Nebra disc or the ‘sun chariot’ (Pásztor & Roslund 2007; Larsson 1996; Kaul 2004).
12 Not only is the hall the centre of civilisation (cf. Herschend 1998:49 pp.; 2001:173 pp.), the world is understood as a number of farms, i.e. Ás-, Mið- and Ut-garðr and in the Old Saxon epic Hêliand, which describes the life of Jesus, the scene at Mount Tabor in which Peter offers to built a hut for Jesus is transformed, and Peter envisage an Ásgarðr settlement with magnificent houses, i.e. halls or ‘home[s] of happiness’, for Jesus, Moses and Elijah respectively (Hêliand vv. 3137-44; Murphy 1992:103).
13 Considering Beowulf, Klaeber’s edition and comments (1950) will serve as the standard for all uncontroversial references to the poem.
14 This distinction between seeing the landscape in terms of creating it or reading it may seem commonplace, but the analysis of landscape has often paid homage to the reading metaphor and forgotten about the creation metaphor. For this reason, widely different scholars can agree upon the same methodological point of view. Christopher Tilley (1994:18) and Stefan Brink (2008:117 & Fig2) may thus both agree on the crucial importance of naming. However, knowing that names are indeed the result of a secondary analysis of a landscape – i.e. an analysis of what others, such as humans, gods or nature, have already created we may venture to say that the approach is not all-embracing. Naming is no doubt important, but when humans have created something spatially observable, the principles and intentions of creation rather than analysis are of primary importance in the same way as writing foregoes reading.
15 Writing about South Scandinavia, the very setting of Thomsenian archaeology, there is a large corpus of texts and archaeological discussion to prove this desirable or undesirable fact. In a 50 year perspective on the discipline, one can point to authors such as Kind-Jensen (1975), Gräsland (1987), Jørgen Jensen (1992), Kristian Kristiansen (1981) and Frands Herschend (1988). Lately, Thomsenian archaeology has been criticized by Michel Noteid (2000) as well as defended by Asgeir Svestad (2003). Its attitudes are still much discussed, e.g. in a recent discussion in the journal Meta.
This discussion started with a reactionary review by Jes Wienberg (2004) of Asgeir Svestad’s dissertation *Finn din egen filosof*– Find Your Own Philosopher (2003) which is a defense for artefact archaeology and a critique of certain post-processual ideas in archaeology. Svestad offered an answer and the editors opened up for a wider discussion. No less than 7 authors took part: Cornell (2005), Hegardt (2005), Karlsson (2005), Notelid (2005), Rundkvist (2005), Herschend (2005a), Kristiansen (2005) bringing the total number to 9. Rhetoric alone united these texts.

The compilation made by Frölund (1997) provides a good illustration to the tests that were made. Modern reports from settlement excavations such as Kyrsta or Björkgården are examples of systematic applications of $^{14}$C analyses.

The Ystad project was able to point out a number of phases in which the landscape could be characterised as open rather then closed, cf. Berglund (1985 1986 and 1988); and Berglund et al. (1991), Tesch (1991:326pp). This openness must not be over-emphasized, because in semi-open forested landscapes as well as open ones, pollen records refer in all probability to an area within 800-1000 metres from the pollen trap only. Irrespective of the trap being a 5 or 100 m radius pond (Sugita, Guillard & Broström 1999:Fig. 5).

In this book the terminology refers only to those who the Romans thought lived in *Germania*, i.e. the European continent north of Limes or *Germania libra*, the Free Germania, the land Tacitus refers to in his *Germania*. Those who live in these areas are called *Germani* and the adjective designating matters pertaining to these people and their lands are called *Germanian*. The point in this is not to confuse these terms with the Germany, German and Germanic, i.e. terms carrying completely different connotations.
CHAPTER II

THE USE OF GRAVES
For a long time, there has been an imbalance between the number of graves and the number of persons who must have died during prehistoric times. Already in 1970s, attempts to calculate a prehistoric population on the basis of graves would give surprisingly low numbers, such as 39 people on MP Öland, when there were no less that well over 1000 farms and a dozen ring forts for these comrades to share. A little later, in the 1980s, a cautious estimate based on this material, the fossil house remains, fences and other settlement indications, suggested that the Ölandic population c. 500 CE would have numbered between six and nine thousand, if not more. Today, with an improved reconstruction of the number of farms on the island, a population around 15 000 inhabitants is far from impossible. A glance at the publication of all known Ölandic Iron Age grave finds and monuments will make it clear that there was never such a thing as 10– or 15 000 graves datable to c. 500 CE.

Traditionally, three kinds of grave deficits without sharp definitions have been established.

The first deficit is the lack of graves that ought to have been there, if everybody were buried in a grave. Berit Sellevold for one has pointed out and quantified the lack of children’s graves in the Iron Ages. This lack has always been recognised, if not calculated, but more or less ignored. When children’s graves have in fact been found, they often stand out as odd, reminding us of children being at once beloved and disposable. Some of those who were in a sense beloved and singular can be said to make up the children’s cemetery at Kastlösa on Öland. Those who have been found stashed away in existing graves are reminiscent of the unwanted murdered child, whose soul in folklore became a *myling*, i.e. the soul’s phantasmal incarnation that chased those who passed its grave at night.

Little by little, children from the Neolithic and onwards are brought into the discussion and so is the lack of children’s graves paired with the opposite, contexts oddly centred on infants. This presents us with a grave deficit and a predicament that must be understood in relation to the way in which a society understands children as a social category, as individuals, as beings and ultimately as childhood.

It stands to reason that if children’s graves can be dispensed with as well as presented as a theme, so can the graves of other groups in society.
Contract archaeology, which tends to widen its object of investigation from the monument to any site influenced by human presence, has also exposed a number of non-funeral deposits of skeletal material, cremated and un-burnt bones, as well as empty grave monuments and places that are in themselves ritual and monumental. Such heterogenic traditions centring on death and the dead, place and bones as well as monument and non-monument are eye openers, and they sit easy with grave deficit, but the most flagrant examples of grave deficit are the ones made visible when congregational Christianity, i.e. The Church, grants everybody a sepulchre on the churchyard.

Most early Christian burials have been destroyed by later ones, because they belonged to a churchyard, i.e. a burial ground in which spatial quality grows with the proximity to the fixed position of a communal church. Owing to the size of the congregations, the stability of the churches, the understanding of space and the popularity of the notion, churchyards tended to become small and eventually crowded places. Nevertheless, owing to the slow introduction of congregational Christianity and despite the general rise in grave frequency during the last non-orthodox or religiously mixed centuries of acculturation leading up to the second millennium CE, we have some examples of early churchyard cemeteries belonging to semi-medieval, i.e. still slightly unstable settlements, churches and churchyards. Similar to their settlements, these churchyards could be given up so early that their grave frequencies were not blurred by the crowding and grave-destroying churchyard effect. Sebbersund and Tirup in Jutland, Løddeköpinge in Scania and Grødby on Bornholm are cases in point representing relatively small communities. At Sebbersund there are c. 1000 graves covering a period of 100 odd years, at Tirup there was once 720 graves covering a c. 150–200 year period, at Løddeköpinge 2,500 graves cover 150 odd years and at Grødby 500 graves cover c. 100 years. At Grødby, the discrepancy between the 27-grave burial ground belonging to the 10th century, and the 500-grave cemetery from 11th century is striking because the former is replaced by the latter with no, or only a negligible, overlap. It stands to reason therefore, that 10th century Grødby was the same as 11th century Grødby and that the latter produced 18 times as many graves as the former. If we were to reckon these communities to represent late prehistoric and early medieval society, the average community would have produced more than 850 graves during a 100 year period. Even if we exclude Løddeköpinge, considering it to be too town-like (a questionable exclusion since township surplus balances countryside deficit), the average society still produces c. 600 graves during a 100 year period. No non-Christian rural Viking Age cemetery produces such quantities of graves.

Nevertheless, there is a point in comparing the graves from the LIA settlement Lindholm Høje to those belonging to the Tirup churchyard. Graves are missing from Lindholm Høje, but we can expect the originally number to have been c. 700. Although fewer graves are missing at Tirup, some are, not least while it was judged impossible to find all graves containing new-born children. Thus we may expect that at Tirup, there were also originally c. 700 burials.
Looking at the topography around the two sites, it is fair to say that the two village areas producing the graves were more or less equally large. The Lindholm Høje village is partly known from excavations and demographically speaking, the Tirup churchyard was filled by a population of c. 75 persons, i.e. 5 odd farms. This would seem a small population to sustain a parish, but that should not come as a surprise to us knowing that church and churchyard were closed down and abandoned in the beginning of the 14th century. Both Lindholm Høje and Tirup were small villages and Tirup was probably the smaller one. Lindholm Høje, however, representing a pre-medieval subsistence economy can be expected to have had a more extensive land use that medieval Tirup where cultivation probably played a greater economic role, Fig. 4A.

*Fig 4A.* The surroundings of Lindholm Høje. Topography and the positions of the neighbouring settlements give us a reasonably fair estimation of their resource area. Based on FOF.
The cemeteries at Lindholm Høje represent c. 300 years of LIA and VA burial costume from the 6th to the 9th century. Dating Lindholm Høje in this way means that we have disregarded the beginning of the cemetery, when it was probably little used, and also the very end, when a substantial number of people may already have belonged to a Christian congregation and consequently been buried somewhere else. Tirup on the other hand seems to be a straightforward representation of c. 150–200 years of use. The burial frequency at Lindholm Høje is thus probably only half of that of Tirup and in any case considerably lower, because it is unlikely that the population at Tirup was twice that of Lindholm Høje, not least while a number of those born at Tirup would end up as dead commoners in nearby early medieval (EM) Horsens, Fig. 5A&B.

It meets the eye that the difference between Lindholm Høje and Tirup is less outspoken than the general one between 10th and 11th century cemeteries. In order to explain the difference, it can be argued that the relation between Lindholm Høje and Tirup is influenced by the fact that the Eastern Limfjord area and thus Lindholm Høje was marked by English and perhaps Northwest European contacts. These contacts in turn may well have influenced local burial
customs making the newly dead relatively speaking more important than distant forefathers. Wise in the event, we can in other words suggest that the local burial customs were indirectly influenced by a European Christianity later developing into the medieval church. In the large perspective, the shift from pagan to Christian ways of taking care of the dead emphasises the near past, the newly dead rather than the commemoration of distant ancestors. With Christianity, the immediate origin of the living, or the congregation, is seen as more important than the heritage of the local community and in due time, the church itself, the house of God rather than the graves surrounding it, becomes the symbol of the origin of man, civilisation and society.

Owing to exceptional preservation conditions created by sand drift, any surface at Lindholm Høje was soon covered and protected by sand. This has given us some insights into a large category of features that the excavator in a clear-sighted expression of his disappointment called ‘monumentless’ pyre sites. There are c. 200 such sites (c. 35% of the total number) and in conventional terms, they are not sepulchres, because they are almost entirely made up of what was left of corpse and pile when the pyre had burnt down. There is nothing to suggest that these monumentless sites, most often the remains of funeral events next to an existing monument, were protected other than by chance. In this case, chance eventually buried them in sand, but in the normal case, we would expect such pyre sites to weather away in a matter of years like the remains of a bonfire. The Finnsburg scene in Beowulf, describing the warrior covered pyre next to the farm mound, i.e. the grave mound next to the hall farm called Finnsburg, would seem to be the equivalent of a Lindholm Høje pyre, albeit more richly adorned and sadly communal. There are no actual grave structures in these cases, neither mentioned in Beowulf nor to be seen at Lindholm Høje, only the spot where the fire was roaring.

Needless to say, there is a range of events that could have taken place between the last smoke of the burnt out pyre and the construction of a stone setting, and there are many examples of such events at Lindholm Høje. Sometimes, part of the burnt bones were collected in a shallow hole in the charcoal layer or perhaps in a small pot, which most often happened to be broken already in prehistoric times. Likewise, a few small stones may be set around the remains of the pyre. But these events are temporary and had it not been for the sand drift, they would not have survived. The short-termed character of the remains of the pyre sites is also attested by the fact that they may overlay each other as well as visible monuments, something regular grave monuments very seldom do, Fig. 6. Most monumentless sites are therefore the remains of temporary events, and contrary to graves they were meant to last but a short while, decay and disappear, because they were not monuments establishing a perennial memorial. Yet they testify to the fact that dead people were taken care of, although not always buried, if by ‘being buried’, i.e. in a grave, we mean contained in a construction meant to last a generation or more reminding the descendants of their ancestors.
**Fig. 5A.** A plan of the graves at Lindholm Hoje. Red designates uncovered remains of pyres. Blue are boat-shaped monuments covering a cremation grave. Green are other grave monuments. Based on Ramskov (1976)

**Fig. 5B.** A plan of the Tirup churchyard and churches. Based on Kieffer-Olsen (1993).
Fig. 6. Overlapping graves at Lindholm Høje in the areas 117 and 221. Based on Ramskov (1976). On the overview, Fig. 4A, we see tendencies to structures at Lindholm Høje, but it is characteristic that an area of overlaps tends to blur these structures because the overlaps follow their own pattern.

Even though Lindholm Høje has showed us the simplest of burial practices, there were probably even simpler ones, because compared to Tirup, pyre or burial sites and thus funeral remains are in all probability still missing at Lindholm Høje. It is not improbable to suggest that some of the deficit is the result of a more expedient annihilation ritual spreading the ashes in the wind or a particular windy funeral hour and high temperatures in a pyre large enough or sufficiently screened off to leave little to be found of a body swept in a shroud\textsuperscript{32}. Funeral rituals ending up in a complete annihilation of the body and a vanishing funeral place are no more than a reflection of the ones that lead to the eternal preservation of the dead in perennial monument, and vice versa. Both these ritual sets are based on theoretical ideals setting up the temporary against the eternal as if they were each other’s inversions. As ideals, they are never possible
to execute and the ‘temporal’ and the ‘eternal’ are always present in funeral or burial rituals.

The wealth of depositional customs practiced during the EIA is not to be expected in LIA, but even so, most corpses were disposed of without ending up in a grave. Actually, the number of monuments at Lindholm Høje may be somewhat over-exaggerated, because the sand drift tended to also cover up the monuments and transform the cemetery to an anonymous, i.e. monumentless area. Consequently, and contrary to cemeteries in more stable environments, the need for new monuments replacing the ones covered up in sand was never-ending at Lindholm Høje.

Because we can imagine a number of funeral fates between blowing in the wind and ending up as a spot of ashes and charcoal rather than a well-organised grave, the number of graves and non-graves as well as the distinction itself may vary over time. The second deficit, therefore, concerns the lack of graves datable to some specific period in a certain geographical area. In her overview of the Danish Iron Age between tribe and state, Lotte Hedeager pointed out the lack of graves datable to the MP. However, the loss of graves which eventually signifies the whole of Denmark in the MP, started in Jutland already in the ERIA and cannot be explained with reference to preservation conditions or difficulties to date a number of graves that would have made up for the deficit. To complicate matters even more, the growing popularity of grave monuments in Jutland during the LIA was probably a reflection of Continental and Anglo-Saxon contacts. The change demonstrated by Hedeager, moreover, cannot be explained as the result of a decrease in population during this period, because LRIA and EMP are signified by a growth in farm size and dwelling area and thus also in population.

Concerning graves in the 1st millennium CE, Heiko Steuer has suggested that despite variations in frequencies, no more than 5% of the original 100,000 graves are known to us and his discussion points out that it is far from self-evident that everybody was entitled to a grave. He supports his discussion with references to a host of ethnographic examples of varying funeral and burial rights and rites. This amounts to saying that although there is no doubt a link between settlement and cemetery, this relation is so complex that for the time being ‘… steckt die Erforschung dieses Zusammenhang noch in den Anfängen’ … investigation into this relationship is still at its beginning. This said in the 1980s, is largely the case also today33.

The few LRIA and MP graves on Öland are cases in point. Since they belong to a period of settlement expansion and even overpopulation34, we would have expected the graves to be many and grave goods to be significant, but for some local and temporary cultural reason, i.e. the Ölandic society in the first centuries of our era, this is not the case. Instead, and similar to other parts of South Scandinavia, there are very few graves from the MP, and we must conclude that among the well above 300 Ölanders who died every year around 500 CE, only a fraction were buried in such a way that they could ever be found. Seen from
this point of view, it is the change in burial frequency that explains the lonely 39 Ölanders.

In his book on Romerike, Dagfinn Skree also starts by pointing out the difference in graves datable to periods with much the same preconditions for creating recognisable graves and burials, quoting Ulf Näsman for the obvious Ölandic example with 15 or so graves dated to the MP. Skree takes this kind of deficit into his own area of investigation and shows that the variations in the number of graves in Romerike during the first millennium CE cannot be accounted for by means of preservation conditions which made some but not other periods and areas visible. Instead, it must be the propensity to bury in a monument that varies35.

This brings us to THE THIRD DEFICIT, the one related to taphonomic factors such as unfavourable preservation conditions, unlucky find circumstances, lack of money, professional interest/disinterest, the devastating effects of some human activities and modern machines. These factors are fundamental to the archaeological sample when we want to decide whether or not it is a fair, i.e. random, representation of what could have been found. Indirectly, inasmuch as graves are crucial for the archaeological discipline, these factors also point out graves as the concern and tragedy of the discipline—a conclusion that must be drawn when we realise that the sources, as we know them, are by no means a fair representation of the past. Such factors therefore are also at the heart of the archaeologist’s critique of the modern. There is no doubt a loss of graves caused by these phenomena and it varies greatly in size and character. However, because it is difficult to calculate this loss, and because graves have been a primary source material for reconstructing grave deficit, this leads to a certain ambiguity as to whether or not there are or would have been many more graves to be found.

When writing about Vorbasse already in the 1980s, Hvass points out that the small cemetery from the 3rd and 4th century must have belonged to families. Tacitly he implies that they did not belong to the community living in the large villages of those centuries, if indeed such village cemeteries had ever existed. In a similar way, Ejstrud and Jensen, writing about Vendehøj in the year 2000, point out that only 10 percent of the graves that ought to have existed, had everyone been buried were indeed found. However, they leave it to their readers to decide for themselves whether the situation is the result of grave destruction or the result of funerals that were never followed up by burials, or deaths never resulting in any funeral as in Nørre Tranås—or both, Fig. 7&8. In between these examples, there are a host of others which leave the problem aside completely, something which, much to their credit, neither Hvass nor Ejstrud and Jensen do36.

The reason why many prefer to emphasis the third kind of deficit rests with the problems it would have caused us if graves, instead of being a random sample representing society in a general way, were meant to represent settlements in a number of very specific styles. Even when we are aware of the problems and
know that graves are not ideal, they nevertheless tend to become ‘the best we have at our disposal’ and used when we structure and generalize pictures of the past. However, if ranking in a super regional society was not the matter, while local affinities with a changing settlement structure were, then it becomes pointless to discuss whether people buried at the 3rd century Himlingøje or Skovgårde cemeteries ranked higher or lower than those buried in 3rd century Vorbasse. And even more problematic: the lack of graves would not per se mean lack of rank, status or power.

Fig. 7. The position of the Vendehøj cemetery in relation to the settlements and the destroyed area. There is nothing to indicate that a large number of graves have disappeared because of the exploitation, but no doubt some graves disappeared just south of the excavated graves, before antiquarian authorities were able to control the area of exploitation.

Fig. 8. A plan showing the distribution of men and animals in the house that caught fire in Nørre Tranders. Based on Nielsen (2002).
Dagfinn Skree in his discussion of Romerike addresses the lack of graves in a systematic way and concludes that there was indeed a group of people who were never buried in a grave. This said, those who were in fact ‘monumented’ came to represent a specific social phenomenon. Skree sees them as landowners and understands the notion of land right or being a landowner to be a catalyst for the burial manifestation. Consequently, a large number of people in Iron Age Romerike were not entitled to any grave. If, as implied by Skree’s argumentation, graves in some areas, at certain times must be understood as a kind of anomaly because part of the population is by definition or tradition expelled from the buriable ones, that is: IF the deficit is of the first or second kind and thus the result of a prehistoric intention to invest in some kinds of graves, but not others, THEN there is something fundamentally wrong with the way graves, generally speaking, represent the past. This possibility probably let Steuer to point to the multitude of ethnographic examples which prove that the understanding of graves rests on a contextual understanding of death. In our time and day, when churchyards in the cities are crowded and caretaking expensive, not everybody is interred. Instead, spreading the ashes in the wind has become an alternative. Already we master a corpse freeze-drying and grinding technique that will soon allow our bodily remains, together with our paper urn, to be transformed into fertile mould in a matter of months after our corpses have been processed and buried in the ground. Recycling ourselves in this model environmental way, we give our ‘dehydrates’ to instant reproduction.

The source critical cautiousness employed by most researchers is understandable although it leads to a well-know scientific position that can be termed ‘undecidedness’. Most often this sad-sounding position results in security, but now and then it will serve as an alibi for not engaging ourselves in a basic critique of our pre-understanding of a phenomenon, and prompt us gently to withdraw from or keenly to proceed with ‘the best we have got’. Eventually, undecidedness will lead us to a fundamental insecurity enhanced when researchers such as Skree reject the down-to-earth character of these concepts otherwise taken for granted.

Insecurity is provocative and in connection with graves it may provoke more in-depth studies that aim at making funerals understandable by means of colourful drawings of the grave as a spectacular installation—the result of a complex and expensive event. Such reconstructions are in part a school plate theme and once, when they were popular didactic means, their complexity referred to lords and royalty, implying that then as now ordinary people, contrary to their peers, were buried in ordinary ways. But today in-depth analysis shows the exceptional grave to be found also in small societies and the grave to be exceptional for many different reasons. This implies that we are not always well aware why a grave is furnished the way it is, thus making us conscious that the interpretation of graves may well be more difficult than we usually think. In the end, we come full circle and the reconstruction for all its clarity casts doubt
upon our naïve understanding of graves as a fair or at least an understandable mirror of society.

We indulge in reconstructions because they are hypothetical, albeit imaginative pictures only. They do not force us to abandon our critical undecidedness; instead they enhance our feeling of security because most often we link in with the familiar prep-school upper-class perspective of the educational plate or historical painting hiding behind artistic freedom. Seen in this perspective reconstructions are thought to be harmless. The real value of reconstructions, however, rests with their ability to cast doubt upon that which we take for granted and create a psychological preparedness for change as well as a more complex understanding of the past.

Given second thought therefore, the complex series of life, death, funeral, burial, monument and preservation is still today an intricate one. Between each link, the process could be cut off and the deathly remains and their contexts disappear in a non-recordable archaeological moment, getting as lost to us as anyone’s last gasp. We must acknowledge this and hypothetically draw the following general conclusion from our insecurity: although the fraction varied, only a fraction of the EIA dead was buried in such a way that we can recognise the context of their funeral as indeed a burial. In most cases of death, we may suspect that after a short time, there were no context let alone any remains to be found.

A Grøntoft Case

Bearing in mind this hypothesis, the riddle of the missing graves is highlighted in a new way by settlement investigations, since there is a general relation between the size and lifetime of a house and the number of people living (and dying) in it. We can illustrate this with overwhelming clarity in the PRIA Grøntoft area. In this model case, houses existed for one house generation only and owing to their size, their inhabitants were mostly nuclear families. Let us moreover, in order not to over-exaggerate our numbers, suppose that there was no population growth in the area during the PRIA. This means that on average, the household consisted of two successful grown-ups and their two growing-ups only, i.e., the size and persons necessary to secure reproduction. Some families were no doubt larger and some more than reproducing themselves, while others were smaller and unable to do so, but by and large, and for the sake of the argument, society reproduced itself—one family in each their house. In our case, this model means that child death is not accounted for and thus not expected to show up in the grave material.

Having restricted the possible outcome of our calculations, we can turn to Per Ole Rindel’s catalogue of the Grøntoft area and count the number of houses with a byre as well as a dwelling part, the so called long houses. Between 195 and 200, i.e. \( \approx 200 \), such houses exist in Rindel’s catalogue and they are
contemporary with all graves in the area, except the Stone or Bronze Age ones, some of which attracted Iron Age man when he was looking for somewhere to bury someone, while others did not. In order for the number of houses to be no more than just $c. 200$, all Bronze Age buildings as well as houses with a central line of posts, supporting a central ridge, have been excluded for chronological and analytical reasons, as have all houses supported by four post only, inasmuch as they are considered to be outhouses. Putting our nuclear families into the remaining houses, we get a total Grøntoft population of at least $c. 800$ persons who qualified for a grave, if we believe people to be buried when they die.

Among the $200$ houses in Rindel’s catalogue, there is a number so well preserved that we can apply the rules of standardisation characterising the Iron Age houses, something Rindel has indeed done in his catalogue, and calculate their length and width as well as their average dwelling area, and thus the average size of the nuclear family’s one-room dwelling space. Knowing the size of the nuclear family, we can also compute the average floor area per family member. While it is difficult to calculate the size of a population based on the size of a dwelling area, it is easier to proceed the other way round and check if a suggested dwelling and family size fit ethnographic examples.\(^40\) When doing this kind of check it is wise to adapt the average ethnographic nuclear family size of $c. 5$ persons. We should account for such a family, because the likelihood that children die is so great that each family, striving to reproduce itself, would prefer to have room for more than two children. Fitting this five-person family into the $126$ Grøntoft houses with a known dwelling area we can conclude that each family member could dispose of $4.5$ square metres, Fig. 9. This is not a large area by ethnological comparison or standard, but given the one-room type of dwelling and the capacity of the entrance room, the byre and the occasional outhouse it is by no means an unlikely floor area. We are in other words entitled to suppose that at least $800$ people, probably more, died at Grøntoft during the PRIA. Yet there are only some $80$ PRIA graves in Rindel’s catalogue.

Given the fact that the characteristic grave form of the PRIA, owing to the frequent use of circular ditches around its low hillocks, is relatively easy to detect also if most of the superstructure of the grave and its urn have been ploughed off, there is very little chance that any larger number of graves has been missed by the excavators as long as preservation conditions have allowed them to find the houses. Moreover, during the extensive surveys in the area it is unlikely that the shards of smashed urns in the fields would have passed unnoticed, inasmuch as shards signal both settlements and graves, the latter being the main concern of the excavation campaigns\(^41\).

Generally speaking, the landscape in western Jutland is flat. However, the relief at Grøntoft is relatively marked, and it is correct to say that the settlement stretches from the higher grounds in the middle of the hill island towards the west-south-west and lower more humid parts of the landscape, Fig. 10. Fields, farms and graves sort themselves along this topographical axis, Iron Age graves being positioned slightly lower in the landscape than the settlements which,
contrary to the fields, never reach the hilltops. Nevertheless their situation is often unprotected and exposed to westerly winds. The graves form a border or they belong to a border zone in the landscape separating peripheral wetland from the settlement area. North and southwest of Grøntoft, new settlements can be expected and in this case, the graves define a border towards the southwest. In the Grøntoft area, travelling from the south towards the north, coming to a cemetery indicates that we have reached the domain of a settlement.

Fig. 9. The size of the dwelling areas in the houses at Pol and Grøntoft, based on the 126 houses measured by Rindel, ascending from 9 to 54 square metres. Since 4.5 sqm equals the average space allotted to each family member, 9, 18, 27, … 54 sqms indicate a household size of 2, 4, 6, … 12 persons. The large household at Pol with perhaps as many as 12 members is in other word more than twice as large as the average household. It meets the eye that a number of households comprised less than 4 persons, indicating that they were hardly able to reproduce themselves. Based on Rindel (1997).

When we travel south from Grøntoft, we reach the neighbouring settlements at Grønbjerg after c. 4 kilometres. Although these settlements are in no way as well excavated as Grøntoft, we can still conclude that they are arranged in the same manner in the landscape as the settlement at Grøntoft. Just below and to the south of a low hill, we find the settlements on a piece of dry land that on three sides is surrounded by wetland. The graves are few and linked to the settlement. If we proceed to the north from Grøntoft, we reach a small settlement at Ørnhøj after c. 6 kilometres. Next to nothing is known about this settlement.
except that it also seems to have had its own burial ground\textsuperscript{43}. East of Grøntoft, the vast grasslands have revealed no finds from the PRIA.

These facts are essential because they make two things probable: (1) Similar to Grøntoft there is a grave deficit also in the neighbouring settlements and (2) there is no large communal cemetery to add up to the deficit at either Grøntoft, Grønbjerg or Ørnhøj. Large cemeteries do exist, but they are not common enough to make up for the grave deficit if we take the number of settlements into account. Within a 10 kilometre radius from Grøntoft, i.e. within an area of c. 300 square kilometres there are no traces of any large communal cemeteries.

\textit{Fig. 10.} A map of the Grøntoft and Pøl settlements (open red shapes) and their cemeteries (white shapes with a red contour) superimposed upon a historical map. The cemeteries are situated below the settlements, which mainly occupy the gentle slopes of the landscape. Based on Rindel (1997) and FOF.

Let us suppose, nevertheless, that graves are more badly preserved than houses and allow for another 20 monuments in the Grøntoft area to have disappeared, implying that there were 100 graves at its two cemeteries representing the settlement. Still, $c.$ 700 dead, a little less than 90\% of the dead did not receive a grave monument. Given the fact that the Grøntoft settlement is in all probability not exceptional, we can expect a very large number of graves never to have been built. In other words, in these parts of Jutland in the beginning of the PRIA, the need for a settlement to state its heritage by means of graves and visible monuments could be fulfilled by burying some 10 per cent of the population. When telling us that only a turf signalled the grave of the Germani, Tacitus was probably correct. He referred to the normal case when a turf was cut out, some of the burned and crushed bones deposited in the hole and covered by the turf, thus fertilising the ground for a couple of years, prior to freeze drying being an option\textsuperscript{44}. That kind of deposition should remind us of the remains
of offering meals that were thrown into the local waterholes. We find these bones only occasionally when by chance preservation conditions have been exceptionally good, but the tradition was hardly restricted to over-fertilised oxygen-free waterholes. There must have been innumerable bone deposits in connection with offering meals, and almost all of them have disappeared.

At Grøntoft, the lack of graves is real, but the context down plays the ritualistic use of corporal remains. Not least owing to contract archaeology in regions with better preserved ancient monuments, we know this to be the case also in other areas, although there were considerable variations between ritual practices. Before we became aware of the width of the ritual spectrum, graves stood out as normal, but with new insights into the size of dwelling quarters as well as funeral and ritual practices, graves stand out as the result of an uncommon custom reflecting specific needs that go beyond the need to care for a deceased next-of-kin.

At Grøntoft, the cemetery can no longer be understood as merely a place where the Grøntofters buried their dead. Instead, it is a scene where a community chooses to make itself eternally present and thus also rooted in the past. Probably the cemetery is an arena for all kinds of ritual and manifestation. Together with a large measure of iteration, eternal presence anchored in the past would seem to be cardinal in maintaining the site, even though we only see its most perpetual character—a present record representing the past projected onto the future by means of a monument.

Graves as a Predicament

In order to put the complex ways in which graves could be used into perspective, we must draw attention to some of the sites at which it is possible to dispose of humans in a way that we could argue represented some kind of grave, rather than a site defined by specific funeral connotations. There are one or more characteristics signifying such sites and we can point out a series with one or more grave qualities.

(1) HOUSES. Mostly infants are buried beneath a floor, e.g. Sejlflod, Smedegård or Tofting Fig. 11. People buried or covered up on the scene of a burnt-out house, e.g. Nørre Tranders, are other examples.
(2) SITES IN FARM CONNECTION or neighbouring a contemporary farm. This phenomenon is most common and in this chapter Brøndsager, Vendehøj and Vorbasse among others are discussed, but there are many more intricate examples such as the contemporaneity between the establishment of the large hall farm in Wijster, Drente, and the secondary extravagant burial in the SA mound just west of this village. We can also point at the very modest situation at Rosendal on Öland and if we go further north, to the Gene farm in Ångermanland, which shows the same feature in a model way connected to colonisation, Fig. 12. Even fake mounds that were occasionally built in mountain regions as a sign of a site being occupied fit this pattern.47

Fig. 11. Plan of the byre part at Tofting with the infant buried under the floor. Based on Bantelmann (1955 Taf. 16:2 and 42).
Fig. 12. Farms and graves at Gene. Black houses represent the end phase of the farm. There are graves both in the immediate vicinity of the farm and further off at the shore signalling the settlement to those arriving by boat. The whole situation of this farm betrays that is was a bridgehead and a production site expanding its activities during as least a 150 year period in the LRIA and MP. We could expect the population to have numbered at least 15 persons (alloting 5 square metres of dwelling space per person). During 5 or 6 generations a cautious estimation therefore would suggest that c. 80 people lived and died at Gene. Thirteen of these were given monuments erected to form a well-known pattern: (1) four graves in a small cemetery at the waterfront and the border zone by the track leading up to the settlement and (2) a somewhat more impressive cemetery consisting of nine graves mirroring the farm itself. To visitors, this pattern would have suggested that a place with deep historical roots indicated by the border zone monument (1st cemetery) had now been reformed and reshaped into a dominant successful farm (2nd cemetery) characterised by impressive buildings. This, however, is a false impression. Based on Ramqvist (1983); Lindqvist (1985) and Lindqvist and Ramqvist (1993).

(3) SITES BETWEEN THE HOUSES in a settlement or a village. In this chapter, Vendehøj is mentioned, but one could also have mentioned Hodde, Smedegård, Hjemsted, Kyrsta, Vaxmyra or Sejlflod. 48

(4) SITES IN SETTLEMENT CONNECTION such as Grøntoft and, owing to limestones being difficult to get rid of, a vast number of Ölandic settlements and cemeteries cf. Fig. 35B49.

(5) SITES OR POINTS MARKING THE BORDER OF A SETTLEMENT such as the grave at the waterfront in Gene, Fig. 12, or cairns in a pass marking the border
between settlements in Lofoten. In addition, the runestone from Eggja in Sogndal, and the odd grave that it covered, would seem to indicate a border site, Fig. 13A&B. On Zealand, the graves from Stenrøldsknøs and probably Thorslunde mentioned later in this chapter are in a position similar to that of a cairn in Lofoten, as are the beheaded men buried much later at Tissø in western Zealand. They may be compared to the Eggja site Fig. 14⁵⁰. The way graves and burials are linked to border zones, as well as settlements, are paralleled by IA gold hoards and the similarities indicate the overriding qualities of the cognitive landscape and the need to make it manifest by means of significant sites.

Fig. 13A. Sogndal, Norway.
Fig. 13B. The position in the landscape of the solitary grave from Eggja and the rune slab containing the obscure invocation and curse. This slab covered the grave with the text downwards. The grave was situated on the very ridge or indeed on the edge (Norwegian eggja) that forms the border between the inner higher and peripheral part and the outer lower and central part of the valley with its rich Iron Age settlements. This spot, where we pass both the edge and the grave, grants us a magnificent view of the landscape below us. The Eggja monument moreover, sat next to the old road running between the two parts of the valley. A little below the edge, the road passes a stone quarry that has produced slabs similar to the one inscribed with the rune, but also stones used in the road bank and the slabs for a small bridge further down. The grave marks the border of the valley. The burial mounds signifying the VA settlement at Eggja stood behind today’s farm houses. These graves were destroyed in the late 19th century, but if the LIA grave was still known during the VA, the situation at Eggjum would in principle have been similar to that of the Gene farm suggesting a farm with two different kinds of graves and thus deep historical roots.

(6) WATER SITES, such as bogs, in which people could in some cases be said to be buried rather than sacrificed. In this connection, the Tissø situation next to water is worth mentioning51.

(7) SITES AT A SIGNIFICANT SITUATION IN NATURE. We come across them mostly by chance, such as the prehistoric remains at the point in Roteberg, Uppland, Fig. 15. Human remains in connection with large boulders or again the executed men in Tissø could fit the notion, as could earlier examples such as the solitary wetland-connected remains situated at the quarter-way point be-
tween the BA cult house and the mound called Grötehöj at Fosie IV in Scania, Fig. 16. For a number of reasons, therefore, it would seem that a point in the landscape with more or less topographical or formal significance could attract human remains or graves or some kind of significant installation52.

*Fig. 14.* The position of the two beheaded men buried at Halleby å just south of the Tisso manor. At Tisso, a magnate farm belonging to the LIA, there was no need to manifest the manor with graves, but the need to mark the borderline that we cross when we enter the area and approach the manor still existed. Similar to the situation at Eggja, the Tisso borderline is marked out by a mixture of regular grave and rituals at a significant but odd place. Based on Jørgensen (2001A).
Fig. 15. Map of Roteberg, shoreline 10 masl and monuments above this level. Once a characteristic island and during the Iron Age a headland with a steep slope rising above the water, facing the southwest, this characteristic point in the Mälar Valley landscape at Roteberg attracted prehistoric man who made bonfires and the occasional grave, seemingly for no other reason than the topographic characteristics of the place. A small plane on this otherwise rocky place has been cleared of stones. The plane is situated where the road passes the fence that encloses a couple of graves. 14C-dates show the site to have been used as a meeting place with at least temporary ritual value during most of the Bronze Age up and until the end of Prehistoric times. Based on Bäckström et al. (2000).

(8) SITES ATTACHED TO ELEMENTS OF THE HUMAN OR CULTURAL LANDSCAPE such as roads: Again, Grøntoft is an example and again, the Ölandic examples are numerous.

(9) SITES IN COLLECTIVE LAND with no apparent connection to a certain settlement such as inland graves, so called hunting ground graves on the Scandinavian peninsular or the above mentioned graves in border positions.
BURIALS IN OLDER MONUMENTS, such as Bronze Age burial mounds, e.g. Grøntoft, but also Wijster and Viking graves in old monuments and the Gösslunda cairn discussed below.

Fig. 16. At Fosie IV in Malmö, Scania, on the settlement site NO VI, a small U-shaped Bronze Age cult house on a farm opens towards a distant burial mound, Grötehöj, c. 700 metres west northwest of the settlement. The way the mid axis in this house was constructed resulted in the axis pointing exactly towards the burial mound. Along this sight line on the edge of a wetland and a quarter of the distance as the crow flies between the cult house to the mound, there were two solitary depositions of burnt bone seven metres apart. One was once contained in a now badly preserved urn; the other had no visible container, but included a bronze needle from BA PER IV. Probably this installation is more of a point on the line to Grötehöj than two graves, i.e. burials primarily used to signify presence in this quarterway point. Based on Björhem & Säfvestad (1993).

This series could be made longer, but it is already long enough to show that the funeral aspects of the graves themselves or grave-like contexts will never be of any help in precisely defining why there is a grave or a grave monument, i.e., an installation of human remain in a certain situation in the landscape. The reason for this rests with the fact that not only can an installation/grave in a certain situation fit several kinds of sites in the above series, but the reason for burying or not burying a person in a marked grave may also vary in time, in their own right, or on their own scale. They vary, that is, in such a way that the material expression would not allow us compare two sites, graves or cemeteries, in terms of social or cultural significance, let alone ritual or spiritual meaning. Needless to say, there are reoccurring patterns, but also an element of genuinely singular qualities in graves. In our days, a case in point is the wish we have to determine whether a grave is Christian or not. With the growing insight into the lengthy transition from a supposedly pure pagan to pure Christian faith, i.e. with the insight that faith is a mixture, its expression continuously changing, there are no absolute markers left to point to. As it happens, neither the Cross nor Thor’s hammer are irreversibly decisive markers. It takes the unified and stable theol-
ogy of large communities and orthodox teaching to produce a set of norms, rules and practices so precisely fixed that the overflow of meaning in a burial can be controlled, and labelled ‘Christian’.

Since an IA grave (without necessarily containing any human remains) expresses at least the site, the monument and a persona on a partly local and ritual as well as ideological scale, the grave itself, i.e. the grave in its own right, the result of a number of practices, is almost void of any specific meaning, even if it is evidently occupied by the remains of a human being—which again needs not be the case. The grave monument as we know it is a visible and public construction, a multi-purpose phenomenon occupying a space while simultaneously signifying past human presence in lost, invented, revived or living memory.

Graves are relatively speaking few and they come in late in the series: life, death, funeral, burial, monument and preservation. They are a kind of monument with an inner as well as an outer structure and thus very intentional, albeit simplified contexts. This implies that as constructions in additions to their intentionality they also refer to several motives, i.e. there is more meaning in the grave as a context than it can convey. Being burials with an outer form graves as monuments are in other words meant to be meaningful and visible or known-to-exist as landscape elements. For that reason, graves merit a contextual analysis which may create some clarity at least concerning their rudimentary structural relationships with the prehistoric landscape, when it comes to monuments and settlements. That is, structures in which the individual is reduced to becoming a symbol of the inner meaning of something exposed. Thus, site relation on that level does not tell us why a certain individual was offered a visible or known grave monument, only that there was a need to link that which had passed away to that which was once living and that which will continue to exist.

Although we may well find it reasonable or convincing to say that a monument such as a mound in Old Uppsala or Jelling exposes the origins of a present or perhaps in its day eternal royalty, the character of such a person or ‘sovereignty’, especially when monumentalized, is nevertheless a negotiated phenomenon. The pious Eddaic hope that the memory of a dead man will never die is in other words naïve, as is the equally comforting Eddaic belief that a stone put up at the wayside is most often a monument erected by a kinsman over a kinsman. Even if it were true, it is nevertheless naïve, because it blurs or supersedes the original point in making a grave: that of making the past present in a landscape which is in some way or other related to that civilised and settled space which in its day and age made up ‘the modern landscape’.

Owing to their hidden inner structure, graves and thus also grave monuments are the stuff that memory and tales are made of. In this history-creating process, they become manifest because, together with the funeral, they bracket the breakpoint in which the complex events following upon death are replaced by the eventless simplicity of the visible monument, be it a stone setting, a mound, a staff or but a known spot on the ground. Funeral and grave are there to turn something present into something past, thus making it possible to start
the process in which commemoration, remembrance, recollection and memory are eventually shadowed by oblivion and enlightened by revision as long as the phase of preservation lasts. In this respect, the vogue and fashions of the funeral are the last records for the living memory to draw upon, because some graves are meant to surpass living memory, and become more perennial than copper and oblivion, eventually ending up as historical sources for revision, just because they exist (for heritage management as well as fools). These burial elements abide by the rules of vogue and fashion and we may speak of themes in funerals, graves and cemeteries that are meant to live-on as revisable and re-readable contexts which can be brought to the fore when living memory has been forgotten.

If ever someone, be it Indiana Jones or Indiana Jones, archaeologist or tomb robber, were to open up a grave, those who made the installation in the first place wanted it to some extent to be understood, even if they tried to prevent people from opening it. We may well wonder how many times the rune slab from Eggja with its concealed inscription was lifted, turned over and read as proof by those who, despite and because of its oblique curse on those who dared to do just that, did exactly that.

In-Depth Examples

The reason why there are PRIA and RIA graves, and why these graves are useful, could be argued primarily to rest with the idea that settlement and grave define each other in a perspective which anchors the present in times immemorial or the eternal. This is not a very precise knowledge, but it means that between them, settlement and grave define the land. The third part in this definition, next to settlement and land, the time perspective, is taken for granted in order eventually to be better understood. To begin with, a number of case studies will lead us towards a better comprehension of how grave and settlement in EIA define one another as well as EIA.

**Grøntoft.** The large excavations at Grøntoft and their publication by Carl Johan Becker and in later years Per Ole Rindel, as well as the qualities of the area as such, makes it worthwhile to discuss the scarcity of the graves more thoroughly.

Rindel has argued convincingly that over time, the settlement distribution at Grøntoft describes two paths. The northern and smaller Pøl settlement with fewer houses continues to occupy its hill during most of the PRIA. The southern one, commonly called Grøntoft, changes from a scattered design to a concentrated one before the settlement is transformed into a fenced village i.e. a nucleated settlement. This is no doubt a correct observation, even though the change should not be seen as a series of regulated steps or phases.
Owing to the small complementary excavation in 1998 of the southern cemetery, we can summarise the character of both the northern and southern cemetery and their relation with the settlements, Fig. 17A&B, pointing out the following:\textsuperscript{59} there are far too few graves at Grøntoft. Those that exist, belong to the early phases of the EIA settlement, when this hill island was settled more permanently in PRIA, PER I. This means that the match between the number of houses and the number of graves was better to begin with than later on. Accordingly, this match or mismatch points out the discrepancy and the chronological gap between the graves and the most organised settlement at Grøntoft, the fenced village. The date of the cemeteries implies that they were primary in relation to most of the settlements and thus part of history and heritage when society changed.

By means of precise measurements and trial excavations (marked green in Fig. 17A) it can be said that a road track, a 30 m wide shallow gorge, has passed between what must have been two separate parts of the southern cemetery. The track would seem to respect the graves and it is in all probability the road that connected Grøntoft to the neighbouring settlements at Grønbjerg and Nørre Omme. The track can also be found on historical maps.

There are some 60 graves and c. 15 small pits in the cemetery and the pits could be the remains of ruined graves or postholes. All these features are grouped on each side of the track.

There are three central monuments marked blue in Fig. 17A. One is a Stone Age grave to the west of the track, one is a very large hillock grave with two burials, in the southern subgroup to the east of the track, and one is a hillock grave in the northern subgroup east of the track. This latter grave is singled out by five pits or postholes forming a pentagon pattern\textsuperscript{60}. The three deviant monuments could be seen as the ‘head’ of each their group of graves. In a similar way, the northern cemetery was situated next to an existing SA or BA mound heading the c. 20 graves in this cemetery, Fig. 17B.

There is a secondary phenomenon uniting the southern and the northern cemetery. It is a treacherous band of Caesar’s lilies, i.e. pointed stakes hardened in fire and buried deep in the ground with the pointed end, a fourth of its length, sticking out c. 10 cm so as to be concealed by grass and heather. This band runs between the graves and through the cemeteries. It respects the monuments, and in the southern cemetery also the track. This artificial flowerbed of lilies, a proto landmine device, planted to wound the feet of those who tried to run through it, was a popular and cunning device, difficult to detect and probably not to be suspected among graves\textsuperscript{61}.

If the band had crossed the track, using the track as a road would have been impossible, indirectly, therefore the lilies date the road and simultaneously, the band restricts the use of the cemetery because it prevents one from walking freely among the graves. This conclusion would seem to hold true at both the cemeteries and no graves were found to be contemporary with, let alone younger than the band.
Fig. 17A & B. Precise measurements and trail excavations have shown that the road through the southern cemetery at Grøntoft (A) is indeed prehistoric although it also shows on historical maps. The southern cemetery therefore is divided into two parts and today, no part of the cemetery is unknown. The northern cemetery (B) is organised the same way as the western part of the southern one, i.e. around an older monument—in these cases a Stone or Bronze Age burial mound. Owing to this central position of a larger monument surrounded by smaller graves, the division of the eastern part of the southern cemetery in a northern and southern part comes to the fore, inasmuch as here too the graves are situated around two more significant monuments, one in each sector. The bands of Caesar’s Lilies are secondary to the graves. Based on FOF; Rindel (1997) and Rindel & Jørgensen (1998).
All in all, the cemeteries make up four balanced sections each comprising some 20 graves. The northern cemetery balances the southern one. Within the southern cemetery, the western and eastern parts balance each other and within the eastern part there is a division between a north and a south group. As a model, the pattern looks like Fig. 18.

![Fig. 18. The model distribution of cemeteries in the Pol and Grøntoft areas. The two cemeteries reflect the two settlements and the division of the southern cemetery reflects the three parts which make up the southern settlement. Eventually the southern settlements are united in a small village behind a communal palisade. Based on Rindel (1997).](image)

If we compare the graves to the distribution of houses at Grøntoft, the latter also seem to be grouped, and this grouping shows already on a general map of all the houses found during the excavations, Fig. 19A. This clustering tendency is enhanced if we sort the distribution the way Rindel has summarised his study of the development of the settlement. He has done so in a number of maps that dates some, but not all of the houses. However, judging from the clarity of the patterns, he has found it fair to say that in addition to the fenced village, we can isolate the distribution of the settlement in three time sections, one in the beginning, one in the middle and one in the end of the first part of the settlement period. The fenced village represents the second one. Rindel’s sections are shown as blue, red and green houses on Fig. 19B–E.
Fig. 19A. Even if we look at a chronologically unsorted settlements map of the Pol-Grontoft area, we see a tendency for the southern part to be divided into three groups, while the Pol settlement constitutes the fourth, northern group. Based on Rindel (1997).

Fig. 19 B. When dates are added to the houses in the southern groups, the impression of a grouped settlement is growing. At the same time, there is a concentration of the settlements. The different groups do not constitute contemporary houses just houses with a relatively short lifetime somewhere within an early, a middle or a late settlements period. Based on Rindel (1997).
Fig. 19 C. The early Pol-Grøntoft phase.
Fig. 19 D. The middle Pol-Gronoioft phase.
This pattern can be described in relation to a number of divisions between the settlement groups, Fig. 20. The first is the topographical division between the Pøl and the Grøntoft settlements that may also be described as the division between the northern and the southern settlement. If we map these settlements on a historical map with a better representation of the hydrography of the area, before mechanized agriculture, it becomes obvious that the settlements are situated on a ridge between two wetland areas. On this ridge, the position of both settlement groups is just below two of the dominant hills marked 275 and 266 respectively on the map. Turning to the southern part of the settlement in its initial blue phase, we can speak of three house groups stretching east-west, north of Hill 266. The westernmost of these groups is situated on a considerably lower level than the two other ones and that allows us to point out yet another topographical division among the southern settlements. Looking at the green and the red houses reveals the southern part of the settlement as moving westwards and being compressed over time, but there is nevertheless a tendency
for the farms to group themselves in three groups. Naturally, this conclusion rests on two phenomena: (1) the way the divided pattern was introduced in the first place, i.e., in the initial settlement phase, (2) the general tendency over time for houses to form clusters of contemporary households.

![Fig. 20](image)

"Fig. 20. The dated houses in the Pol-Gronoft area projected upon a historical map, in order better to understand the relation between settlement and topography. Based on Rindel (1997)."

In terms of balance, this means that similar to the graves represented by the heads of each of the four groups, we have a balance between four primary settlement units and their development. If we number and delimit these groups of graves and houses we get similar patterns: Groups number three and four balance each other, but they also form a pair balancing group number two. Together, groups two, three and four make up the southern settlement which balances the northern group, i.e. group number one.

Seen as a model, the map of Grøntoft looks like Fig. 21, and we can summarize the situation in the following way: a balanced human settlement landscape consisting of houses, house remains and graves has been fitted in between the top and the bottom of the topographical landscape—between hilltop and wetland—on the western slope of the hill island.
Fig. 21. The model distribution of settlements and graves in the Pøl-Grøntoft area emphasizing the way the basic elements in the human landscape balance each other.

When Grøntoft was settled in PRIA there was a need to inaugurate a new division of the landscape by means of graves. These graves signified the division of the land and the land use that was about to commence, but the graves also anchored the division of the land in times past, because the graves were attached to SA and BA mounds. Since the hill island was also used in the LBA, the settlement probably started out as an even more floating or fluctuating settlement system, and we may venture to say that the cemeteries inaugurated a new land division and use based on spatially defined small groups of people rooted in the past.

At Grøntoft, burials and monuments inaugurate or they are taken to inaugurate an understanding of the landscape as a human geography. This landscape is divided into two parts, of which the southern one is divided into three. The point in making this division manifest is the fact that to begin with, it is not easy to detect this balanced structure when walking the settled landscape among houses and fields. Over a period of time, the ideal division is being reinforced as living history by new graves in all four cemeteries; eventually, the cemeteries are closed and the monumental order is made up by the graves of the area. When this happens, there is no need to preserve burial remains, let alone to erect any grave monuments.

During this period, the northern settlement is topographically well defined and stable and from the beginning, it contained or was made up by the largest farm of the area, an example of one of the relatively few large PRIA farms. The southern settlement was more spread out. To begin with, and in terms of balance, this may be looked upon as an attractive situation (concentrated graves vs. spread out houses), but historically speaking, it seems to have been more important within the Grøntoft society eventually to concentrate the farm buildings in a village or fenced settlement. In the end, therefore, the cemeteries signified an old and stable heritage, the original mounds surrounded by the younger graves, while the settlement pointed out the present, the fenced settlement, as a focus.
Unification and, generally speaking, somewhat larger households accompany this development in which graves and monuments become a closed history in line with those SA and BA mounds in the eastern part of the hill island that never attracted Iron Age graves. Instead, the settlement carries the ideological weight of contemporary and future communities.

Defence, which is hardly a measure of security in relation to the nearest neighbours at Grønbjerg and Ørnhøj, if indeed these settlement did still exist, is introduced as an even greater stress on the present and an investment in a future. The shrewd trick to let the cunning lily-device defending the present, run through monuments signifying the past stands out as a stratagem based on that kind of veneration for the past that the attackers would think that ‘everybody’, including the defenders, comprised. Indirectly therefore the bands of Caesar’s lilies show us the significance in the PRIA of the historic.

Towards the end of the 1st century BCE the Grøntoft area would seem to have been drawn into a larger complex of events in which it cannot survive. Probably the settlement, although rich enough to invest in impressive defence works, was too small to defend itself against the levies touring the country in the end of the PRIA. Earlier on, Grøntoft prospered in its isolation at the middle of its hill island, but in a period of dynamic unrest, isolation is difficult to defend, especially if one’s area is the ideal resource area for those, and they are the vast majority, who settle along the perimeter of the hill island in the beginning of the RIA. Grøntoft is drawn into a larger landscape perspective and a larger course of events which shifts the balance of the settlement pattern. This shift eradicates Grønbjerg, Grøntoft and Ørnhøj, but it also leads to an economic boom and the eventual establishment of a new RIA settlement west of Grøntoft, close to, but still west of the abandoned Grønbjerg settlement.

In the second half of the PRIA, the human geography is being rearranged to accommodate a more nucleated village structure and more communal grassland, woodland and resource areas. The Grøntofter would in all probability have hailed this development, which they could be said to have taken part in themselves, had it not happened to wipe them out.

**Vendehøj 1st to 2nd C.** The changes in the Vendehøj settlements are discussed in chapter III; in the present chapter therefore graves will be fitted into the general development, Fig. 22A&B. At Vendehøj, similar to several other settlements, there are some solitary graves that we cannot relate to the settlement in any precise way, despite their being contemporary with the houses. Suffice it to say that they were never intended to be monumental. It is also possible that at the village cemetery there was a small group of early graves belonging to the very beginning of ERIA (graves øæ to år), but only one of these could be dated to Per. B1a, i.e. 0–40 CE. Given the fact that several graves were destroyed on the hill, the only significant pattern left is the small grave group established in periods B1b and B2, i.e. 40–150/160 CE. These graves in themselves make up a
small cemetery probably damaged by gravel prospecting in its southern part, but with its central group of graves still intact. In their discussion, Eistrud and Jensen make it clear that these graves should be seen in connection with settlement phase 4 and the introduction of the large and dominant farm, XL. They also observe that the more prominent graves in this central part were ordered in pairs, as if they contained four couples: øn+øm (B1b+B2); db+dc (B1b+B2); b+fo (B2+B2), pu+py (B2+B2). There is an additional, solitary, but well-furnished female grave in the southern part, vs, belonging to period B2.

One of these graves, b, was a prominent weapon grave excavated in the 1960s, before most of the other graves and all the settlement remains. This grave soon got a reputation in the archaeological literature as a chieftain’s grave from the ERIA64. Today, it can still be said to be a well-furnished grave, but the relation to the settlement and its families have naturally become more prominent. Eistrud and Jensen take up the family theme and following Lars Jørgensen’s methodology, which points out that a family shows its status and wealth through one grave only, they see the four couples, which include one chieftain, as a manifestation of the leading family occupying farms XL and XLVII65. To a certain degree, this interpretation is correct, but it ought to be refined a little.

First of all, the analysis of the development of the farms makes it likely that although we could see the dominant farms as belonging to a family, this family had two lines. The change between Phase 4:1 and 4:2 indicated that although Farm XL was laid out as indeed a large farm, it had obligations towards the other large farm, XLVII, which in its turn showed its status succeeding the original large farm XXI.

Turning to the four couples in the cemetery, we must first of all observe the chronological difference between the pairs, meaning that: øn+øm and db+dc, owing to the slightly earlier date in each pair respectively of øn and db, have been anticipated somewhat earlier than the other two couples, i.e. b+fo and pu+py. The earlier pairs, graves øn+øm and db+dc, are both rather modest couples. They are moreover contemporary, which means that they belong to the same generation and that they lived during B1b, before they died in the middle of the 1st c. CE. The two pairs b+fo and pu+py obviously represent a new generation of almost contemporary pairs of graves, Fig. 22A&B.

There is a complete analogy between settlement and graves inasmuch as they both show that over two or three generations, a family with two heirs establishes itself as the dominant power of the settlement. In terms of roofed farm area, the two heirs eventually come out relatively on par, but in symbolic and ideological cemetery terms they come out markedly different. It is still fair to suggest that the monument b+fo was indeed conceptualised by the family branch that lived on the farm with the befitting name ‘XL’—a branch that wished to exhibit itself as the leading one.

First of all, the caretakers at Vendshej employed these matched graves to create a representation in the cemetery of the settlement, pointing out the two interrelated dominant farms. Second, when it became possible to form two
large farms in the village, XL and XLVII respectively, at the expense of a number of other farms, i.e., to say, when it became possible to create two large farms without changing the roofed area of the village, then this exploitation called for a manifestation in the form of the outstanding burials and monuments $b+f_0$. Thirdly, when this was brought about, and despite the fact that the village changed structure in Phase 4:2, there was no need for any new graves. This means that inauguration as well as commemoration was a cardinal objective when investing in grave and monument, but a secondary, and as it turned out diminishing, change was not.

Consequently, only a really positive major change or achievement—in this case radical socio-economic stratification—should be explicitly linked, by means of a visible grave, to a person or in this case two couples. What it means to have brought about change, or succeed in achieving something, varies with one’s social status and possibilities, but when it comes to the dominant farmers, taking over a village and rearranging it is not doubt qualifying. At Vendehøj, these ideological expressions are interesting because they stress the importance of both man and woman in a relationship, which indicates the virtue of farm, reproduction and genealogy. However, they also stress social roles outside the local community in this case by means of weapons and imported artefacts, which were hardly much needed in the daily life at Vendehøj. The Vendehøj context does not allow us to go much further when it comes to understanding social roles, but as attempts to create historical monuments, the graves merit comparison.
Fig. 22A. A map of the Vendehøj cemetery.
The basic Vendehøj notion of the inauguration and commemoration of a historical change have a parallel in the way funerary memorials were used by the Romans when in 13 BCE they founded Mainz as a military and civil settlement. In this situation, when but a few died compared to later periods after the settlements had grown, there is nevertheless a great need for funerary memorials. They have been collected and studied by Valerie Hope. Not surprisingly, this
material is rich in expressions of identity, but when it comes to a comparison with Vendehøj it is only the relative dates and the frequencies of the monuments that meet the eye. By focusing on the inscribed monuments, the memorial aspect is emphasised and that allows us to draw some conclusions concerning the need for commemoration in the new settlement. If we look into all the 20 different periods used to date the Mainz monuments, such as 13 BCE – 43 CE or ‘Flavian’, i.e. 69 CE – 96 CE or ‘First part of the 1st century CE’ etc., and suggest that by and large, the monuments tend to be evenly distributed within each of these periods, we can put together a series of year frequencies. This will show us the relative and the general pattern of the need to erect a funerary monument, within reasonably broad periods in the first centuries of the history of Mainz. The result of these computations is summarised in Fig. 23. Looking at this diagram it becomes possible to say that in the first generations after it has become obvious that Mainz is a success, the need for memorials is large, but after three or four generations, the call for funerary memorials drops significantly. In effect, other non-funerary memorials grow in importance in relative as well as absolute numbers. Inasmuch as the Romans nourished the idea of graves inaugurating a new settlement by means of monuments with a funerary as well as a memorial touch, their attitudes may also have served as a paragon for more modest barbarian, Germanian or South Scandinavian, pillars of society wishing to inaugurate and commemorate themselves or their parents in graves and monuments. Mainz can be dismissed as a farfetched paragon for South Scandinavian barbarians, but nevertheless, the very Silius, who probably presented the chieftain at Hoby with his Augustan drinking cups, ruled Germania Superior from Mainz and led his army into Germania together with Germanicus, and also on his own.

In their discussion of the social structure in Eastern Jutland, Hedeager and Kristiansen have noted Vendehøj grave b as an important local definition of power in a scene that link in with a wider power structure connected to graves such as Bendstrup Mark, a number of other east Jutish graves as well as Hoby on Lolland. These are graves with status objects in the form of imported goods and/or weapons which link them to each other as well as to 1st century Roman-Germanian gift giving, in which Roman drinking cups and sets served Germani as a model. It makes sense that if drinking habits can be shaped by acculturation, grave monuments and the purpose of grave monuments may also benefit from the same kind of cultural encounter. Cases in points are the contemporary round grave buildings, imitations of Roman monuments, erected in Southern Jutland. The point here is not to defend a case of direct loans from Roman culture, but to argue for an intellectual preparedness that allowed leading Germani to alter and gear traditional manifestations in order to stress their ancestors.
VORBASSE 3RD–4TH C. Vorbasse has been published in overview articles which give us a long-term perspective and indeed overview, but few precise links between graves and settlement. Nevertheless, it is characteristic that there is an enormous deficit in graves inasmuch as no truly communal cemetery belonging to any of the Vorbasse settlements is known. Be this as it may, the two existing cemeteries are worth discussing and to begin with, we may point to an enhanced Vendehøj situation.

What happens in Vorbasse in the 3rd and 4th century can be compared to Vendehøj in Phases 3 and 4 i.e. 1st to 2nd century CE. At Vendehøj, an irregular village with one slightly larger farm is laid out in the 1st century. The same happens at Vorbasse in the 3rd century, albeit on a more impressive scale because the new type of longhouse with barns, byre and dwelling quarters has been introduced in the beginning of the 3rd century together, generally speaking, with more roofed space on larger farms. More people live on the farms and the byres as well as the dairy production are so large that there is a point in putting a barn next to the byre. At Vorbasse, the slightly larger farm is situated at the northern end of the village.

Although for practical reasons, settlements are divided into phases, this new village is not a stable phase; on the contrary, it is moving to the west, because its farms are moving, and eventually restructuring itself in a more strict fashion. Owing to this process, it becomes obvious that the slightly larger farm in the
northern end of the village is becoming the clearly largest farm, a stable unit eventually situated at the eastern edge of the village. The 4th century end product looks like Fig. 24A, but we must imagine this pattern to be the result of a continuous change between the map section in Fig. 24A and the one in Fig. 24B. The position of this large farm is equal to that of the large farm at Vendehøj Phase 4. Everything is diminutive at Vendehøj compared to Vorbasse, but things are very much in proportion. At Vorbasse however, there is only one large farm and only two prominent male graves at the cemetery. They are weapon graves and the one which is probably the younger of them, Vorbasse 13, is very much more lavish than the other, although that is also a well-furnished grave. It is reasonable to conclude that these two male graves inaugurate the leading family and its achievement to create a large dominant farm in the village or indeed the village itself. The lack of graves compared to Vendehøj is a result of the lack of settlement history in the Vorbasse community.

At Vorbasse, and contrary to Vendehøj, there is only one family and one farm represented by two men, but there are four well-furnished female graves. This is nearly as many as at Vendehøj, but the pattern which indicates married couples does not exist at Vorbasse. Here the men occupy the centre of the cemetery surrounded by the women. Still there is of course nothing to say that the men were not married to the women, one or more at a time.

In a similar contrast to Vendehøj, there are no graves missing at Vorbasse and thus only 16 graves in the cemetery of the Vorbasse village colony. At Vendehøj there were at least twice as many graves and together with the consumption of wives and/or mistresses or female relatives, which is more marked at Vorbasse than at Vendehøj, this indicates that the seclusion of the leading family and its household, which in economic terms must have been much larger than its equivalents at Vendehøj, has developed towards a even more stratified local society. In part, this development can be explained by the introduction of the new and on average larger farms, and in addition it seems plausible that the dominating farm owner at Vorbasse had more to gain from his village. One of the things the dominant farm owner at Vorbasse could invest in was a small hall building.
Fig. 24A. Map the first 3rd–4th century settlement at Vorbasse with the cemetery to the east. Based on Hvass (1988:Fig. 20).
Fig. 24B. A map of 4th century Vorbasse with the row of farms and the dominant large farm still in its original position now to the east of the other farms. The already finished cemetery is situated west of the dominant farm. Based on Hvass (1988:Fig. 21).

In principle, the use of graves at Vorbasse is the same as at Vendehøj, but at Vorbasse it becomes much easier to see that those who intended to inaugurate the family and commemorate the achievement, and finish the cemetery within two or three generations, needed the graves and the burial ground for just that. It was not a matter of making some lavish graves to inaugurate the family. Instead, the cemetery itself was meant to commemorate the achievements of the family. For that reason, the persons in the graves may well be immature boys
similar to the ones in Brøndsgær, Old Uppsala or Högom with an inherited position, rather than the spurs of the experienced warlord\textsuperscript{71}. In the Vorbasse case, the cemetery is a model project conceived beforehand to fulfil certain needs. This means that when the first grave is installed the members of the leading family had better be sure that they would succeed in carrying out their intentions, which as it happen cannot come as a surprise to observant burial guests. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE, there are in other words people whom we could expect to gather around themselves a number of families and folks in order to colonise a piece of land and organise it as a village headed by their family and themselves. In all probability, the reason why they chose to commemorate their achievement with a cemetery falls back on the earlier traditions as we saw them at Grøntoft: to let the history and the land right of a settlement become manifest by means of monumental (and exclusive) cemeteries. The emphasis on a few individualised founders and the short-lived burial vogue echo Roman ways and help us explain why there are so few graves in connection with settlements. Next to a number of RIA settlements, only certain types of monuments are needed, i.e. those signifying the leading founding family and whoever this family wants to commemorate. The large communal cemetery does not fit the idea of these stratified settlements.

Vorbasse merits a further comment, because there are in fact three village cemeteries in the area: the one already discussed, the one attached to the ERIA settlements and the one belonging to the village of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium CE. It would seem therefore that the grave monuments connected with two RIA villages equal those of today’s church standing amidst the dead as the symbol of the origin of society. Cemetery and churchyard fulfil the same symbolic function; the younger phenomenon, needless to say, adds a new ideological dimension to the original concept of an anchor-hold.

\textbf{VORBASSE. 1\textsuperscript{st} C.} The first cemetery at Vorbasse belongs to the ERIA and the 1\textsuperscript{st} century settlement, of which only two farms have been found within the excavation area. This cemetery is made up by 18 urn burials and they hardly belong to these two farms only, since the cemetery is divided into three groups on a row and, further, because 600 metres to the west there is an unexcavated but contemporary settlement, Fig. 25\textsuperscript{72}. Similar to what is more apparent in the case of Hjemsted discussed below, these small sub-cemeteries probably represent three settlements in the Vorbasse area and it can further be argued that they echo the situation at Grøntoft. However, there is also one isolated urn burial between the two excavated farms and the three grave groups.

Owing to the modern road that passes through the third group, we may expect there to have been more graves in this group, perhaps making the total c. 25 graves. The interesting aspect of the 18 known graves is the fact that they are all female, anthropologically as well as archaeologically speaking, while the solitary urn burial is male. It is likely that each of the three groups represent a fam-
ily or a settlement, and together a community, but they do it in a very specific gender fashion, which must certainly be the result of a conscious choice, widely different from the one that guided the farmers of the 3rd century. For this reason, the solitary male burial is equally significant. The gender expression is linked to the whole settlement area and its families, i.e., to a larger group of people whom we saw in a more competitive context e.g. at 1st–2nd c. Vendehøj and at 3rd–4th c. Vorbasse. This is indeed a rather odd pattern, which is hard to interpret in depths, but none the less we may venture to say that the groups represent the farms of the area, as well as some sort of common origin linked to women or some kind of womanhood and perhaps a man. At Vorbasse, the hiatus between the ERIA and the LRIA is significant, because the gap makes the general change between the two societies apparent in a settlement as well as in a grave and cemetery context.

Fig. 25. A map of the first century CE settlement at Vorbasse. The settlement consists of spread out farms, perhaps in a manner similar to the Hjemsted settlement, and a separate cemetery that would seem to mirror the different farm sites. Based on Hvass (1988).
HJEMSTED. Although the reconstruction of the settlement patterns and the relation to the cemeteries have been done and interpreted in slightly different and relatively general ways, stressing a core development rather than finer points, we may still say that from the beginning of the RIA and up until the middle of the 5th century, a number of farm-owning families who lived in a greater Hjemsted area have chosen to bury some of their members at different places on the hillock called Hjemsted Banke. This hill seems to have been communal grounds, shared by several farms and families who organised their burials in groups or as solitary graves, most often situated in the vicinity of an older and already abandoned group of graves or in rare cases as new solitary graves, Fig. 26A&B. 73 Owing to the settlement pattern and the changes it underwent, several solitary graves have been within eyesight of the settlement areas belonging to the LRIA and EMP. This may well have been intended, and thus the result of a wish to link in with both settlement and former burial grounds, but it may of course also be the result of a wish to point out a real or alleged kinship with former inhabitants. Be this as it may, the overall pattern is one of small cemeteries and isolated graves. If the Vorbasse area had not been so completely transformed, it stands to reason that we could have expected its ERIA cemetery structure to develop along the same lines as Hjemsted.

When it comes to the ERIA, before the hill was settled, we cannot study the settlements in relation to the graves, but we know that the settlements are situated at some distance from the cemeteries. Per Ethelberg suggests that there is a settlement 600 metres to the west of the cemetery area. There are seven small grave groups or family cemeteries belonging to the ERIA and seven belonging to the LRIA. Although there is an additive element in the groups, and often in the ERIA a clear beginning in the form of an inhumation grave, we cannot speak of a constant burial rate. After a couple of hundred years, when the family cemeteries of the 3rd to the 5th century are created, we can also judge the number of graves in relation to the number of farms at Hjemsted, and it becomes obvious that not all members of a family have been buried. In Hjemsted, this is all the more striking because one of the social situations made manifest in the graves is the connection between a grown-up and a child. Children, inasmuch as they can be located at all, are in other words frequent. When a settlement was first being located to the Hjemsted hill in the beginning of the 3rd century CE, the grave frequency was high in relation to the number of farms, because in all probability Ethelberg is correct in suggesting that there were not more than two farms on the hill in those days. This, however, does not mean that every dead was buried, it just means that in those days when the settlement on the hill started to grow, graves were essential to several settlements situated both outside and within the excavated area. This indicates that in a wider settlement area, people choose to bury only some of their dead on the Hjemsted Hill.
Fig. 26 A & B. (A) A map of the ERIA graves at Hjemsted Banke, i.e. Hjemsted Hill. There are no houses contemporary with the graves. As Ethelberg points out, the grave groups may be related to different farms and similarly the larger groups, enclosed in green frames, may represent villages or settlements. (B) A map of the situation during the LRIA and MP when the farms have moved to the hill and settled it with a small, slightly changing village and the occasional solitary farm. Here, there are two grave situations represented by the blue areas. (1) Small groups of inhumation burials in a band to the north of the main settlement representing families and farms. (2) Solitary graves attached to the ERIA cemeteries or grave areas, i.e. the green areas. Based on Ethelberg (2003).

Irrespective of the way we reconstruct the LRIA and EMP settlement, it is apparent that although there are smaller and larger farms, no farm has a dominating position or character similar to that of the large farm e.g. at Vorbasse. It is typical, therefore, that in the Hjemsted area the new settlement introduced in the
LRIA does not represent a headed group of settlers colonising a hill. Instead, what happens at Hjemsted is a more continuous rearrangement of a number of settlements. Judging from the graves, these settlements are organised on a family basis and although we can eventually see a nucleated settlement on the hill, there are also farms, large and small ones, situated outside this nucleus. Ethelberg thinks that they are satellites, but that must be understood more as a description in terms of coordinates rather than one of, socially speaking, satellite status. These farms look like normal self-subsiding ones and cannot be compared to the solitary farms in Høje Taastrup on Zealand e.g. in relation to Brøndsgården: Ishøj Parish SNB 30, or on Öland: Rosendal in Böda Parish, or at Kyrsta: Vaxmyra, Ärentuna Parish, where size and position would seem not only to indicate a one-sided economic situation depending upon herding, iron production, or woodland products, but also an inferior and temporary status and occupation.

The use of graves on Hjemsted Hill is in other words the result of an ERIA division of the area into a number of farm owning families. This is not to say that the families were completely constant, but by and large we may expect the area to support and to be divided into seven parts. The settlements at Hjemsted have a tendency to nucleate themselves over time and there is also a small tendency for the cemeteries to grow into a continuous field of graves. This weak and late tendency could in principle have had an earlier and more purposeful start that would in the extreme case have meant that we were presented with a seemingly homogenous cemetery with graves dating from ERIA to EMP. At Hjemsted, such a general development was not the case. And therefore, instead of thinking of the cemetery as consisting of 100 odd graves evenly distributed in a field, we should in fact understand it as a number of grave groups belonging to a settlement area containing some seven families. These families buried some of their dead on the hill, because at different points in time they felt the need to make their kin manifest in the grave pattern. At Hjemsted therefore, the need to demonstrate a hierarchic social structure in graves and farms—in cemetery as well as settlement—was not as cardinal as in Vendehøj and Vorbasse. On the contrary, Hjemsted mirrors deep-tradition as well as social innovation.

**HØJE TAASTRUP.** During the last 25 years, extensive excavations have been carried out in the township of Høje Taastrup some 20 kilometres west of Copenhagen. Based on a keen local antiquarian interest in settlement remains and guided by intensive surveys, hundreds of thousands of square metres in all parts of the local landscape have been cleared of their topsoil and minutely excavated. Circa 1500 prehistoric houses, several in more than one phase, and thus the remains of more than 2000 individual rural buildings, have been recovered—compared to less than 200 graves. This general prehistoric pattern: too few graves in relation to the number of houses and their inhabitants is characteristic also of RIA and EMP, but during these periods graves and cemeteries
are not just few, they are also now and then examples of odd contexts. Four sites are worth mentioning, Fig. 27. (1) The solitary grave at Stenrøldsknøs, (2) the family cemetery at nearby Brøndsager consisting of three graves only, (3) the cemetery at Torstorp Vesterby where during a relatively short period in the 3rd century a young woman was buried with seven children. The skeletons were not preserved, but the length of the grave pits fitted only children below the age of ten. (4) And lastly, the cemetery at Engbjerg with 25 graves organised in four small groups, 5, 6, 7 and 7 graves respectively, probably representing the inhabitants on four farms.

Stenrøldsknøs and Brøndsager belong to one and the same settlement pattern, inasmuch as the former is a monument marking out the western border of a LRIA settlements and the latter a small cemetery related to the dominant farm of
the settlement area in question, Fig. 28A&B. Here the other farms are situated at an altitude of c. 25 metres above sea level on a small elevation just east of the dominant one. This pattern with farms a little below the hilltops is typical when topography suggests it. The four settlements at Brøndsager, which comprised c. 10 farms at the time when the graves were created, would seem to form a small community if not a spread out village of the kind we know from Öland. There may have been more farms linked to this community, perhaps in a more solitary position similar to the one at Ishøj sogn, SNB 30, which seems to have fulfilled a purpose in connection with iron production. It is not farfetched to compare Brøndsager, settlement and farms, to Vendehøj and Vorbasse and see the graves as a monument inaugurating the large farm and its family.

**Fig. 28A.** A map of the settlements on the two hills at Brøndsager. Here the LRIA shift in the settlement structure is accompanied by the creation of a new large farm on what used to be a secondary site occupied by the occasional barn. The erection of the new farm corresponded to the eviction of the small village, the original Brøndsager settlement on the southern more dominant hill. When this twin farm or small hamlet was abandoned, the hill was claimed for the three graves that inaugurated the shift in settlement structure. Based on Fonnesbech-Sandberg (2000B).
Brøndsager is an example of a remodelling of the human landscape in terms of economy as well as ideology and in the series of examples of how to take over a settlement, it fits in between Vendehøj and Vorbasse. At Vendehøj, transformation came from within the village, at Brøndsager eviction was part of a more radical change and at Vorbasse we could argue for the colonisation of a currently unoccupied land. Since transformation, eviction and colonisation includes a measure of force, there would seem to be a considerable measure of power and thus also of right and oppression involved in such an economically stratifying takeover. Hjemsted, Vendehøj, Brøndsager and Vorbasse make up a series reflecting the general social change. Hjemsted represents the lesser and Vorbasse the greater remodelling of society. The graves at Stenrøldsknøs and Brøndsager stand out as parts of the ideological justification of the development not least while they fall back upon the traditional use of graves to signify border and settlement in relation to a community—the link to community being less communal in LRIA Brøndsager than in PRIA Grøntoft. There is a simple quanti-
tative way to illustrated this development of the use of graves: it took c. 80 graves to form the link at Grøntoft, it took the odd 30 graves to do it at Vendehøj, at Vorbasse 16 graves was enough and at Brøndsgaard/ Stenrøldsknøs it sufficed to bury 4 persons. Even if some graves were destroyed when they dug the marl pit at Brøndsgaard, and even if gravel prospecting has taken its toll at Vendehøj, the trend is still a strong one.

In the cases of Torstorp Vesterby and Engbjerg, the link to contemporary settlements is not equally straightforward. However, Engbjerg, Fig. 29, is a typical mirror of a farm or family based society and thus comparable to the small cemeteries at Hjemsted. It also has a link to inauguration cemeteries inasmuch as it covers just two or three generations, and some of the graves are decked out so richly that they represent the wealth of a better farm. Furthermore, it seems as though the layout of the cemetery reflects the position of the farms in relation to each other and the hilltop. Similar to settlements, the graves are situated below the summit of the hilltop called Engbjerg. The difference in altitude is by no means dramatic, but the absolute summit is nevertheless avoided. More characteristically perhaps, the Engbjerg cemetery adheres to several rules that would seem to reflect local tradition. Women are buried as if they were resting on their left side looking east, men on their back, in a supine position facing those who look straight down into the grave. Such a gender aspect on burial position is not unknown, but at Engbjerg this rule is without exception. In terms of chronology, the burial rules at Engbjerg go against the overall tendency of change from ERIA to LRIA. In a similarly local fashion, one person in each grave group is buried with one or more glass shards in his or her mouth. Such cases can be found in other places too, supposedly when an obolus for Charon’s ferry is not to be had, but at Engbjerg it is a pattern rather than something that can happen to be the case and we must thus ask ourselves whether the shards are substitutes for coins or indeed a notion in their own right. At Engbjerg the main burial theme is farm representation, but there are probably a number of additional themes running parallel with main one.

Torstorp Vesterby, Fig. 30, on the other hand, is a thematic cemetery illustrating a Mother and Child notion. It may be that the cemetery is related to a LRIA farm situated some 60 metres north of the cemetery, but this farm might also be slightly older. Such a possible or likely contemporaneity is not in itself sufficient to conclude that cemetery and farm reflect each other, because the representation of a farm in a cemetery is usually a representation of the farm-owning family and its kin or followers in two or three (successful) generations. The oddities of the Torstorp Vesterby cemetery do not fit that type. If the connection between woman and farm is nevertheless there, we are obviously presented with something more than a farm connection and thus again with something quite different from the usual success story.
Fig. 29. A map of the LRIA Engbjerg cemetery. The graves are grouped and there is also a tendency for them to be aligned. Each group contains a grave representing the peculiar fashion of giving the dead a glass shed as a kind of obolus. The age distribution seems to fit the ages in which prehistoric man actually died: half the population died before the age of 20, a quarter between 20 and 40 and the last quarter at 40+. Very few however die in their 30s. The dead therefore would seem to mirror farms on which grandparents, parents and children were living. Based on Boye (2002A)
Whether the woman, who is equipped with the riches of the well-to-do, is also the biological mother of the children, or the mother of one or some of them and a mother figure for the others, is also difficult to say. However, if we allow for a period of breast feeding, thus probably postponing the next pregnancy for c. one year, except for the child in the grave so small that it was probably a newborn, we can conclude that it is hardly possible for the c. 25 year old woman to be the mother of the seven. Only in the very unlikely case that she gave birth for the first time when she was c. 15 can we defend this case. Moreover, it is extraordinary to give birth to seven children that all died before the age of ten. We would have expected at least one or two of her children to have survived their mother and grown up. We should in other words ask ourselves whether 8 or 9 pregnancies before the age of 25 are indeed likely.

Understanding the Torstorp Vesterby cemetery is a matter of being able to answer the question: who was the first to die? If we believe in the idea that it is an unfortunate mother and her unfortunate children who are buried at the cemetery, they must have died in the same tragedy. Weird things are possible, but it is farfetched to imagine such a harsh or brutal fate on the basis of a pattern that could equally well be produced the other way round, i.e. by burying the children next to a mother after she had died and been buried, perhaps together with her newborn child. At least such an interpretation would seem a more straightforward and a less traumatic way of creating a memorial site of more general value.

To make the children primary and the mother secondary is to go a long way in establishing a raison d’être for the burial scene. Still, the epitaphic notion of
the elderly man and his two wives, one died young, depicted together with their children, of whom nine out of ten died as infants, has a place in everybody’s mind who have visited a protestant church with baroque memorials depicting series of prematurely dead children. However, also that kind of epitaph is the outcome of a life, a picture made possible in the event, because it was believed that all God’s children were remembered, on Earth as well as in Heaven. Despite this belief, such memorials are still made in the event, and truth but epitaphic. So too at Torstorp Vesterby, where it is reasonable to consider the young woman to be the central and primary person, accompanied in death by a number of children, some perhaps her own, most of whom died later than she did.

That a solitary female grave could in itself reflect the inauguration of a settlement or farm seems to be evident in the case of Järrestad in Scania. Here the foundation of the LRIA and MP farm at Hestebier was contemporary with the construction of a richly equipped solitary female grave in direct contact with a farm that continued to respect the grave for hundred of years. The graves from Torstorp and Hestebier are similarly equipped and contemporary – although the woman at Hestebier was twice as old as the one in Torstorp. Such an interpretation, making the burial of the woman the primary event, is supported by the above mentioned less complex phenomenon known from the Mälar Valley and Gotland showing us that some graves attracted child burials. In the case of Lundbacken, the grave belonged to a man, thus giving child death a general genderless ring.

If we look at the pattern of the Torstorp Vesterby cemetery, it would seem that the children’s graves fall in three groups while there is a tendency for their orientations to converge behind the buried woman—a geometry that amounts to saying that they tend to form an auditory in front of her. If we believe in this pattern, we may even suggest that the central child burial in front of the young woman’s grave, the middle child so to speak, belonged to her. Be this as it may, since it is difficult to know, it is still safe to say that the cemetery is an installation of Motherhood, more precisely a way of contextualizing the harsh conditions for bringing up children to the age of 10, when they can begin their introduction to the social spheres outside the family. At least we can suspect this to be the case in the Høje Taastrup area, because there is an 8 year old girl at Engbjerg buried in a way that would usually match a more grown-up woman. At Torstorp Vesterby we get a glimpse of an installation signifying two mixed social roles: that of a mother and perhaps that of a founder of a prestigious farm.

The reason we can at all see the themes in the Høje Taastrup cemeteries must be sought in the fact that graves are uncommon, that cemeteries are small, that they are restricted in their scope or period of use and moreover coloured by or meant to expose the hierarchical structure of society. Although some of the Høje Taastrup cemeteries are rich in grave goods, that fact does not mean that there are no modest examples of small thematic cemeteries. It just means that
nice artefacts and nice graves are still more interesting or ‘right’ than transient and anonymous contexts.

The examples from Høje Taastrup highlighted several aspects, but two would seem to be of greater interest—the relation to hills and the relation to themes. These relations can be found also in other parts of Zealand on an even grander scale, e.g. in the settlement structure at Boeslunde, Fig. 92, and the thematic cemetery at Skovgårde. Respecting hilltops is probably a very general phenomenon during most of the EIA, known also from Jutland, e.g. Grøntoft and Sejlflod, or Fyn e.g. Gudme. Only in the long run and actually not until a major shift in ideology, i.e. the loss of pagan faith, will the settlements conquer the hill tops. Contrary to Central Jutland, in which the expected design is a distribution of farms and their cemeteries in rows stretching out in a flat landscape, the hilly Zealand landscape has created some hill-surrounding patterns. These patterns put the fragmented character of the settlement pattern, e.g. at Brøndsager, into its right perspective, which means that primary RIA settlements on Zealand are still situated the PRIA way below the hills above the wetland. And farms are still separately fenced. At Engbjerg, this relation to the hills seems to be mirrored also by the graves and their relation to the local settlements. In a larger perspective, this seems to be a settlement-mirroring pattern that link in with a RIA idea of reflecting settlement, rather than the PRIA border situation of the cemeteries. At Stenrøldsknøs, this latter task was taken care of by a solitary grave. In the Skovgårde cemetery, secondary themes as well as settlement reflection comes to the fore in a way that enhances the examples from Høje Taastrup.

Skovgårde. The 3rd century CE grave from Udby was found 1943 almost on the eastern top of Skrålbanken, a twin-topped hill 500 metres east of today’s village. The grave was damaged when a farmer came across it while ploughing his fields and he reported his find to The National Museum in Copenhagen. Later that year, a rescue excavation secured the remains of a richly furnished grave, in all probability a man buried in supine position. This grave, dated to c. 250 CE, was not alone on the hill inasmuch as the grave of a simply equipped female, Gr. 1944:1, was found 20 odd metres northwest of the male grave excavated in 1943. The farmer who found these shallow graves and his wife, who carefully penned their letters to the National Museum, were keen observers. He had been used to finding some larger stones in his fields, but it was not until 1943 that he lifted one concealing a grave. Tradition known also to the farmer, had it that skeletons were found in the early 20th century on the eastern side of the hill further down the slope towards the present road 151, perhaps in connection with limited gravel prospecting. There is little doubt that in the mid 1940s the farmer had eventually ploughed off so much of the hilltop that he reached a level at which he started to touch the graves. Two trial excavations in 1955 and 1982, carried out to check the hill for more graves, gave negative
results and it was concluded that there were probably no more than two graves on this part of the hill.\(^a\)

In 1988, when the construction of the E55 took away the western, lower part and secondary top of the hill c. 200 metres west northwest of the graves from 1943/44, archaeologists found a group of 19, predominantly female, graves. Most of these were more or less contemporary with or slightly older than the ones from 1940s and many were richly furnished. In order not to confuse the new group with the old graves, which were considered a burial ground unconnected to the new one, the latter was eventually called Skovgårde after a nearby farm situated just north of the Udby village. The Udby-Skovgårde complex is a typical RIA hill-related settlement situation, Fig. 31.

Fig. 31. A map of the Skovgårde situation, superimposed on a historical map. The situation is reminiscent of the one from Boeslunde and Hoje Taastrup – Iron Age settlements surrounding a hilltop with graves. That graves were once situated to the East of the old road is of course not impossible. Based on Ethelberg & al. (2000) and FOF.

Whatever the context east of the road 151, all the graves on the western slope of the hill east-northeast of Udby would seem to belong to the same complex. We know little about the whole ensemble, except that the grave from the 1940s held the more dominant position in the landscape without occupying the very hilltop, while the Skovgårde group occupied the lower part of the hill stretching
out towards the north northwest. From the spot where Gr. 1943:1 was once situated, we overlook the graves excavated in 1944 and 1988 and a substantial part of the surroundings, not least to the south, and the LRIA grave at Egebjerg, belonging to the neighbouring settlement, one and a half kilometre south of Skrålbanken.

Given the surveys and trial excavations carried out on the hill, we can venture to say that during the third century, a context was built up in which a rich solitary male grave, an old man, in tandem with a less prominent young female’s grave of roughly the same date, did eventually balance a group of rich female graves. This development would seem to be true, even though we know nothing about the graves that may or may not have existed further down the hill, to the east of Gr. 1943:1. Together, the two sites make up the Udby-Skovgårde complex, an exponent of the burial tradition featuring a limited number of richly furnished graves, a tradition that reached Southern Zealand in LRIA and peaked in the third century. As shown by Lars-Göran Bergqvist’s extensive catalogue of richly equipped graves in Scandinavia between LPRIA and MP^82, this grave vogue happened to start centuries earlier at Langå on Fyn and it was meant, by means of burial costumes and rites, to unite and inaugurate among other things such concepts as kin, place and memorable death. In their local setting, these graves represented the start of something great and seen from that perspective we can understand why only one, two, sometimes three or in rare cases four generations were lavishly buried. A limited number of burial generations were enough to drive home the message and it seems impossible to relate the amount of power behind the cemeteries to the number of generations buried.

Although sparsely furnished, Grave 1943:1 contains some prestigious objects, among others elegant footwear with silver clad buttons and plain clasps, a simple finger ring of gold however weighing 12.8 grs, and a simple silver fibula keeping the man’s dress together at his left shoulder. The deceased was no doubt well dressed, but the grave owes its fame to a bronze vessel, a Hemmoor bucket, with a decorative frieze just below the rim. This frieze depicts an aquatic circus episode or a mythological illustration divided into two scenes. A pair of gods, a Nereid, i.e. a salt-water sea nymph and a Triton (technically an ichthyocentaur, i.e. a fish-horse-man) are the main characters of each their scene. In one of these, the Triton, swings his cudgel while attacking a sea-beast. In the other, a sea bull throws itself against another beast—a lion-like creature—that blocks the way to the Nereid. From what mythology tells us about the life of Tritons and Nereids we can conclude that Triton and bull are on their way to comfort the Nereid who is, if not in distress then none the less held on her couch by the monster. There is much turmoil, fighting and fleeing among the hybrids in the waves along the rim, but also two juxtaposed dolphin-riding cupids who interrupt the hurly-burly dividing it into the two scenes while promising some sort of happy end, in which Triton + Nereid = True. Owing to mythological convention, the frieze can be said to picture a storm that
will be forced to abate and give way to the calm waters where eager Tritons and Nereids mate and prosper for the benefit of sailors and fishermen, the offspring of Tritons and Nereids being what we catch in the sea\textsuperscript{83}. The vessel is the \textit{pièce de résistance} of this grave and hardly something the undertakers threw in for good measure or for want of a bucket for the brew that the man drank from his traditional local mug.

The overall topographical situation suggests that the modestly equipped young woman makes up the complement of the rich male grave on the higher grounds of the Udby-Skovgårde cemetery.

The richly furnished female Skovgårde graves on the other hand make up the counterpart to the male one. This relation, (rich) solitary (and accompanied) male versus (rich) grouped female, is part of the general tendency during Roman Iron Age period C, as opposed to period B, for lavish female grave equipment to become more prominent. In his catalogue of the best equipped Iron Age graves in Scandinavia, Bergqvist lists a fifty-fifty distribution of anatomically defined men and women in South Scandinavia during Period B, but a twenty-five seventy-five distribution in favour of female graves during Period C. However, segregated and richly furnished female grave groups have a long tradition also in this part of Denmark, dating back to the first century CE and the graves from Jullinge on Lolland. The 1\textsuperscript{st} c. CE cemetery at Vorbasse would seem to be a parallel to the Udby Skovgårde scene.

Eighteen of the nineteen graves on the lower part of the hill, northwest of the male grave, are distributed in three or perhaps four small groups around the flat top of the hill in a north, east, south and west sector. They are accompanied by a horse grave situated outside the east sector, Fig. 32. In South Scandinavia, animal graves are rare, some horses and the occasional dog, five graves or so, a growing number however, make up the total\textsuperscript{84}. The earliest human graves at Skovgårde date to c. 210 CE and they are contemporary with the horse grave. The latest ones date to c. 275 CE. Anatomically speaking, one of the buried is considered to be a man while the sex of the children could not be determined; still there is little doubt that the group represents the leading figures of a predominantly female gender within four families during two or three generations, i.e. a time span of 60 or 70 odd years.

Based on graves we have little to suggest that there was an absolute link between social and biological sex, let alone burial gender, in the RIA. Primarily a grave exhibit a social role and position, not gender or biological sex even though they may covariate. Genetics is not the cause for the burial. On relatively speaking large cemeteries such as Sejlflod or Hjemsted, archaeologists have not ventured to discuss matters such as sex or gender in any detail, precisely because inhumation graves with no skeletons and neutral artefacts pose an insurmountable problem for such discussion, leaving graves where they were often left by their undertakers, i.e. in the twilight zone of humble, anonymous and genderless normalcy. There are typical female graves and typical male, as well as typical
in-betweens, but by and large, biological sex is of less social (in our case less grave-social) importance the older one gets.\textsuperscript{85}

\textbf{Fig. 32.} The distribution of graves on the Skovgårde cemetery. Based on Ethelberg & al. (2000) and FOF.

The age distribution, nevertheless, is peculiar at Skovgårde inasmuch as it is surprisingly even, with children and old age being more on par with adults and matures than we would have expected during the LRIA, Fig. 33. In fact, the distribution is so odd that we ought perhaps to explain the anatomically speaking ‘male?’ and ‘male’ graves with reference to their being old enough to represent the later stages of a life role and fulfil a purpose by representing these stages of life with the same weight as the earlier stages, of which the quota is more easily filled because people die young more often than old.

Age is an important archaeological issue at Udby-Skovgårde because of the dependency between burial equipment and the age of the deceased. This relation has been pointed out as a possibility in passing\textsuperscript{86}, but in reality it is so
strong that gender and age qualities, irrespective of genetic sex, govern the grave
goods in terms of exclusiveness and thus also as markers of status and material
wealth. Needless to say, this is far from always the case. Instead, it is part of the
gender-age theme that comes to the fore at Skovgårde.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave no &amp; age</th>
<th>Gravo goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comb tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>6 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>3-4 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-4 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-10 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>14-16 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>16 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>18-20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>20 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adultus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>25 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>30 cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30-35 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>45 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>55 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>55 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>60 yrs cb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: S=silver; G=gold; n=needle; s=spindle; cb=comb; c=cup; v=vessel; ce=ceramic; gl=glass; sa=sacrifice; fo=food.

Fig. 33. A schematic distribution of age and grave goods categories at Skovgårde. Based on Ethelberg & al. (2000) and Alexandersen & Bennike? (2000).

In the Skovgårde publication, Per Ethelberg and in effect also Ulla Lund Hansen argue that expensive grave goods designate a high social status, and poor goods a low one. This maxim and methodological mistake to several of the co-authors in the Skovgårde publication, e.g. to Pia Bennike and Werner Alexandersen. In their anatomical analysis of the skeletons, they found a dental trait (no disposition at all for wisdom teeth) which indirectly, and without their observing it, happened to indicate that the lack of grave goods, or no more than modest equipment, does not per se designate an inferior social status. With no DNA analysis at hand, the authors discuss the genetic implications and conclude that two of the women in the Skovgårde cemetery are most probably next of kin. Despite this indication of a similar social status by descent, one of the women is richly equipped and young, while the other is old and poorly equipped. Thus, if status is more than an outward phenomenon such as age, i.e. if status is also a matter of birth, then lack of grave goods does not in itself signify lack of status.
If we look into the age theme, we can follow the whole lifecycle of ‘the womanly’ in the grave equipment and state the following, Fig. 33. As a girl you are born to be introduced to social life by means of comb, needle and cup. When you have learnt to handle these you get the spindle and the vessel, indicating progress in motor capacity. Expensive jewellery follow suite before the extra cups or glasses indicate your position as a lady with a mead bowl, who offers the guests of her home the ceremonial toast. The fact that the woman in Gr. 205, despite being relatively young, did not get one can be explained by her anatomical condition—she was limping and thus somewhat handicapped. Some are, and in this case it changed her personal role if not her group affiliation. Berit Sellevoll has showed that physical status correlates positively with the quality of the grave goods. Her observations therefore support the conclusion that the young and able were also the most decked-out women. Being handicapped may thus in some cases have been considered a personal shortcoming, at least among women, depriving them of a certain distinction such as a glass and the role that comes with it. This notion of the equipment as a sign of personal distinction is also suggested by the fact that the extravagantly equipped woman in Gr. 209 is given only a shard to represent the extra cup. With no lack of wealth in her family it is unlikely that the shard was put in because the family could not afford a glass. Instead, we should think of the shard as a symbol of the cup she had not yet been given because she was still socially speaking a trifle too young or inexperienced to serve the mead. While alive, she had not yet got this distinction or achieved this rank and there was thus no personal glass vessel to put into the grave. Yet, it was felt that she ought to have the right, posthumously, to become a lady with a mead cup. Food is sacrificed at your funeral in the beginning of this social phase, indicating that you are presented with it, but later in life, when meat becomes part of a burial meal down in the grave, food would seem to be the right way to match your social position as a housewife.

There are other issues at Skovgårde than age, but the theme is nevertheless so important that it is fair to fit a suite of labels to female development between 15 and 30+: (1) marriageable (i.e. a period of introduction, engagement or betrothal), (2) bride, (3) lady, (4) mother, (5) housewife – and see these labels as signs of social status as well as personal abilities. As yet another sign of the mixture between personal talents and social roles, it would seem that although every woman in this phase of life is expected to engage herself in handicraft not everyone is expected both to spin and to sew. And the fact that some combs were placed in the graves more like a tool than as a part of personal equipment indicates that not everyone were expected to comb their own hair either. The comb and the meat are placed in the upper part of the grave of young women giving the impression that these gifts were not closely related to the persona of the woman herself, but rather to servants waiting upon her. We can understand serving as one of their last duties during the young woman’s funeral, because being served and herself serving only the mead was part of her social role.
When a woman becomes 30+, her life changes, probably because she has by then given birth to and started raising her children as well as managing her household so well that a new generation is understood eventually to take over. This obviously does not mean that by definition women have lost status. In the Skovgårde contexts, we would rather expect her status to have grown and to have become more firmly anchored in her social role. Therefore, the ‘wisdom toothless’ richly equipped young woman in grave 7 needs not be of higher rank than her modestly equipped old relative in grave 9. Nevertheless, in view of the rapid transition from childhood to childbearing age, i.e. the ten-year period between 15 and 25 signified by the transition from grave 3 to grave 207, it would seem that there was a short step from childhood to motherhood and a long one, 30 odd years from housewife to old age.90.

In all fairness, Ethelberg points out that none of the status-defining methods applied are perfect, but roughly speaking, for the sake of the argument, we can sum up the relation between wealth and age adopting ‘The Skovgårde relative status core value’, i.e. the RSS listed in, Fig. 33, column 8, and conclude the following: if the RSS value is above 30 then the woman is juvenile or adult. If she has a physical handicap, like the woman in Grave 205, she can be an adult even if her RSS value is below 30. The fit 15–30-year old women represent the reproductive phase of their gender—i.e. their marriageable, child-bearing and child-caring age. In the Skovgårde cemetery life, coming of age equals a growing social status until the zenith of the semi-public female carrier, if not her status is reached when she has given birth to her first children and is trusted with housekeeping. For that reason, the most decked out women are usually in their 20s. The woman on the cemetery at Torstorp Vesterby died at this age and she can be said to be comparable to the Skovgårde women of her age.

Traits that indicate the status of a 25-year old are (1) her jewellery, which is striking albeit just one big and one small silver fibula; (2) the fact that she has part of a meal in one of her pots rather than sacrificed food; (3) that she has got a glass cup in addition to her mugs.93

Two of the items in the Skovgårde graves, the spindle and the extra cup, are strongly related to women’s ritualistic behaviour. Spinning a thread and offering someone the mead cup are skills related to the fate of mankind and men. Therefore, when we see how these skills are introduced in Skovgårde, it becomes clear that there is a point in the fact that the first equipment a girl gets is a needle and a cup for herself, then she gets the spindle and the vessel. To begin with, she is taught how to handle thread and liquor in order later to be introduced to spinning and serving, i.e. productive womanhood and two cornerstones in the construction of LRIA gender. Eventually, when married she is given the extra cups and her role as a mediator. Anachronistically speaking, i.e. in the terms of the Eddaic poems, the profession of the Norn, spinning, is introduced before the reproductive phase while that of the politically active woman: the wife or the Valkyrie, handing men the mead-cup in the hall, relates to the later part of that phase. Judging from the roles of these two kinds of...
women in LIA and VA myths it is only fair to suggest that spinning is the more basic female quality, while serving (and in effect mediating\(^94\)) is the social obligations of a more engendered womanhood. Using age-related grave goods, the burials depict some of the prominent LIA rituals and myths denoting female or womanhood qualities and we may venture to say that Skovgårde is a LRIA prerequisite for the mythic perspectives of the LIA. Reproduction and foresight are behind the former context; fate behind the latter. Primarily, these burial markers are symbolic, but the correlation with female craft and position in the household adds a mundane dimension to the tasks symbolised by the objects. The spindle produces a thread for ordinary people’s dress and ordinary men drink when ordinary housewives offer them the cup.

Status in Skovgårde results from the fact that a complex social role, the model womanly, is buried at this specific site and not somewhere else. The status of the buried stems from the role they all play on a stage situated in the intersection between fitness, gender, age and social status. Within this in all probability high-status group, there were probably differences, but since the equipment of a grave is related to physical and social fitness, age, personality and lifecycle, material differences do not allow us to judge or rank status outside the symbolic world of the burial ground. However, since the textuality of the Udby-Skovgårde complex is so intricate, we can come to terms with one aspect of LRIA status, that of age, and conclude that there is one kind of status in being young, another in being old, a third in being a child, a fourth in being a mother, a fifth in being a bride and so on.

Keeping age and gender denotations in mind, we can turn from the context of the grave back to that of the cemetery and its four sectors which surround a flat hilltop. Since, as mentioned above, this pattern of organisation, i.e. surrounding a hilltop, is present in several Danish Early Iron Age settlements that by and large shun the top of the hill\(^95\), we can venture to say that the burial ground mirrors a settlement pattern or a landscape in which graves and grave groups represent the farms and their buried folk. The horse grave, Gr. 26, provides this metaphor of landscape, farm and people with a particular meaning. In this grave, the buried is a c. eight year old stallion. The water pipe trench that damaged three of the graves in the south sector also damaged the horse grave and took away its central parts, the pelvis and most of the legs. The lower extremities however, were spared. The horse was large for an Early Iron Age horse and it was buried without being decapitated or slain\(^96\). However, its right metatarsus was broken in a fracture that had not healed. Shortly before its death it would in other words have been made a limping or a lame horse. The context speaks against an accident and it is reasonable to conclude that this cruel and painful way of injuring it was intended, but not intended to cause its immediate death.

Burying a large eight year old lame stallion is an odd or indeed significant thing to do on a burial ground with a theme like that of Skovgårde. However, the fact that the horse is lame and one of the first to be buried, if not the very
first, links it to the woman in Gr. 209. (1) She was also buried among the first on the burial ground and (2) the runes carved on her rosette fibula reads Lamo talgida — Lame cut. Since ‘Lamo’ is a male name meaning ‘lame’ as well as ‘limping’, and since the brooch is one of the fibulae designating women in their marriageable years, it would seem that the lame/limping horse represents Lamo, the man who wrote on her fibula. Viewed in this way, horse and women could signify Lamo’s flock of mares in addition to their female status. The real Lamo could very well be the man Gr. 1943:1 not least since the grave goods include the hippo-virility frieze and its allusions to the fertility of mating Tritons and Nereids. Needless to say, if you set a forceful Triton or hippocampus ashore, it will be disabled limping on its tail like a seal on land.

It is possible, therefore, that the man in Udby 1943:1 is indeed Lamo and a prominent local man identifying himself with the horse creature, and the young woman next to him with his Nereid in old age. It is not farfetched that a somewhat handicapped but socially powerful man would try to explain his enfeebling handicap with the opposite—his divine forcefulness.

Let us suppose that the excavations at Udby-Skovgårde have actually given the results we seem to observe—that the textuality of the installation is in fact to be trusted. In that case, we have got the following: a landscape of graves building up during three generation on a hill, the so-called Skrålbanken and snogebirken. Lamo, the horse, is put to death in the beginning of the project, Lamo the man dies in the middle of it. The balance in this landscape links in with its topography and it is made-up by the well-furnished male grave on the higher south-eastern part of the hill, contrasted by the gender-bound burial ground to the northwest in the lower part of the hill.

Ritually speaking, the landscape was built up of 20 odd funerals, on average one funeral every third or fourth year. For these rites, the most elaborate grave constructions were the ones with two levels: the lower coffin level and the upper display level where, during the funeral, as far as preservation conditions allow us judge, combs and sacrificed animal parts were exhibited, Fig. 34. Some kind of open ritual, probably for several people to take part in and see, was in other words making up the funerals. The elaborate graves are of course the ones belonging to the successful women between 20 and 35 who are neither young nor old and therefore engaged in the most complex social tasks — they were buried in graves 209, 8, 400 and 7. In Beowulf’s terms, they are the Queen Wealththowes of society: wives and mothers mediating among men.

Metaphorically speaking, the solitary male grave is related to the sacredness of the heights or the small, often forested, summits of the Zealand landscape, while the lower burial ground is related to settlement, open grassland and horse breeding (the stallion and his flock), i.e., to a landscape heavily marked by culture. Skrålbanken and Snogebirken therefore designate a small hill, in itself representing the Udby landscape or indeed a ‘land’ in southern Zealand, albeit to the best of our knowledge without the lakes and waterholes representing the interface to the netherworld. In this small metaphoric middle world land, the
A horse among the females is situated in a top position similar to that of the man in Gr. 1943 in the larger landscape.

Symbolically speaking, man and stallion are complementary and related to the sacred, to origin and kinship and to the virile. The women on the other hand represent the womanly related to age, fitness, foresight, personality, reproduction, mediating, housekeeping and so on. Their lifecycle is a conventional career in which, having been born, they become children, marriageable girls, mothers, hostesses, housewives and elders at somewhat varying points in life. Of course not everybody fulfils this life circle.

Mythologically speaking, we have come in contact with a man called Lamo, probably related to the woman in grave 209. If he is also the old man in grave 1943:1, then he is not the husband of the women in graves 400 and 207. Instead, we can expect him to have died in the 250s CE, c. 35 years after he was represented by the sacrificed 8 year-old stallion. Even after his death, women continued to be buried at Skovgårde for another 20 years or so. It took some 60–70 years to complete the cemetery and bury the women there to represent this time span as a relatively steady life rhythm. To be precise, they are selected in such a way that together they represent the social state or condition of a female life, and Skovgårde is not without parallels.

---

*Fig. 34*. An illustration of a grave with two levels. Note the odd position of the comb which indicates that it is secondary to the rest of the grave goods. The comb, therefore, is distinguished as non-personal. Based on Ethelberg & al. (2000).
Those who were buried in such Skovgårde cemeteries were in other words chosen not because they were dead, but because they had the right social position, age and role when they died. Those who organised the rites at Skovgårde, moreover, must have decided beforehand to construct the monument, i.e. the cemetery, in this particular way. They relied upon a continuous flow of corpses in order to engender one female life, represented by 18 graves, and we may ask ourselves who she was. In all probability she was the first woman buried there, the one in Grave 209. Together with the 17 others she represents ‘the womanly’.

To create this installation the organizers were prepared to work and wait for 70 years and to match the death of the first woman with the sacrifice of a horse consciously relating the whole scene to the ritual realm of horse sacrifice as well as to a number of other themes—not least connected to royalty or nobility and the royal or noble couple. Vedic texts elaborate this perspective, but already Old Babylonic text (2000–1600 BCE) refer to the queen’s intimacy with the horse. It seems fair to explain this intimacy with reference to the ability of the stallion to represent forcefulness and virility as well as king and husband.

In Scandinavia, horse sacrifice is common and firmly connected to death as well as the communal meal in the first millennia CE. Ritualy slaughtered horses cover a number of aristocratic Scandinavian graves of the LIA and VA. Moreover, horse sacrifice comes to a very definite end when the Church has established itself and its burial rites in Scandinavia. To Homer, Hades was a place with noble steeds, klutópōlos being its standard epithet and within Roman culture a variety of the complex, october equus, is linked to circus games. By and large, the use of horses in ritual contexts would often seem to present itself as the right thing to do. There is, so to speak, an intellectual preparedness to make good use of horses.

Jaan Puhvel has discussed the theme of horse, ruler and death and there is little doubt that compared to his examples, the modest scene at Skovgårde reveals but a few hints of affinity with the Indic aśvamedha ritual; the affinities are nevertheless there. Aśvamedha was no small matter. It started in the spring when the King spent a night in chastity with his favourite wife. The next day a prize stallion was selected and after a number of ceremonies, among others sprinkling it in a pool, it was set free with a hundred gelded or aged horses and four hundred young men looking after it. A full year is spent herding the stallion up to the northeast and back again keeping it away from mares and further immersion in water. When the stallion is returned preparations have been made for the final three days of the ritual. On the first two, the stallion and three other horses show their vigour drawing the king in his chariot. On the third day the king’s three foremost wives anoint the stallion and adorn its mane and tail with pearls. When they are finished the horse is smothered to death, a ram without horns and a billy-goat being the other two principal victims among hundreds of animals. The stallion is covered, and the king’s favourite wife among the three who anointed the horse joins it under its cover in a one night
cohabitation and (symbolic?) intercourse. One reason given by the queen for her doing this is the risk that if she does not do it some other woman will, in order to benefit from the strength of the horse. Obviously this part of the ritual is as far from any politically correct post Vedic tradition as it is from our own understanding of PC-behaviour. But readers of Ibn Fadlan, being familiar with the slave girl abused in the funeral rites, are at least not taken completely aback by the description and the murky mixture of power, death and sexuality behind the rituals\textsuperscript{101}.

In the morning when the queen reappears, the three wives outline the cutting up of the stallion on its skin. In the ritual the stallion represents the ruler as well as the Indra-related Prajāpati, the Lord of Creation, who originally received the sacrifice.

The Śatapatha Brāhmana which, among others, tell us of the aśvamedha also tell us about the puruṣāmedha in which the role of the stallion is played by a man bought from his family at a price of one thousand cows and one hundred horses. In this ritual the queen therefore is supposed to conduct coitus with the man when he is dead or dying, and the resemblance to the Viking Age funeral rites at the Volga becomes slightly more apparent albeit not less appalling. The female role depicted in the aśvamedha ritual is no doubt, in part, the result of a male sexual fantasy since only women can be quite sure what happens under the cover.

The situation at Skovgårde has very little to do with the aśvamedha except for the sacrificed horse, the link to the land and the link to the woman in child-bearing age and her husband/horse. This is not a similarity to suggest any aśvamedha replica at Skovgårde, far from it, but a similarity which suggests that on Zealand in the third century CE, there was sufficient ritual awareness so as to build a long ritual practice relating origin and fertility, to the possession of land and to death, stallion, man, husband and wife. The Skovgårde context, settlement and cemetery related to a hilly area, is the closest we come to an archaeological definition of a LRIA concept of ruler and consort. Since there is only one and a half kilometres to the next similarly hill-related settlement and but a few more to the nearest rich graves in the region (Harpelev, Grumløse, Hastrup, Broskov, Broskovvejen, Nestelsøgård, Kildemarksvej and Skyttemarksvej), Lamo’s realm was hardly a very large one and any old steed could roam it in a week or so. The size of this geographical perspective moreover, befits the scene around Brøndsager. Here too the distance between the rich graves, Brønd- sager/Stenröldsknås and Ellekilde/Thorshulde 1870, was but a few kilometres\textsuperscript{102}. Despite their being small-scale, Udby-Skovgårde and probably Brøndsager as well were small lands, ‘nano-kingdoms’, with a people and an elite as well as a ruler, a ‘nano-king’ with no less than a universal ideological foundation and cosmological role. If we consider the use of graves in structuring nano-kingdoms and proceed from the Brøndsager/Stenröldsknås case, there needs be a prominent settlement, a cemetery inaugurating and reflecting this settlement and a prominent grave that marks out a border point. This model is relatively
large-scale in Brøndsager/Stenrøldsknøs and it may perhaps also be seen on a somewhat larger scale in the neighbouring pair Ellekilde/Thorslunde 1870, although an Ellekilde settlement has not yet been excavated. The origin of this structure could be present in a place like Hedegård in Jutland, where there is an early (PRIA per IIIB) inauguration cemetery next to a prominent settlement and 800 m to the east, some prominent marginal features, notably the Storhøj find, that could be the equivalent of Stenrøldsknøs or Thorslunde 1870.103

The rites which resulted in the Udby-Skovgårde context may well have been hard core and alien to most of us, but given the allusion to the much more soft core circus or bath show depicted on the vessel frieze, ‘only’ the harsh treatment of the sacrificed stallion is visibly appalling. Whether or not the Skovgårde elite were triggered by circus games and slaughter is difficult to know, but also of minor importance, whereas their ability to fall back on widespread ritual and myth or to revive or reshape it is remarkable. This ability suggests a broad mythical and ritual heritage or awareness, but also a relationship between EIA ruler and consort in which the qualities of a fertility goddess in the queen are still significant, because fertility and childbearing in this LRIA context is linked to mythology as well as public ritual and sacrifice. On the other hand, when we look at the funeral installations, settlement and household ceremonies seem to play an important, although perhaps not yet a fateful role, despite the fact that Norns are modelled on the Roman Fates (Parcae) and, further off, on Greek Moirae.104

The forceful male progenitor manifested in the landscape by means of his grave is equally apparent, but his equipment is relatively modest and not comparable to the luxury of a worldly ruler with something to prove. Such graves are LIA at best and compared to King and Queen in the LIA, when ruler and consort have become an individualised pair and an institution in which civilised man civilises a young woman with Norna and Valkyrie qualities through marriage, the differences are considerable. Allusions to the horse-and-ruler cult, an aśvamedha metaphor rather than the later allusions to the hieros gamos paragon, as a middle-worldly replica of marriage within a pantheon, would seem to root Skovgårde firmly in the EIA. Lamo, the man, perhaps felt a spiritual affinity with Roman circus rites, but that is not much to boast of, given other possible affiliations. Instead, the preferences of the Udby-Skovgårde burial ground are important because they point out one of the great differences that broke through in South Scandinavia during the MP. When rulers became a couple, two individuals united in a complementary pair, a ruling balance in themselves.105

The high-status Udby-Skovgårde burial ground forms a context made up by 20 odd units in much the same way as a narrative can be told in 20 odd strophes. Such a context can of course be interpreted, e.g. by assigning absolute or conventional cultural values to the burial markers, parallel to describing the poem by means of its topoi. Nevertheless, only the odd researcher would refrain from interpreting the meaning of the narrative as well as its context and struc-
ture, because eventually some sort of consensus about the meaning will emerge, despite possible misinterpretations. Obscure as they are, Eddaic poems and intentionally constructed burial grounds must always to a certain extent be understood in their own right. This ‘must’ is based on the fact that it has become apparent during the last 20 years or so that prehistoric compositions as well as context formation have textual qualities beyond the commonplace and *topoi*. Since these qualities are not completely beyond our reach, we must reach out for them, not least while understanding the meaning of a narrative or context is a prerequisite also for all formal analyses.

**FAGERUM, ROSENDAL AND GÖSSLUNDA ON ÖLAND.** Recently Jan Henrik Fallgren has summarized and discussed the characteristics of the Iron Age graves and cemeteries on Öland centering on their relation to settlements and roads. The latter relations are of two kinds: those linked to the roads leading to and from a settlement and those related to the so-called *landborgar*, the low ridges running north-south on the eastern and western side of the island. In the flat landscape, these ridges have a prominent position from a vertical as well as horizontal point of view and they have served the need for settlements, borders, profane communications and sacred elements in the landscape. On these low ridges, cemeteries have been used from the Iron Age up until today, because they attracted Iron Age cemeteries as well as Christian churches and churchyards. They are typical of Öland and a cultural palimpsest. In addition to these road and border or border zone cemeteries, Fallgren notes that there are also some shore bound settlements or harbours where the graves reflect the settlements rather than their borders.

In addition to the relations to settlements, there are a number of patterns on the Ölandic cemeteries that we recognize as South Scandinavian, such as groups of children’s graves and tendencies to forming female and male grave groups. However, the cemeteries around the settlements from the RIA can also be brought into a more detailed relation with South Scandinavian traditions, because we find solitary and peripheral graves signaling the existence of a nearby settlement as well as cemeteries reflecting the settlement and its dominant farms.

Rosendal is a case in point, Fig. 35A&B. This village is probably a relatively late settlement, since the graves excavated in the three cemeteries around the settlement are LRIA, MP and EVP106, albeit rather insignificant ones. In terms of dates, this is a deviant pattern on Öland, but it befits a late settlement expansion in need of graves to prove its position in the cultural landscape. As a village, Rosendal has a dominant farm in the south and a number of smaller and dependant farms north of the large one. There are three kinds of cemeteries in this village and, as pointed out by Fallgren, the eastern and western ones are border zone cemeteries situated along the roads leading into the village. Passing through these cemeteries, we enter or leave the central village area. The south-
ern cemetery on the other hand is situated just 75 metres from the dominant farm and not linked to the village by any road. This cemetery is part of the infields of the dominant farm and together, cemetery and farm face the relatively speaking wet and fertile grasslands south of the village. These important grasslands separate the small but dominant farm at Rosendal from the corresponding large and dominant farm at Fagerum, 500 metres south of Rosendal. The roads from Fagerum to Rosendal would seem to have gone either east or west of these grasslands, passing the eastern and western Rosendal cemeteries. There were probably no cemeteries between Rosendal and Fagerum and it is fair to believe that Rosendal was created as an annex to the Fagerum settlement. This farm-reflecting southern cemetery contains the most prominent grave monument in the village.

![Fig. 35A. A map of the Fagerum and Rosendal area. Fagerum is fragmented by the present rural landscape because its position is relatively speaking the better one. Accordingly, the inferior position of Rosendal has preserved most of the Iron Age village. Based on Fallgren (2006).](image-url)
Fig. 35B. A map of the Rosendal village, note the roads leading from the cemeteries into the village. An analysis of the form of the stone fences in the village shows the primary or dominant character of the large farm in the south. This farm only has convex fences annexing the land around it with relatively speaking short stone walls. The other farms hug in to this primary farm, cf. Herschend (1997A). Based on Fallgren (2006).

In addition to these cemeteries at Rosendal, the settlement also seems to have been marked by some solitary graves that were not primarily linked to roads and settlement. These graves are older than the village and it is only by chance that they have become points or places of reference in its vicinity. Nevertheless, they are something to walk or ride by, something to use for orientating oneself in the open landscape around Rosendal, and no doubt sacred places. One such grave, a cairn, in a similar position on southern Öland has been excavated next to the Gösslunda village. At Gösslunda, the infields have been completely destroyed by modern agriculture, but some finds have been registered from these fields and they tell us that also here some graves reflected the settlement, while others and probably the greater part surrounded the settlement area. A typical landmark north of the village, Gösslunda rör—‘The Gösslunda Cairn’, was built already in the EPRIA and prior to any permanent settlement. It covered a weapon grave and was surrounded by four other graves, Fig. 36. Either the grave is situated where old tracks crossing the island meet each other, or it is in itself the origin of these tracks and eventually, when the village was established it became Gösslunda rör. The cairn continued to attract the odd grave up until
the LVP and as a solitary grave outside a village it also happened to mark out the open grassland belonging to the village. In this way, solitary graves are the equivalent of the solitary houses now and then found next to them e.g. at Rosendal. It would seem therefore that such graves which happened more or less by chance to be village-related needed to be re-inaugurated now and then e.g. with a burial or a house. In most parts of South Scandinavia, preservation condition do not allow us to point out this kind of monument, but at Høje Taastrup we saw an example in the graves at Stenrøsknøl, where the LRIA grave was situated next to an earlier mound. The solitary graves would seem to have been an essential landscape element, defining the territory and the outer part of a village by being present and pointed out.\(^\text{107}\)

**Fig. 36.** A map of the Gösslunda area with the gold hoard SHM 6999 (72.4g), indicating the centre of the prehistoric settlement. Based on Herschend (1980) and Fallgren (2006).

**KYRSTA-VAXMYRA AND TREKANTEN-BJÖRKGÅRDEN.** In most cases, when archaeologists excavate for modern infrastructure, which they often do, their sections through the landscape are elucidating, but generally speaking, their trenches are far too narrow to catch a settlement in its entirety. At Kyrsta just north of Uppsala in Central Sweden however, topography and the need for a highway, as well as a road crossing the highway on a bridge, resulted by chance in a much more complete picture of both settlement and graves from the PRIA to early medieval times (EMA), Fig. 37. Actually settlement remains, albeit peri-
odical rather than continuous, stretched as far back as LSA/EBA. The area is a typical example of the transition from a floating to a fixed settlement system within a subsistence area.

Fig. 37. A map of the Iron Age settlements north of Old Uppsala in the Mälar Valley excavated in connection with the construction of the new E4 highway. Based on Eklund (2005), Onsten-Molander & Wikborg (2006A; 2006B) and Fagerlund (2003).

The time depth of the village was not just remarkable, it was also somewhat ironic, because when the road project was proposed, the inhabitants in Kyrsta protested: the highway would divide their village into two! To support their protest they referred to the fact that they had lived for generations in the village and would like to continue to do so without having the E4 pushed through their village. Despite referring to their group identity and ‘roots’, an unspeak
term often valued by politicians when used by themselves, the villagers’ protest were not acknowledged inasmuch as society does not acknowledge aboriginal rights among people considered to be normal majority Swedes\textsuperscript{108}. Nevertheless, when the excavations were finished it was clear that the inhabitants were more than right: they and their predecessors had indeed been living for a long time at Kyrsta. In fact, few if any in Sweden had ever been living for so many generations continuously at one and the same place and in the same settlement situation: some time around 1000 BCE and 700 years after the first occupation, the settlement became permanent and people started for 100 odd generations to be living at Kyrsta, first along an east-west shoreline, later next to a track and eventually by a road lined by rune stones. Two of these stones are still standing where they were once erected to mark out the beginning and the end of the village. Today, this landscape is smashed and the perpetual sigh of the north-south traffic reminds the villagers of their radically changed unique status\textsuperscript{109}.

Excavations at Kyrsta-Vaxmyra and Trekanten-Björkgården laid bare five settlement sites that became habitable during the EBA, Fig. 38. Topographically speaking, they are typical of the landscape: situated on very gentle slopes between woodland and wetland, i.e. between the higher and lower parts of the landscape, i.e. between land scattered with rocks and boulders and open plains. The area covered by the excavations was large, c. 150 000 square metres, four sites were situated in arable land and three were close to existing farms. To gether these four variables – (1) topographical position; (2) situation on arable land; (3) nearness to modern farms; (4) size of excavation area – suggest that the sample represents type sites of the landscape and a general picture of the settlement in the area. To corroborate this picture and add square metres to the investigated area we could add the excavations at Bredåker and bring the area of investigation well above 200 000 square metres of typical Upplandic settlement area.

One of the goals fulfilled by these excavations was the \(^{14}\text{C}\) dating of all the house constructions belonging to the sites. \(^{14}\text{C}\) samples were taken from post-holes and hearths and these dates gave a rough correlation between absolute dates and the house typology, i.e. the morphological traits related to the basic construction and layout of a two or three aisled house. Although \(^{14}\text{C}\) dates are crude, gathering all possible \(^{14}\text{C}\) dates, representing 203 prehistoric houses, in one probability distribution results in a diagram, a general outline, which can be interpreted, Fig. 39A–C. There is a slow rise in house frequency up and until the EPRIA. Then we see a steep increase of the relative frequency followed by a period of decrease that lasts until the middle of the first millennium CE when the frequencies fall markedly and disappear before they rise a little in the end of prehistory. Behind this pattern, we should see the following mechanisms: To begin with, the settlement pattern was floating or fluctuating, with few houses occupying the same spot for any longer period. Settlements were close to the shoreline. Some time c. 500 BCE, hydrography started to reflect the yearly cycle rather than the sea level and up until extensive drainage in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th}
centuries not much would happen in the landscape. Areas close to rivers and brooks were humid and wet during spring, but still essential for haymaking and summer grazing. In this first stage, the population density was probably slowly rising.
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**Fig. 38.** The five settlements Kyrsta, Vaxmyra North, Vaxmyra South, Björkgården and Trekanten taken here to represent the general traits in the Iron Age settlement and its development. Vaxmyra South and North represent settlements with specialised economies, i.e. sites that were never be resettled. Particularly Vaxmyra South would seem to have specialised in products related to the exploitation of the forest. Based on Eklund (2005) and Onsten-Molander & Wikborg (2006A; 2006B).

Over a 2- or 300 hundred year period in the LPRIA and ERIA, we can expect the floating character of the settlement pattern to persist for a while also when the population is rapidly growing. In the RIA, however, farm sites become stable, houses are maintained to last longer and eventually rebuilt on the very foundations of their forerunner, Fig. 39C. Already in the ERIA the lifespan of some houses seems to have doubled and the decrease in the number of houses therefore does not indicate a loss of dwelling space. Around the middle of the first
millennium CE, however, the settled area shrinks and the change is so radical that we cannot explain it with reference to stable non-ground penetrating multi-generational house constructions only. Indirectly, as it were, the slight increase in house frequency in the LIA and VA indicates that the house construction was not completely reformed around 500 CE. Moreover, the continuation of the traditional building technique is indicated by a number of VP houses which adhere to the traditional three-aisled post-supported construction. Both (1) a shrinkage of the settlement sites, (2) a slow concentration of some settlements to their present-day situation, and (3) yet another step in a development of house construction depriving us of postholes, is needed in order to explain the changes.

---

**Fig. 39A.** A 14C-diagram based on the E4 excavations at Kyrsta, Vaxmyra, Björkgården, Trekanten and Bredäkra, signifying the archaeological settlement development in central Uppland. The diagram refers to all the houses and other features that archaeologists found worth dating.
**Fig. 39B.** A 14C-diagram based on the E4 excavations at Kyrsta, Vaxmyra, Björkgården, Trekanten and Bredåkra, signifying the archaeological settlement development in central Uppland. The diagram refers to all the houses found on the sites. The changes indicated by the datings of the houses are more dramatic than the picture made up by all the dates, but in principle, the development is the same.

**Fig. 39C.** A 14C-diagram based on the E4 excavations at Kyrsta, Vaxmyra, Björkgården, Trekanten and Bredåkra, signifying the archaeological settlement development in central Uppland. In
order correctly to understand the dating of the houses, we must bear in mind that up and until
the beginning of the CE, houses represent one human generation only, but as indicated by the
dates of the overlapping houses at Vaxmyra North, the life length of a house is doubled in the 1st
century CE. The diagram takes this into account by doubling the probability values of the first
centuries CE. This results in a truer mirror of the dynamics of the RIA, and indirectly it shows
how the opening up of the landscape in the beginning of CE creates a small plateau in the number
of houses in use before their number starts to grow again in LRIA. In part, the dramatic drop in
the number of houses in the middle of the first millennium reflects the marginal character of
some of the excavated settlements.

This development has been a much debated issue, and some have drawn on the
observation that LIA and VA settlements are in all probability to be found under
medieval and present day villages could they be excavated. This is no doubt
correct, but its does not mean that the pattern expressed in the diagrams of Fig.
39A–C will be changed, could we but make these excavation. The reason why
we must not expect this kind of change is the equally probable suggestion that
also a great number of PRIA and RIA as well as MP houses are situated under the
historical settlements, balancing the chronological effect of whatever LIA houses
that can be excavated. The development seen during the centuries around 500
CE is indeed shrinkage or the reduction of the expansive RIA settlement, and we
do not see peasants moving their farms to virgin lands. The individual character
of the five settlements Vaxmyra 325 and 326, Kyrsta, Björkgården and Trekanten
supports this interpretation.

As usual, the loss of postholes in connection with the VP houses in relation
to the ones from RIA is apparent, and it must be seen as a change in the charac-
ter of the buildings, irrespective of whether we understand the change as a sign
of quality lost, techniques changing, or both. Looking at the settlements one by
one, Vaxmyra 325 and 326 are clearly peripheral and cannot be upheld after the
LRIA, They are examples of sites being given up for good in the middle of the
millennium, Fig. 40A–C. People move away from these places abruptly because
there is no decrease in settlement activity prior to its definite end. The settle-
ments therefore make up a 300 odd year parenthesis. At Trekanten and Björk-
gården the topographically suitable settlement space is limited because of the
proximity of the River Fyris which narrows down the strip of arable land be-
tween the rocky woods and the river. Because of its neither central nor periph-
eral situation Trekanten is abandoned some time during the LIA.
Fig. 40A–C. (A) The settlements at Kysta and Vaxmyra north and south of the brook. Based on Eklund (2005) and Onsten-Molander & Wikborg (2006B). (B) The settlement at Vaxmyra north and south of the brook. (C) The settlement at Kyrsta.
Although the arable land called Trekanten happened to fall between two medieval villages, the farm Björkgården, was nevertheless redirected here in modern times when agriculture expanded once again. This indicates that the land can indeed support a farm. Since the situation at Trekanten is beneficial compared to that of Vaxmyra, we would not expect the former settlement to have been abandoned without first being scaled down, on the contrary, we expect decrease before disappearance. This, as it happens, is exactly what the excavations have shown. The two large RIA-MP farms at Trekanten become two small homesteads in the VP. In all probability, this settlement is not abandoned till the 8th century. To the north, at Björkgården, the excavated area is too small to allow any specific conclusion other than this: a specific farm site that was used for a couple of hundred years in the RIA ceased to be used.

In Kyrsta, the settlement continuity is unbroken. We cannot describe the shrinkage in detail, but in all probability the settlement is contracting to a situation a little east of the investigated area. Within the excavated site we find only a few remains of VA buildings. The VP buildings at Kyrsta are to be understood as barns or perhaps small homesteads situated on one of the abandoned earlier farm sites, indicating that no land was abandoned, although, relatively speaking, the fields of these old estates became a little more peripheral. No such small house was found at Vaxmyra 326 and that seems to indicate that these old fields were too far out or too wet to be economically interesting in terms of harvest and hay-making.

There is a good correlation between the development of the five sites in the middle of the first millennium and their economic strength in terms of self-subsistence capacity and surplus production. Kyrsta, being more fortunate than Trekanten, has a clear continuity and Trekanten being more fortunate than Vaxmyra has a typical decrease period. Vaxmyra with the most specialised economy, Vaxmyra 325 specialising in woodland products and 326 in grassland, cannot survive the depression in the world economy and what comes with it when the Roman Empire lose economic strength in relation to Northern Europe.

It is in this perspective of the overall settlement development that the Kyrsta-Vaxmyra community must be understood. This complex is a settlement unit and a cross-section of a typical Upplandic valley framed by woodlands and ridges. Originally, there was water in the valley between these ridges, but little by little, owing to the land upheaval, sounds were transformed to fields and grassland. In the case of Kyrsta-Vaxmyra, the river, which eventually became a brook that flowed through the wetland, was situated in the southern side of the valley thus giving its gently sloping northern part (Kyrsta) the better conditions for farming. But the open and marshy flatland became so wide and dry already in the PRIA that it was possible to place a settlement (Vaxmyra 326) on a small islet surrounded by meadows close to the brook, and also to establish a settlement on the slope at the edge of the woods just south of the brook (Vaxmyra 325).
Not everything, but a good deal of the Kyrsta-Vaxmyra community has been excavated, yielding both settlements and graves. What we lack the most is a precise knowledge about the earliest grave monuments. Probably they were situated just behind present Kyrsta, in what is today a forested area north and east of the village. As grave types they are BA and topographically speaking they are border defining, i.e. situated behind and above a settlement area which was used at intervals before it was permanently settled. Back then, in the LSA or EBA the Kyrsta site still had some shallow waters or waterlogged areas to the west of today’s village centre, but this water dried up, more or less, already in the EBA and was turned into a small ditch draining what water there might have been, southwards into the main brook, e.g. during spring. The area nevertheless remained humid and today the new highway crosses the village in this area.

Cairns and stone settings are the marks of presence even if presence should happen to be discontinuous during the BA. These graves belong to the earliest settlement history which is concealed in the woods, but the situation from the LBA, before the settlement becomes completely continuous, and onwards can be sketched as follows:

In the PRIA, when settling at Kyrsta becomes a more and more recurrent event, the need for a new kind of cemetery occurs. In the case of Kyrsta, some graves are probably cairns or stone settings north of the settlement, but a hillock and impediment some 200 metres to the west of the main settlement site is also used. This main or central part of the village will continue to be central and attract farms and later on the occasional LIA house up and until the 8th century. With the stable situation of the village, the hillock west of the settlement area becomes a typical border-zone-creating monument. It is filled with burial remains of a kind, but no actual monuments, because this topographically well-defined hillock must in itself be understood as the monument. To the PRIA society it makes up for a BA burial mound. Because the hillock is filled with heavy boulders and a series of equally heavy stones forming rough strings, it is virtually untouched by later devastating events. No one has in other words bothered dynamiting this obstacle to rational farming and we are thus presented with some very flimsy, but still well preserved remains of burial rites and pyre waste, spread out on a sacred site where boulders would conceal the remains, and rock, boulders, crushed bones, charcoal and the occasional artefact make up the monument and indeed the western border of the settlement. We may even venture to say that the stone constructions, which fill no rational or historical purpose in terms of fencing, are in fact part and parcel of the sacredness of the hillock. In principle, they can be said to fall under the definition of a harg, i.e. primitive open air stone altars and wooden constructions, Fig. 41 & 42. Owing to a fence, a dike and an opening in the fence corresponding to a bridge over the dyke situated between the hillock and the village, we can conclude that the settlement was approached by a road or track passing just south of this western cemetery. In Kyrsta, the PRIA therefore introduces itself in a typical fashion: a monumental cemetery and sacred place by the road leading to
the settlement. At Kyrsta, the holiness was in the natural hillock; at Grønstoft, this holiness was constructed around a LSA mound.

At the beginning of CE, this old cemetery was abandoned or completed and a new one is founded between Kyrsta and Vaxmyra 326. At the same time, the Kyrsta settlement is expanding and we get a cemetery that reflects the settlement without forming a border; rather the cemetery is next to and reflecting the twin RIA village. Vaxmyra 325 on the other side of the valley and the brook has its own graves in close connection with its farm houses, signifying that in this outskirt position, settlement and graves make up a unit. A similar close connection is seen also in PRIA Kyrsta, inasmuch as there is one grave in connection with the westernmost LPRIA farm. As we have seen e.g. at Vendehøj, graves among houses are to be expected during the PRIA.

Fig. 41. The two settlements at Trekanten and Björkgården situated in a small niche of meadows and arable land next to the River Fyris. Onsten-Molander & Wikborg (2006A).
The graves and cemeteries at Kyrsta-Vaxmyra show us the typical Iron Age development from border defining to settlement mirroring graves and cemeteries. In addition, and to begin with, there are a number of house related graves within the settlement. In Kyrsta, the Iron Age burial notion continuous up and until the 13th century CE, i.e. well into the Church-organized Christian era, when the villagers stop burying their dead on their old RIA cemetery. It became the cemetery just south of the village, when Vaxmyra 326, north of the brook, was abandoned in the 4th century CE.

**First Conclusion: Why are Graves Needed?**

In the above examples we have met a number of different Iron Age grave usages. In relation to settlements and the local landscape, all these ways of making a burial manifest can be labelled cemeteries or graves that signify (1) a reflexive identification between grave and settlement, because they mirror each other and constitute place, or (2) a border zone defined or enhanced by graves. Society, and thus also Iron Age society needs monuments, e.g. in the form of graves to inscribe its presence as well as its historical heritage upon its environment, inasmuch as it is a landscape. Since settlements remind one of graves and vice versa, these labels, reflexive identification and border zone, are by no means opposing. On the contrary, they are balancing and complementary. To a specific cemetery or grave, therefore, both labels could adhere. The typical demarcations are not the most usual, but we may still argue that they represent an early rela-
tion with a settled area, inasmuch as the phenomenon would seem to be more obvious in a Bronze Age than an Iron Age context. The rich grave from Stenrøldsknøs at Høje Taastrup, however, is a significant RIA case of one grave making up a landmark, actually reviving an existing mound Stenrøldsknøs. In this case, society could be said to have invested in a definition of a border point when the large farm at Brøndsager was established. The graves in the Gøsslunda cairn would seem to belong to a zone of solitary graves or small cemeteries in a band of asteroids around the Iron Age settlement. At Kyrsta, the hillock west of the village eventually became an isolated mound and demarcation when over the centuries the village and its new reflexive cemetery moved to the east.

If we want to see the grave/settlement relation as a typology, we might venture to say that the obvious delimitations became less frequent and overlaid by cemeteries, like the ones at Grøntoft, which formed an identification as well as a demarcation of the settlements. In effect, this meant that the settlers kept some of the old solitary and border-marking mounds intact east of the village as indeed pure demarcations, while they converted others, i.e. some of the western ones, to become the origins of cemeteries mirroring settlement and border as a non-solitary phenomenon. In these cemeteries the notion of mirroring the settlement is in other words intertwined with the notion of the border. At Grøntoft and in a large number of Ölandic cases, such cemeteries are linked to a road that may be said to pass through the border zone, signifying transgression. At Kyrsta, the use of the natural hillock as a mound indicates that the qualities of a mound, i.e. holiness and demarcation, are elements of nature itself and that a mound is nothing more than a construction and an enhancement of nature and the natural order in which we settle.

Eventually in the beginning of CE, most of the ideas about delimitation, punctual holiness and border zones are given up, probably because the settled landscape has found its new general structure. Instead, society develops the idea of a reflexive identification between settlement and cemetery. At Kyrsta, this meant giving up the old hillock cemetery and creating a new one more closely related to the settlement. However, the new one was not a complete break with traditions inasmuch as it still road related.

The most clear cut examples of early cemeteries that represent an identification with the settlement are the ones reflecting the leading farm, i.e. a particular group of houses, and the leading family. The examples from Vorbasse and Brøndsager could be said to constitute the first examples and thus the youngest typological grave or cemetery layer in landscape. At Vorbasse and Brøndsager the element of border zone is virtually non-existent. Instead the graves are a mirror of the farms or a complement to the farms and vice versa. It is reasonable to trace the origin of this attitude to the grave back to the LPRIA and ERIA and scenes such as those at Tjørring or Galsted, Fig. 64 and Fig. 62A. In the latter example, the large farm south of the village created its own ensemble of graves and grave fences next to the farm buildings. Although the outer grave forms in
Southern Denmark and the short-lived inaugurating cemeteries may well owe something to Roman influences, the origin of the concept is hardly Roman. For a very long time, the reflexive identification shows itself to be class-biased and upper-class bound, but when the idea of the churchyard as a communal burial grounds around God’s house (a paragon of the upper-class hall) is being enforced, the identification between settlement and grave becomes almost univocal and indeed communal. There is some class bias still in the cemeteries from both Sebbersund and Löddeköpinge, but at Tirup, except for the initial practice of pointing out women as unclean and expelled to the northern part of the churchyard, there is a next to ideal match between grave and house. It signifies the equality between the buried.

In peripheral parts of South Scandinavia, nevertheless, old traditions sometimes die hard and in Kyrsta the 12th and 13th century graves on the Iron Age cemetery are cases in point, because we have no reason to doubt the Christian faith of those interred. In the 12–13th century, most of the inhabitants in Kyrsta were probably buried on the churchyard at Ärentuna Church, despite the fact that the stone church standing there today dates to c. 1300. Some, however, felt the need to be buried as records in the local community supporting its deep-rooted Iron Age identity. Similarly, the VP houses in the old fields support a notion of heritage which seems to have had a long community-defining history in Kyrsta.

Settlement-related cemetery patterns are long-lasting and in the end all three types (1) the occasional grave among the farm houses, (2) graves representing the dominant farm, and (3) border-defining graves, existed side by side as ways of describing the past as a historical presence in an always modern landscape. There are two modes characterizing this kind of presence: (1) we may enter into it when we tour the country or (2) find ourselves being within it, surrounded by the presence of graves and so to speak defining our position in the landscape by means of graves. Obviously both notions are important.

Chronologically speaking, the complexity of the landscape grows and that amounts to saying that as a general rule or ideal notion, and thus not without exceptions, graves are not forgotten or cut out of the landscape. On the contrary, by virtue of their status as historical records, albeit difficult to interpret under our notion of the term, they continue to matter. Graves and cemeteries make it possible to explain the past and to revive it e.g. by relating graves to saga, or by reusing them as in the case of the Gösslunda cairn. In a similar way, those who moved in with the existing graves at Hjemsted transformed these, originally speaking more demarcating graves, into settlement identifications. We can imagine the two notions, identification and demarcations, as accords: the former soft, the latter jarring, allowing us to build up a lot of transitions between these two extremes of a tonal system. Church-organised, i.e., ecclesiastic and congregational Christianity brings an end to all this and favours the upper class-based harmonic identification between house and grave. Needless to
say, there is nothing in Christianity itself to prefer graves to be situated next to churches or indeed within them.

In the first part of the first millennium, the local community became more and more reluctant to bury their dead in graves, or to put it the other way round: community did not manifest itself by means of graves. However, existing graves were needed to reflect and demarcate the settlement, but such topographical aspects of demarcation and identification ran parallel to the idea that graves presented the past in terms of origin. Lars-Göran Bergqvist, among others, has pointed out a number of cases to support this historical notion of creating a grave to mark the beginning of something radical or the continuation of something original. Similar to the topographical poles these two sides of the historical do not form a binary opposition. In each society, they balance each other, and eventually that which was once inauguration becomes tradition, and similarly, the traditional could be revitalised and employed to inaugurate something new.

If these are the notions that guided people in deciding whether or not there was a need for a grave, then the way graves were constructed and fitted out to match the notions would seem to have turned into themes and very conscious manifestations in a time perspective sometimes covering several generations. For that reason, the themes themselves are a kind of third dimension which generated graves.

Second Conclusion: (1) Cemetery Themes

Several times during the 20th century, excavations at an EIA cemetery at Kastlösa on Öland where large groups of children were buried made it obvious that Iron Age cemeteries could be thematic. These insights have been slow to take on, but still there seems to have been a number of themes to express on cemeteries. Burying only children signifies a wish to execute a very specific if not odd theme. Burying part of a family seems more straightforward, but already in Vorbasse the number of graves and the differences between them make us wonder what is meant by ‘a family’. Lars Jørgensen in his analysis of LIA cemeteries on Bornholm argued that he sorted out the families on the cemeteries. And ‘family cemeteries’ or ‘family sections’ on cemeteries are no doubt a reasonable thematic label also in the RIA. But as Jytte Ringtved has pointed out, ‘family’ is not a simple notion let alone a label to stick on any small cemetery or grave group on a cemetery. Yet, some kind of family notion existed in burials and it was carried into the Middle Ages and modern times. In comparison with later family vaults in churches and on churchyards, the Iron Age examples presented here are strangely short-lived. One-generation Brønsager for sure was short-lived to the extreme, but also Vendehøj and Vorbasse are passing phenomena covering only two or three generations. Inauguration rather than commemoration must therefore be considered an essential part of the RIA family theme.
Linda Boye has discussed Engbjerg as a model three-generation example\textsuperscript{115}. By and large we are right to conclude (1) that there are themes, and (2) that theme analysis has still to be developed.

In the vicinity of Ålborg in Jutland, the Sejlflod cemetery, Grave Group 2, presents an example of how among others child and gender themes could be intertwined and blur the character of a cemetery. This indicates that a cemetery instead of being a one-theme-only installation can be an arena where different themes may be developed and overlay each other. The Lindholm Høje cemetery indicated that there is more to the arena and to themes than the graves, but graves and their different themes are nevertheless sufficient to destroy our possibilities to understand what happened on the arena. At Sejlflod, however, we can still trace some of the arena qualities of a LRIA and MP cemetery.

Roughly speaking, grave orientation at Sejlflod is either east–west or east southeast–west northwest, and graves tend to be fitted into rows. If we check this pattern with the chronology of the cemetery, adding some dates derived from Jens N Nielsen’s catalogue and Ringtved’s criteria, there is a tendency for early graves belonging to Ringtved’s Group C, i.e. 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE, to be orientated east-west. Later in Period D, 5\textsuperscript{th} and part of 6\textsuperscript{th} century, orientations are tilted towards the north. Fig. 43A. The grave density reveals a similar pattern, inasmuch as the earliest graves are relatively speaking sparsely distributed. Their distribution pattern can be described as a kind of open centres, later surrounded by younger and more densely distributed graves. Density therefore is created by later graves and children’s graves and if we count the number of graves represented in each 5 by 5 square metre block, we find that there is one large early hole in the centre of the cemetery, and similarly, in the eastern part, there seems to have been two smaller holes, Fig. 43B. If this is a fact, then the graves in these holes could reflect some kind of kinship or family resemblances reflecting the original layout of the adults’ graves. Later on, this pattern disappears into the new orientation of the rows and the denser burial pattern.

The most obvious patterns stem from the distribution of children’s graves. These graves attract each other and form small clusters characterised by nearness. If we link all graves situated less than five metres from each other, we see the groups and we can conclude that 75 percent of the children’s graves are situated less than five metres from the grave of a neighbouring child. Had they been evenly distributed on the cemetery, the average distance between them would have been c. 9 metres, Fig. 43C. There are no, or just a couple of children’s graves at the ‘holes’ of the cemetery, not at the centre but more so in the peripheries. Children’s graves could be fitted into the rows or put between rows and even force other graves to adjust themselves to existing children’s graves. These clusters are child themes building up over a period of time.

The second most obvious clustering is made up by gender-like groups. Ringtved suggests several possible groups, but for the sake of clarity and example, we can define a sector of gender-similar graves by referring to the number of nearest neighbours representing the same gender as any given grave. Map-
ping the cemetery in this way brings an obvious female sector to the fore, Fig. 43D. This sector belongs to both the C and the D phases. There is no male sector to match this concentration, but to the east and southeast of the female sector, there is a sparsely covered male area, more or less surrounded by female graves. There are some weak tendencies for clusters to occur at the periphery of the cemetery. They must not be over-exaggerated, because by chance, small clusters occur more easily at the periphery, where on one side of the graves there are no graves and thus no negative genders to spoil the pattern.

Nevertheless, if we look only at gender sectorisation and children’s graves, there is a connection between the largest cluster of children and the large section of female graves, Fig. 43E. But in the southwest and the northeast, two small clusters with three female and male graves respectively have both attracted five children’s graves. Some of these contain gender defining artefacts and they reveal that the grave gender of the children does not follow that of the grown ups.

Generally speaking, the Sejlflod cemetery is a mirror of the Sejlflod settlement. It is quite possible that different families may have felt that originally they belonged to different parts of the cemetery. But this does not prevent the cemetery to display a number of themes such as child cluster, gender section, gender balance and child-adult relation next to each other. In Ringtved’s phase D, starting in the 5th century, these traits are weakened and the formal notion of burying people in rows (in itself a kind of theme) becomes more prominent. Sejlflod therefore suggests that some of the themes singled out by cemeteries as belonging to the RIA exist in less pure forms before they disappear into less explicit burial contexts during the MP. This pattern has links to Northwest European burial traditions, but the change is also a change in the character of the arena which becomes more of an expanding field than a scene where different themes are staged. Cemeteries nevertheless have arena qualities.

Summing up the concept of themes, we may say that they are more or less precise and that they exist on a variety of cemeteries distributed between a Brøndsager situation with short-term, singular and limited qualities and a Sejlflod situation with a long-term variety of arena qualities. Themes are introduced when graves become rare in relation to the size of the population. That means that we cannot see graves as expressions of a natural wish among the survivors to commemorate a deceased relative. On the contrary, there has to be a rather specific reason for burying someone as an installation and at a cemetery—a poetic situation as unique as a strophe or a poem. Grave installations are material metaphors or strophes and cemeteries poetic manifestations. Graves and cemeteries, because they are rare manifestations, become the equivalent of other poetic expressions.
Fig. 43A. The cemetery at Sejlflod in Jutland. There are 45 early light green graves and 15 (33%) of these are united by blue East-West lines. There are 62 later dark green graves and only 13 (20%) of these are united by blue East-West lines.

Fig. 43B. Grave density expressed by an escalating blue tone in relation to early and late graves.
Fig. 43C. The light blue children’s graves form clusters with themselves in the denser parts of the cemetery.

Fig. 43D. Clustering described by escalating blue (female) and red (male) colour scales. There is an obvious female sector to the north of the central ‘hole’ in the cemetery, in which men dominate, albeit in a weak cluster.
Second Conclusion: (2) The Decked-Out

Of the different themes pointed out in connection with settlements, graves which designate a dominant individual or a member of a dominant household are the ones that will gain most from extravagance, because funeral riches could be expected to cast their shining spell and sometimes mythic status also among the prodigies of these their splendid ancestors. Decked-out graves are the emblem of the self-declared RIA elite, and although a burial practise which refers to large settlement areas and a greater number of people than the farm-reflecting cemeteries will not benefit in equal measure from rich grave equipments, we may still suspect that the rich graves at e.g. Møllegårdsmarken do represent influential or successful family members. By and large, and owing to the farm-reflecting cemeteries, we are right to suppose that the richly furnished graves are expressions of some kind of economic and social success during or at a certain stage of the social competition leading up to the stratified society of the mid-millennium. The graves of the decked-out are worth looking at, because these installations are part of a fashion that strives to make the buried look embellished and definitely non-local.

Despite different attempts to define them, rich graves are still an ad hoc phenomenon, albeit widely agreed upon. For that reason, Lars Göran Bergquist presented a list of artefacts and suggested that if a grave from the PRIA or RIA contains one of these artefacts, then it is rich. The point of doing so is that it...
works, not because it is a logical or strict definition, but because it reflects what caretakers happened to find lavish. In a few cases, mostly cremations graves, the burial may contain only one such item, but in practice, one of these artefacts seldom come alone and in the LRIA there is a tendency to double the prestigious artefacts instead of defining new ones. Thus few archaeologists will dispute the list of graves that fall out as a consequence of this *ad hoc* definition.\(^\text{119}\)

Chronologically speaking, these richly furnished graves are a twin-peaked phenomenon and thus a twin wave fashion stretched out during c. 500 years, although the peaks are separated by 100 odd years only. If we take the length of the standard chronological periods into account, the second and last wave is the shortest and most dramatic one. The character of this wave come to the fore in the relative escalation in the 10-year index between periods C1a and C1b: from 3.2 to 18.3, i.e. from 3 to 18 graves on average every 10 years, Fig. 44A–C.

In this South Scandinavian region, the twin vogue phenomenon is not a synchronic one, something a division of the region into three sub-areas will make clear, especially if we look at the 10-year indices. The first wave hits vast areas on Jutland and the peak, which is quite marked, belongs in period B2. In the northern area, the first wave is much weaker and not equally marked. In the eastern area, there is an early abrupt occurrence in B1 and a very marked second one in C1b. The first and the second onset are thus more dramatic in the eastern area. The second wave also hits both the southern and the northern areas. In the south, it is as strong as the first wave, but in the northern area, it is stronger and more prolonged. But instead of starting earlier, it continues after the wave has come to an end in the two other areas. Therefore, we may speak of a prolonged second wave. Had the diagrams included even more peripheral areas, this second wave would have peaked even later.

The division of the whole region into sub-areas gives a rough picture only of the events, but there are some main conclusions to be drawn: the waves reflect the success of dominant farms and their settlements. Vendehøj and Vorbasse signify each of the two waves in Jutland, the ones in B:1/B:2 and C:1b respectively. As graves and cemeteries, they each mark a successful step in the social stratification, and they indicate two consecutive steps in the development of society when there was a need to use burials as manifestations of change. In the northern part of South Scandinavia, this social stratification was not equally dramatic and it began somewhat later than in the southern parts. It stands to reason that understanding the two waves of lavishly fitted out graves is a matter of understanding the development of farms and villages.

In the classical world such as the Roman in the first and second centuries CE, historians took an interest in three concepts: Freedom, Justice and Luxury.\(^\text{120}\) Luxury is condemned when thriving, and freedom and justice hailed when losing their high grounds. This is true also of the days of Hadrian when not least the Emperor himself looked back upon the classical Roman period of Caesar and Augustus with a critical eye to the development that followed in the 1\(^\text{st}\) c. CE. He saw himself as reviving classical values and classical culture. The sim-
plicity of Augustus’s homespun clothes was a paragon of myth amidst a continuous and massive display of luxury. In the archaeological material of South Scandinavia, luxury comes to the fore in graves and war offerings and behind these sources there is an obvious context of public display. Luxurious in armament is a growing male phenomenon while luxury in dress and outfit is a growing female vogue, slowly moving luxury into an institutionalized public male sphere and a more private female situation. In terms of LRIA burials, we may speak of a growing contrast between male simplicity and female extravagance. This institutional and gender-bound shift in the use of luxury parallels the contemporary shift in Rome. When vogue, institution and gender structure the growing display of luxury, we must infer a critical discussion, similar to the Roman one, on such expressions and a wish to motivate and regulate the phenomenon in a period when it nevertheless became more and more popular to display it. Out of necessity, the South Scandinavian world was guarded in comparison to the Roman, but in both worlds, luxury and the exotic played similar and parallel parts in a period when society was in the process of reshaping itself. We may argue that society will always, at least more or less, react in this way to growing wealth, but it is difficult to deprive a hegemonic culture of the inspiring force of its model behaviour and model analysis of itself. If a society such as the South Scandinavian one is in the process of developing its social hierarchy and if the process benefits from objects and behaviour that link in with the Roman model of luxury, then Roman culture was in all probability significant.

Fig. 44A. A somewhat arbitrary division of the central part of the South Scandinavian region into three areas. The number of richly equipped graves in each sub-area shows in red.
NOTES
21 Today, archaeologists interested in death, burial and funeral rites have started to make minimal definitions of phenomena such as grave cf. Gansum 2004:112) and burial cf. Oestigaard (2007:5 pp.) in order among other things to make them compatible with a considerable grave deficit. Some calculations e.g. of the number of people living on the farms that was supposed to have produced the graves at a certain cemetery would seem reasonable, but they lacked anything above possible local relevance and they were reasonable only as long as we accept that there were only one farm contributing to a cemetery cf. Ambrosiani. (1973); Hyenstrand (1974:87). The antics of the approach was summarised albeit with a limited critical approach by Furingsten

22 According to Weiss (1973:17 pp. & 66 pp.), the level of infant mortality in a rural pre-industrial society such as that of RIA South Scandinavia where life quality seems to be growing cf. Andersson and Herschend (1997:85 pp.) can be estimated at 20 odd percent. Child deficit has been pointed out by e.g. by Sellevold cf. Balslev Jørgensen et al. (1984), Welinder (1995) Eistrud & Jensen (2000) and Jørgen Jensen (2003:158 pp).

23 These cemeteries have been described by Hella Schultze (1996:148 pp. and 2001:204 pp.), and by Königsson and Rasch (1996:184 pp.) in a Viking Age context. See also Molin (1999).

24 Besides seeing children as belonging to a specific part of a cemetery, they are also linked to specific graves that have during prehistoric and historic times attracted secondary burials of children. In these, children would seem to have been stowed away rather than given a place of their own. Nevertheless, both habits signify children as a group Gamrell (1994:28ff); Pettersson (1992:Fig.5, grave 15); Larje (1989:72); Lundh (1991:289). The time depth in which children are seen as a group with a special albeit most often anonymous relationship with death goes back into the Stone Age. Up and until ERIA as exemplified general publications such as Lillehammer (1989), Johnsen and Welinder, eds (1995) and cases such as Liversage (1981:104); Runcis (2005); Lindman (1993) and Larsson (1994).

25 The rescue excavation of the Ringeby site in Östergötland made it possible for Anders Kaliff to show the heterogeneity behind the deposition of bones on ritual sites and/or cemeteries (1997:40 pp. & 92). In several ways, this started a still fertile field of research into ritual and ritual practises where a need for a general understanding of society must be paired with contextual analysis cf. Oestigaard (2007:67 pp.). In recent years, the widely different views on graves and ritual contexts are attested e.g. in books such as Dealing with the Dead Artelius & Svanberg (2004); Att nå den andra sidan—To Reach the Other Side Notelid (2007); Fire, Water, Heaven and Earth Kaliff (2007), but in spite of these views, a general consensus favouring contextual analysis is nevertheless often made impossible because excavations are still too centred on the grave monuments, the cemetery context or the settlement-as-a-pyre context.

26 Sigtuna is a nice example of the transition within Christianity from the early Christian or Late Heathen to the Churchyard organisation. In the difference between the first cemeteries, The Nunnan Block, and e.g. Church 1, we see how the density pattern changes from a Pagan/Christian to a pure Christian one cf. Kjellström & al. (2007:93 pp.) Obvious manor related cemeteries such as Yeavering or Raunds in Northumbria cf. Hope-Taylor (1977) and Boddington (1987) are not known from South Scandinavia, but may nevertheless to be expected in a transitory period.

27 In the case of Grødby, Wagnkilde (1999; 2000, 2001) or Kieffer-Olsen (1993), silently considering faith and burial ritual being a matter of either pagan or Christian, albeit understanding the biased character of Grødby, do not discuss finer points such as chronological overlap or seemingly traditionally equipped graves being Christian.

28 References to the following sites will clarify the differences between early Christian and late heathen cemeteries and graves: Tirup Kieffer-Olsen (1993); Boldsen (2000); Lindholm Hoje, Ramskov (1976); Grødby Wagnkilde (2001); Løddekøpinge Cintio (1980; 1988); Sebbersund Birkedal & Johansen (1993; 1995; 2000:28 pp.); Christensen & Johansen (1992); Stenlöse Engeberg (1991); Birka Gräslund (1981:4 & 82f); Kaupang. Stylegar (2007). It is nevertheless fair to compare the well-preserved Lindholm Hoje cemetery to the well-preserved churchyard at Tirup, because both villages would seem to have been small. The cemeteries are equally large, c. 700 burial remains. See also Randsborg 1980:80 p. on the relation between settlement size and the number of graves: relatively speaking many graves (10.000) in Viking Age Hedeby and few
(2,000) in Iron Age Gudme, represented by the largest Iron Age cemetery in Denmark, Møllegårdsmarken. Birkedahl and Johansen (2000) have pointed out the archaeological background for this interpretation referring among other things to the settlements such as Sejlflod, Lindholm Høje and Sebbersund and their cemeteries. See also Trier Christensen (2008) on the importance of the eastern part of the Limfjord area.

Caroline Arcini (2004:63-72) has convincingly argued the case for EIA pyresites, supported by an analysis of how they were constructed. Arcini and also Sigvallius (2004:163 pp.) have shown the tendency for existing monuments to attract pyres as well as burials.

The lack of graves has been discussed by Engström (2006:158f. and 2007:94 pp.) The current differences in opinion among archaeologists can be seen comparing the discussion by Engström to that of Appelgren and Renk (2007). The Finnsburg episode in *Beowulf* v. 1108-1124 contains the description of pyre and cremation (cf. Klaeber 1950:174). Concerning the word 'burg': the commonplace meaning township or borough is not automatically to be inferred.

Pyre temperatures were studies by Holck (1987:134 pp.) and found commonly to be high. Seventy percent of the recorded temperature indicators pointed towards temperatures above 1000 C.

Regionality versus super regionality in connection with graves is a problematic field where cautiousness is often eventually exchanged for a less differentiated general view accepting super regionality; compare e.g. Jensen (2003:282 to 2003:322). At least for 30 years, partly based on an analysis by Lotte Hedeager (1978), Ulla Lund Hansen (Lund Hansen & Nielsen 1977; Lund Hansen 1978:25) and following her a vast number of archaeologists have argued that Himlingøje by virtue of the valuable grave finds was a supra regional centre. Perhaps the crescendo of this argumentation is represented by Storgård (2001 or perhaps 2003). Per Ethelberg *et al.* (2000:145 pp.) fits Skovgårde into the Himlingøje power sphere solely on the basis of valuable and symbolic artefacts with the ability to survive in inhumation graves.


In 1985, Kolb surveyed the discussion on demographic estimations in a wider perspective despite his Mesoamerican focus. The subject had not attracted much attention since the mid 1970s and 75 per cent of his references were older than 10 years. Kolb pointed out the difficulties finding a floor area constant as once proposed by Naroll (1962), because the rough correlation and large standard deviations and variances pertaining to the numbers behind the loglog regression implied that an average measure could completely misguide one’s estimations in any given case. Judging by articles written on the subject after Kolb, e.g. Zorn (1994), who does not quote Kolb, many of the problems summed up by Kolb were still evident in 1994. In all probability there is hardly any general solution to the problems of estimating an average floor area per family member, but there are areas as small as 3 sqm in farmer communities with one-room dwellings.

The excavation and research history is described by Rindel in his introduction (1997, Vol 1:10-40). The methods, revolutionary in their days, consisted of stripping off the top soil with a machine cf. Becker (1965:209f; 1968:236; 1971:81 p.) surveys rested on trail excavations and most important on field walking and information provided by the farmers about the finds in the
fields after having ploughed them. Cf. Becker (1966:39 p.) Eventually, 250 house remains in 160,000 square metres (one house in c. 640 sqm) were excavated (Becker 1975:296).

42 (Rindel 1997:Catalog pp. 138 pp.).
43 (Rindel 1997:Catalog p. 144.).

44 Cf. Lindqvist (1970:86 pp.) concerning the expression sepalchrum caespite erigitur— the grave is erected with turf. Translations, such as Rives’ (1999:88), that suppose the words to mean that there is a mound over the grave, or anything but a modest cover which may well have been a turf, have chosen to refer to a kind of monument that archaeologists cannot find. General references to Germania for uncontroversial points could always be looked up in Mattingley 1970, Rives 1999 or Önnerfors (2005).

45 Owing to his experience in rescue archaeology and a novel view on ancient monuments and places, Anders Kaliff was able to significantly broaden the view on burials and sacred places in relation to LBA and EIA usage of cemeteries in his dissertation (1997).


47 The branch connecting sites in the area where the connection between the dominant farm and a grave is present can be designated by the following sites: Wijster van Es (1967); Vorbasse Hvass (1983); Vendehoj Ejstrud & Jensen (2000); Brøndsgager Fonnecke-Sandberg (2000:26; 2004); Veien Gustafson (2001); Rosental Fallgren (2006) and Gene Ramqvist (1983). Prescott (1998:219) has discussed and referred examples from the southern Norwegian highlands and suggested the tentative interpretation that the association between house and mound/cairn is so essential that the lack of something to bury cannot prevent the erection of a monument.


49 Maps in Fallgren (2006) contain a number of examples.

50 The grave from Eggja is put into its context by Schetelig in Olsen (1914-24:78-82) and Solberg (1986); and the obscure runic text on its covering slab can be studied in Olsen (1914-24) Jacobsen (1931) or McKinnel et al (2004). The position of the cairn with the richly equipped grave at Einangen in Lofoten Johansen (1990:20, 2003:Fig 4.1 & p.27) testifies to a prominent demarcation of a border, while the beheaded men at Halleby River, just south of the Tissø manor, refer to a more gothic checkpoint Jørgensen (2003).

51 On Tissø see Jørgensen (2003).

52 There are a number of places which have been visited and recreated for thousands of years for what seems to have been not much of a reason (cf. Goldhahn 2007:33 p.). Some, such as the small Unnerd mountain in Gothenburg, represent a large input of work and iteration (Andersson, S. 1996; 2003). Some, like the Kyrsta impediment in Ärentuna north of Uppsala, represent iteration more than input of work (Engström 2006). Some, like Roteberg in Sollentuna north of Stockholm, represent little iteration and less work (Bäckström & al. 2001). Some, like the impediment at Lunda East of Strängnäs, fit the notion of a harg (see below note 110 and Andersson, G. 2004). What makes these places resemble each other is the fact that for a long time they were seen as sufficiently significant to attract all kinds of reoccurring and unique civilising visits and performances. Eventually, most often in prehistory, these places stopped being productive and
some, e.g. Unnared and Kyrsta were turned into places of ancient monuments already in prehistory.
53 Cf. maps in Fallgren (2006). A case in point is the cemetery which was later over by the Valsgärde manor and converted into a VP-VA boat grave cemetery. Already in PRIA graves were lined along a track leading from a ford in the river Fyris, deliberately crossing the small hill rather than going around it, and south into the settlement area, cf. Ljungkvist (2008:39; Fig.11).
54 Ramqvist (2007:164 p.) has summarised the phenomenon Inland Graves (insjögravar) with a view to the balance between different economic occupations such as exploitation of natural resources, hunting for subsistence or herding and related burial practices. cf. Engelmark (1978:45 pp.), Gollwitzer (1997 &2001) and Stedingk & Baudou (2006:185 pp.).
57 For uncontroversial references to The Poetic Edda references are made to Larrington (1999) in this case the poem Voluspá.
86 Olsen (1914-24:78 p.) has given the best account of the find circumstances for the Eggja stone. Spurkland (2006:33 pp.) has references to the runic text on the slab. The location of the site at the old road out of Sogndal can be seen in Fig. 13B.
59 The cemetery has been re-examined and mapped (see Rindel & Schou Jørgensen 1998:221).
60 Geometrical patterns are the emblems of PRIA graves. Circles with central blocks, wheel crosses, squares, envelopes as well as pentagrams and heptagrams are all patterns that characterize the outer structure of PRIA graves see Gräslund 2009:18-24.
61 The identification and the use of Caesar’s lilies have been discussed e.g. by Eriksen & Rindel (2002; 2003; 2005). Jensen (2003:94 pp.) gives an overview of the sites.
62 PRIA as a period of unrest is indicated by the offerings at Hjortspring Randsborg (1996) and some other smaller finds Kaul (2003:219 p.), by Caesar’s lilies and by defence works such as Lyngsmose and Borremose (Eriksen and Rindel 2003, Jensen 2003:127 pp.) as well as fenced communities, (cf. Rindel 2002:167). Also the mentioning of Cimbri and Teutones (cf. Lund 1993:82), but more so Caesar’s account of Germani and Ariovist (Gallic War 1.31-54) point in the direction of LPRIA in Western Europe north of the Rhine being a turbulent period.
63 cf. Rindel (1999, the series Figs 21.7 compared to 21.9 and 21.10).
64 Hedeager & Kristiansen (1982).
65 On burial practices aiming at singling out the representative graves within a family, see Jørgensen (1988).
66 The Romans shared this idea of graves inaugurating a new settlement by means of grave monuments with a memorial touch. Consequently, they may also have served as a paragon for more modest barbarian, Germanian or South Scandinavian pillars of society wishing to inaugurate and commemorate in one and the same grave and monument. In her investigation of Roman monuments in Mainz, Hope (2001:105 tables 3.6-3.10), has showed that to begin with when the settlement was founded, 13 BCE cf. Wiegels (2000:534 pp.) the need for grave monuments was large, 85 percent of the funerary monuments were 1st century, with a small maximum a couple of generations into the 1st c. CE. Of the non funerary monuments only 27 or 10 percent were 1st century. Later therefore these other kind of memorials took their place in the public space. As time went by, i.e. in the 2nd and 3rd c. the need for monuments generally speaking shrank and became stable, on average 14 monuments per decade. This means that when the need to commemorate something is decisive such as a dynamic beginning, death comes in handy during three generations because it happens so frequently and because those who played a role in shaping or reshaping a society could easily be seen as significant when they died.
Eistrud and Jensen (2000), Klingenberg (2006), Hedeager & Kristiansen (1982:Fig. 43 gr 50) and Herschend (1999:61-63).

See Neumann (1978), Hørløkke, and later Ethelberg (2003:206; Galsted), linked these grave monuments to Roman graves south of Limes.


See Hvass (1988:70 and Fig. 17).

Arthenius (1995:321 311-355) has pointed out that the helmet in the Old Uppsala East Mound will fit only the 12 year old child in that grave and not the woman. On Högom, see Ramqvist (1992) and on the dress of the man, Nockert (1991). Concerning the age of the buried man, Brusling (1992:16 p. &43 pp.) has pointed out that the dimensions of the tunic, e.g. the circumference of the cuffs, 16 cm, will fit only a very slender person and thus hardly a grown up.


Ishøj (cf. Boye 2006:111&318); Ishøj SB 30 see FOF; Rosendal (Fallgren 2006:32 pp.) Vaxmyra Eklund (2005:27) are economically one-sided settlements without being at the centre of any larger settlement or area.

The rich and diversified material from these excavations must be studied in a number of publication e.g: Mahler (1985; 2000) Boye (2002a; 2002b; 2002c; 2003; 2006) Fonnesbech-Sandberg (2000a; 2000b; 2002a; 2002b; 2004; 2006).

(ETHELBERG 2000:25 pp.).


A possible unobtrusive example could be the small poorly equipped cemetery Eksercépladsen in Vordingborg (cf. Kjær-Hansen 1989:132).

See Nielsen, H (1992) and Ethelberg et al. (2000).

Based on Mogens B Mackeprangs report on the excavations at Udby 1943, The Danish National Museum no C 24129-36, we can state the following: The male grave is situated 59 metres west of main road, today’s road 151 and 83.5 metres north of the east-west local road which connected the village with the main road. To the South, 1.5 km, is Egebjerg where Blom and Sarrawu have excavated LRIA graves. The skeleton no 1 1943 was orientated SW-NE with the head in the SW. The Hemmoor bucket stood north of the man’s right foot. Around the feet there were remains of some kind of shoes with silver clad bronze buttons and plain clasps. The skeleton no 2 1944 was situated c. 21 metres NW of skeleton no 1 (i.e. towards the other female graves discovered in 1988) with the head to the North facing skeleton no 1.

References to Skovgårde are Ethelberg (1989); Ethelberg et al. (2000) and Mackeprang (1944).

See Bergqvist (2005).

Friezes on Hemmor buckets are quite common and can also depict other circus or hunting scenes. Cf. Andersson (1993:36 no 123). Lund Hansen (1987) Mackeprang (1944:64 pp.) There is a well illustrated example in the find from Otterstadt, se Stardier (2006:201 and Fig. 264). Nereids, Tritons or Ichthyocentauri, their father and mother, sisters and twin brothers as well as their aquatic friends and foes may be looked up in Pauly’s Reallexikon and in LIMC. (Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae). Far from being esoteric they belong to a group of marine creatures popular among bath stylists of the first centuries CE, Cf. Packard (1980:330 p.).


Early in Scandinavian archaeology, this fault was unwillingly committed by Vedel (1884) and Bolin (1926) in connection with hoards of bullion. For that reason, it could rightly be termed the Vedel-Bolin trap (Herschend 1980). The point is ample enough: Gold hoards from the MP are signs of wealth but also considered to be sign of some sort of crisis, often unrest or wartimes. When the hoards disappear we are all certainly trapped between seeing the lack of hoards as a sign of poverty or peace, of poverty and war or of poverty or prosperous peaceful times. The simplistic either/or interpretation of simple expressions, such as burials or hoards, of very complex phenomena will sooner or later trap the archaeologist between incompatible interpretations.

See Bennike & Alexandersen (2000).

See Balslev Jørgensen et al. (1984) and Andersson & Herschend (1997:Fig 26a & b).

There is probably a wealth of other interesting material aspects concerning life and death in Skovgårde, e.g. in relation to the Charon coin tradition, see Boye (2002b).


It seems likely, according to Montagu 1957, that the menarche begins at age of 15 and usually it is followed by a period of so called adolescent fertility. Understanding fertility as fertility within seven 5-year classes, the reproductive maximum can be shown to occur in a flat top between 20 and 30 escalating rapidly towards menopause at c. 50, cf. Weiss (1973:Fig 3).


Cf. Nielsen H (1992) and Nielsen, J (2000:10; Fig 10).

See Hatting (2000:406 p. There are other examples of violent offering rituals e.g. the decapitation in of a horse at Eketorp, Backe et al. (1993:355;Fig.10).

At Smørum, skeletons were badly preserved and three graves cannot be defines as materially speaking male or female, cf. Boye (2006:161 p.; 2007:21 pp.) Nevertheless, the Smørum cemetery could represent a context in which one grave signifies the male gender or a male role, surrounded by 8 graves signifying a female role.

See Behrens (1998).


Except for the new cemetery at Ellekilde (cf. Iversen 2008), all these places with prominent graves: Harpelev, Grumløse, Hastrup, Broksø, Broksøvejen, Nestelsøgård, Kildemarkskvæf, Skytte-væf and Thorslunde, can be looked up in Bergqvist (2005:catalogue). There is only a preliminary report on the Ellekilde cemetery. Created in ERÅ it seems at first to be a relatively anonymous, but after a hiatus, a rich 3rd century male grave in a mound became its centre, attracting a number of new graves. Its new theme therefore can be compared to that of an unmitigated 3rd century Vorbasse scene—a prominent founding father surrounded by kin and clients.

On this complex, see Madsen (1995:Fig1; 1999). The area in connection with Storhøj is a settlement and cemetery area before and after the Hedegård settlement, but during the settlement phase the area is marginal.


Hieros gamos in Nordic tradition is analysed by Steinsland (1991). The concept has a long scholarly tradition; Skogstrand (2008) has discussed this and dismissed the BA origin of the con-
cept. Other Indo-European concepts with a prolonged echo such as the Twin Gods are still considered a BA phenomenon cf. Kristiansen (2004).

106 The abbreviations MP and VP (Migration Period and Vendel Period, the latter of which may be divided in to an early and a later phase around 680 CE are the Swedish equivalents of Danish terms EMP and LMP.

107 Gösslunda is described by Königsson & Rasch (1996:275 pp.). In this monument there are first of all 5 graves from the initial phases of the monument when it so to speak was a new monument, now and then attracting secondary graves between EPRIA and RIA B1. But in addition to this there is one grave from the EMP and one from the LMP respectively. In this during the LIA deviant monument, no less than 28 per cent of the graves belong to these otherwise non-frequent burial periods. Still the cairn is an example of the need now and then to bury someone in a very old monument

108 This word, coined by Steven Poole (2006) in his book UnspeakTM, is defined as a mode of speech that persuades by stealth. E.g., climate change, war on terror, ethnic cleansing, road map.


110 A harg is an open air sacred place, an elevation with different constructions made of stone and wood, cf. Sundkvist 2008:147. The Kyrsta impediment see Engström & Wikborg (2006:Fig 18) fits this definition even though no wooden constructions could be detected. The sacrificial sites at Helgö Zachrisson (2004:354 pp.) and Linda Andersson & al. (2004:14 pp.) also fit the definition of a harg, and so does a stone supporting structure at the Eskorp ring fort on Öland, cf. Fabech (2006).

111 Some grave buildings in southern Jutland show Roman influences, see Neumann (1978:21).

112 The present day church in Ärentuna is dated to c. 1300 CE, see Wikborg (2007).

113 Hella Schultze (2001:204 pp.).


115 See Boye (2002A) and Fonnesbech-Sandberg (2006).

116 For the interpretation of these complex patterns and long-term connections one can follow the notes in Ringtved (1988b); Schegschneider (2000) or Birkedahl & Johansen (2000).

117 Since the early 1990s (cf. Andrén 1993:50), the metaphoric qualities of the grave has been pointed out and material metaphors as a concept has been steadily developing.

118 The cemetery Möllegårdsmarken, cf. Albrechtsen (1954-73), is thematic inasmuch as it is the only very large and complex cemetery which demonstrates the centre of a RIA realm. The Gudme realm is in itself outstanding in South Scandinavia and a very complex phenomenon. Similarly, Möllegårdsmarken would seem too complex to be analysed according to any themes.

119 Sorting society according to the equipment in its graves is a tricky business. The more elaborate the models of sorting and their relation to society, the more specific and less general the contexts to which the models apply. Ethelberg (2000:145 pp.) refers to the sorting problems and settles for an ad hoc solution and so does Bergqvist (2005:257 p.), who strives to solve this problem by pointing out only those graves that were the more richly equipped in relation to geographically and chronologically contemporary graves. His criterion is built upon the interest taken in demonstrating a network greater than the local in the choice of grave goods. The graves in his catalogue therefore collect the graves that were indeed better equipped, inasmuch as they contain a material that had a value related to production as well as transportation. If this way of sorting the graves brings out a pattern, at least it reflects a very simple assumption, namely that some wanted to equip their graves in a different and less parochial and probably also more expensive way. The same is true more or less also for Ethelberg’s approach. Nevertheless and contrary to Bergquist, Ethelberg exerts himself ranking these RIA Zealand corpses according to a Latin system labelling them as no less than rex, dux, princeps, comes, ingenuus, libertus/servus (cf. Ethel-
It is not clear why Ethelberg cannot differentiate between serfs and freedmen. Needless to say, Tacitus is behind the labelling and that makes caution and a reference to Lund (e.g. 1993:46 pp) called for.

120 Cf. The article 'Luxus' in Pauly (vol 9 cols 534 p.).
CHAPTER III

ORDERING HOUSE AND SETTLEMENT
Introduction

The world as a landscape: landscape as in what we see around us and landscape as in more than we can see, i.e. all landscapes in some way or other perceived and understood, existing in any given moment, will make up the world in which we act. In this sense of space, we create and refer to the human landscape as a kind of order.

Perception and understanding, although always hard to separate despite the often obvious interval between them, are two fundamental categories, because the perceived is thought to be able to harbour the meaningful, as sound will harbour language. Understanding the landscape is in other word a case for the leap from ‘I have seen’ to ‘I know’. This leap makes us act upon what we have seen and felt as if we respond to the result of an action, which in its turn is the result of something preconceived and carried out. In this way, we not only make the perceived situated in the historic, we also come to see the landscape, not least the human, as responding to our actions. Since the landscape can respond, it also possesses the ability partly to free itself from our definition of it as historic and manageable. When this happens it surprises us and that again urges us to undertake a new analysis of the landscape in order once again to manage it in what is, hopefully, a never ending interaction. The landscape becomes a present predicament and makes an impact upon us. Because we accept this interactive character between on the one hand, the ordered and historic landscape and on the other, the landscape or nature (formerly also the supernatural) as a reality, we believe the landscape to be an attractive field of research.

There are landscapes linked to centres within themselves, landscapes seen from a point of view, and landscapes which we consider to be surroundings in which we recognise places, centres as well as focal points and nodes. Seeing centres, nodes, focal points or places and surroundings is the basic methodology for making a landscape historic, i.e. a landscape acted upon and in some sense controlled.

There are patchwork landscapes in which every scrap is a node in itself or a field containing a nodal point or nodal feature—something to catch the eye. To the pure ‘view’ the ‘node’ is neutral, i.e., no more than observed as part of a structure, but every node may be reconsidered and become centred or focal if we put ourselves in a certain perspective or apply a filter that singles out some but not other features from the greater landscape. This means that granted a view, any node may be recast in our minds to dominate others in a hierarchical system. In practice or in the past, some nodes are easier to recast than others.
Basically, a centre will relate to surroundings and have some sort of governing quality, while a focal point is the intersection of phenomena converging in a point and thus creating a focus or an enhanced phenomenon in a certain place. Underlying such a landscape, characterised by centres or focal points, there will however be a space consisting of several patches or areas, each containing no more than nodes, in a system which may or may not become a system of nodes ranked and transformed into centres or focal points. Therefore centrality, focality and nodality, i.e. the quality in our mind of a landscape displaying centres, foci or nodes, give initial meaning to our surroundings, and any feature in a landscape can shift between being merely perceived or indeed understood as a centre, a focal point or a node. Most landscapes will be nodally or focally arranged in eyes of the beholder, because one tends to take for granted one’s own point of view. This point is often tacitly understood as a centre, but moreover, because it is evident that the concept of land-scape – i.e. ‘scape’ in the terminology of the poet G. M. Hopkins: a reflection or impression of the individual quality of a thing or action121—is a meaningful mental and actual field created through sight, viewpoint and observed points, which refers to space on different scales. Owing to the concept of dimensions therefore, a centred or focal landscape could be viewed as a nodal or focal one or as part of a larger nodal, focal or centred landscape, all depending on the scale and our point of view.

In the time space of this study, South Scandinavia c. 500 BCE to 500 CE, centred or focal landscapes, although growing, tend to be small rather than large. There are however known exceptions. Therefore, even the educated South Scandinavian from his or her peripheral point of view could for a very long time consider the city of Rome the centre as well as the focal point of a landscape made up by the Roman Empire, because Rome, the city and its Forum, was the obvious focal point to which all roads were supposed to lead, as well as the centre which radiated ‘the imperial’122. When this cognitive imperial landscape dissolved, the disintegrating human landscape obviously favoured a nodal understanding of the world and simultaneously ‘the world’, in the expression ‘the view of the world’, lost some dimensions and became narrower because of this loss. The mental landscape of the heroic traveller, whether he is a Beowulf, a Heliand, or a Dane like Prince Hnaef in the Finnsburg Fragment, is nodal and super-regional in a vast network of halls and places. On the local scale, halls turn into centres, but on the super-regional scale, i.e. the travelling scale of the heroes, halls are the civilised, albeit now and then haunted, nodes of a network123.

But we will start trying to understand how the settlements fit into and create landscapes because they constitute places. Way back in PRIA, to begin with, in a region stretching from Holland to Central Sweden, essential points in the landscapes fluctuated. They were floating because farm houses were unlikely to be rebuilt on the exact spot, site or place where they were originally erected and thus the human landscape tended to be continuously analysed anew and rearranged. In fact, farms never suffered total makeover. Although maintenance was no doubt a perpetual task if not a daily occupation, the fundamental supporting parts of the house construction, the posts and the walls, were hardly ever pulled down or out of their holes in order to be substituted by new ones in the same foundations. Innumerable archaeological excavations
have sectioned PRIA postholes and showed them to be in one phase only, thus proving them never to have been used to support more than the post originally anchored in these holes. In other words: the ‘place’ occupied by the house was created by the very erection of the building and the ‘place’, in this case a typical nodal point in the human landscape, aged and decayed with the building.

Today, preservation limits our understanding of the house in terms of maintenance and decay, and other elements beside supporting posts and walls, could well have been slowly decaying or indeed maintained similar to human beings growing old despite their taking care of themselves. Given these limitations, only when we section post holes from the later part of the period do we begin to see that essential parts of the house skeleton, the roof-supporting posts, show signs of having been renewed. In houses form the RIA and later periods, on the other hand, such signs are abundant and indeed the rule. In this period rebuilding a house is often seen to be an addition to one end or a small displacement length- or sidewise indicating that the old house was pulled down and the new one erected simultaneously, Fig. 45A&B. 124

Recalling PRIA landscape therefore will be a matter of accommodating a series of fluctuating landscapes with houses growing up, growing old and being closed down at different points in time and space giving the PRIA settlement landscape its floating character. Recalling RIA landscape, on the other hand, will be a matter of accommodating a landscape in which the shades of a number of stable settlements were continuously shifting a little. The transition from the nodal and floating to the focal and fixed landscape is the most essential characteristic of the transition from the PRIA to the RIA.

Fig. 45A&B. An example from Drengsted of three partly repaired houses built on top of each other without necessarily pulling down the older house completely before erecting the new one. The blue house is the oldest and its short end has been rebuilt in quite a rough way. The next house is the red one and the youngest house is the green one. Based on Mikkelsen & Nørbach (2003).
The House as Remains

When we look at house remains from the PRIA, we should ask ourselves whether these houses were left to become ruins or pulled down or demolished or levelled out or covered-up when they had served their purpose. In nearly all cases, the state of preservation has destroyed the house completely, leaving only the lower part of the postholes to be excavated and interpreted. But in some cases when preservation is better, it would seem that houses have indeed been pulled down and demolished, but also buried or sealed. We can understand these house burials to be the result of rituals centring on the covering-up of the floor and the foundations below it. This view of the house is in harmony with the house as linked to offerings in its foundations because offerings, as well as the ritually conducted termination of the house as an edifice, refer to the metaphysical values of the building as something added to the house as a construction. The house therefore has ‘landscape’ qualities, despite the fact that to our mind, these added values can only be signified, not sensed.

Anne Carlie has identified a handful of house remains in which it would seem that one has deposited a specific artefact material or constructed a burial in connection with the abandonment of a house. These cases are no doubt very clear ones, but they would seem only to be the few examples left of a once widespread practice that the normal preservation of houses will not allow us to see. Modern excavations in well-preserved settlements, such as the one in Nørre Tranders, however, testify to the general importance of the house offerings. Although we may speak of a kind of burial rite, and of house remains being visible in the landscape as a kind of monuments, such low house shaped hill-ocks are obviously not by far as permanently sacred as graves. This is indicated by the simple fact that there are very few such house monuments compared to the number of graves even in periods such as EPRIA, when houses were most likely to be sealed up. This comparative lack of houses is true with the notable exception of the abandoned houses in peripheral South and Central Scandinavia in the Migration and Vendel Period (MP and VP). Here we may talk of a period in which houses were left as monuments in the landscape. On the other hand, these houses represent a major shift in land use and that, in the long run, preserved them as ruins. Probably we are correct when we say that the covering or burying ritual in itself and the temporality of the hillock before it falls out of memory and veneration, is the essential thing because the treatment of the house remains, similar to that of the cremated body, can be said to form a commemorative pattern. In addition to this, we must not forget that many RIA and MP buildings destroyed the remains of PRIA houses when the old abandoned sites attracted new settlements. It stands to reason that the reformed RIA concept of the house tended to desecrate house hillocks.

When it comes to burying or sealing houses there are some well-known Danish examples not least in the so called village mounds. These sites belong to relatively deforested and limited areas in Northern Jutland where the inhabi-
tants have been forced to use more turf than usual in their houses. Moreover, they have chosen to build all their abodes within a very limited area, one house more or less on top of a demolished one. For two reasons, the limited area in itself is significant: (1) the structural village character, i.e. ‘village’ in terms of a group of clearly defined farms, is not very developed and (2) IA building materials are always reflecting the material available in the environment of the settlement\textsuperscript{126}. This mound habit or fashion, moreover, stands out as regional, deviant and specific in a South Scandinavian context and indeed as a fashion. The village mounds therefore remind one of the structural phenomenon termed inversion, i.e., the inversion of the spread-out settlement into something opposite, the narrowly limited place. Only in part is the tradition determined by the physical landscape in a way similar to the settlement traditions e.g. in the Gest. First and foremost, the pattern constitutes a social norm chosen to make up the contrast to the adjacent settlement areas\textsuperscript{127}.

In the village mounds it may at first seem as though one house was built upon its immediate predecessor, making the mound the result of a will to rebuild a specific house, but that is not the case. In fact, to begin with, each new house was built on an open plot above a sealed house. When excavated, the stratigraphy therefore consists of a series of sealed house remains marked by a short hiatus rather than continuity. Despite the fact that the community as such was continuously inhabited, only a part of its area was at any given moment covered by buildings in a slightly unstable pattern. The stable focal or central character of the place was in other words not significant compared to its nodal and floating character. Only in the late, RIA, phases did rebuilding become the norm. Earlier on, people built anew reusing a plot or a sub-area of the settlement. The total space being still limited and the need for erecting new houses still great, the effect is none the less a long series of stratified house remains at a certain place in the landscape.

Because preservation in the village mounds is extremely good, the remains are easy to date and that means that a series of layers comprising 14 houses covers c. 500 years\textsuperscript{128}. The average lifespan of a house is in other words around 30 years, allowing for a small time gap between two buildings in a series, Fig. 46A&B. Compared to houses preserved in arable land, many artefacts are found in these settlements. The number of finds however, does not by far total all the artefacts lying or standing on the floors when the houses were lived in. Instead, nearly all goods and chattels were moved out before the floor was covered by those parts of the turf walls or roof that were spread out over the site when the house was pulled down. However, some artefacts were spared and buried in the process.
Fig. 46A. The excavation plan from Norre Fjand shows how to begin with the main farms moved a little between each building phase, House XIV to House XVIII to House IX, but after this series, i.e. in the youngest settlement phase, rebuilding one’s house on the same spot starts with houses IXb and IXc. Based on Hatt (1957).
Fig. 46B. At Selager we can see the same typical movement in the blue square and also in the red one. Here in the centre of the settlement, a paved road runs between the two farms where the position of the buildings have shifted a little. There are between 5 and 7 house phases in a series in this part of the settlement, which cover a period of 150–200 years, making the average house phase c. 30 years long. At Selager, however, there are also examples, although not completely investigated, of houses having been rebuilt while the old house was still standing, cf. the green area. Based on Knudsen & Rindel (1989). See also examples of these differences in Jensen (1977).

Had everything used during the lifetime of a house been deposited, layers would have been much larger and indeed reminded us of the later Norwegian farm mounds. In these more extreme rural settlements, the artefact material is abundant because there were no or just small second-rate fields where one could dispose of waste and manure. From a village mound, probably almost everything was recycled or moved out of the village as garbage or waste into the
fields. The houses and the settlements were no doubt tidy and neat when they were occupied, even if they did not live up to our standards.

We must in other words draw the conclusion that when a house was abandoned, it was done according to a balance between leaving the house as it was and completely removing it. The floor and some things belonging to the house and household were in other words left intact before the roof was pulled off, some rafters and posts taken care of and the rest covered in turf. Needless to say, offerings in both the roof- and the wall-supporting foundations were also frequently left in the remains and covered up. Owing to the fact that far from all the turf could have been used for this purpose, we must think that the point was indeed to cover up or seal the floor and leave on it that which it was thought fit not to move away from the house or the settlement. Without much ado, everything could of course have been cleared out, had it been the intention of those who took care of the building. What was left was but a fraction and thus something chosen not to be removed.

In burnt-down houses, where the preservation is sometimes even better than in the mounds, it becomes most obvious that things, which one would have found it reasonable to remove, even if they were damaged by fire, were not removed: not manure, not grinding stones, not animals, not human beings. Many things were no doubt removed; even things severely damaged by fire, but still not everything was taken away before the remains of the house were sealed. It meets the eye that also human beings were left on the floors and buried together with the house in a period when undertakers must have been expert collectors of bones from cremated bodies.

To support the general character of the attitudes to abandoned houses, the odd floor can be studied even from later periods and that will give us the opportunity to get a better grip on the intentions behind preserving a floor. In House 11 at MP Vallhagar on Gotland, the fact that the remains of a dead person were left at the scene of fire, together with a number of artefacts, was interpreted by its investigators as yet another proof of the fact that the abandonment of the house was a result of the catastrophic state of war devastating the island. Consequently, and far worse than a plague scenario, nobody was left to take care of the remains. If we prefer this kind of seemingly rational, but very specific explanation, to a less dramatic partly ritual practice that would allow for the house to be buried as well as pulled down even if it happened to be burnt down, then we also infer a very radical interpretation, in which but a handful of excavated houses are the sign of a total destruction of society. It would seem much more reasonable to suggest that the burned houses were indeed exceptional, but singular events that ought in some way to be handled. Turning the house into a monument after it has ceased to exist as a house is not an unreasonable thing to do especially if the way the house came to an end was significant, if e.g., it meant the end of a household and its family. Continuous floor management and the occasional sealing of a house floor are also attested on the farm from MP
Dune in Dalhem. But in most cases archaeology has given us too little information about the biography of the Gotlandic house.

As indicated by the example from Vallhagar, the tendency for a floor to be sealed can be followed hundreds of years into our era and now and then we find cases where common sense rationality cannot at all explain the phenomenon. On Öland, in the Eketorp ring fort, where the house walls during the middle of the 1st millennium CE supported their roofs for almost 300 years. i.e. a time span equivalent to 10 generations of roofs, excavations most often revealed two distinct floors, now and then three, and in a few cases only one in the 50 odd houses, Fig. 47A–C. Obviously what was found on these floors did not represent what was dropped on them during a hypothetical average floor life extending more than a hundred years. Only that was found which happened to be dropped, trodden down, or left on the floor just before someone wanted to rebuild or leave the house.

Rebuilding a house in the ring fort means first of all to put in a layer of earth, thus raising the floor level, and then to make a new set of roof-supporting foundations. In effect, this procedure means lowering the walls and if we do not want to lose space, we shall have to add two new causes to the walls. However, that could turn out to be quite an affair, because in the radial layout of the ring fort such alterations must nearly always be agreed upon by ones neighbours with whom the house walls were shared. From the point of view of the defence, moreover, raising the walls and thus the roof could be a problem because the roof may become a visible target above the rampart. Compared to just doing the usual: shuffle out the old floor and make a new one on a suitable lower level, the opposite, adding a layer raising the floor, is not an obvious common sense thing to do, quite the opposite.

During nearly all the 300 years or so when the house walls in Eketorp were used, what actually happened to the floor was of course that it was dug away or levelled. The original floors have no doubt been used, repaired, redressed and cleaned innumerable times during the ten odd generations when they were live on. Therefore, we must ask ourselves why there are two floors rather than just one, or why not 10, if there are more than one. Do two or in some cases three make a difference? Sometimes, it must have made just that, because the lower floor is always sealed by a 10 to 20 cm thick layer of earth. Even in case the lower floor was that of a byre and part of the remains left on the floors were waste from the lamb slaughter, the inhabitants, instead of cleaning up, preferred to raise the floor a bit, sealing it before converting it. The conclusion we should draw from this context is not that the floor of the houses were raised, but that the original house represented by its floor was sealed and abandoned. There was a need to bury a situation related to some sort of house identity expressed most clearly by the earthen floor and the remains laying on it.
Fig. 47A–C. (A) The section through the two floor levels in House II at Eketorps Borg. In this ring fort, no less than 33 14C-dates from the hearths in an equal number of floors suggest that the second ring fort was in use for c. 300 years between 385 and 675 CE (cf. Herschend 1994B:68f). The artefact material suggests an equally long era, but the find material stresses the later part of the period. In House II, only two of expected ten floors to fill up a 300 year period have been preserved and the oldest of these two floors was protected or sealed by a layer of earth. The postholes and post-supporting limestone slabs have been projected on the section along the mid axis of the house. The section shows that the floor levels are inseparable in the outermost part of the house, where the remains of the first ring fort rampart form a stable foundation for the earth floor causing the floor to be torn away. The time difference between the roof construction of the lower (B) and upper floor (C) is indicated by the differences in the post pattern. The younger pattern has a narrower mid aisle and a greater distance between the trestles in the inner part of the house. That difference is in compliance with a 200 year gap.
Also when the whole settlement was abandoned, the limestone house walls were pulled down over the untidy floors after the houses had been dismantled. It can be argued that doing this was a way to prevent squatter from settling in the roofless houses, perhaps repairing them and it is an indisputable effect of the demolition that what is left is difficult to roof. However, forgetting to pull down the ring wall nevertheless gave the squatters enough protection, and walls, to move in once the ordinary population had moved out.\textsuperscript{131}

Compared to the early examples from the village mounds, mid first millennium CE Eketorp stand out as a similar, but peripheral example of respect for the house floor in a very deviant settlement—an echo in its floors of a once more specific tradition, now completely transformed, not least because the houses in the ring fort stood for a longer period of time than ten PRIA houses without becoming a village mound. Despite the growing life length of the building, it would nevertheless seem that in an abstract sense, ‘the house’ signified by ‘the floor’ could come to an end while the walls were still standing. Since the normal is not to rebuild in such a way that it preserves an earlier floor, we understand that it takes an unusual event to preserve. In Eketorp, we may suspect that it is the many changes from an original outhouse function to a secondary dwelling function that cause the sealing of old floors to become a pattern. But there are also examples of two dwelling floors on top of each other as well as a few houses with one floor only. These situations indicate that the real reason for sealing a floor and rebuilding a house has to do with a radical change among the inhabitants living in the houses. Although we do not know the precise reasons for sealing a floor, we may infer that it could be consistent e.g. with a radical change of house ownership. The dominant and functionally speaking stable farm in the ring fort, houses 02, 03 and 04, on the other hand, has only one floor in each of its houses, Fig. 91A&B.

Given second thoughts about the sealed PRIA houses in most of Jutland, i.e. outside the village mounds, we understand that a pulled down house would have reminded a visitor of a low four-sided barrow or indeed a ‘house monument’, i.e. the equivalent to a grave monument. This is especially true during EPRIA when hillock graves would have been the round counterpart of the rectangular house mound. A case in point is the well preserved house remains from Gørding Hede. House 1 was left with some of its kitchen ware still intact on the floor before the house was set fire to and eventually preserved as a low four-sided mound, still in the late 1940s, some 20 cm high and visible, Fig. 48A–B.
Preserved by chance, the house hillock shows us that although some houses were burnt down by accident, others such as the one from Gørding were burnt down on purpose, because they were not abandoned in a hurry, but emptied and prepared, before they were set fire to. The house came to an end the same way one puts an end to the human corpse on the pyre. In fact, in areas characterised by houses with walls in wattle and daub, one of the most common finds in the post holes of an EIA house are fragments of burnt daub which may well be explained as the result of setting fire to the house\textsuperscript{132}. Moreover, judging from the settlement offerings in at the village mound at Norre Tranders, it seems that rituals involving fire were the preferred ones when marking out the termination
of something such as a house or a household, not least while construction offerings never involve a fire. At Nørre Tranders, the settlement-linked fire offerings could represent the ritual house fires that cannot be performed in a dense agglomeration of farm houses. Be this as it may, both types of house destruction, by chance or on purpose, tie in with a stage in the preparation of the house to become a burial monument or a household memorial. The accidental fire would now and then have obliged people to seal the house and preserve the ruined state in which the accident left it, but otherwise kitchenware and fragments of fire blocks, i.e. the objects most directly linked to the fire place and to cooking, were the ones thought fit to be left in the fire and buried by wall and roof. House I from Gørding and House I from contemporary Ginderup represents the difference between the prearranged and the accidental fire.

The preference for not rebuilding a house indicates that the identity of the house was a specific notion contained in the material phenomenon itself. Similar to the human body harbouring life and mind, the building was a kind of body sheltering the essence of a specific household. The house could end its days and continue its presence in the landscape as a form of house- or household grave. Of course there was nothing absolutely sacrosanct in a buried house as well as there was nothing absolutely sacrosanct in a grave. Nevertheless, in PRIA, and when settled places grew old, we must expect the landscape to be marked by buried houses representing the past. These remains made up a settlement history displayed among each generation of standing houses similar to the way graves make up the history of past generations among the living.

This kind of respect or veneration was a disappearing notion typical of EPRIA. The village mounds that come to an end in the beginning of the CE, and more significantly LPRIA villages such as Grøntoft or Hodde or indeed any RIA village, are examples of this. Similar to the settlements in MP Eketorp, they signify that the house in itself is no longer a body with the life length similar to that of a human being. There is also evidence from Selager in southernmost Jutland and the time around the beginning of the CE that houses in a village were pulled down and levelled out by means of ploughing in order to give room for a new ones. Such behaviour need not be void of ritual, but it does not stress preservation, nor does it respect the household the way that those who took care of Grøding Hede would have understood ‘respect’. In Selager, e.g., some house sites preserve 6–7 house phases during a c. 200-year period and all phases but the last, the real end phase so to speak, were cleaned up and levelled out by means of ploughing before a new house was built or the old one recreated. Such ploughing is virtually unknown from later periods and we may well see the ploughing as the transformation of a caretaking tradition on its way out of normal behaviour. After 30 years, when a house was pulled down and ploughed, this ploughing could be seen as the end of one house and the beginning of the next signifying a shift of generation as well as continuity.

If the Selager ploughing is an example of the transition from burying to rebuilding, i.e. from an old to a new practice, which eventually became a normal
one in large parts of South Scandinavia, we must still draw attention to the specifically loaded ideological situation concerning what to do with old halls in the LRIA and MP. Halls are new and splendid, but also old-fashioned houses, inasmuch as the erection of a hall must often be seen as the inauguration of a new chieftain, magnate or petty king and thus the installation of a new hall owner. When he begins his career as a leader, we expect that he starts with his own hall—building it himself, like real-life Merovingian King Sigebert, or perhaps better, receiving it as a gift from his devoted people, the way the fictitious Heoroth was given to mythic King Hrothgar in *Beowulf*. The hall therefore is linked to the ruler, similar to the way in which a PRIA house would be linked to its owner, but simultaneously the hall is also linked to a specific and stable farm, as long as this farm and its family is prosperous enough to maintain a hall and a hall owner.

Each time someone inaugurates himself on a hall farm we must in other words figure out how the hall succession should be solved. In Uppåkra, this problem has found a very clear solution, inasmuch as the small, but lavish, hall is not one building but a series of 7 or 8 halls superimposed upon each other, Fig. 49. This leads us to the conclusion that among those who can afford to do so, i.e. those in powerful centres, the hall is renewed at the same spot where all the forerunners stood and in much the same size and style. In effect, what takes place during several centuries is a series of resurrections of one and the same building in somewhat different outfits, thus creating stability as well as generational shift—historicity as well as modernity.

*Fig. 49.* The section from Uppåkra and the floor plan of house number 14, clay floor (yellow), hearth (red) and ember pit (blue). The black roof-supporting trenches and postholes belong to House 2, the latest house phase. The hall has been rebuilt on exactly the same spot by digging in new posts in old postholes and trenches. Based on Lentorp & Larsson (2004).
A weighty reason for drawing this conclusion is the fact that, contrary to the houses at Eketorp, all the floors of the earlier halls are preserved under the floor of the new one, and some floors were indeed covered by a layer of earth.\(^{136}\) This series of sealing the floors before rebuilding the hall, which has no practical purpose, can only be understood as an intentional process and an echo of the practice of an older tradition to bury most of the houses and their floors while leaving some significant artefacts eventually to be found by archaeologists who may thus be uncovering a purposeful installation, similar to a grave, rather than a reflection of daily life in the hall. Similar to rich graves, which represent the essence of the dominant farm owner, the buried hall represents the essence of his estate and its situation.

Let us turn again to PRIA Per. I and II and look at a map of the Grøntoft excavations. In so doing, it becomes obvious that although the houses are densely distributed, similar to graves they seldom overlap each other, except of course in the later phases and in the village that belongs to the end phase of the settlement and changing traditions in PRIA Per. III, Fig. 50. We may therefore speak of some kind of precision in the way the early houses were distributed and the house remains made visible as well as respected. This respect testifies to the existence of a concept of preserving the remains in order to build up a pattern of the past in that part of the landscape to which the settlement belongs. It is a matter of preserving a number of sites which represent both the house as a building and the house as the floor of the household—the frame and the result of life within it—or the foundations for the house as a constructed space, and the house as a focused field for human life. The buried houses represent all the earlier stages of the community, and because they are visible remains, they become a manifest inscription of the past upon the landscape. Building up this kind of landscape by means of a number of house hillocks in a palimpsest made up by generations of farms is a most conscious way of making the present the result of the past and also a way of turning something perfectly present and commonplace into history. This may seem to be a small matter, but turning the commonplace into nodes of history shows a society with a strong ideological backbone.

As long as the houses of the PRIA are not rebuilt in what stands out as a more permanent or ever present village, the landscape in terms of houses must instead be said to be occupied and structured by two kinds of settlement nodes: the house hillocks, i.e. the buried or ‘past-away’ houses, and the ‘living’ ones, i.e. the inhabited houses. The past therefore gives the impression of a sheet dotted with series of notes and notches reminding the present of what was once in real life contained in buildings and households. During the beginning of the PRIA, the past as a settled landscape stands out as a common and rather communal basis for differences observed and honoured in the present. The past is the stable backdrop of the floating present.
The distribution of (1, red) solitary, (2, green) rebuilt and re-erected as well as (3, black) overlapping houses at Grøntoft. Categories 2 and 3 can be seen to belong to the latter part of the spread-out settlement prior to that of the village (green and yellow shadow in Fig. 50A). In the village phase all houses are rebuilt and overlapping. Overlaps outside the village are uncommon and more often than not between an older two-aisled house and a younger three-aisled PRIA house. Contrary to IA tradition, rebuilding with an overlap, moreover, is typical of the SA. Based on Rindel (1997).
Preserving a house in a way that reminds us of a grave is odd and a transient ideal reshaping itself over the centuries before it disappears. It makes up a stage for the change we are about to encounter in the beginning of Common Era. When caretaking traditions are shifting, when house remains must no longer be transformed to monuments, i.e. when the right of the house floor to be buried in a monument is no longer common practice, existing house hillocks will probably also start to lose their status as monuments of the past. Compared to dead people, dead floors are but a fraction, perhaps between a fifth and a tenth. They tend, however, to be in the way and one can understand why there was a call for a change in the ritual behaviour that brought a floor to a close. Not least while a change in people’s right to be buried in a monument was also shifting. When destruction becomes the norm, veneration will stand out as the complement, the exception proving the norm, and not surprisingly, we saw examples of a will now and then (the Eketorp case) or among the hall-owning pillars of society (the Uppåkra case) to preserve a floor. It is interesting therefore to ask ourselves whether there is a landscape dimension to veneration—for how long could a hillock be respected? Looking for prehistoric examples of veneration for very old house hillocks is not common practice among archaeologists, but there are at least examples to show that a survey could be worthwhile, e.g. the situation at Løvel 10 km north of Viborg. In an excavation that uncovered parts of a MP village, the fences of the largest farm were relatively well preserved. Since deep holes and regular fencing are signs of wealth, the findings were not surprising, but the small change of the course of the fence in its north-eastern corner in order to avoid the remains of a house from the LBA or perhaps EPRIA is a sign of respect for what must have been the visible remains of a 9– to 1200 years old house. Had these remains been easy to see, it stands to reason that the main house on the farm and the fence would have been planned three metres or so to the West. Instead, we must conclude that after the erection of the main house when building the fence, the house hillock was detected and the course of the fence slightly altered in order to avoid crossing the hillock—an early example of successful heritage management137.

The House as a Life Span

Until recently, the lifespan of a PRIA house has been debated with an emphasis on its length. How long will the building stand before it rots and falls down? Several authors have tacitly constructed their arguments in order to prolong the life of the house as much as possible138. In this way, instead of opting for a flexible situation, they create a continuous and stable settlement, in passing inventing phenomena such as the heritage rights of the oldest son to the farm. These authors argue for a strictly sedentary settlement situation, similar to the one eventually characterising LPRIA and RIA. In these discussions, ‘short-lived’ and ‘makeshift’ seems to be synonymous phenomena. In accordance with this way of thinking, archaeologists who
take a pleasure in reconstructing houses tend to complain about the decay of their buildings, a rot which seems to start and become visible as soon as their project is roofed and finished. The rot starts despite the fact that they have hardly made any grave mistakes in their reconstructions, often used prime quality timber and protected their posts with tar or birch bark. Nevertheless, because the posts that support roof and walls are anchored in holes in the ground the wood will rot in the transition from earth to air, from wet to dry conditions, as indeed it should. There are technical solutions to the problem, known also from the EIA: put your post up in the air on a flat stone! but for thousands of years this solution is rare and belonging to the most barren of regions only. Instead of declaring prehistoric man a fool, which few re-constructors of prehistoric houses are prepared to do, having toiled with their project, the conclusion must be that this decay, as well as the posthole anchoring the house in the ground, is part of the house concept—the idea of the house, as it were—and thus the very best and not the worst part of one’s reconstruction; a good example of the house as a miniature landscape striking back on ordering man. This decay is often difficult to comprise, not least while the idea of allowing a calculated destruction to take place refutes all modern ideals and ethics, if not the economic interests and practice of building companies. We paid homage to these ethical values with prestige words such as ‘quality’ and ‘sustainability’. Yet, if we insist on burying our roof-supporting post in postholes, the posts will rot in the transition between earth and air. The IA master builder and the modern reconstructor alike know this for a fact.

Although there is a clear tendency among some archaeologists, consciously or unconsciously, to expect all houses to be used as long as possible, there are, not least among Danish archaeologists with a long experience of house excavations, exceptions to disprove the rule. In Sweden, the growing number of overlapping $^{14}$C-dated houses has also started to make some archaeologists argue for short-lived houses. There is little doubt that today’s desired stability and centrality of town, suburb, street, house and home, the stable framework for any series of total makeover, guide the discussion of the lifespan of houses in a way that is felt to be natural. Should we doubt this, we may for the sake of the argument imagine a discussion which tries to shorten the lifespan of a house as much as possible. If we do so, we will make ourselves aware of the fact that such discussions are so uncommon that they are non-existent. If they were carried out, they would be considered odd, because to most modern apartment- or villa-owning citizens, buying, let alone erecting a house is a long-term investment supposed to outlive the investor and mark the place for generations. The house can be maintained and its interior rebuilt completely as long as its appearance and/or place is preserved.

To most students of the past, upper middle class as we are or strive to become, the link between site and exterior is cardinal, and for that reason even the reshaping of slum-ridden old town quarters in concrete form is viewed as an example of misguided modernity uprooting values and depriving us of our heritage. Preservation of the exterior and longevity made operative as cautious maintenance are under-
stood as virtues by most archaeologists and needless to say, there are many examples of concrete ugliness. Even though we preserve the interior, we leave few traces of those who lived there before us and therefore we have taken one step further ahead than the hall owners at Uppåkra, who strived as best they could, repeating and maintaining the exterior and the construction as well as preserving the floors of demolished halls.

The emphasis we put on the position of the house and its exterior reflects our notion of houses as stable phenomena in landscapes, something we observe, something with the ability to harbour focus and centre.

Our modern notions, based as they are on specific concepts of spatial order, have non-intuitive consequences. That comes to the fore if we look into other examples denoting the concept of ‘place’ in relation to settlement sites. We may, e.g., point to the discussion that developed around the concept of cult continuity during what was formerly seen as the short transgression from Viking to Middle Ages in Scandinavia, i.e. 10th – 11th century CE. In this discussion, those who argued against continuity eventually found themselves defending a case tacitly referring to spot continuity—one church above one vihå so to speak—and a case that was eventually lost, when their opponents presented the archaeological results from the excavations in the Church on peripheral Frösön in Jämtland. This showed the position of its Christian altar to be on top of a pagan offering site. Later on, a number of other cases, such as a medieval church situated in the court of a large VA farm, settled the immediate question, Fig. 51.

*Fig. 51. A hypothetical map of Lisbjerg. The church was placed in the middle of the yard of the large manor. Tentatively, and in grey, the central position of the church is indicated on the plan by means of turning around the preserved parts of the fence 180 degrees. Based on Jeppesen & Madsen (1989).*
Before Frösön, those who argued for continuity were willing to except all kinds of situations indicating just that. But when spot continuity was proved, everybody felt that this continuity between offering sites and buildings was ultimate proof. Such continuity meant that a modern and thus dominant or more developed concept of ‘place’, a house and a stable focus and centre, a constructed phenomenon harbouring a room and a stage for cult, the sacred room, was indeed a prehistoric and not just a historic landscape reality. The controlled space of the cult room therefore became something sophisticated that one could point out and recognise as prehistoric, rather than historic. Those who argued against were silenced by the same proof, because they also comprised the same modern (and to their mind developed) concept of place and house. They had thought that this developed notion was unknown in prehistory. Much to their satisfaction, this was no more the case.

Today, there is common agreement that the IA hall represents this kind of cult building, which may well contain the ritual space and practices of church and temple in an embryonic form, as well as a mundane interface between hall owner and community. This means that there is cult continuity and a very long one, too. Actually, on second thought, a much too long continuity, because referring to the hall as a ceremonial room, i.e. to the idea of the house as a stable centre in society and a focal point in the landscape, opens up a time perspective disappearing down into the first part of the first millennium of CE. This timespan is so large that more than one major religious shift or change of faith may have taken place within the notion of hall-temple-church continuity. The timespan has become so long that we may well ask ourselves whether temple and church grew out of halls rather than religious beliefs.

To begin with, it was the dichotomy: Church room ceremony vs. open air sacrificial feast, introduced e.g. in the provincial laws as a metaphor for Christian vs. pagan worshipping, and understood as an example of modern vs. primitive man, that lived on in the discussion of cult continuity. But in reality, this problem does not rest with the house; it rests with the way cult literally speaking ‘takes (its) place’. This in its turn is a small problem, because cult is a latent performance in anybody. Where cult takes place is a matter of how we live our environment and how we understand place.

The understanding of the house in the EIA landscape prevents houses from being the room for communal cult, because communal cult tends to need a visible and stable site a place to share iteration of ritual and convention, i.e., a meeting place of some kind somewhere in a landscape. With a floating settlement system, such a place cannot be a house or a settlement except for the family, the diminutive collective, who lives there in its house, in its everyday cult and ritual performance.

Spatial cult continuity exists because the understanding of landscape and house has changed but slowly, for a very long time. In fact, change starts so early that already in the LIA the notion of house and landscape could be comparable to that of the Middle Ages. Continuous and slow change eventually al-
allowed Christianity to move the ordinary communal cult firmly indoors, except for open air activities e.g. in connection with phenomena such as spring cult and of course warfare.

Cult continuity nevertheless rests with the way cult takes place and not the place it takes. Proving cult continuity with reference to a building is methodologically speaking wrong. Coming to grips with this, after a somewhat pointless detour to our way of understanding the house, we can see that not only is the VA question of place continuity solved, it has also dissolved because understanding the landscape as a scene for cult is a matter of analysing a long-term continuity, where indoor and outdoor play changing but continuous parts.

Understanding Tacitus

Turning back to the PRIA world, both the archaeological record and reconstructions allow us to say that a house, the standing building, was never old in our sense of the word, but aging. Its position in the settlement was not a stable one, the way we understand something to be stable. We shall have to consider a concept of early Iron Age stability related not to time immemorial, but to the life cycle of the house itself and of those who dwelled in it.

Fokke Gerritsen has developed the idea that the EIA house in Holland was related to the reproduction of the family; that house biography parallels the domestic circle. Gerritsen leads the discussion from the traditional view on houses as rational technical structures towards houses as socially constructed. He links his discussion to Kopytoff’s concept of cultural biography and the point of departure in his case is the same pattern as the one in Jutland. He starts by referring to the well-known concept of ‘wandering settlements’:

"Wandering’ means that when the end of the lifespan of a farmhouse had been reached, no new house was constructed at the same location or in the same farmyard. This pattern differs significantly from the settlement pattern in the region during the Roman period. Although single-phase farmsteads still occurred, settlements in this later period tended to be nucleated and tied to the same location for several centuries.\textsuperscript{141}"

It would seem that there is much to gain if we too make Gerritsen’s point of departure and hypothesis of cultural biography our point of view, not least while the stratified house series have already indicated that the lifespan of a house was c. 30 years. Bearing this in mind, rereading Tacitus’\textit{Germania} Chapters 16–28 will bring some additional clarity to the understanding of the EIA house. Understanding Tacitus, however, is a matter of perspective.

Tacitus had no first hand knowledge of Germania, and we know little about the sources he depended on, except that he explicitly refers to Caesar, to unidentified older authors and to ‘well-known’ facts. The latter may well cover a
considerable amount of traditional oral information circulating in Rome among the upper classes. Anyhow, the opinion expressed already by Gudeman that *Germania* is quite heavily based on older texts and information with a certain time depth seems to be confirmed by archaeology.\textsuperscript{142}

The two small treatises that Tacitus wrote in the last years of the first century CE, *Germania* and *Agricola*, both have a hidden agenda and they are both as exquisitely written as they are difficult to understand exactly. In the case of the former, the point is to describe the mentality of the people who fill the land between the European Limes and the end of the world. Although from Tacitus’ point of view, these people grow more primitive with their distance to Roman civilisation, their ways are nevertheless distinct, and they may therefore be described in general terms by means of an ethnography of their tribal ways and a tribal geography. When it comes to tribes and geography, *Agricola*, formally a biography of Tacitus father-in-law, happens to be set among Britons in Britain. This means that by reading the two treatises, the educated Roman would (1) have covered the topic of the northern world outside Limes and (2) become acquainted with Tacitus’ critique of Rome and Roman ways during the first century CE. Like most classical writers, Tacitus copies descriptions of anything non-Roman from older authors when it suits him, changing solely the name of the described people from none to *Germani*.\textsuperscript{143}

In his general description of Germani, Tacitus therefore relied on folklore and conventions much coloured by literary ideals and by cognitive ideals related to the PRIA. He chose to describe the character of these traditions as ethnos-defining, i.e. essentially Germanian and thus non-Roman ways. Archaeologically speaking, these Germanian ways were nevertheless changing and moribund. They give away themselves as signs of acculturation and transformation rather than stable ethnic markers. Given his agenda, which in our terms is made up by an ever popular wish within a colonial perspective to write an ethnography of stable patterns, Tacitus ignores or fails to see the dynamic character of the society of the Germani. Even as a historian, in *Annales*, his blindness when it comes to Germani is so complete that the heart of the matter, the reason for the warfare in the beginning of the first century CE, becomes a question of defence against the Romans and their project of civilising the barbarians they called Germani.

This defence was epitomized by Arminius’ triumphant victory 9 CE in the Teutoburgerwald. But if we look more closely into *Annales*, many of the conflicts mentioned by Tacitus stand out as examples of a power struggle between Germanian leaders, often triggered by the Roman presence, i.e. by the presence of the alternative and superior society and its diplomacy. The example *par excellence* is Arminius’ own career, which was urged by ambitions that went far beyond the basic obligation to defend his fellow Germani against aggressive Romans. Likewise, the conflict between Segestes and his son-in-law, the selfsame Arminius, is a model power struggle with a kinship component. An early a soap opera, it included the abduction of Segestes’ headstrong, but abduction-keen
daughter Tusnelda by Arminius. This enterprise or fait accompli, undertaken to make himself a son-in-law in an influential family, is as essential as fighting the Romans. It meets the eye that the historian Velleius, the effusive eulogist of Tiberius, writing in the late 20s CE, and once a well-placed officer, when it comes to understanding wars in Germania, is much more aware of the internal Germanian power struggle in spite of the fact that this struggle does not add to the alleged genius of his protagonist.

Knowing that a more socially stratified society is in the wake in Northwest Europe as well as in Scandinavia, we must conclude that the transition to this society was indeed facilitated by the wars between chieftains and their tribes whether they waged war against Romans or people designated by Romans as ‘fellow Germani’. We do not know whether South Scandinavians were directly involved in Roman warfare against Germani, but it has been argued that the prestige goods and high quality Roman drinking sets, the luxury that found its way down into early first century graves in South Scandinavia were originally gifts to chieftains that could be expected to add to the troubles of the tribes punished by the Romans by back stabbing these their neighbours or fellow Germani. In this way, they paid tribute to the ongoing power struggles in Northwest Europe as much as they lent themselves to a standard Roman policy of divide et impera (divide and rule). The drinking cups from Hoby are the best example, inasmuch as they are probably a gift from the Roman governor Silius and their decorative scenes, packed with illustration from the Trojan War, are suitable allusion to the intricate friendships and alliances formed during long wars. Be this as it may, warfare tended to bring forth the individual leader in an ideologically correct setting—be it the alleged defence against Romans or the necessary attacks on threatening neighbours. Warfare, moreover, formed a counterpart to peaceful life, enhancing the power and position of the individual as well as the need for hierarchy.

From an archaeological point of view, the PRIA bands of Caesar’s lilies, the warfare commemorated in the warfare offerings of the RIA, and the military hierarchy behind the solidus payments to Ölanders, Gotlanders and people from Bornholm and the Mälar Valley in the MP are all examples of the ongoing power struggle and state of warfare that accompanied the social change, enhanced, if not set off, by the indirect Roman presence.

Tacitus’ descriptions of the Germani as a general phenomenon must be read with his overall historical perspective in mind, which in relation to the Germani puts Varus’ defeat in 9 CE, and Germanicus’ visit to the battlefield 6 years later, in a key position. Because of these events, and from Tacitus’ point of view, because Tiberius, the emperor, did not allow Germanicus, Tacitus’ hero, to fulfil his mission in Germania Libra, the Germani became an emblem of a 1st century Roman failure. However, the Germani were also a double-sided icon, primitive and dangerous, cunning and virtuous, immoral and moral, comprehensible and incomprehensible—inverted Romans so to speak. This puzzle is at the centre of his description of Germanian ways and becomes so emphatic that
character and mentality rather than facts become the essence. There is no will in Tacitus’ treatise to describe the actual Germania Libra of his own day and age after Limes was established\footnote{148}.

In Chapter 16, Tacitus turns to the matter of settlement as a prelude to his description of family life which starts in Chapter 18:

\begin{quote}
That Germani inhabit no cities is familiar enough; they cannot even stand dwellings joined together. They live separately and set apart, wherever a spring, a field, or a grove has caught their fancy. They do not lay out villages in the way customary among us, with buildings connected and clinging together; each person surrounds his home with an open area, either as protection against accidental fires or through ignorance of building techniques. \(\text{(Germania 16.1).}\)
\end{quote}

This description is not confirmed by archaeology; on the contrary, in a late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE perspective, it is rubbish. But it is nevertheless an adequate, albeit prejudiced, description of the settlement structure in the last century BCE or the beginning of the CE by someone who cannot or does not want to see that a transition is taking place from the nodal to the focal to the central, with a shift in emphasise from house to village and a change from the instable farm to the stable one.

In other words, in his description Tacitus must fall back on older descriptions of a society not yet in contact with Roman culture. Knowing the cunning way he expresses himself, when he tells us that his viewpoints are familiar enough to everyone (\textit{satis notum est} ‘is sufficiently known’, which does not mean ‘correct’), it is fair to suspect that he refers to sources that are indeed outdated but well known narratives about Germanian ways before they were smeared, if by a Roman touch. His hidden agenda is writing about those Germani whose mores had not been influenced by their contacts with other more developed societies such as the Roman. By saying that their habits are ‘sufficiently known’, Tacitus tells his reader that whatever he or she may know about the subject, Tacitus’ information is \textit{also} known to exist. Should someone have told Tacitus that there were actually, in his day and age, some densely populated row-ordered villages, e.g. Galsted\footnote{149} in Southern Jutland, Tacitus would have pointed out that his sources were the ones referring to a more primordial and interesting stage. (Should those considered to be cannibals on New Guinea have ceased to exist and started to smoke cigarettes and drink \textit{Coca Cola} instead of following their traditional habits, then that is just a sad colonial (un-Guinean) fact. To the modern Tacitus, they are still cannibals. Similarly, to the original Tacitus, the occasional village in Jutland would not have nullified the fact that it was un-Germanian).

In chapter 18 to 21, with some additions in chapter 25, Tacitus describes the life of the Germani as if they were two model persons—a man and a woman. This is not the way we would have expected him to describe a life. Inasmuch as
he writes in a genre, which to his mind was scientific rather than fictional, we are entitled to expect something similar in structure to the biographies in Suetonius’ ‘On the life of the Caesars’, i.e., a short summary of their parentage, birth and early lives, usually up to a certain point in time, a *vita*, followed by any kind of comment on matters signifying the man, i.e. on categories, not necessarily in any chronological order, but rather elucidating and with an eye to personal morals and mentality. Tacitus, when writing about his father-in-law, Agricola, follows this scheme in a style both personal and standoffish. However, when it comes to Germani, he does not proceed in the expected way and that stands out as odd, because writing about their lives he has the most obvious moral agenda. He wants to show that decadent Romans would have had something to learn from the primitive, by no means faultless, but still in some ways virtuous Germani. In this specific case, manhood, relations among fathers and sons, as well as next of kin and marriage or parental life would have been effective themes to single out for comments. So, why does he not start by letting them grow up to the point when these matters become of importance?

Instead, Tacitus’ description is indeed chronological, but not from birth to death. On the contrary, he starts with marriage and the setting up of the household – that is to say he starts with the grown-up Germanian couple about to form a family. After marriage, the children are born and they grow up and they leave home for homes and lives of their own, as if they were born out of their parents’ home rather then their mother’s womb. Eventually, the parents die, in the shape of the father, because women do not count much except their primitive ways, and their lives are concluded—not, as it were, from a human or religious point of view, but in socio-economic terms and that is probably why women do not count. In this pattern, which is already highly thematic, Tacitus cuts in his moral points of view, and from time to time they stand out as almost unrelated to the story about the Germani. They would not have done so, if he had organised his tale of their lives as a flow and growth from birth to death, commented upon from a moral point of view when it befitted their lives. The most absurd example is the point he makes of saying that secret letters or secret illicit correspondence between men and women were unknown among the Germani. Well, of course they were! Nearly all Germani were illiterate. It does not help that here too he phrases his sentence so as to hint that he is aware of this fact, because in his wish to comment upon a typical Roman problem, he has evidently forgotten to tell us of all the other things Germani were unaware of, such as runes (echoes of the Latin alphabet) if indeed they existed. Instead of referring to Germani, Tacitus rather refers his readers to his contemporary, Juvenal, who for one, satirizing the foolish husband with a rhetorical question, knows where to find the real signs love: *quae scripta et qout lecture tabellas, si tibi zelotypae retegantur scrinia moechae*—what notes and how many love letters would you find, if you opened up the desk of your envious adulterous wife? (Juvenal satire 6 vv 277–8).
It would seem therefore that Tacitus, instead of having studied the life of the Germani, had access to a story about the stages in their cycle of reproduction, rather than their cycle of life, and that he used such a story about the married life of Germani with little editing and limited success in order to give us his own opinions on domestic matters. Of course we can figure out a life cycle from Tacitus’ description and see it as a series of steps from birth to death namely:

(1) Birth – (2) Childhood at home – (3) Becoming of age – (4) Marriage and household making (no love letters please, we are Germani) – (5) Bringing up the children – (6) Using children to form social networks – (7) Old age – (8) Death and the end of social life (it is the children’s responsibility to tidy up things).

But this series is a very artificial one, because the story we are told starts with marriage and the formation of the household and goes on to cover the rest of life from that point onwards, fitting in childhood between adolescence and old age.

In fact, the narrative Tacitus used to describe the shift in generation is made up of the following series:

(A) Marriage, (B) Child-bearing and fostering, (C) Making networks, (D) Securing old age and (E) Closing down the generation.

Parents create a home in stage A, when they marry, and children leave their parents home in stage C, as a part of the social networking. In stage E, the End so to speak, they are the executors. Family life, although male-centred, is the issue, not the life of the individual. The tale can be summarized in the following way: The wife comes to her husband, receiving all necessary family and household utensils under the supervision of parents and kinsmen. The social contract is set up and the marriage is indeed an arranged one. The married couple defends society and contributes to the strengthening of the community not least by producing and bringing up children (or rather letting them grow). By creating a new generation and fitting it into the social network, parents secure for themselves good living conditions during their unproductive old age. When eventually they die, their children have already entered their own reproductive and networking phase, and therefore, owing to their social competence, they are able to close their parent’s social contract by settling their affairs. The aim of each generation is to put children into the world, break even and come to an end. That is also what the house hillock represents when children and grandchildren pass it on their way through life, and come to think of their ancestors.

The home, furnished by the husband, is the frame for this narrative and it is characteristic that furnishing the house inaugurates the marriage. A man by
means of his kin sets up a home of his own in order to marry, and eventually he
dies there, after his children have left him for homes and houses of their own.

If we cut out most of Tacitus’ different comments, the story runs more or
less as follows:

A) MARRIAGE: *They are almost unique among barbarians in being content with
one wife apiece – all of them, that is, except a very few who take more than one
wife, not to satisfy their desires, but because their exalted rank brings them many
pressing offers of matrimonial alliances* (Germania: 18.1).

The dowry is brought by husband to wife, not by wife to husband. Parents and
kinsmen attend and approve the gifts – not gifts chosen to please a woman’s fancy or
gaily deck a young bride, but oxen, a horse with its bridle, or a shield, spear, and
sword. In consideration of such gifts a man gets his wife, and she in her turn brings
a present of arms to her husband. This interchange of gifts typifies for them the most
sacred bond of union, sanctified by mystic rites under the favour of the presiding
deities of wedlock (Germania: 18.11).

That the woman may not suppose herself free from the considerations of fortitude
and fighting, or exempt from the casualties of war, the very first solemnities of her
wedding serve to warn her, that she comes as a partner in his hazards and fatigues,
that she is to suffer alike with him, to adventure alike, during peace or during war.
This the oxen joined in the same yoke plainly indicate, this the horse ready equipped,
this the present of arms (Germania: 18.111).

B) CHILD-BEARING AND FOSTERING: *On these terms she must live her life and
bear her children. She is receiving something that she must hand over intact and
undepreciated to her children, something for her sons’ wives to receive in their turn
and pass on to her grandchildren* (Germania: 18.111).

To restrict the number of children, or to kill any of those born after the heir, is con-
sidered wicked (Germania: 19.11).

In all their houses the children are reared naked and dirty; and thus grow into those
limbs, into that bulk, which excite our admiration. They are all nourished with the
milk of their own mothers, and never surrendered to handmaids and nurses. The
lord you cannot discern from the slave, by any superior delicacy in rearing. Amongst
the same cattle they promiscuously live, upon the same ground they without distinc-
tion lie, till at a proper age the free-born are parted from the rest, and their bravery
recommend them to notice. (Germania: 20.1).
The young men are slow to mate, and thus they reach manhood with vigour unimpaired. The girls, too, are not hurried into marriage (Germania: 20.II).

Each of them [i.e. the ‘slaves’] has a dwelling of his own, each a household to govern. His lord uses him like a tenant, and obliges him to pay a quantity of grain, or of cattle, or of cloth. Thus far only does the subserviency of the slave extend (Germania: 25:1).

C) MAKING SOCIAL NETWORKS: The sons of sisters are as highly honoured by their uncles as by their own fathers. However, a man’s heirs and successors are his own children, and there is no such thing as a will. When there is no issue, the first in order of succession are brothers, and then uncles, first on the father’s, then on the mother’s side (Germania: 20.III).

D) SECURING OLD AGE: To ancient men, the more they abound in descendants; in relations and affinities, so much the more favour and reverence accrues. From being childless, no advantage nor estimation is derived (Germania: 20.III).

E) CLOSING DOWN THE GENERATION: Heirs are under an obligation to take up both the feuds and the friendships of a father or kinsman. But feuds do not continue for ever unreconciled. Even homicide can be atoned for by a fixed number of cattle or sheep, the compensation being received by the whole family. This is to the advantage of the community: for private feuds are particularly dangerous where there is such complete liberty (Germania: 21.I).

This narrative expresses an ideal of reinforcing and reproducing a society based on the nuclear family and its home, irrespective of the family members being free men, freedmen or slaves/tenants. In this society, genuinely frugal compared to luxury ridden Rome, there is nevertheless some kind of hierarchic order which is hinted also by the size of the dwelling areas at Grøntoft. This pattern may also be said in principle to cover three far form distinct social layers. 1) The very few nobles obliged with more than one wife. 2) The nuclear families of free farmers. 3) The dependant families of slave/tenant or freedmen which Tacitus introduces in Chapter 25. How they become married we do not know, but it would seem reasonable to assume that their contracts too were as arranged as those of free men. Probably slaves, tenants or freedmen are simply people who cannot themselves afford to set up a household. But that is not very important, as long as nobles and free men indulge in match-making and marriage contracts as a way of forming alliances. We can illustrate the reproductive system in a model, Fig. 52.
Fig. 52. Tacitus’ model of social reproduction.

It is easy to see that the narrative Tacitus knew fits the characteristics of most the PRIA house, namely, the fact that in those days in Northwest Europe and South Scandinavia, the house as a building represented one house generation only, and that the length of that kind of generation equalled the better part of a human life.

In Tacitus’ description there is nothing to indicate that the wife moved into the parental home of her husband, nor that any children married and stayed-on in the home of their childhood. This may of course have happened, but it was not model behaviour or the norm expressed in the tale that Tacitus made his source and drift. Later on, and certainly when Tacitus lived, the original one-generation houses were already continuously maintained and made to last for several generations, thus adhering more closely to what would also have been the Roman norm. Luxury too was manifest. This discrepancy between a text written c. 100 CE and material fact in the first century meets the eye and there is little doubt that Tacitus falls back on (1) an old story, (2) a story relating an ideal, and perhaps also (3) a story from a peripheral part of Scandinavia where earlier ideals may have lived on. And even in the latter case, the one generation practice was probably already abandoned by most.152

Because the narrative does not suit him well, there is no reason to suggest that Tacitus has invented this story in order to later rearrange and adapt it to fulfil his purpose. It is much more plausible that he has made use of an old
narrative, perhaps from the days of Caesar, or the 2nd century BCE when the
historian Posidonius wrote about the Germani. In such a tale, this very non-
Roman pattern of generation and marriage could probably still be observed as a
norm preferred in some Germanian societies. Archaeology after all suggests that
Tacitus’ model is correct in so far as a general model is correct.

It is also possible that later on, the norm could be respected as an ideal, al-
though as a practice transformed in different ways, and meant only to signify
the introduction of a new household or regime if not the inauguration of a new
house. The latter must be considered possible, because it would indeed explain
the habit among the LRIA and MP upper classes to begin their mature social life
by building themselves a hall. Indirectly, the significance of the generational
shift is also implied by the loss of attributes when the women at Skovgårde
become 40 plus. In this context, the loss of attributes seems to signify the exis-
tence of a new lady in the upper-class household.

If we accept that erecting and furnishing a house belong to the social situa-
tion of the newly married couple and the beginning of their cohabitation, we
must also agree that not only do kinsmen and parents arrange and supervise the
marriage while inspecting the gear that man and wife bring into the alliance, the
whole house moreover, mirrors the spatial order of the project. And most im-
portant: The house gives this family-of-man-project its material frame and di-
mension, despite the fact that it has not yet been launched.

Consequently, when the young couple marry, they are meant to engage
themselves in a 30 to 40 year life-and-home project stipulated by the house in
which they are supposed to eventually die after having successfully reproduced
themselves and reared their offspring. In essence, the size of their living quarters
and their byre determine the size of their nuclear family and thus also the pros-
perity of their life project. In most houses, there is no room for any enlarged
family and therefore only few are allowed the space it takes to entertain more
than one mistress or wife. It may well be that the compact living to which most
of the married couples in PRIA Jutland accommodate does not mean that they
killed their third or fourth child, but it does mean that in practice, it was hard
to sustain a large family in a small house with but a few animals in the byre.

When husband and wife are settled, they are in fact granted their part of
something similar to the ‘Gross Communal Base of Subsistence’ and, following
Gerritsen, we can conclude that the right for the free to form a household goes
hand in hand with the concept of ‘land right’153. In addition, however, the size
of the house also shows us the social stratification of society and the position of
its families.

In the size of the houses we see free men (i.e. households big enough to re-
produce themselves and raise a third child), as well as freedmen, tenants, drop-
outs and slaves, (i.e. households so small that they cannot or can just barely
reproduce themselves). Because the few exceptionally large and stable house-
holds exist during the whole of the PRIA, Tacitus’ exception, the few leading
figures who out of decency and political concern—as far as Tacitus is informed
believe it or not—are obliged to live with more than one wife, can also be traced in the archaeological record. In these large households, the shift in generation is more difficult to handle and we may expect that when the owner dies and those living on the farm must be provided for, the heir, instead of spreading out everybody, moves in and takes over the household. Naturally, that could also involve splitting it up, and that is what happens with the large Poel farm at Grøntoft.

Indirectly, what Tacitus tells us about the formation of the family is most important and in complete accordance with the often cited passage from Caesar who informs us that every year, the leading men in a given community gather to distribute land.154 This practice parallels with the communal interest taken in match making and in sizing the household. The match as a social contract holds the keys to the other variables; the gathering each year to settle people and point out arable land and pastures seems to mirror the fact that during spring, new couples will be formed, settled and given their share of the communal lands. Knowing the archaeological background of the quotation, there is nothing in Caesar’s text to indicate that by default all households in a community were given new land every year. In fact, it seems enough to introduce a couple of new households into the community in order to evoke a number of questions concerning land distribution: where should the newly-weds settle? How will these new farms and their craving for land affect the farms of their kinsmen and their freedmen, tenants and slaves? Likewise, some farmers will have died between the annual meetings and consequently, the heirs will voice their claims and demand their right. The widow may remarry, stay on in her house or move in with a son or son-in-law and so on. Inevitably, death and marriage will lead to a redistribution of land and land rights besides settling a number of other accounts. The heart of the matter in Caesar’s description is not an irrational wish to shuffle people around as best the leading figures wish. On the contrary, it is a matter of protecting the rights of the free farmers and everybody with land rights in a society that archaeologically speaking must be described as rapidly changing and growing. It goes with the fluid character of the settlement that the question of land and land right must be constantly negotiated. Sharing communal rights calls for regular meetings.

Knowing that only a small number of large farms occupy the same site for more than one generation, and knowing that the right to form a household will be radically restricted in the beginning of the RIA, we may suspect that the base of subsistence—primarily that is the land belonging to the community—was formally controlled by a few or one dominating family who was obliged to respect people’s right to live from the land or indeed respect the ‘land rights’ of men, inasmuch as they were next of kin or members of the community.

In the beginning of the RIA, however, these lords go one step further and redefine, extend or develop their formal control into a land reform, which results in a decrease of the number of farms, leaving but a few stable farmsteads (now and again rebuilt and moved a little within their fences) to occupy the land.155
The fact that already before the change of farm structure, there were tenants and slaves, i.e., the inhabitants of socially speaking non-reproductive households, indicates an early decrease in the number of farms, if not necessarily in households. However, the eventual loss of the right to form a household meant an additional loss of land right for a large part of the population as well as a concentration and development of land right to become the equivalent of a spatially stable inheritance. The lower strata of the population, including no doubt some free men, disappear into the larger farms because there is no longer any need to settle all free men and women, tenants or slaves in households occupying some of one’s land in order to maintain it. Probably cattle can represent the landowner’s claims to land, when the farm and its farmhouse becomes ancestral and the inmates either owners or non-owners.

Around 100 CE, when Tacitus writes, it is as easy to see the results of the land reform in Holland as well as in northwest Germany or Jutland. For generations, change have already been a fact and it is beyond doubt that Tacitus chose a description of an old system, an egalitarian more kinship-dependant society, at best hidden somewhere in northern Germany or in conventional wisdom and communal myth. By this time, moreover, thefirst marriageable young women and brides decked-out ‘with gifts chosen to please a woman’s fancy’, the way we saw it in Skovgårde, have already been buried. Tacitus may not have had access to any other information, but it seems more likely that he was aware of the changing situation and chose to use a tale that (perhaps) he thought depicted the truly primordial Germanian ideal. The flaw in Tacitus is the dated truth, not the structure of the narrative. Anyway, pointing out the change would not have strengthened Tacitus’ critique of Roman ways. Change and time depth moreover was not his agenda. As a typical old-fashioned ethnographer he described a static primordial and idealised situation as if it were the present one. As a botanist among topoi germanicae, he picked a suitable one—a somewhat dusty immortelle.

The House as a Balance

Although there are significant differences in size between the earliest PRIA houses, and although these differences are a mirror of social stratification, there is, as we have seen, at least in the middle and later part of the PRIA (PER. II and IIIA), one typical and common, relatively short building which serves the ordinary PRIA family as its dwelling and farm. In addition to these houses there are some longer ones with more roof-supporting trestles than the standard ones. The dwelling area of the typical house is c. 25 square metres or a little less than half its roofed area. This space makes up the homestead for Tacitus’ nuclear family. Only a few farms had outhouses.

Similar to the family, the farmhouse has a marked beginning, a phase of surplus production in the form of food, i.e. a period when children and cattle fill
the house, and lastly a period of old age and decay when the children, who are entitled to some of the subsistence base held by their parents, have grown up and formed new families of their own, leaving the house with their share of the animals. Eventually, the house is demolished and buried when its last inhabitant moves out or dies. The house has become a phenomenon in its own right, a life more or less on level with that of its inmates. As a function of its size, the household represents a part of the settlement area, and thus a fraction of the communal base of subsistence, as well as a model of reproduction. It also signifies the status of the household and encapsulates its biography. This notion can be developed.

The invention of the classic PRIA house, a one-house farm and household, took place in tandem with a subsistence system based on the house, ideally with the nuclear family in the dwelling room and their animals in the byre, and in between the entrance room. Some denotations of this house come close to an ideal representation of a general conception of balance between, on the one side, man and on the other, part of the surrounding world. However, given the fact that this is indeed a changing ideal, it is probably not possible to label any house a precise denotation of a certain cosmology. None the less, this house is characterised by a number of stable, in part socially constructed factors besides the fact that it is allowed to decay in a way that, metaphorically speaking, links in with the concept of a lifespan or a life length, i.e. with ‘life’.

In Central Jutland during the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE, the cosmological pattern inherent in the farm house becomes especially apparent, and so does the change to what will eventually become the prevailing cosmological view during the RIA. Since the beginning of the 20th century, the EIA standard farmhouse has been know to be an east-west orientated building, with a central entrance room characterised by two juxtaposed doors in the outer walls and two, one in the each of the interior partition walls, leading from the entrance room to the byre and dwelling respectively. The roof was carried by side beams supported by trestles and in nearly all cases, the dwelling occupied the western part and the byre the eastern part of the house. There are a few examples of the reverse and some other deviances among thousands of regular houses. If the variations in basic layout are negligible, the differences in appearance are more marked owing to the differences between available building materials in different parts of the country. The interior layout therefore is the primary significant trait.

There is a very particular post pattern characterising the house in Central Jutland, inasmuch as the roof-supporting posts are nearly always 8 in number and arranged in two groups of 4 posts respectively. Each group is made up of two pairs of trestles and each quadruple of posts related either to the dwelling room or to the byre—two trestles in each room. Door posts and the occasional post fitted into the byre break the pattern, but they are not roof supporting.

Two trestles, as it were, make up the basic ridge- and roof-supporting unit or element in EIA architecture. Constructing a house with four trestles is no doubt a rational solution to the problem of roof support in small buildings, but the
number of posts does not correlate well with the size of the house. A house can be 15 metres long and have only 4 trestles, or it can be no more than 7 metres long and crowded with 4 trestles. When excavated, some of these small buildings may look as if they have only 3 trestles, but that is a false impression and the combined result of preservation and the fact that one of the four trestles was placed in very shallow holes, because, technically speaking, i.e. in terms of roof support, there is of course little need for this trestle. Actually two trestles only, i.e. the basic module, would have served the purpose of keeping up the roof in small houses, Fig. 53. The holes for the two trestles in the byre never seem to be missing because, besides being roof-supporting, they are also part of the compartments and for that reason they must be well anchored. In the small houses therefore, the trestle in the shallow holes always belongs to the dwelling room and in here they belong to the trestle closest to the entrance room, i.e. the trestle which does not carry the weight of the hip. Conventionally, we may speak of the latter as the ‘Hip Trestle’ (HP) and the former as the ‘Entrance Trestle’ (ET) recognising their conceptual qualities, while noting that in small buildings, the ET is inconvenient and technically pointless, inasmuch as there is but one metre between HP and ET in these tiny quarters. Because there is no such thing as a pointless trestle, this amounts to saying that for ideological reasons, the ET cannot be suspended with as long as we wish to create a dwelling room in the social sense of the word.

Not surprisingly, it is in the byre part of the house that we meet some deviations from the post pattern and the occasional addition to the length of the house can be found here. This is only natural, given the fact that there will often be a tendency to wish for more animals than the ones originally planned for, e.g. when the family and its labour force grow, or when access to pasture and land improves. Because the need for extensions during a forty year period seems so obvious, the fact that extended houses are so uncommon makes it is easy to overlook the fact that the missing extensions are the very emblem of the one-house farm. Nevertheless, the fact that extensions are few supports the authenticity or at least the historicity of Tacitus’ description of the life of the married couple.
Fig. 53. The length of the PRIA house varies, but nearly all houses have a similar layout when it comes to symmetry and roof-support. Four trestles in four pairs of postholes carry the side beams and the roof. Irrespective of the length of the house, there are but four carrying trestles. In small houses, the remains of the holes in the dwelling part for the post pair next to the entrance room tend to be shallow and often only one hole can be seen. Owing to this series of states of preservation we can venture to say that even when these postholes are missing, the trestle was none the less there. It was not needed from the point of view of roof construction, but well as part of the design of the dwelling, with the quality of being the Entrance Trestle (ET).

Instead of extensions and asymmetric patterns, the striking feature when it comes to the rooms is the fact that dwelling and byre are always equally large. There is a complete balance in the house. In effect, as pointed out this means that the size of the house was known or negotiated beforehand and consequently it reflected the social status of its owner—the size befits the owner and vice versa. Even in the few cases where the houses were from the beginning given larger dimensions than usual, the balance between byre and dwelling prevails. In these exceptional houses, there are three or four trestles in each part of the house, rather than more trestles in one part than in the other. This balance indicates that the size of the byre reflects the size of the land controlled by the family living in the house. By defining the size of the byre, the farm’s share of the village or the settlement area is also defined. Metaphorically speaking, the
house is the mother of the land and in practice, it is an embodiment of the notion of ‘the household’, the embodiment of an abstract or cognitive mental phenomenon which encapsulates the family and its livestock as a balance. Do not ask why, because it is evidently a firm belief and a traditional value, bordering both ‘land right’, ‘ownership’ and ‘fairness’. It would be as colonial and prejudicial as Tacitan to question it.

It is especially interesting that being rich does not imply that one can build a large byre, thus demonstrating a will to support one’s family better than others, i.e., with more meat, butter, cheese and milk. Still, when inhumation graves are introduced in the beginning of our era, it becomes apparent that for both sexes, material status and physical size covariate, reflecting the fact that physically fit people were ranked higher, or went through life more prosperous, than others. They were simply better off and better fed. The solution to this problem of wealth hinted in Tacitus’ story spells slave/tenant, i.e. people whose obligations towards their masters come in the form of an input of produce from the slave’s household into that of his master:

... each of them [i.e. the male slaves] presides over his own abode and household. Treating him like a tenant his lord charges him with a quantity of grain, cattle or cloth

(Germania 25:1).

Since many of the small houses in the Grøntoft area are too small to accommodate a nuclear family of four or five, their size indicates that they were built to lodge small tenant- or slave households partly producing for a master’s benefit rather than for the upbringing of their own children.

Because of the balance between its two main functions, we should also incorporate the life cycles of the animals in the notion of the house. The wedded couple enter a house with their animals, settle them in the byre and start breeding them, proceed under the ET into their own quarters and beget their own children, who grow up supported by animals as well as parents. Eventually, the children leave the house to do what their parents did. Each house therefore contains the whole human lifecycle balancing its first and second half i.e. married and unmarried life. Entering the house for the first time and dying in it or being born into it and leaving it for a new one, are the major events in the life of both people and animals. The essence, and that which makes the house similar to an organism, is the fact that as a home, it can both fail and succeed in sheltering and caring for its inmates.

In addition to the general pattern of balance, there are a number of symmetrical or balanced features that can be observed in different less widespread contexts. One such feature is the fact that the floor of the byre part of the house is often lowered some 10 or 15 cm, while the hearth is equally elevated. This difference is often combined with differently constructed walls in byre and dwelling, respectively, and a slightly different setting of the posts in relation to the
two short ends. We can imagine a number of seemingly rational reasons for these traits to occur, but that is not the point, since there is an abundance of well-working somewhat later houses, where this kind of lifting and lowering, trenching and posting was not practised. In a larger perspective, therefore, PRIA designs are deviant enough to designate the house as indeed balanced. Not because it was necessary, technically speaking, to balance a house in this way, but because it was suitable to do it.

There are also a number of odd situations which indirectly emphasise the balanced design. A house from Birk, in Gjellerup, east of Herning in Jutland is a case in point. Although this house has a central entrance room, there is a byre in both the other two rooms. It goes without saying that if the house has only one function to fill, then it is indeed much more rational to enter by one of the short ends. Since short end entrance did not occur to the men from Birk although it did occur to men from contemporary Tofting in Friesland, we get an indirect proof that the balanced design was a quality in itself.

Fig. 54. The initial undefended settlement at Lyngsmose consists of 6 small farm houses, two of which are connected with a fence, thus indicating their contemporaneity. From the plan of the postholes in the northern house, it would seem that this was the more used one and thus probably the first. Based on Eriksen & Rindel (2002; 2003;2005).
In a similar way, the strength of the house design comes to the fore in the original, undefended, Lyngsmose village, Fig. 54. In this initial stage, Lyngsmose consists of six houses, two of which were situated close to each other and linked by a fence. This is of course a solution to the problem of housing two households working in close cooperation in one place, but given the extreme closeness of the two houses, it stands out as odd that a more rational solution with one byre and one or two dwellings was not chosen. The gain in construction cost only would have been some 25% and there would have been something to gain also from cooperation in the intimate daily life that must anyway have existed between two farms linked together and forming a small yard, ten by ten metres. From a land right point of view, cooperating households indicate that sometimes two or more households share the same part of the communal lands and constitute something similar to a farm with two households. Indirectly, the situation in Lyngsmose, as well as similar ones in Gronbjerg Skole and Omgård Sig, are strong indications that family, household and house, rather than farm were heavily, and perhaps primarily, inspired by ideological considerations about order, rather than a notion of rational subsistence economy.

![Fig. 55. A large fenced farm at Damgård (Tjørring) near Herning in Jutland. The two yellow axes of the blue main house divide the settlement into four balanced parts. The two red and green pairs of outhouses or secondary houses in the two latest phases occupy each their quarter balancing each other diagonally.](image-url)
The pointless and ethnocentric litanies of innumerable highly rational and misplaced colonial officers coming across yet another shortcoming of the indigenous population and their economic system (not to speak of their laziness) spring to mind when, as professionals, we understand that perfectly sound arguments would not have convinced our indigenous forefathers.

Balance and symmetry can unfold themselves also in patterns large enough to contain several houses. At Damgård in Tjørring near Herning in Jutland we find an example of this, Fig. 55. This farm, among other similar ones, was erected in the last century BCE and the main house is capacious and balanced. It has four trestles in each of its parts. It is indeed the uncommon ‘two-wife-type’ of farm and as such a significant one. Not surprisingly, a large single farm from the later part of the PRIA is completely surrounded by a fence and thus an example of seclusion rather than defence, but still nevertheless inaccessible. To begin with, this trait marks out the large farms only, but later on, the settlement at Tjørring being a case in point, everybody puts a fence around their houses. At Damgård the trenches of the fence and the way they cut the house remains make it possible for us to sketch the development of the farm. First it consisted of one house only, closely surrounded by a fence, which reminds one of an extra outer wall because of its orientation and the fact that the openings in the fence are directly in front of the doors of the house (this first fence is cut by all the later outhouses on the farm). Eventually, the fence is altered in order for it to incorporate houses IV and V. The alteration consists of two characteristic, symmetrically arranged, bulges on the original fence. Still later the fence is widened and remade in a similar bulgy fashion to accommodate houses II and III. The four outhouses are arranged symmetrically around the axes of the main house. At the same time, rebuilding the fence has resulted in a large yard to the south of the main house and a smaller one to the north. The farm has got a front and a back and a small asymmetry is thus being introduced in its last phase. The example shows that there are some very specific notions linked to entering and leaving ‘the settled’ as opposed to ‘the unsettled’ and that the east-west axis has qualities different from those of the north-south axis. We can expect that the outhouses are in themselves a complement to the main house, inasmuch as it would be reasonable to suggest that they were filled with goods produced by the slaves’ or tenants’ households attached to the large farm, thus representing the complement to the land owner and his household.

This example of the way in which the balance and complementarity of a house unfolds itself into the balanced settlement can be found in even larger contexts. The first phase of the Grøntoft village from PRIA per. III, is structured by three north/south axes and by two east/west axes, dividing the village into six plots with each one farm in a symmetrical pattern, Fig. 56A&B. The symmetry is not an ideal one, the western farms e.g. tend to be slightly larger than the eastern ones, but there are some interesting features of reflection inasmuch as the outer plots and the two halves of the village fence match each other, if they
are turned around more or less 180 degrees. ‘Balance’ or ‘complementarity’ therefore would seem to characterise the situation better than actual ‘symmetry’.

*Fig. 56A.* To begin with, the Grøntoft village has a most elaborate and balanced layout characterised by a system of north-south east-west passages. We can see the village as divided into two parts, the eastern and the western, into four parts—the two outer smaller parts and the two central larger ones; or into six parts—three in the east and the west respectively. To a certain degree, these sections are each other’s reflection as it can be seen if we rotate the eastern part of the village fence 180 degrees and impose it upon the western part, or vice versa.
Fig. 56B. At Grontoft, the somewhat odd informal system of balance is rapidly changing during the lifetime of the village, each remodelling of its layout making it simpler. Change starts in the eastern part and eventually the plan of the village tends to resemble that of a giant house. The fence with its central entrance becomes more rectangular and the number of houses reminds one of the 8 posts in a house.
The main houses have their byre in the eastern part, and their dwelling rooms in the western part of the house, but in Grøntoft, this balance can be lifted out into the surrounding landscape, where the fields are mainly located north and east of the village and the ‘heritage monument’, the old cremation grave cemetery to the southwest, Fig. 57. Because the manure from the lowered byres end up in the squared basin-like fields and because the dead are cremated on the pyre by the same fire that burned on their elevated hearth, and later on buried in slightly elevated round hillocks similar to a fire place, and moreover put into a pot and covered as if to make the glow survive the night, we can indeed argue that the balance of the house unfolds itself into the settled Grøntoft world.

**Fig. 57.** The balanced layout of the Grøntoft village landscape comes to the fore when we prolong the divide that runs through the village. This line orders the landscape in such a way that the green area, i.e. the area in which the fields were probably situated, dominates the eastern part of the subsistence landscape whereas graves are situated in the western part. On the divide, the villages itself and its houses are situated more or less at right angles to the divide.

In this way, the notion of balance expands into a landscape that covers virtually all daily life, and the house becomes a metaphor for the surrounding landscape in addition to its being a metaphor for a share of this landscape. It goes without saying that there cannot have been any set of rules that forced people to organise things in this way, and the Grøntoft pattern may well be a coincidence. However, if pointed out, it is raised from coincidence to pattern and a form of reality that link in with a notion or perhaps only a feeling of balance. That, in its turn, is impossible to understand as a coincidence, because it has been repeated in thousands of houses adhering to the rule that houses should be orientated east-west, with two main functions and two juxtaposed entrances, one in the northern wall and one in the southern. Consciously and unconsciously, balance is a theme in the settlement structure and one’s contexts may be more or less marked by the idea.

The fundamental settlement order is represented by the basic idea of two ordering axes. This order can be more or less elaborate, but not completely
dropped. Where the two axes cross, we can speak of a focus as a place where inside/outside, byre/dwelling, animals/humans come together in a point of balance and choice. This is not a centre radiating anything, it is but a temporary focus: a focal point situated in a node and defined by the alternative dualities and balances that meet in this point.

Strict adherence to the system means that walking north-south in the landscape one can change aspect of life by entering or leaving a landscape, a settlement or a house. But when we walk east-west, we pass from one balanced part or surrounding to another: from byre to dwelling room, from one farm to another, from settlement to fields or graves before we reach the next similar settlement area. All these nodes are needed to maintain life within the space of the human world. Houses are never accessible on the east-west axis, nor are most of the fenced settlements, except in the end of the PRIA, when most patterns are about to change. Between the small landscapes, the borders are obviously not manifest, but they may still have been sensed, e.g. in the feeling one may have to be away from the village or outside: in the wilderness or in between settlements.

The middle of a landscape, a settlement or a house, is where the north-south and east-west axes are brought to intersect. These points are obviously not centres in the traditional sense of the word, they are points in a large set of places where you can choose what kind of motion you want to perform. In the rigid world of the house, this point is very difficult to avoid if we want to move out of any of the three subspaces, because the middle of the entrance room, i.e. the balance point of the house, is indeed the very point in which the axes meet.

One can be anything between very conscious or completely unconscious about being in this point and the notion of the point of balance where things meet could in theory be a stable one, but in practice, the denotations of such a balanced point are difficult to see if we seek to point out their empirical representations. They are but a spot on the ground or a place which could no doubt be created by nature as well as by the peculiar construction of the house. With nothing tangible to define them, we can expect points of balance to become cognitively speaking unstable and other kinds of place to become more prominent.

In the architecture of RIA, eventually only the central entrance room prevails as a traditional norm to which everybody adheres, when building a main house on a farm. Dwelling and byre are situated on each side of this passage room, and probably nobody understands it in its historical perspective as the room of the ‘balance point’. Nevertheless, in Jutland during some centuries of PRIA there are contexts enough to support the notion of focal points of balance and change, and also to argue that there are man-made points in the landscape where one may change aspect of life.

Balance points are typical foci and they can be compared to those lakes and waterholes that attracted offerings, not least so-called bog people, i.e. human beings buried in water. It is fair to see such waters as foci in nature where one
transgresses from one aspect of life to another, from one world to another. Lakes therefore, resemble cremation sites in as much as they are also the scene of a transgression from one vertically arranged part world to another. In a world dominated by ideas of balance, it is only natural that the cremation sites, where we transgress from our middle world into heaven by means of fire, are balanced by lakes, where we transgress from the middle world to the netherworld by means of water.

In this respect, lakes and pyre sites are similar to the balance points in settlements, but lakes are not simply constructed. They exist in their own right: given, discovered, transformed into or delimitated. It is fair to assume therefore that the human world is constructed along the same lines as the natural world and we can say that instead of being in nature, the human geography is constructed as a complementary world and indeed an ordered one, inasmuch as humans order nature.

Balance as a Common Notion

With these general views in mind, let us go back to Tacitus to see whether unknowingly he will inform us also of the more general aspect of balance and focal points in the geography of EIA society. Let us start from the beginning of *Germania* and pick out some of the general traits related to the balanced and nodal understanding of the Germanian world. Rather than to prove something beyond doubt by means of the text, this exercise will be a matter of catching an echo. Tacitus writes:

*In ancient lays, their only type of historical tradition, they celebrate Tuisto, a god brought forth from the earth. They attribute to him a son, Mannus, the source and founder of their people…* (Germania 1.2).

Tacitus’ idea of the theoretical balance between Nature and Man, the gods Tuisto and Mannus, as well as the double-sidedness in ‘Tuisto’ himself, a name meaning ‘twinned’, is expected. Nature, or that which is brought forth by the earth, is double-sided, in a lot of ways, such as land and sea being a kind of twins. Nature is put up against man, with man thriving in nature between its different twin aspects – because man grows out of the double-sidedness of nature and becomes its complement. The enormous bias in Tacitus’ description for matters concerning Man, i.e., Mannus, is also to be expected.

Tacitus continues:

*From their sacred groves they remove certain images and symbols that they carry into battle* (Germania 7. 2).
The groves, as well as wetlands and lakes, i.e. nodes in natural landscape are well represented in Tacitus and in reality we can often expect both lake and grove to be represented at the same site. Moving one of the signifiers of such a nodal point of transition, the image, into the battle field makes very much sense in the nodal and focal world view, since battlefields are indeed temporary points of transition between life and death. Moving an image into a battlefield which may be in the middle of nowhere, moreover, civilises the site and brings it into a human geography. When we have carried the day, taking the spoils and the image back to the original place of the latter in order to dump the weapons of the defeated into the water is not a bad idea either, if we want to strengthen the focality of the place.

There are other examples of how one satisfies the need for a temporary nodal point of transition:

They attend to auspices and lots like no one else. Their practice with lots is straightforward. Cutting a branch from a fruit tree, they chop it into slips and, after marking these out with certain signs, cast them completely at random over a white cloth (Germania 10.1).

Making a spot, the white cloth, a point of choice is in accordance with the idea of nodal points of balance, because such points allow for an either/or decision, or to rephrase: the white cloth is a point in which fate (i.e. ‘chance’) is made the sole agent. The same kind of accordance is contained in the belief that deconstructing the duality that resides in a tree, e.g. cutting up a branch from a tree that contains both barren wood and the ability to produce fruit and being grafted, will help to solve the problem, because the duality must be brought out of its twin or intertwined structure, if we want to make a choice. Coming from a fruit tree, the small pieces of wood still contain a choice between two outcomes that fate can decide. The idea of breaking up the twisted to bring about some kind of result is also hinted by the god Man[nus], the paragon of man, who can be said to break up the twinned Tuisto as a form of ordering human life. The idea that something undecided or hidden can be brought out by a pattern of small slips or staves would also seem to explain the magic of the runes, inasmuch as their forms will occur when casting lots. Although runes are a rational system of arbitrary signs or signs copied from various other alphabets and sound systems used to express the sounds of spoken language, their attested magic qualities could nevertheless refer back to the patterns on the white cloth, where the variables that blur the essential are reduced and kept constantly in order for the patterns of reality readily to disclose themselves to those who can indeed read.
Tacitus continues his comments on prophetic tokens saying that

*there is also another way of observing auspices, which they use to forecast the outcome of serious wars. From the people with whom they are fighting, they somehow seize a captive, and send him against a champion of their own countrymen, each with his native arms; the victory of the one or the other is received as a precedent* (Germania 10. 3).

Complementarity and balance fit this way of creating the place for the single combat, i.e. a nodal point of transition. This place is similar to the white cloth where, instead of pieces of apple wood, they throw in two warriors and their weapons representing each side of the issue against each other, and wait for fate to choose between the two.

In addition to these beliefs in nodal points facilitating decision making, Tacitus goes on to describe the political structure in general terms and points out that

*the leading men take counsel over minor issues, the major ones involve them all; yet even those decisions that lie with the commons are considered in advance by the elite* (Germania11.1).

This division between elite and collective power shows in many places where Tacitus describes political structure. What he points out is the balance between the everyday elite decision-making (linked to noble birth or outstanding competence) and the exceptional collective decisions. Archaeologically speaking, elite decision is reflected in the village that centres on the large and stable farm. Like Mannus, the leader or leaders of a village solve the problems of the twisted complexity when there are things to decide. This Mannus ideal comes to the fore in wars (Germania; Chps 13 and 14) which accentuate the individualised leadership, since wars are difficult situations calling for civilised order and decision, but when it comes to electing a chieftain, collective decision is needed.

In Chapter 15, Tacitus describes a typical situation in which, after the war, soldiers cannot adapt to a society that lacks the strong leadership and hierarchic order of the war-transformed community. Taken together, the accounts of war single out the Mannus ideal as a means to solve the otherwise twisted situation of warfare, and we sense a discrepancy between old and new ideals. In the old, the notion of ‘balance’, the twisted and the twin was more important. In the new, it is not, and the discrepancy is brought about by the fact that settlement and army can be managed in the same way. This way is in all probability inspired by Roman ways, inasmuch as the structure of command in the Roman army rested on individuality in a hierarchic order.

From Tacitus’ description of the collective council we understand that it is in fact timetabled (assemblies every fortnight) and flexible enough to serve most
purposes, although at the moment described by Tacitus, it does not work on
the village level:

*Unless something unexpected suddenly occurs, they gather on set days, when the moon is either new or full, because this they regard as the most auspicious time to begin their business. They reckon time not by days, like us, but by nights: in this way they make their appointments and set their dates, since to them the night seems to bring on the day (Germania 11.1).*

This description indicates that even in nature-governed time there are nodal points of transition focussed on balance, such as the moment of transition between the increasing and decreasing moon. But such points can also be arranged if necessary in a way similar to the image in the battlefield, the white cloth with the lots or the space for the single combat. The reason why this can be done can be inferred from the way in which the day and night cycle is understood and because time is counted as a number of nights. Nights as it happens are seen as a period similar to pregnancy, i.e., a period which creates a starting point, i.e., a transition bringing forward the sun. If we like, we may compare the night to the first part of the life cycle in the house before we are born into marriage, and the day as the rest of our lives when we begin our own married life in our new house.

Moving into punishment, Tacitus says that

*traitors and deserters they hang from trees, but the cowardly and unwarlike and those who disgrace their bodies they submerge in the mud of a marsh, with a wicker frame thrown over (Germania l2.1).*

This allows us to see a death sentence as a form of transition, and spot a duality also in misbehaviour on each side of normalcy. This is in line with the cognitive understanding of the balanced cosmology. We should not believe the nodal points of death-as-a-penalty to be too different from that of the sacrifice because groves and water covariate. As sites, these nodal points are situated in the same spot and Tacitus’ description is interesting because we come to understand that we can indeed infer a vertical axis, i.e., ‘an up’, hanging people from a tree, where archaeology can only point to ‘a down’, people submerged in water.

Despite a good deal of obscurity, there is enough in Tacitus’ descriptions to recognise the character of the focal point as a point of choice and transition and thus similar to what archaeology can define as a characteristic of significant points in the settlement and indeed in the house. It is their floating character and their ability to be constructed or discovered that makes them typical of a specific cosmological understanding which tells us that man can construct a
world of his own and that his construction, the human landscape, is in accordance with the general structure of the world. His choice moreover is quite free, because the structure of the world, despite the differences in appearance and impact, is simple and uniform or indeed coherent: it is twisted and may therefore be opened up and the parts sometime displayed.

Summing up ‘Landscape’ and the Changing Settlement Order

The human geography is conceived as a flexible nodal system, a conscious construction, balancing nature. The house is the most common archaeological example of a micro geography that can be put almost anywhere, but there are also points of attraction in the landscape, i.e., places of a more focal or central character. To begin with, these places may be occupied in different ways, but one of them, the fenced and stable large farm, e.g. the above mentioned Damgård, will eventually become the farm norm. When favouring the qualities of the large and stable farm starts to become an issue, the landscape, instead of being understood as consisting of innumerable floating nodal points, will begin to be defined by a limited number of places with focal and central rather than nodal qualities. Hodde is the classical example of the fact that large farms can attract other farms, mostly smaller ones, and give them some kind of protection or indeed place. Hodde therefore is also an example of a shift in the understanding of the human landscape. This shift began to take place in the second century BCE and the development goes hand in hand with changes in the character of the household.

In Hodde, the central and fenced farms dominate the settlement. The largest farm holds an exclusive position at the northern side of the village fence. The small settlement area around this original farm and later around the whole village is delimited by small rivers or brooks to the north, west and south. On the eastern side, there is a wetland area, but also a dry passage leading into a larger hinterland. This passage is a kind of opening similar in position and direction to the main opening in the village fence. While the fence around the original farm had openings facing north or south, the opening in the village fence is deviant inasmuch as it opens to the east. If we look at the shape of this village as it is represented by its fence, we see that the form of the outline parallels that of the resource area around the settlement—the fence around the village is paralleled by brook, river and wetland around the resource area of the original farm, Fig. 58.
There is no communal cemetery within this area, only two minor ones close to each other situated on a small elevation north of the village on the brink of the brook which delimits the resource area. If we look at this area as a magnification of the village area, the position of the two cemeteries is similar to that of the large original farm of the village and the farm next to it on the northern perimeter of the fence. The graves are contemporary with the village, not with the original farm, and in each cemetery there are some well-furnished graves containing weapons, Fig. 59. Contrasting Hodde and Grøntoft, the latter represents the creation of a place, a kind of centre and focal feature, however arranged around a set of points that would have reminded the visitor of the balanced and nodal character of the house. Hodde on the other hand is an example of a place with a focus signifying centre qualities, a single large fenced farm. This focus develops into a centre with a pair of stable dominant farms within the village. In Grøntoft, the entrances are modelled on those of the house, but in Hodde, this is not the case. Here the openings from the farms are constructed to access the area around the village in a radiating system.
Fig. 59. When we add the Hodde settlement and its graves to the landscape, it becomes clear that the village is orientated at a slightly different angle to the north than the subsistence area, but the village is still centred the same way as the landscape. It is moreover obvious that the prominent graves contemporary with the prominent farms of Phase 1, are aligned in the same way, the farms along the northern border of the settlement and the graves along the northern border of the subsistence landscape. To the east of the village we find the occasional PRIA settlement as well as an iron production area and RIA settlements.

If we look into the scale relation between the landscape and the settlement, we detect a 10:1 relationship between the topographical outline and that of the village fence. It would seem therefore that when the owner of the primal solitary farm decided to create a fenced village and invite other farms to settle it, he measured his land and shaped the village after his survey. He would moreover have chosen to divide the measures he took by 10, in order to set out a village of suitable dimensions. After some generations, it became apparent that that the village was too small, but even so his planning and mapping efforts were significant and we may wonder why he chose to divide his measures by 10 rather than by some other number, such as 8 or 12. Although we will never know if and why 10 was befitting, we can still argue hypothetically that for anyone acquainted with Roman numbers dividing by 10 is an easy task, because any measure down to ten units can be divided by changing M, D, C, I and X to C, L, X, V and I respectively— CLXVI (166) being one tenth of MDCLX (1660). We may also wonder whether the size of a village was thought of as one tenth of its area of subsistence. Be this as it may, without numerical literacy, the Hodde trick cannot be performed and in some way or other, the shape of the perimeter must have been decided upon. The alternative to measurement and computation is some kind of haphazard planning difficult to favour over a systematic procedure, when the latter is the simpler. Based on Hvass (1985) and FOF.
The preliminary publications concerning the settlement at Lyngsmose have favoured some slightly diverging interpretations and perhaps overlooked a small house with four posts overlapped by a standard farm building. The settlement nevertheless follows the common pattern indicating that the oldest houses are not overlapping, whereas the later ones are, and the last ones in their turn rebuilt. Six houses (red) were not erected within the defence, but it can nevertheless be argued that the defence was built around them. The defence, consisting of a bank and a moat filled with Caesar’s lilies, was designed to have four gates linked by crossroads, but one of the 12 houses (i.e. 14 house phases) which were built behind the bank, blocks this design. Therefore, we may suspect that the house represents the end phase of the settlement in which settlement, rather than rational defence, had become the more important issue. In their latest interpretation, Eriksen and Rindel see the settlement as two phases: one before the defence and a second, very short one filling up the ringfort. Because we can count to three overlapping house phases in the southwestern quarter is is however easier to argue that the settlement consisted of five farms existing in four more or less synchronous farm/farm house phases for 120–150 years. Since the length of the bank is c. 240 metres and because of the men needed to man the four gates, 5 or 12 households cannot defend the settlement. Those who live in the fort are there to be present, guard and maintain it so that 50–60 men can defend it when necessary.
There is a certain amount of defence in the manifest fencing of both Grøntoft and Hodde, and there are also larger defence lines in the landscape. To begin with, the character of a fence and that of a defence need not differ, although they may, not least since there is probably a great need for many different fences. In the long run, fencing a settlement becomes a way of defining a farm and its seclusion in a system that looks very different from the defence lines which become fortifications in their own right. Still, we can venture to say that defence and seclusion are essential in the formation of a stable place which, in addition to containing or surrounding nodal points, also holds qualities that remind us of the centre which radiates and attracts.

Lyngsmose is an example which illustrates a position between a defence structure and the house-resembling fences that we know from Grøntoft, Damgård, Omgård Sig or the original Hodde farm, Fig. 60. To begin with, Lyngsmose is a small place characterised by two linked and one fenced farm. This is a good definition of place, because in most cases, people would have tended to separate the new farm from the old one, but not so at Lyngsmose. Having willingly or unwillingly created a place at Lyngsmose, the settlement develops without singling out the original ones. This means that the place is viewed as primary in relation to the first farms and it is this place, not the settlement that is fortified. Building farms at Lyngsmose seems to begin with to have been a normal collective decision and a temporal one-generation solution. The eventual fortification of the place does not look like the fencing of a group of houses, because it has four gates or openings in the defence works dividing the settlement into quarters. One can access this place from all four corners of the world in a way very similar to a military camp. There is no house in a central position behind the fortifications, just the crossroads surrounded by houses probably one or two in each quarter. The focal point, the cross, is still a node although not an occupied one, contrary to the ones at Damgård or the original Hodde farm. The node, moreover, is not one of several balanced ones represented by the houses in the village and their entrance rooms, similar to the ones in Grøntoft or Omgård Sig. On the contrary, the place is primary and it seems fair to suggest that it has protective qualities that rate above the ones of a house. It stands to reason that the fortifications cannot be manned by those who live in the village, and that the layout echoes that of a Roman camp, however, without a marked centre where the roads intersect.

The centre at Lyngsmose is a collective centre or a meeting place. It fits into a nodal system in the way an offering lake would do. The village is there for practical reasons, supporting those who maintain the fortification and man it, but as a place, the settlement is separated from the centre of the defence. The nodes of the village are within the houses, and as a place, the village is an open one, however, fitted into a frame that belongs to another nodal system.

Only little by little does the balanced and focal cosmological geography give way to a world characterised by dominant central points that radiate power and stability from the buildings on a farm. In some ways, this new or enhanced
landscape is imposed upon the older one; in other ways, the old ones are erased by the new order. This transition was accompanied by tensions. Fortified settlements, weapon graves and weapon offerings suggest just that, as does the expansion of the Roman Empire and its lasting impact, because Roman culture signified a model of social order similar to the new one. The Roman landscape, with obvious central points, and a hierarchical social order linked to this landscape, may well have served as a role model for the new Scandinavian order without South Scandinavians becoming small Romani. The Roman policy against the people they met, first to conquer or, if defeated, to punish and later to control, suggests that the Roman expansion acted as a catalyst as well as a threat also on communities not directly in contact with Roman forces. Indeed, the whole idea, boosted by the Romans, of calling the northern part of Europe Germania and filling it with Germani is a prerequisite for pointing out leaders that could also be understood as a stratum in a socially speaking uniform society. These leaders were only too happy to embrace the idea of representing a genuine leadership and even more happy to find themselves involved in a power struggle staged and supported by Roman policy, triggered by their own ambition, and based on the fact that in reality, their social raison d’être was the defence of their tribe or clan, i.e., one of hundreds of small-scale societies. As long as Romani ite domum—Romans go home! was a prolific slogan, leadership fed on Roman example.

Archaeology shows the ongoing transition in society, while Tacitus in his ethnographic description and historical annals creates a well-defined context consisting of one kind of people in a unifying space in a specific period. This view, an early example of oversimplification partly setting the standard for the colonial attitude to others, is of course damaging. Yet, it was probably worth the trouble to use Tacitus’ narrative to figure out the way in which nodal and focal views mix in his description, because this mixture is likely to be a fair description of the situation, whether or not he wanted to convey it to his readers.

Taking the PRIA as our point of departure, it is perhaps easier to see the changing rather than mixed understanding of the world, and similarly, to see the affinities with the later RIA perspective, rather than the links to an earlier BA cosmology, not least why the notion of the centre has some affinities with the few large PRIA farms with a sometimes more stable position in the cultural landscape. These farms could perhaps have given the RIA idea of the centre its origins, indicating that central chieftains and stable farms had always existed. The floating character of the human landscape, on the other hand, could well have been a characteristic also of the LBA. But otherwise, it is the twin or balanced duality of many phenomena and the indirect reference to the dioscūri, the twin gods, inherent in the name of the primordial god Tuisto, that is perhaps the best, although vague reference to earlier world views.

Be this as it may, the way in which the house continues to be buried and rebuilt as the chieftain’s hall, centuries after the house-burying habit ceased to be common, indicates that an ideological expression could survive by means of
transformation and reformulation, reminding us of the past as well as confirming the present state of the art. Irrespective of this, the thoroughness of the change in the understanding of the human landscape during the first centuries of our era is unparalleled.

NOTES
121 ‘-scape’ relates to the catchword of Gerald Manley Hopkins’ criticism, i.e. ‘INSCAPE’. Wimsatt (1996:640 note 18) has some relevant references to the shibboleth. But see also Gardner & Mackinzie (1967:xx p.).
122 Nobody knows the origin of the ambiguous expression about the road system, but Chaucer (1390s) knew the expression: Tutte le vie conducono a Roma All the roads lead to Rome.
123 For Beowulf or prince Hraef in Finnsburg see Klaeber (1950), for Heliand see Murphy (1992). On the heroic traveller see Herschend (2001).
125 On house offerings see Anne Carlie (2004) in this context (2004:190 pp.) Hansen (2006) and Henriksen (1998). A hint to the Norwegian material is given by Guttormsen (2003:35-44). Bielke-Voigt (2008) has collected offerings and archaeological contexts from Northwest-German and Danish settlements. She prefers the term ‘intentional deposition’ to ‘offering’ and proposes to define the intentional as either profane or ritual. I retain the term ‘offering’ inasmuch as it is as difficult to define as ‘ritual deposition’ and because what has happened, e.g. to the miniature pot in a posthole, is the fact that it has been added to or indeed offered the context of the house in order to become a part of it although strictly speaking, e.g. to keep a post upright, pots are uncalled for. Whether or not the objects we offer the context ‘house-construction’ are accepted by the said context is beside any material point. It is unwise, moreover, to restrict offerings to be ‘gifts to the gods’, i.e. to commonly acknowledged or theologized deities who can be correctly addressed, since who are we to know the whereabouts of deities? That too is the reason why Christians understand the added benefit of seeing Christ in ordinary faces and helping out, perhaps with gifts. Or to quote a net-related slogan: ‘Drakken gives added benefit and protection by offering McAfee virus protection to customers’—it works both ways round, if we offer D what D needs we get ‘something more’ that we may need in return from McA, cf. http://www.mcafee.com/us/local_content/case_studies/cs_drakken.pdf . Last visited 2008-05-20. Concepts such as ‘offerings’ are simply not in need of any strict definitions, suffice it to say that we may now and then infer the existence of active mental values in a rational material context from material added to it.
126 Such differences can be studied comparing Haarnagel (1979); Kjær (1928); Myhre (1977; 1980); Hagen (1953) Herschend & Kaldal Mikkelsen(2003) Stenberger (1933; 1955) and Edgren & Herschend (1979).
129 Concerning farm or settlement mounds see Bertelsen (1995). The intricate relation between artefacts and land use can be seen e.g. in the investigations on Lurekalven in Western Norway, cf. Kvamme (1988). On this small island, 0.88 km² 40 km Northwest of Bergen, permanent cornfields were cleared in the 8th century CE and fertilized with manure, ashes and sods in a ‘Plaggen-
wirtschaft’ system. Nevertheless, this permanent farm cannot be traced in the archaeological material until the 10th century. The archaeology belongs mainly to the Medieval period and shows that the occupation, a humble settlement, comes to a close during the Black Death. From then onwards the island is used for grassing only. This means that when the most profitable period exploiting the vegetation of the island is over people start not to bring all their garbage and waste into the fields. This allows us to conclude that although the archaeological material can be said to signify some sort of material status and well as laxness when it comes to recycling, it also indicates that eventually in a marginal rural setting there are more profitable things to do than fertilizing the fields, despite the fact that fertilizing is indeed what the fields need. Although Lurekalven never managed to become a farm mound, because in the end nothing was profitable enough to sustain a permanent settlement, the investigations revealed the mechanisms which in marginal areas lead to an imbalance between fields and manure as well as livestock and cereals.

130 Remains of human being in burnt-down houses are known e.g. from Nørre Tranders Jutland (Nielsen, J. N. 2002) from Uppåkra in Scania Lenntorp (2007) or from Vallhagar on Gotland Börrnstad (1955:175); Geijvall (1955).

131 For the stratigraphy of the Eketorp ring fort, see Herschend (1976:203 pp.). The position of the flame coloured layers shows in Herschend (2001:Fig.18).

132 Archaeology still awaits a precise analysis of the possible habit of burning down Iron Age houses as a deliberate way of bringing them to an end. There are however some studies, cf. Stevanovic (1997) some indications among others on the Kyrsta, Vaxmyra, Björgkården and Trekanten excavations indicating that daub exposed to high temperatures causing the clay to sinter is more common in postholes from PRIA when houses were still solitary. On burning down Iron Age Houses see Rasmussen (2007).

133 For Nørre Tranders see J. Hansen (2006). For Gørding and Ginderup respectively see H. Andersen (1951:40-64) and Kjær (1930:19-30).


135 There are a number of literary examples which point to the paramount importance of building a hall or being presented with a hall. When Hengest has won a half victory in Finnburg, he insists upon getting a hall (Klaeber 1950:vv. 1085-1088). When Hrothgar is made king he is presented with a hall (Klaeber 1950:vv. 70-77) When Beowulf returns home a hero he is presented with a hall and a high seat by King Hygelak (Klaeber 1950:vv. 2194-2196). When Venantius Fortunatus describes the successful carrier of the young Sigibert he ends by building himself a hall with a mind to settled down and marry. See Venantius Fortunatus Carmina Book VI poem 1; translation and comments in George (1992) and Herschend (1998:99).

136 For the Uppåkra hall see Larsson & Lenntorp 2004. House covering at Uppåkra moreover meant that next to the hall the plot where a long building stood before it was burned down was cover up rather than cleared, cf. Lenntorp (2007).

137 For Løveil see Beck & Kaldal Mikkelsen (2006:Fig. 8; House XII).


139 Lack of cult continuity and lack of prehistoric temples was a main concern of Olaf Olsen’s (1966) who concluded that what might be understood as temples were no more than the homes of chieftains sometimes used for religious feasts, but not regular temples. Olsen also argued against cult continuity. Gräslund (2001:33 pp.) and Sundqvist (2008:143 pp.) have summarised the dissections that has followed Olsen source critical discussion. Today cult continuity is often
attested not least because of place continuity from hall to church and Olaf Olsen himself pointed out the example Lisbjerg, cf. Olsen (1999:90).

140 Since c. 1990 a number of striking examples of the fact that large hall farms and cult house/temple/hall and churches are spatially related to each other, have come to light cf. Lisbjerg, Jeppesen & Madsen (1989:6; 1991:271 pp.); Tamdrup, Hvass & al (1991:111); generally Nielsen, L C (1991:253 p.). New examples moreover are continuously being added such as Staby, Eriksen and Henningsen (1995:52 pp.), Gamlesogn church, Anonymous (2005:167); Lockarp, Heimer et. al. (2006:158 p.); Järrestad, Söderberg (2003:109 pp.); Borg in Lofoten, Herschend and Kaldal Mikkelsen (2003:41 pp.). In Dejbjerg (Hansen 1996), Järrestad and Borg in Lofoten, the magnate farms have been established well before the VA. In four studies discussing different aspects of the concept of cult in Scandinavia, such as cult leadership and cult buildings, Sundqvist (2008) has summarized the discussion of these matters and convincingly argued for continuous reformation of religion between 400 and 1050 CE rather than a dichotomy between pagan and Christian.


142 The reference to Caesar is in Germania chp 28. To older authors in chps 2, 3, 4 and 9. To well-known facts chp 16. cf. Gudeman 1900:107 pp. An example of Tacitus’ of outdated information is given by Ronald Syme 1958:128 concerning the Danubian tribes who stopped being ’loyal clients’ in 89 CE when Domitian attacked the Dacians.

143 This preference for copying was hinted by Gudeman 1900 and clearly exemplified by Eduard Norden 1922, 42pp.

144 See Annales Book 1, 55-59. On early general and Late Antique relations between Roman and Germani see E A Thompson (1965); Heather (2005); Brian Ward-Perkin (2005).

145 Velleius was part of Tiberius’ staff in his wars in Germania and although Velleius had a completely distorted view of superior character of Tiberius Caesar, his insights into Germanian tactics cannot be dismissed. (cf Velleius chp 104 pp.).

146 For the large farm contemporary with the Hoby grave see Klingenberg (2006). For the grave and the drinking cups see Friis Johansen (1923) and additional, on the cups, Herschend (1999).

147 On the terms war/warfare offerings/sacrifice see below Chapter VI.

148 In Scandinavian archaeology during the last 30 years, there has been a tendency to use Tacitus as a straightforward source to ERIA South Scandinavia. Brondsted (1962) however was cautious striving to find archaeology illustrated by the written sources. Jensen (2003) is both source critical (2003:105) and prepared to trust details (2003:235). Ethelberg (2000:165) who could be said to represent a vogue which also can be seen in Storgård (2003) finds Tacitus description of the social structure among Germani to be factual. Today, however, a new and sensible criticism has been voiced, e.g. Fuglevik (2007) and Fuglevik and Gundersen (2007).

149 For an analysis of Galsted see Ethelberg & al. (2003:190 pp.)

150 Suetonius fits Roman biography into a very precise scheme developed on the basis of Hellenistic biographies, cf. Suetonius, Augustus. Chapters 1 to 9 make up the vita, the rest of the text relates to categories, i.e. a text per species (Stuart 1928:179 pp. and 185). Tacitus, when writing about his father-in-law, Agricola, follows this scheme in a style both personal and standoffish. (cf. Tacitus, Agricola; Mattingly 1926. On Tacitus’ style and style in the early Empire cf. Williams (1978, especially p. 241 pp.).

151 Some researchers such as Lund discussing interpretation graecal/romana (1993:46pp.) have pointed out that the terms used by Tacitus in describing the social strata among Germani, designate the five layers that would be familiar to a Roman reader (1993:56). In his analysis, a typical interpretatio moderna, Lund draws the conclusion that Tacitus in his description gives us an interpretation referring to Rome rather than Germany. A sensible reading of the present para-
graphs from Germania must nevertheless stress the difficulties Tacitus has, in practice, to differentiate between free farmers and freedmen, tenants or slaves. Had he insisted on his *interpretatio romana* this would hardly have been the case. It would seem therefore that Tacitus refers to a stratified society rather than a social order consisting of five layers.

A two-generation life length for a house is indicated by the $^{14}$C dates at the settlement Vaxmyra in Uppland Eklund (2005:107 Fig.94).

On the concept of land and of land right see Herschend (1997A). In *Beowulf* vv. 2880-2890 alludes to the loss of Land Right and thus indirectly on the right itself: those who do not support Beowulf in his fight against the dragon lose the right to settle and they are supposed to walk about haphazardly.

The quotation from Caesar is from Gallic Wars iv:22 cf. Translation by Edwards (1966) and a comment in Herschend (2001:162 p.).

In Jutland this development shows both in fewer houses and in a new and larger type of houses. In southern Jutland this change seems to start earlier than elsewhere, cf. Ethelberg (2003) who has called the house in question the Over Jersdal house. In the wake of the new houses rebuilding and repairing become common place. All in all there is a large and stepwise rather than slow and continuous change in the settlement structure around the beginning of CE.

The status of the Iron Age population in Denmark is described by Balslev Jørgensen *et al.* (1984).

See Olesen (2001).


Damgård, (cf. Steen 1997 and Olesen & Rostholm 2004) is part of a not yet fully published settlement site in and around today’s Tjørning, which cover no less than 500 years of settlement from 300 BCE to 200 CE in the same topographical and socio-geographical situation. The unique quality of this settlement was its ability to live through the turbulent social change around the beginning of the CE.

Asymmetry in farms and farm houses is a widespread phenomenon around the beginning of the CE. On several settlements in Uppland and Västmanland, e.g. Vaxmyra House 14 (Eklund 2006:88 pp.) we see a variety of this asymmetry in farm houses with a straight southern and a bent northern façade in the beginning of the CE. The Middle Scandinavian house (cf. Herschend 1998B:fig 2) in itself is an expression of asymmetry.

The neologism ‘Complementarity’ is need. The quality of duality or dichotomy is often seen as related to mutually excluding phenomena comprising a universe in an absolute way. This is especially true of dichotom relations because they can be transcribed into expressions stating that ‘everything is either A or B’. Duality too refers to a more or less global context with two sides or parts only. The general character of these concepts invites further universal notions such as ‘opposition’ and ‘definition’ or ‘specificity’ per se leading those who apply such concepts into interpretations supported by a way reasoning that exaggerates the universality and simplicity of the purely logical at the expense of the impure and contextual which in its turn is prone to change with time and space.

Nevertheless, the contextual forms the backdrop for a number of practical inferences such as the feeling of balance between entities as well as the notion of the ‘match’ between two phenomena. Such notions of match or balance are obvious to most people even though we are aware that they are much more flimsy notions than dichotomies. The balance e.g. between land and sea can be appreciated by most without much abstraction, and so could the most practical but hardly logical one between water and air or, for that matter, the more intriguing match between fire and water; day and night—perhaps in its slightly more abstract outfit ‘light’ and/or ‘darkness’. This kind of balance orders our perception of the world albeit not in any consistent logical way, but in a practical one ranging from a notion of empirical straightforwardness to one of logical construction.
and universality. The subject matter is an old one discussed at length in Plato’s *Symposion* e.g. contrasting Aristophanes’ notion of the original human being as man and woman linked in one body, happily matching each other, with the abstract Socratic definition of love related to a concept of either doing the good or the not-good.

To free ourselves from the negative connotations following an abstract application of dichotomies, which leads us astray when it comes to understanding and detecting prehistoric contexts, we need a term which allows us to point out the way in which two phenomena can match each other as balanced qualities making up some form of temporal and spatial unit, despite their obvious difference. Finding a verbal root to fit our needs I have settled for ‘complement’ in the sense of to balance, harmonize, match or go together. The adjective complementary fit our purpose when it comes to describing the situation of the two phenomena involved, but we need a noun to describe as a notion the state when two phenomena are complementary to each other, i.e., when they complement each other. In short we need a noun referring back to complementary. The right way to form such a noun would be to invent the word *Complementarity*, i.e. the notion signifying the state in which two complementary entities complement each other.

In Rindel’s reconstruction of the gates of the village the easternmost opening in the southern part of the fence is not considered to be a gate because it lacks the hole for the post that supported the gate. The hole in the fence is nevertheless there and that indicates that when digging the trench a gate was anticipated.

The verb to read stems from the Anglo-Saxon *rædan*, i.e. counsel, consult, interprete, read. The noun rune from *run*, i.e. a mystery, secrete conference, whisper or murmur (cf. Skeat (1936:read & :rune). These two concepts mingle when it comes to understanding what runes are, and we may therefore refer to the magic of runes, cf. Moltke (1985). In the above quoted paragraph the word *notis* ‘with signs’ has often been translated ‘with runes’, but that is hardly correct given the fact that Tacitus was familiar with letters. Latin oracles were sometimes performed with staves of beech, i.e. *udes*, and Marijane Osborns (1981:168-173) has argued there is a link between runes and the casting of lots in situations that called for divination. We may thus suspect that when the lots are thrown as staves and when the priest is supposed to pick up three staves he looks at the patterns formed by them. Should it happen e.g. that three staves formed the rune *feoh* i.e. ‘cattle’ and/or ‘wealth’, then it would be possible for him to point to that kind of pattern in order for him to pick up the three specific staves and interpret their signs. There may of course also be a lot of other runic patterns among a number of staves softly to memorize and interpret. The rational idea of forming letters by means of combining straight lines may thus easily be linked to the random patterns formed by staves thrown upon the white cloth. The patterns formed by chance may thus later have inspired the construction of the runic letters.

Arminius came to an end because he plotted to make a king of himself and him his son. (*Annales*).

The way Tacitus (*Annales*) describes the leaders Segestes and Arminius testifies to this.
CHAPTER IV

BUILDING PERMANENT VILLAGES AND FARMS
Although settlements, in relation to landscape, were floating and nodal in the beginning of the Iron Age, there was also a tendency for focal points to emerge or to establish themselves, at least for a limited period. The house, albeit lasting but a generation, is a case in point on the household level. It was created by the collective as a node with the quality of becoming the home of yet another family. In a modest way within the house and thus to this new family it contained a focus—a point of balance facilitating choice and return. Eventually, and again to the family, the nodal house and its focus became a centre in the sense of a place with a dominant function ordering the world around the family and its house. This is true not least when the children are fitted into the farm network, allowing the parents to enhance their social status.

We have seen that the tendency to create a focal point in a landscape did not only structure houses and settlements; it could also refer to a pattern that unfolded itself into the surrounding landscape in such a way that a focal point in the houses of the fenced Grøntoft village could be said to refer to the settled surroundings. There was in other words a tendency to create larger balanced landscapes, in which settlement and landscape were complementary. The balanced Grøntoft landscape was an intricate case, in part constructed by Iron Age man, but perhaps also in part an unintended structural effect. The position of the fenced village between fields and cemeteries that gives structure to the landscape as a whole may thus have come about more by chance and common sense than by cosmological intent. Yet, once observed, it is easy to fit the situation of the village into a general cosmological pattern of balance and complementarity, because this balance was attested more fully within the fenced settlement and because it dominated the individual houses completely. Whether intended or not, the large Grøntoft pattern would eventually have stood out as significant to the beholder.

The reason for this is the longevity of the fenced Grøntoft settlement which, despite the brevity of its individual houses and its overall balanced and focal structure, could also be understood as a form of settlement centre in the surrounding landscape, in practice governing the life pattern of those who lived there. This notion was added to by the earlier gradual concentration of the open settlement structure to the area just north of the village. Although fenced villages played a role in structuring society and its households, they eventually stood out as dated and unsuccessful solutions. In this way, they remind us of the densely settled and indeed heavily ‘fenced’ Ölandic ring forts. They were
interesting experiments, but also masterminded settlements with little potential\textsuperscript{167}. Instead of the Grøntoft structure, the real impetus for the radical social change in the RIA was the reformed farm economy and growing social stratification. This, however, did not take place till after the settlement crisis around the beginning of the Common Era.

**In the Beginning of the Common Era**

The pattern of complementarity between a fenced settlement and its surroundings was also observed in Hodde. The situation of the cemeteries within the topographically defined subsistence area paralleled the situation of the dominant farms within the fenced settlement. This meant that in the human landscape of subsistence, the position of graves and cemetery balanced that of the large farms in the village and their asymmetric position within the fenced settlement, because the shape of the village fitted the shape of its surroundings. Together, cemeteries and shape pointed out the notion of a centre reflecting and reflected in the surroundings. The same tendency to let a settlement mirror its surroundings can also be found in the somewhat later Galsted settlement. Here the reflection is rather weak, but still the orientation of this village with a communal fence seems to have been laid out with an eye to the orientation of the landscape, i.e. the hill island where it was situated. Projecting the settlement unto an historical map with a more fair representation of the wetlands, in their capacity as border zones, makes this is easier to see, Fig. 61A–E.

![Fig. 61A–E. Maps of the Galsted settlement. (A) The fenced village and its Bronze Age mound (red and blue) in the Galsted excavation area (yellow). (B) The small hill island and the alignment of the fenced village to the lines of the landscape. (C) Map as (B) with the addition of the wetland area mapped on Videnskabernes selskabs kort. (D) Galsted between heath and wetland fitted onto Videnskabernes selskabs kort. (E) The Galsted village with c. 10 contemporary farms. Based on Ethelberg 2003.](image-url)
Fig. 61A–E. Maps of the Galsted settlement. (A) The fenced village and its Bronze Age mound (red and blue) in the Galsted excavation area (yellow). (B) The small hill island and the alignment of the fenced village to the lines of the landscape. (C) Map as (B) with the addition of the wetland area mapped on Videnskabernes selskabs kort. (D) Galsted between heath and wetland fitted onto Videnskabernes selskabs kort. (E) The galsted village. Based on Ethelberg 2003.
Fenced villages in Jutland, such as Grøntoft, Hodde or Galsted indicate that a settlement is the mirror of a communal resource area or the land of the community. They belong to a period between the scattered farms of the PRIA and the first villages headed by a specific large farm which constituted the focus and the centre of the village as well as a dominant farmstead. Galsted relates to this development because the fenced village is abandoned and a new one, perhaps its sequel, laid out as a row of fenced farms. Next to this row we find a large multiple household farm a little to the south, Fig. 62A. This separation between the solitary large twin or triplet farm and the row of small farms is not the same kind of change that we start to find in some 2nd century settlements and several later ones when one farm stands out as the large and dominant one. Instead, the twin or triplet farms are a prolonged PRIA echo.

![Fig. 62A. A schematic illustration of the development of the Galsted settlement. Phase 1 is the fenced village. Phase 2 is the twin or triplet farm and its graves just south of the new row of fenced farms and their cemetery (1+6/7 farms). This phase may overlap Phase 3 in which the large, probably triplet farm, is moved further to the southeast on the low hillock and out of touch with the row village. This move suggests that each settlement, the row and the triplet, has its own subsistence area. It is possible that the overall pattern indicates that a family has been able to move out of the fenced village and establish itself in a socially speaking more elevated position.]

At Galsted, there are actually two large farm complexes south of the villages and they belong in the 1st and 2nd century CE respectively. These farms are peculiar, inasmuch as they are both twin or perhaps triplet farms. In this respect we can compare them to Tjørring, Gårslev, Hvedsager, Hammelv or Stepping, discussed below, i.e. to other economically speaking powerful twin or triplet farms. Three conclusions can be drawn from the Galsted development. (1) We
can suspect that the large farm had a PRIA forerunner in the area, when the fenced village was built and that later on, it forced itself upon the settlement on the low Galsted hillock, dividing it up between the large farm complex and the row village. (2) It is possible that originally, the multiple household farm was situated within the fenced village without being especially large or archaeologically visible. Moving out of the village would thus indicate that one of the families were able to establish their own settlement. (3) The fact that large farms are twin or triplet farms seems to indicate that these farms are related to the notion of a family with multiple households.

These farms are easy to see when they are separated from the farms in a village, but they can perhaps also be seen in Hodde, where the two largest farms, a possible twin or triple household farm, are situated next to each other, Fig. 62B. If the development at Pøel is thus an example of a large farm that becomes divided up into smaller ones, then Galsted is an example of the opposite: a large farm that occurs next to a village, causing a split in the settlement. The fact that the large farm moves to the south and re-establishes itself with a new set of graves indicates that its dominant position is relatively weak, because it probably moved in order to make a more rational division of the land instead of forcing the village to disappear.

In all probability, the large farms in Southern Jutland belonging to the so called Over Jersdal group are a continuation of the large solitary farms of the PRIA. Such farms may develop within society or come to an end. When in the ERIA they stand out as twin or triplet farms they do not signify a major change in settlement structure, because they do not give rise to the ordinary LRIA village in which the dominating large and stable farm is situated within the village itself. As long as large farms are separated from the smaller ones that make up the villages, both villages and dominant farms possess some kind of independence.

The Grøntoft settlement is a case in point. As of old, the settlements at Grøntoft were divided into a northern and a southern group. The northern one, the Pøel settlement, started out as one large farm with a fairly stable position for a couple of generations. Later, when this farm was broken up into a few smaller ones, these households continued as a settlement in their own right. The southern group was made up by the farms that eventually formed the village. The large farms of the PRIA therefore, would seem simply to represent a subsistence area that can, but need not always, be managed by one household only. The status of these settlements seems to be derived from the concept of the ‘leading family’.

Moving the dominant farms into the villages must be seen as beneficial for the large farms, because it tends to secure their dominant position among the other ones within a larger subsistence area. Eventually in LRIA and MP, there will be only a few large farm-free villages left. Multiple household farms and fenced villages are therefore not a step in the transition from scattered floating settlements to the stable village dominated by a large farm. Instead, they are a
cul-de-sac, a non-viable compromise, but nevertheless a new way of organising the settled landscape. Despite the fact that they are not a success in a long-term perspective, they are nevertheless investments, and there ought to be a reason why people engage themselves in that kind of social and economic engineering.\textsuperscript{168}

![Fig. 62B. A schematic map of Hodde phases 1 and 3a. Based on Hvass (1988).]
Fenced and defended villages point to the communal defence and perhaps a local leader, rather than a large stratified and tribal society represented by a leading and armed figure. Fenced villages therefore are a reflection of the need to protect oneself, but they are also the result of a decision to do so in a specific communal way, falling back on the notion of the settlement and local knowledge rather than trust in a field army. When we prefer to organize our defence as a protection of our local settlement, we are probably not supporting the ambitions of a chieftain such as Arminius, who gathered large armies and strived to become the ruler of a realm. In the fenced village, the armed men are supposed to stay at home and defend society when necessary, e.g. against the minor Arminius. Although warfare in the PRIA could probably still be described as mostly local, despite the occasional need to seal off a fjord with a barrage and construct long belts of Caesar’s lilies, it must nevertheless have served to keep men prepared or educated enough to take part in larger operations, should the possibility occur, as indeed it seems to have done in the beginning of the first century CE, when the failed Roman expansion and half-hearted punishment expeditions succeeded each other. We should keep warfare in mind as a part of South Scandinavian Iron Age identity.

In *Germania*, rather than *Annales*, Tacitus exposed the communal attitudes in society as a kind of normalcy related to simple ideals anchored in the old society. In Tacitus’ description, the right to form a self-sustaining household consisting of humans and animals is the central theme, and in the archaeological record this kind of households signifies most of the houses belonging to the later part of the PRIA. Nevertheless, some households do not conform to this ideal, because they lack a byre. Such households are relatively common in Hodde, but they probably did not exist in Grøntoft.

If a household does not have a byre, there is of course much work that need not be done, but also a loss of potential commodities such as hides, meat, milk and manure. The loss of manure is crucial, because it results in a loss of agriculture. Self subsistence in byre-less households is in other words difficult, and in order to survive, the members of such a household, whether serfs or not, will have to work for genuine farm owners as craftsmen or farmhands in exchange for animal products. Despite Tacitus’ pointing out the uniformity of the households of the Germani when it comes to production, there were in other words different kinds and some dependant ones not wholly devoted to self subsistence. In Hodde, there are a number of dependant households, but a hundred years later in the beginning of the CE they have disappeared, e.g. from Galsted where the households are larger than in Hodde and fairly uniform despite two or perhaps three slightly smaller ones. When we proceed from Grøntoft over Hodde to Galsted, we see that the community of the fenced village aims, to begin with, at protecting the household, even if it is not a self subsisting one, but society fails inasmuch as the households are eventually reformed. Households become larger and as it happen also fewer.
In order to describe more in detail some of the general changes in the structure of the farm from the PRIA up until the first half of the first century CE, we can put together a small series of settlements which, if we compare them, will clarify some essential points. This series consists of Grøntoft Village Phase 1, Hodde Phase 1, Hodde Phase 3a and Galsted Phase 1, Fig. 63.

![Fig. 63A. Running metres household in households with both dwelling and byre in Grøntoft Phase 1, Hodde Phase, Hodde Phase 3b and Galsted Phase 1.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement and Phase</th>
<th>No Hhs</th>
<th>Rm Dwell</th>
<th>Rm Byre</th>
<th>Analysis 1*</th>
<th>Analysis 2†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grøntoft fas 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodde fas 1, with large house</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodde fas 3a, all households</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galsted fas 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodde fas 1 without large house</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodde fas 3a, households with a byre</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Analysis 1: Average running metres byre in a household.
†Analysis 2: The relation 1 running metre dwelling space:running metres byre space.

![Fig. 63B. Houses in Grøntoft. Village phase 1.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Rm Byre</th>
<th>Rm Dwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A IIIc</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Va</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Ia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A VIa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A VIIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IXa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A XIII</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A XVa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A XVI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A XVIIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A XVIIb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>9 Hhs</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis 1: Average running metres byre in a household: 35.7/9 = 3.96 metres.

Analysis 2: Average relation Dw:By: 33.7/29.9 = 1:1.12.
**Fig. 63C. Houses in Hodde Phase 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>House-</th>
<th>Rm</th>
<th>Rm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I fas 1a</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fas 1b</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>9 Hhs</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis 1:** Average running metres byre in a household: 58.6/9 = 6.51 metres.

**Analysis 2:** Average relation Dw:By: 58.6/51.8 = 1.13.

---

**Fig. 63D. Houses in Hodde Phase 3a.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>House-</th>
<th>Rm</th>
<th>Rm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIIb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLVIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLVIIb</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLIX</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXIV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXV</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLIII</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXVI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>13 Hhs</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis 1:** Average running metres byre in a household: 80.3/13 = 6.17 metres.

**Analysis 2:** Average relation Dw:By: 80.3/69.8 = 1.15.

In Hodde phase 3a we see the first indisputable examples of households without a byre: houses LIa and LXVI. Disregarding these we get the following results:

**Analysis 1:** Average running metres byre in a household: 80.3/11 = 7.3 metres.

**Analysis 2:** Average relation Dw:By: 80.3/61.3 = 1.3.

Disregarding the large House I we get the following results:

**Analysis 1:** Average running metres byre in a household: 71.3/12 = 5.93 metres.

**Analysis 2:** Average relation Dw:By: 71.3/60.8 = 1.17.
Fig. 63E. Houses in Galsted where byre and dwelling can be measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Rm Byre</th>
<th>Rm Dwell</th>
<th>Relation Dw:By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1:1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1:1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1:1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1:1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1:1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1:1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1:1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1:1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1:1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1:1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1:1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa/Average</td>
<td>11 Hhs</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>1:1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: in Galsted the Dw:By relation is 1:1.17. Galsted is a settlement in which the planning of the house is also the planning of the size of the household. The relation Dw:By is the same, more or less, as in Hodde, but the households are larger because there are 7.5 rm dwelling to 8.7 rm byre. In Hodde Phase 3a the corresponding numbers are 5.4 and 6.2 rm.

To begin with, we may look upon the series as average settlements when it comes to self subsistence and take an interest in the relation between space measured in running metres occupied by dwelling quarters and byre respectively. This measure is relatively speaking constant. On average 1.0 running metre dwelling equals between 1.13 and 1.17 running metre compartment in each side of the byre. In percentage, this is a rise from 100 to 104, but it takes place during a period of some three hundred years and is by no means significant. In fact, the variation within a settlement is always greater than the long-term change; however, variations become more limited with time. In a village such as Grøntoft, where collective investments in defence played an essential part, it would be difficult to automatically suggest that the very few who lived in a farm with a slightly larger byre and a smaller dwelling necessarily had a higher standard of living. A byre could well be the shared byre of two or more households, or belong to a somewhat extended one. Instead, the dwelling/byre relation tells us that cattle-breeding is a constant phenomenon up and until the beginning of the RIA. This is only to be expected in three settlements with similar agricultural subsistence system in one and the same type of landscape and agricultural zone.

Despite the relation between dwelling and byre being a constant one, the absolute size of dwelling and byre changes. If again we seek the average, we can note that in Grøntoft Phase 1, the dwelling is 3.74 running metres, in Hodde
Phase 1 and 3a, they are 5.8 and 5.4 metres respectively and in Galsted, the length of the dwelling is 6.8 metres. This is a significant increase, more or less a doubling, and it indicates that when we get closer to the beginning of the Common Era and to an understanding of the Roman world, those who live on the farms tend to do so in a less nuclear family-dependant daily life. This development goes hand in hand with standardisation and the seclusion of the farm by means of fences and thus also the seclusion of the household. Not surprisingly, the development corresponds to the introduction in Galsted of a new type of main house – the one with six pairs of posts rather than four. This house is still symmetrical, indicating that cattle breeding and dairy production continue to be important.

When the house becomes larger, the household grows. Making the byre longer is hardly any problem, because it can be prolonged in the middle, so to speak. Nothing needs to happen to the beginning or the end of the byre and no new species are introduced, just some new compartments. Moreover, the proportions between livestock categories are in all probability relatively stable. If making the byre longer poses no problem, expanding the dwelling will, because it disturbs the whole pattern of family and household life inasmuch as people are not supposed to be put up in compartments or boxes, but gathered around the hearth. To address the problems around expanding the dwelling, we may start by asking ourselves whether some new kind of dwelling space has been added to the short end of the house, or whether the area next to the entrance room is actually the new one. Owing to the lack of well preserved floors, this is an intricate question.

If we take a look into a more advanced part of the RIA, it becomes obvious that in the long run, the transformation of the dwelling consists of additions in both the short end and the part next to the entrance room, i.e. additions to the hearth room. Knowing this would seem to render the original question superfluous; nevertheless, there is a pattern to point to. Although the first addition dating to the ERIA is often smaller than the old room with the fireplace, this hearth room is still the one closest to the entrance room. In these cases, we may in other words speak of a small addition in principle, or theoretically speaking, situated within the trestle closest to the short end. To be sure, there is not much room in a trestle, but we should nevertheless imagine that the new room emerges as a result of cleaving this trestle lengthwise into two trestles, and pulling them apart as far as we want to prolong the house. In this way, we create a new room without disturbing the old one, Fig. 73.

Later on in the RIA, when the dwelling is made up by four parts or rooms, the position of the fireplace in what was once the kitchen-dwelling is no longer at its centre. From time immemorial it has been the rule to put the fireplace in the diagonal cross that one can draw between the four posts in the hearth room, but now (with feng shui evidently loosing its grip) the fireplace is slightly displaced towards the short end of the house and at the same time the hearth room is somewhat prolonged. This asymmetry is a common trait in LRIA South Scan-
dinavia and it introduces the division of the central dwelling room into an upper and a lower part. The notion of the displaced hearth is taken into the hall of the Late Iron Age where it signifies a social difference, the upper part being socially speaking the more uplifted one.

Going back in time to the finds from Ginderup, we think that in the original PRIA house, the family slept in one of the corners of the short end of the house, i.e. behind or above the hearth and the hip trestle (the HT) in a part of the house that was also used as storage. This meant that the hearth room was dwelling room and kitchen—the kitchen-dwelling as it were—and there was in all probability no inner wall in line with the HT. The whole of the dwelling therefore was an open room, a fact proven not least by the excavations in the Jutish village mounds with their well preserved houses. These earlier and later traits, together with a number of house plans where the foundations for partitions walls have been preserved, allow us to conclude that making the dwelling-part longer in the beginning of the RIA is a matter of eventually constructing a partition wall incorporating a trestle. The position of this wall in relation to the hearth is the same as that of the original (HT), but the new trestle supports only the side beams. Since private storage and bed space originally occupied the space between the short end and the HT, and because the households are growing, it is reasonable to suggest that it is the combined bedroom and storage functions, i.e. the ‘chamber functions’, that need more space. The new trestle is in other words the Chamber Trestle (CT) and the change of the dwelling is the introduction of a separate chamber. This means that the dwelling consists of three sections or compartments signified by the trestles, ET, CT and HT, and two parts, the common room and chamber. What we see here is the introduction of the idea of the compartment, if not the box.

For want of well preserved houses to prove the function of the new chamber, and knowing that habits change more slowly than the need for more room, it is difficult to know whether the partition wall was always built when the third trestle was introduced. But in the long RIA run, seclusion and privacy enters the dwelling quarters and space becomes formalised and uniform when free-standing posts disappear into partition walls. Halls are of course the exceptions, inasmuch as they are buildings in which we expect deep-rooted tradition, such as free-standing decorated wooden pillars, to remind the visitor of the original dwelling trestles and posts. In halls, echoes of antiquity and the sound of lavish innovation, such as double doors, are intended to mix.

In our series, the Galsted household signifies growth and a new standard. All farms seem to be constructed simultaneously and nothing suggests that any of them was in use for more than 30 odd years. The layout of the settlement mixes change with tradition, because it simultaneously changed the households and stuck to the old ideas of symmetry. It favours the new idea of individually fenced farms, but puts all the farms behind a communal fence. There is a communal space in the middle of the settlement, but this is not a centre of communication and perhaps not easily accessible, because it incorporates a Bronze Age
mound. In Hodde, there was also such an inclusion, a Stone Age mound, but contrary to the one in Galsted, the mound in Hodde was small and peripheral so as not to block the central open space in the village. On the contrary, entering the first Hodde village we proceed towards this monument from the past and the history of the place now linking in with the present. In Galsted too, the village design links the settlement with a grave and a past, but it does so in a most ostentatious and impractical way. In Galsted this is hardly the problem it would have been in Hodde, because there is no great need for the central place considering the fact that each farm is situated in a relatively large fenced yard. The open central square is not needed as a work space for the villages, and there is no obvious public access from outside the village to the central square. It is the forum of the commune only.

Galsted is social engineering, inasmuch as it is a compromise and relatively empty symbolic references to the past in the form of the mound and the communal fence, i.e. elements that stand out as formal and imposed upon the village as a closed community rather than integrated into a village with a public interface.

Comparing the original fenced village Grøntoft Phase 1 to Hodde Phase 1 simply indicates that the households have become larger. More people are living on the farms and most characteristically, there are not as many small households with a byre in Hodde as there were in Grøntoft. Little by little, the small households were incorporated into the larger ones without any radical changes in the structure of the normal household. This means that without introducing a new room, the need for more beds is slowly growing and indirectly, this supports the interpretation that the eventual change in the room structure of the house is indeed a matter of adding a chamber. Turning next to Hodde Phase 3a, we detect a new kind of small byre-less households situated outside the village fence. In these small dwellings, the households have in all probability been dependent on one of the larger farms behind the village fence. In Hodde Phase 1, there were no such houses and therefore we may venture to say that to begin with, all households had their own byre. Later in Hodde Phase 3a, linking small byreless households to larger ones with a byre must therefore be seen as the result of the need for herdsmen or craftsmen, e.g. in the production of iron or iron objects, as well as of the respect that people had for the right of others to form a household. This right would seem to deteriorate as slowly as the dwelling part of the main house grows.

It is in other words probable that a certain profession, in this case a complement to rural self subsistence, can give people a possibility to form a household. Indirectly, craftsmen and herdsmen are of course fed by the farmers, something that is indicated by the constant spatial relationship between dwelling and byre, but the heart of the matter is the right, or the loss of right, to form a complete or self-sustaining household. Between Grøntoft and Hodde and Galsted this
right changes and become more restricted. In terms of farm and settlement structure society, represented by the Galsted village, becomes more homogenous. Although we see the signs of professionalism, it is important to notice that we see no signs of professional institutions, such as apartments and courts surrounded by smithies and byres. We can point out all these elements, but not any new and dynamic formation of them. This means that we see a drop-out of households rather than the dynamic growth of a new institution.

If we were to disregard the need for animal food to nourish the members of the small byreless households in Hodde Phase 3, i.e. if we did not count their dwelling area in the balance between dwelling and byre by running-metre, this relation would become 1:1.31 in Hodde. This difference, a growth by 14 per cent from 1.15 to 1.31, indicates the scale of the burden of provision taken on by the larger farms in Hodde when they attach a byre-less household to themselves. If the costs were really 14 per cent of the total costs for sustaining the household, they are actually rather high. Yet this may well be the case. If we look at the average byre length per dwelling in Hodde Phase 3a, it amounts to 6.1 running metres, but if we look at the size of the byre in households where there is a byre as well as a dwelling under the same roof, the byre grows to 7.3 running metres. This is an 18 per cent raise, which makes it probable that the burden of provision results in a growing number of members in the households with a byre, exactly because the quantity of work goes up for those who live there, since their responsibility for the byre is greater than that of those who live in a byre-less household. Hodde could be the result of economic miscalculation, investing too much labour in herding and iron, but it could also be an example of the price one had to pay for the integration of people into larger households—integrating some, letting others continue to form households.

As pointed out, the byreless households disappeared almost completely in the beginning of our era. This allows us to conclude that the change that occurred during the PRIA meant that those who represented the growing number of people in the household belonged to a group or stratum in society that eventually lost its status as a farmer group, i.e. a group of peasants with control over land. Since the size of the households with a byre goes up by a 100 per cent from Grontoft to Galsted, we must conclude that the number of farmers and the number of marginal households were considerably reduced during these 250 years. The alternative, a growth in population by 100 per cent during 250 years of prehistory, is unlikely, keeping in mind the constant relation between dwelling and byre, which indicates that the system of production did not change.

In Hodde, we have a possibility to judge the relation between the large farm and the rest. In so doing, we find that to begin with, the large farm with its relatively speaking large number of compartments in its byre seems to have housed a family or a household with better provisions than others. When Hodde develops and becomes a more populous society, the number of compartments in the byre goes down and we may expect the large farm to have
become poorer, inasmuch as it seems that the size of the village grasslands is constant and thus spread out on more hands than earlier. The development indicates that the village has reached its limit of agricultural production within the PRIA system, that is: communal needs or people's rights take a greater part of the surplus.

In a way, this interpretation is correct, but what the change in reality means is probably that when the population grows, the influence and political capacity of the leading family—i.e. its man power—also grows. In all probability, the development in Hodde is also an investment in people and we may speak of a client-like system, in which the original owner of the village and its lands settles dependent farmers around him during a period in which the status of being a farm owner is growing.

There is an additional settlement pattern to support this interpretation, namely the absolute size of the dwellings. In Grøntoft, the area is c. 23 square metres. That in its turn means that the family living on these square metres is a nuclear one, consisting of parents, a couple of children and perhaps yet another grown up person, should we prefer not to agree with Tacitus and raise two children rather than three or four. We could suggest that a grandmother moves in when her husband dies or when it becomes apparent that she can no longer manage her own household. Be this as it may, the household is centred on the nuclear family. Not surprisingly, when we sorted the houses in Grøntoft by size, it became obvious that the majority was distributed near the average dwelling space, cf. Fig. 9.

As time goes by, the size of the dwelling is doubled and that must mean that the household is no longer made up of the members of a nuclear family. There are many more people belonging to the house, but as long as houses are not rebuilt on the spot where they were first erected, we must still reckon on house and household to be dominated and owned by the pair whose matrimony it inaugurated. If the household grows, the number of servants or serfs, i.e. persons dependant on the farm-owning couple, is also growing. That in its turn suggests that the right to form a household applies to fewer and fewer people in society. In terms of forming a household, this indicates that not only are the new couple given a dwelling of a certain size to fit their reproduction and a suitable byre; they are also given a number of farmhands and maids, in addition to their tenants' households. When new households are formed and old ones dismantled, i.e. when society is sorting itself out, a growing number of people are shuffled around.

When households start to grow and when we begin to see overlapping houses, and later on, houses being rebuilt on the spot where they were originally erected, many different things are indicated: (1) the growing restrictions on forming a household of your own, or to put it more bluntly, being the son of a land-owning farmer does not give one the right to form a household of one’s own, (2) the escalating number of inmates and stratification in households, but also (3) the subsequent redundancy of the leading men (Old Labour material)
referred to by Caesar; the social engineers who used to assemble and distribute land in a responsible way.

Judging from the three settlement examples, we must in other words allow for a continuous although twisted development of the structure of household and family. This development suggests that farm management has or is about to get a closer connection to household and farmstead, rather than the family in its primary and narrow meaning, in which the family is formed around the married couple and their home. Because the large farm, albeit uncommon, exists during the whole of the PRIA, we must conclude that there were always two different kinds of families living in the same community: the nuclear one and the extended one. The latter most likely represented a higher social status, albeit not a stable social stratum per se, and it is only fair to suggest that a large estate was something of an ideal for the ambitious farmer in the end of the period. Nor should we forget that the social climbing that engaged Arminius when he strived to become Segestes’ son-in-law, fits the picture of a society consisting of a large number of average households and but a few large ones.

This boils down to saying that if we consider the loss of land right and the existence of byre-less households to be a sign of poverty, and if we think that it is problematic when those who live on large farms lose provisions, i.e., if we think that the populous Hodde 3 is overpopulated, we should see the situation in Galsted as a way of solving these problems. In this perspective, Galsted is indeed a leap in the social, if not economic, development, because it is in fact the introduction of a new and limited group of people: the nine or so farm-owners who divided the village between them. In their village they do so with a number of ideological references to an earlier society. These ideological references were probably called for.

The Grøntoft village represents the end of a settlement area and Hodde a non-successful solution to the village problem. Historically speaking, both settlements fall short of solving the problem of how to sustain themselves, and when the PRIA draws to an end—they move out of sight or disappear. In Tjørring, despite the fact that the site has only seen preliminary publication, we have instead an example of a settlement that follows a slightly different line of development with a more stable and continuous use of a settlement area. Here the settlement starts c. 500 BCE with the odd solitary farm or two. During the following centuries up and until PRIA per III, such small unfenced farms are still present, but eventually they get an important company in the form of fenced farms represented e.g. by the Damgård example stretching out in an east-west band. This solution is different from the Grøntoft idea of the fenced village and in fact the fenced village never occurs in Tjørring. Instead, the phase contemporary with Hodde is a village consisting of individually fenced farms. Its horseshoe structure with an opening to the east is reminiscent of the Hodde pattern, albeit with larger farms. In this period and again similar to Hodde, but in a more lavish fashion, the large farms situated in the northern part of the village are distinguished by some extravagant graves on a cemetery north of the village.
In the very beginning of the CE, Tjørring takes a step further in its development. The village is moved 200 metres to the north and a new large fenced farm is created among smaller fenced ones, Fig. 64. There is in other words no Galsted experiment in Tjørring and the extravagant grave finds continue, only more closely linked to the large farm because it moves towards the cemetery. This farm is nevertheless a peculiar one, because as it contains three small separately fenced farms behind its stout squared fence. These farmhouses are odd examples of the lingering right to form a household, however dependant it may be. In the enclosure, the largest main house, which measures 23 metres, is also quite a unique one, because its dwelling part is prolonged and constructed with a separate entrance in the short end. Eventually, i.e. in the ERIA, it seems as though the village in its last northernmost situation comes to consist of fewer but larger and rather equal sized farms with main houses ranging from 18 to 20 metres, except for one slightly larger farm with a main house measuring 23 metres. This farm with a 30 x 30 metre yard occupied the northern side of the new village next to the cemetery. When it comes to the right to form a household of your own, Tjørring and all the other multiple household farms indicated that members of the leading families are the last ones to give up their rights.
Although the expansion of the household during the PRIA seems to have been a slow process, we must still ask ourselves whether everybody slept in the chamber or kitchen end of the main house or whether we must imagine that overpopulation, caused by the diminishing number of farms, forced some of the farm hands to sleep in the byre. The fist clear cases of byre-living people are MP and Ölandic, but the possible hint by Tacitus, ‘Amongst the same cattle they [the children] promiscuously live, upon the same ground they without distinction lie’ *Germania* 20.1, as well as the horrible snapshot of those men and animals that died when a house at Nørre Tranders caught fire, could signify that some of the grown ups and children on a farm around the beginning of our era were actually sleeping in the byre. The Nørre Tranders house was 18 metres long and dated to the very beginning of the 1st century CE. We are right to infer, therefore, that the dwelling part of the house covered c. 40 square metres and accommodated an extended family. The size of the byre was probably the same.

When a house catches fire, it is to be expected that people first try to get out the animals closest to the entrance. They tend to save what they can rather than take the risk of losing everything. There are several obvious examples to support this rescue pattern and in Nørre Tranders, this too seems to have been the case, although only two or three compartments in the outer south-western part of the byre are empty. At the other side of the house, the man among the sheep could well have been caught by the fire while trying to rescue these animals. The fact that all the animals in the interior of the byre further away from the entrance died in the flames is consistent with this rescue pattern and a sign of the fact that it was impossible to get more than a few animals out of the house when it was all in flames. The four human beings in the south-eastern short end of the byre, one grown-up and three children, are more difficult to see as rescuers trapped in the byre. They are much more likely to have been trapped because they slept in the innermost part of the byre. If four of the five people in the byre died there in their sleep, it seems as though farm hands and children mostly slept in the byre and not in the regular dwelling part of the house. Although the Nørre Tranders case is extraordinary, the interpretation is in all probability correct and it adds a harsh social dimension to the shift in the 1st century CE household—although by no means an unlikely one.

In the case of Hodde Phase 3 and 3a as well as in Galsted, it would seem that those who had the power to act were also well aware of the social change they imposed upon others. In Hodde, there was some real economic and perhaps costly compensation, i.e. the small byre-less households; in Galsted, such compensation was non-existent, intangible or ideological, i.e. paying homage to the communal fence and the manifestation of roots anchored in the past attested by the BA mound in the middle of the open square of the village. We must draw
this conclusion because of the apparent lack of economic change behind the change in household structure in Galsted. In terms of production, the economic system is the same as in Grøntoft and Hodde—one running metre dwelling to one point fifteen running metre byre.

Settlements such as Hodde and Galsted are blind alleys and the signs of a structural crisis in society. They try to continue a settlement structure rooted in the past, i.e. symmetrical houses in a village behind a common fence, but this structure has difficulties adjusting to the concept of the enlarged household that deprives many people of the right to form a household of their own and perhaps also of the right to sleep in the dwelling part of the house, which would have been the traditional sleeping quarters in the original PRIA house. Dominating farms such as the one in Hodde, i.e. within fenced villages, were a passing phenomenon; it was passing already in the Hodde village itself and was non-existent in Galsted and other villages belonging to the decades around the beginning of our era.

The lasting effect of the change during the last centuries BCE was a loss in the number of households and a change in their structure. However, the ones which survived became larger farms in stable villages, consisting of homesteads inhabited by extended families and/or servants, if not serfs. The older system with tenants or tenant-like slaves disappeared and their labour force was moved into the new farms, in what seems at least in part to have been a loss of social status. It is partly correct, therefore, to say that some of the essential characteristics of the large farm in Hodde, and other solitary farms of the PRIA, i.e. the extended households, diffused themselves among the typical farms of the ERIA. Similarly to the Hodde farm, the lifespan of all farms grew and they became anchored in a specific topographical situation, since they were no longer linked to the human generation and a nuclear family. Instead the villages, i.e. all the farmsteads or homesteads together, are said to be either stable or now and then ‘moving’ to another place within the resource area of the settlement.

To introduce a dichotomy stating that a settlement is either ‘stable’ or ‘moving’ is in all probability not a reasonable approach to correctly describing change in a settlement position. Stability in settlements is an added quality that grows in the long-term perspective, but it is perhaps more significant that moving can occur on a large and not entirely transparent scale within a stable subsistence area. The fenced Galsted village was functioning only some 30–50 years and never completely built out. Neither did the houses need more than the occasional renewal of their supporting elements before the whole settlement was pulled down. There is nothing to suggest that there was no hiatus between the fenced village and the new row village that eventually came to comprise seven farms. It is quite possible that the fenced village was replaced by a solitary multiple household farm to begin with. In this connection, the Tjørring example is significant, since it shows the ability of a community to manage a long-term dynamic development within a limited resource area without falling back upon the non-viable Hodde/Galsted solution to the problem of the village.
The length of life of something as complex as a village community must be seen in the light of the quality and the delimitation of its agricultural area, as well as a number of social factors that we know little about. Owing to many reasons, therefore, villages are reorganised or transformed and such measures may be taken to further the stability of the subsistence area. Reorganisation, moreover, may or may not include a resettling of all the farms or just some of them. In principle, the lifespan of the RIA village, as it comes to the fore when it is closed down and resettled, parallels the lifespan of the farmhouse and the building of a new one in the PRIA. The difference is one of complexity; the lifespan of a one-house farm is a simpler affair than that of a village, but they are both denotations of the concept of 'lifetime' in relation to 'place' and thus also of some kind of temporal stability and change. The changing condition of the family member is the motor of the farm and similarly the changing condition of the family within the community structures the village.

In the PRIA landscape, there were a number of places with a certain quality. When settled, they could be marked by stability, e.g. in the form of one or two farms which could now and then attract other farms. Therefore, the place concept, i.e. ‘place’ as a stable phenomenon and a focal point related to other neighbouring focal points and with a link to centrality, was the landscape outcome of the period. As well as being occupied by one large farm, this kind of place was occupied by a number of fenced farms loosely arranged to form a village. Additionally, we can expect many other points such as points of transformation or possible change to be present in the landscape, even after a more firm establishment of the central place or settled focal point, because ‘change’ presupposes some form of ‘stability’.

Compared to the archaeological landscape, as it is defined by the archaeological record, that which belongs to the human landscape incorporates a kind of place that cannot be recorded by traditional archaeology, since it has not been shaped by man, except perhaps a little. Formally speaking, one of the most essential places, the centre of the entrance room where people walk in and out of the house as well as between its rooms, is exactly this kind of immaterial, but important, place that is totally defined by the surrounding contextuality. The scientific awareness of these places in the landscape is a relatively late phenomenon, not least because they run the risk of denoting all kinds of New-Age-Feng-Shui connotations. The awareness grew out of the overview of the settlement landscape, which in turn is a result of the large settlement investigations. This means that past landscapes and the land of a community have become immanently meaningful on a much more fundamental level related to all kinds of human understanding and action. In this way, the landscape becomes so complex that it will always display patterns significant enough to invite interaction referring to these spots. Landscape becomes a social psychological predicament, because it becomes more complete in a way which exceeds the concept of the source material.
Emancipation and the Economic Turn

One of the significant outcomes of the late PRIA was the change in the construction of the main farm building, when six pairs of posts rather than four became the standard. Although significant of a major social change, this larger house did not become as popular as the one it replaced and it did not last very long—long enough, nevertheless, to make it possible for us to see another kind of change in addition to the strict one from four to six trestles.

The farms from Tjørring, Gårslev, Hvedsager, Hammelev or Stepping exemplify a new type of farms characterised by several outhouses and the occasional extra dwelling house. Often the erection of these estates was accompanied by one or more significant graves. These farms show a relative lack of spatial order and it is not easy to figure out the exact functional relation between main house, secondary main house and outhouses, but the two cardinal facts, i.e. more outhouses and less order, seems to be correct, Fig. 65A&B. These farms have often been considered to be chieftain’s farms or an agglomeration of farms belonging to a wealthy family and that may well be correct. We can easily imagine that their layout is the result of the changing social structure of society, signified by the diminishing number of autonomous households and the disappearance of the tenant/slave system that provided a large farm with part of its surplus. Their structure is a way for significant farms to adapt to or lead the way into a new social order, in which farms have become extended and continuous households. Nevertheless, the farms stand out as deviant and complex mostly in relation to farms such as the ones in the Galsted village, where the farm houses have six trestles, but no outhouses. In this village of reformed main houses, the lack of outhouses is a kind of prolonged echo of the classical one-house PRIA farm.

Turning to the small, but more dynamic Jutish village Vendehøj north of Århus, where each farm is fenced, we can describe the relation between main house and outhouse in a more systematic way, because the excavators have analysed their farms in exactly these terms, Fig. 66. We can also describe the lack of designed order on the farm, since it can be seen sometimes to lack the formerly obligatory parallelism between its houses. If we try to figure out the relation in size between main house and outhouse, it becomes obvious that in Vendehøj Phases 2,1 and 2,2, i.e. the very end of the PRIA, many farms have no outhouses and on none of the farms do the outhouses cover as much as 30 per cent of the total roofed area, Fig. 67A&B and Fig. 68. Phases 2,1 and 2,2 suggest that during the last decennia before the beginning of our era, the households became more numerous, but smaller, signifying a development parallel to the change we saw at Hodde.
Fig. 65A&B. Plans of the farms (A) Gårslev and (B) Hvedsager. In these farms, the average relation between main houses with 6 pairs of posts and large outhouses with three or four pairs of posts and lastly small outhouses with two pairs are 4 (main) to 9 (large) to 10 (small). Nevertheless, in square metres the relations are 385 to 280 to 160. This relation, however, is biased because the main houses have been thoroughly rebuilt so as to represent two house phases while the outhouses are but one-phased. This means that each main house represents at least two houses and thus two thirds of the roofed area on the farms while the outhouses cover one third. Based on Hvass (1988).
Vendehøj Phase 2 (i.e. 2,1 and 2,2) is characterised by the old main house with four pairs of posts and thus the traditional family-centred household structure. In phase 3, nevertheless, the change in building tradition becomes manifest and at the same time, the number of outhouses grows and their share of the roofed farm is doubled.

This change indicates a growing need to store all kinds of fodder and goods, a phenomenon well illustrated not least in Northern Jutland, where the local building tradition prescribed cellar storages\textsuperscript{177}. In happy cases, these cellars have given us some insights into the very heterogenic surplus goods and valuables that filled the storerooms around the beginning of the CE. The growth in outhouse capacity should also be seen in relation to a change in the size of the cows in the byres. Harm Tjalling Waterbolk has showed that the width of the compartments in the byres is a reflection of the size of the cow—not of its comfort\textsuperscript{178}. Although little material exists that demonstrates the changing size of cows in the beginning of the CE, there are nevertheless some examples from areas in which the possibilities for cattle breeding were similar. Because breeding livestock is nothing that takes place in isolation, the examples probably do indicate a change.
Fig. 67A&B. Vendehøj phases 1 and 2. The number of farms grows from phase 1 to phase 2, but in the second phase there are also more farms consisting of only one house.
In the last phase of PRIA Hodde, the average width of a compartment was c. 0.75 m. In Vestergård, a late first century CE village in the same part of the country, as well as in 3rd century Vorbasse the average width of the compartments was slightly above 0.85 m, signifying a 15 per cent increase of the breadth of the cows. Cows being three dimensional, the increase in volume and weight would have been close to 50 per cent. Waterbolk noted a similar although more pregnant growth in the size of cows when he pointed out that Roman period Weijster had wider compartments than earlier settlements, and drew the conclusion that the increase was due to contacts with Roman cattle breeding. In principle the same conclusion must also be drawn here, since we have no reason to believe that RIA farms engaged themselves in long-term selection in order to produce larger cows, when larger animals were available a couple of hundred kilometres south of their farmsteads.

The new outhouses on the normal farms signify a more intensive harvesting and production of different kinds of surplus stored on one’s farm, irrespective of surplus being mushrooms, honey, grain, fodder, cheese, iron, furniture, weapons or something else. Generally speaking, outhouses are a measure of wealth and power in relation to those households where there are no outhouses. These latter ones eventually tend to become dependant upon the former. The outhouse quota, defined as that part of the roofed farm houses that is made up of outhouses, is thus a crude measure of the effectiveness of the economic sys-
tem and the stratification of society in terms of wealth or some other form of economic power. Again Vendehøj can illustrate this ERIA macro economic pattern, because we can follow the relation between outhouses and main houses in five chronological phases between the LPRIA and the end of the ERIA. The phases themselves are not important, but the trends are, Fig. 68. If we look at these trends, we see that at Vendehøj, the shift in the relation is synchronous with the introduction of the six-trestled main house. When this house becomes the standard, the outhouse area starts to grow. This is no doubt a reform of society and the start of something new when it comes to the size of farms and households, and the reformed Vendehøj village reminds one of its first, landnám-like, colonial phase when every farm had some kind of outhouse and when the difference between large and small outhouses was perhaps more negligible. In the reformed village differences are greater, but every farm has more outhouses than any of the farms in the original Phase 1. When it comes to roofed outhouses, the largest reformed Vendehøj farms are similar to the other large farms such as Hvedsager or Gårdslev, Fig. 65A&B.

If the colonial phase and the reformed phase are thus similar in kind, the same is true of the phases that follow them. In these phases, the average, relative, amount of outhouse area drops and the distribution becomes characterised by its extremes. Needless to say, the drop after the reformation of the village is from a different level than the one before the reform, when more than half of the households lacked outhouses. That kind of crisis on the farm level is not repeated. It has already been pointed out that this situation with many poor households is a parallel to the end phase of the Hodde settlement and in effect a sign of an overpopulation and a breakdown of the economic system—the sign of a turbulent and probably unruly period: the first Iron Age stagnation.

Farmwise speaking, the reform is an economic success and to begin with a relatively fair one, inasmuch as all farms have got more outhouse areas than any of the original Phase 1 farms. The differentiation or stratification is nevertheless greater and the reform cannot prevent further stratification of society, even though it constitutes a period when the number of households dropped and the number of farmhands grew. The emancipation from the PRIA system therefore, comes with a price.

The relation between main house and outhouse is a relative figure, but if we link it to the absolute size of the farms in terms of roofed areas, the largest farms among the original ones are not the ones with the most favourable main house/outhouse relation. After the reform, however, the largest farms are also the ones with the largest relative outhouse area. This pattern singles out the economic character of the reform and consequently the more haphazard character of the relation before the reform, Fig. 68. The shift means that farms become more closely related to subsistence, surplus and storage than before, when we could expect storage to be limited and tenants to produce part of the commodities that sustained the larger farms on an everyday basis. The economic turn therefore seems to result in a loss of tenants.
In the beginning of such a period of expansion, and despite the social stratification, we may expect relatively peaceful times, everybody being employed so to speak, and of course also materially prosperous times, because the new system produced more than the old one. It is only fair to suggest that the household pattern has lost its family character and that, initially, this is an advantage for some of those who do not own any land—an advantage at least informally because their competence will be related to a lasting farm household (a farmstead) rather than a temporary family household.

Vendehøj

The Vendehøj publication by Ejstrup and Jensen represented a new step in landscape orientated settlement publication in Danish archaeology. This was a new step in relation e.g. to Rindel’s publication of the excavations at Grøntoft that were carried out in the late 1960s. The attitude to landscape and settlement presented by these studies, and their success, can largely be traced back to several studies by Charlotte Fabech and Jytte Ringved. Owing to their analysis of general trends, the main traits of the changing agricultural landscape are known. Another generation is already forthcoming, e.g. represented by Mads Holst, who rightly has sought to loosen up the concept of settlement phases, which tends to over-emphasise the inflexible structure of the settlements. Thanks to his analyses, the row character, e.g. of the Vendehøj villages may thus be said to be a result of the tendency to move the second generation of each of the farms a little to the east or west of the first generation of a farm rather than actively planning a row of farms.

If we combine the model developed on the basis of the archaeologically speaking one-phased houses of the PRIA and the social model found in Tacitus we can sketch a development without setting aside the results of, on the one hand Holst and on the other Ejstrup & Jensen. Although the division of the settlement into phases overemphasises the regulated character of the village, it does indicate the general development of a settlement, especially if we use the houses and house phases belonging to a certain settlement phase as examples of buildings having been used for one generation only, i.e. if we maintain the idea that forming a family would coincide with making or repairing a home. New houses and the kind of repair that leads to a definition of a new house phase would so to speak be equivalent. The point of departure therefore, is the assumption that a house in a phase represents a 30 year period of use on average. This means that if someone settles successfully in a place, there will after some 20 years be a need for a new farm belonging to the offspring of the couple in the first farm. After another 20 years or so, the grandchildren of the couple in the original farm could build a new farm or rebuild the first farm into a second phase and settle there – and so on in a chain of generations. Needless to say, there may at a certain point in this chain be a need for two new farms rather
than one, as well as no need at all. The chain may in other words be broken. If this idea concerning houses is the one leg of the analysis, then the other is the dating of the phases, because it gives us a rough framework of the number of houses belonging to a specific period. In Vendehøj, Ejstrup and Jensen have divided the settlement into an initial phase and four consecutive ones. Some of these, Phases 2 and 4 are also divided into a first and a second part, reflecting the actual number of farmhouses that once stood and belonged within the time frame of a certain phase. The total number of houses and house phases with an average life of 30 year is therefore the equivalent of all the farms made out by Ejstrup and Jensen. All in all, there are 61 farms, farm phases or farm generations representing $61 \times 30 = 1800$ farm years, together covering a period of c. 360 years. Ejstrup & Jensen have dated the main phases in the following way:

The initial phase, Phase 0, and Phase 1 cover the 2nd c. BCE, i.e. 200–100 BCE.

Phase 2 covers the second part of the 1st c. BCE, i.e. 50–0 BCE.

Phase 3 covers the decades around the beginning of the Common Era, i.e. 25 BCE–25CE.

Phase 4 covers parts of the 1st and the 2nd century CE, i.e. 25–150/160 CE.

This system is not univocal, chronologically speaking, but if we turn to the plans it becomes clear that Phases 0 and 1 represent one kind of settlement while the other phases represent another more complex one. In the first pattern, the farms sit next to or neighbouring each other in an east-west row or pattern. There are 9 farms in these phases or 270 farm years, because 9 times 30 equal 270. If these farms formed a chain of reproduction, they could be stretched out for 190 years, Fig. 69. In this way, we could cover the period 200–10 BCE, but judging from the map of Phase 1, it would seem that farms III, IV and V would for a short period have been three contemporary farms next to each other, as would perhaps VI, VII and VIII, Fig. 70. This means that the settlement probably consisted of a little more than 2 farms on average, which in its turn means that there was one or perhaps several small hiatuses between Phase 1 and Phase 2. Given the date of Phase 0/1, this does not come as a surprise, inasmuch as this phase belongs to the floating cultural landscape in which a place or a settlement site, despite being just that, was not continuously inhabited.
Although the spread-out settlement pattern is introduced in Phase 2 simply because the settlement is larger, the farms are still small, and even smaller than the ones in Phases 0 and 1. There are two phases within Phase 2 and that means that the length of the phase is probably at least 60 years within the 1st century BCE, depending upon when the phenomenon characterising the decades around the beginning of the CE begins. There are 19 farms or farm phases within the settlement phase and that adds up to 570 farms years which, divided by 60, i.e. the length of the phase, gives us an average number of contemporary farms of 9 or 10. This explains the many small farms and, as pointed out, the situation could be said to be typical of the end of the PRIA: the number of farms are growing, but the farms also become smaller. The land belonging to the village is in other words constant or a constraint on the settlement.

Be this as it may, in Phase 3, i.e. in the beginning of the Common Era, the classical shift occurs: farms become larger and fewer. Phase 3 can also be considered to be c. 60 years long, but there are only 12 farms to cover the period, which means that during Phase 3, there were 12x30/60 = 6 farms on average in the settlement as compared to 9 or 10 during Phase 2. But this drop alone cannot explain the growing size of the farms. As discussed above, there must also have been a change in work input in agriculture and cattle breeding. In Phase 3 something radical happens, inasmuch as the farms become larger, so large in fact that all the new farms, even the smallest ones, are more extensive than the largest farms of the earlier periods, Fig. 71. This is a radical change caused by the loss of right for a number of people to form a household, but also a radical doubling of the roofed square metres, indicating a corresponding growth in the economy.
Fig. 70. Plan of Vendehøj phase 1. Based on Eistryd & Jensen (2000).
In Phase 3, moreover, we detect a slight tendency for one farm to stand out as larger than the others, but it is much more significant that Phase 3 contains a group of relatively speaking small farms. The fine sorting of relative poverty in Phase 2 has disappeared and been replaced by a diversity among larger units, which singles out the relatively speaking small farms. This means that in a period when a third of the farms disappear and all surviving farms grow, there are some that cannot expand the way the majority manages to do. Phase 3, as it were, exhibits a segregation which has become a fact, because not every farm owner succeeded equally well. The new economy is in other words not always a blessing to those who continued to have the right to form a household. For this reason, we can conclude that Phase 3 is an intermediate period in which the new subsistence and surplus economy is introduced.

If we look at Phase 4 as one period with 21 farm phases and suggest that the village phase was a 125 years long period ending c. 160 CE, then the average number of farms is approximately five (21x30/125 ≈ 5) and this loss of farms in relation to Phase 3 may belong to the end of the settlement on the hill, given the relatively few farms in Phase 4.2. In Phase 4 we can indeed speak of the introduction of the large farm, which is five times as large as the smallest one, and also speak of a growing number of small farms. In fact, the segregation is as typical as the introduction of the large farms. In Phase 4, one third of the farms are comparable in size to a farm in Phases 1 or 2. That is to say that the kind of segregation introduced in Phase 3 continues to transform society. Instead of closing down more farms, i.e. fulfilling the economical intentions of the radical shift from Phase 2 to Phase 3 social stratification takes over a group of farmers originally intended to consist of equals.
Not surprisingly, the roofed area in Phase 3 and Phase 4.1 is the same, 1772 and 1815 sqm respectively, and this means that the differentiation has been brought about by means of redistributing or splitting the wealth within the village, but not by means of enhancement, the way it happened when the transition from Phase 2.2 to Phase 3 took place. This split among the farms is fulfilled in Phase 4.2, when the settlement comes to an end. By this time it consists of two large farms and six smaller ones. The two large farms are four times as extensive as the smallest one.

In the process, the roofed area is more or less halved, reduced from 1815 to 1028 sqm, and that must be seen as a sign of depopulation and perhaps also of loss of land. We can look at depopulation in two ways: If half the population had moved, at the same time giving up their land right, we would have expected the remaining population to have led a better life on somewhat larger farms and not a worse one in smaller farms. It is quite probable, therefore, that the village is reorganising itself and that some of the smaller landowners have already moved to a new settlement with better conditions. The second alternative, depopulation, explains the situation to be a result of the fact that the large farms have had the power to change the land of the village into their grassland and been able to establish themselves more permanently, driving out the others. Both developments may work together, although soon enough, the whole settlement is closed down. Needless to say, the situation can also be a harsher one. The village could simply have lost parts of its lands, perhaps owing to the over-exploitation of its assets.

When it comes to understanding how the large farms developed we must first note that the forerunner in Phase 3 of the later farm XLVII is the largest farm in Phase 3, i.e. farm XXXV. Keeping the link between farm 3:XXXV and 4:XLVII in mind we turn to Phase 4.1 and the introduction of a new and large farm with the appropriate number XL. This farm is introduced as indeed the largest one in the village. But already in Phase 4.2 its size is adjusted, XL becomes a little smaller, because the old farm XXXV, the largest one in Phase 3, which is now called XLVII in its Phase 4.2 appearance, is growing, Fig. 72.

The explanation for these patterns must be based on the following: There is little doubt that the new economy introduced in Phase 3 made it possible for two farms eventually to exploit and as least for a while dominate the whole settlement in Phase 4. The development means that to begin with one large farm, XXXV, was introduced and after a while, an even larger farm, XL, was created at the expense of the other farms in the village. Eventually the two farms, XL and XLVII were made equal in size. It looks as if this development belongs to a dominating family dividing itself up into two relatively equal branches. If we fall back on the Tacitan model to explain the forking we would expect an older son to move out of his parents' home into his new XL farm, while a younger brother eventually established himself in farm XXXV.
What happens to Vendehøj is the introduction of a new economic system, in which there is a latent possibility that some will benefit more than others, and indeed that some will get a dominant status and others a dependant one forcing them to live in very small households with few outhouses. There is a measure of exploitation in this development. The change in Vendehøj is caused by a change in the agricultural system and that is something that can be performed in the whole of South Scandinavia. The development in Hodde and the more successful Tjørring and probably also Hedegård would seem instead to depend on iron production and thus a more local way of creating a surplus that does not automatically lead to the introduction of a large dominant farm. Yet, when working in tandem—simultaneously exploiting natural assets and reforming subsistence—the resulting development would seem most decisive.

The introduction in Vendehøj of the new subsistence economy did not create a society marked be equality, on the contrary, the economy enhanced a difference that was characteristic of an ideological development much prior to the economic change. This means that social stratification is an undercurrent in the whole period c. 200 BCE. to 200 CE. The introduction of the main house with six trestles and the new household, i.e. the social reforms, came first; the economy that made use of more outhouses and favoured more stable farms came second. When the Vendehøj settlement is closed down in the 2nd century, Iron Age South Scandinavians are at the brink of introducing yet another new and standardised main farm house characterised by its stable suite of dwelling rooms. This, as it happens, is an indication of a reform and a stabilisation before society takes the next step in the development of the large farm and social stratification introducing the hall.
The New Dwelling Quarters, NDQ

In the decades around 200 CE., the layout of the main house on South Scandinavian farms changed, not least in Jutland, and the house became larger, Fig. 73. In fact, the farms themselves became larger and more uniform, and the relation between main house and outhouse tipped. At several normal sized farms the outhouses, or the economy areas, became larger than the main house. This tip was dramatic. The old relation between main house and outhouse was made void because the prolonged main building contains a room which is in effect an outhouse—an ‘economy building’—linked to the byre. Moreover, a new type of outhouse, built along the fences of the farms, was also introduced. If, for the sake of comparison we analyse a large and a middle-size Vorbasse farm, we end up with the following roofed areas and relations, Fig. 74.

---
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Fig. 73. The principle behind the development of the EIA dwelling from the PRIA to the NDQ of the LRIA.
Fig 74. Table exemplifying (1) the change in balance between the old main house and its outhouses and the corresponding relations after the introduction of the NDQ and (2) the difference in size between an average farm and a hall farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large farm</th>
<th></th>
<th>Average farm</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sqm</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Sqm</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byre</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Old Main House’</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omh + Hall (78M²)</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outhouse(s)</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm(s)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit house(s)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence houses</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Old outhouses’</td>
<td>271.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oo’If Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total without the hall</strong></td>
<td><strong>463.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>389.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total including the hall</strong></td>
<td><strong>541.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative balance measured in the equivalents to the old terms ‘main house’ and ‘outhouse’ is the same between the two farms, but the large farm is very much larger than the middle sized. The economy on the two farms is probably the same—a reasonable suggestion because the introduction of the NDQ is based on a new farm concept. The large farm however, being larger, can invest in a hall. If we wish we might say that the investment in the hall stems from commodities produced on the c. 80 sqm roofed area (one fifth of the average farm) or the difference between the total areas of the two farms, if we do not count the hall itself. The hall therefore indicates that the large farm produces for a surplus in goods rather than in subsistence for more farm hands. It stands to reason that the commodities pay, in part at least, for the hall building, its interior decoration and the entertainment of invited guests.

This new kind of farm must again be seen as a reform in the sense that farms become larger economic units and more orientated towards a production that needs storage and roof protection. Similar to the one in the 1st century, this 2nd century reform develops into a period of progressive social stratification signified by the introduction of the hall farm.

Although the creation of the new farms was in many ways a continuous change, development in the decades around 200 CE takes a leap. This leap is shown the new size and layout of the dwelling part of the main house. These quarters may rightly be termed NDQ, not least since geographically speaking
their characteristic layout is a much broader phenomenon than the design of the main house in Jutland.

The dwelling grows because an extra room is added to the living quarters expanding them to a four-room or four-section en suite dwelling between the central entrance room and the short end behind the fireplace. In terms of compartment- or room-defining trestles we can venture to say that a dwelling trestle (DT) has been added, making the trestle series ET, DT, CT and HT. Yet, calling the trestles by different names becomes odd, since most of them are more or less concealed in the partition walls. As it happens, the added trestles, DT and CT, have taken up the position of the original ones, ET and HT, around the hearth.

Despite the transformation and the accompanying isolation of room function by means of partition walls, the largest room, the kitchen-dwelling and hearth room, meets the eye on the archaeological drawings of the ground plans because it is nearly always the largest room and indeed the central one marked by heavy postholes in the partition walls. If we were invited into this room, we could still detect the two 'original' trestles and their four post since they were wider than the walls. They would have reminded a modern visitor of pilasters, but a contemporary visitor of the lost free-stranding posts in primordial PRIA dwelling. Technically speaking, however, they had nothing to do with the original posts. Instead, these posts are preserved and magnified in the halls where they would have reminded a modern visitor of wooden pillars (sula or 'column' in proto Nordic) and Iron Age man of the archaic origins of architecture. Trying to put a name on the trestles is in accordance with the building tradition, and the obvious need to name its ordering elements, but it also illustrates the way in which the common development in farm house architecture worked against preserving the meaning of original names, and traditional cultural values. For that reason, it is all the more significant that the upper classes when building their halls insisted on free-standing posts and trestles and capacious open rooms with visible inner roofs. In so doing, the upper classes stood out as paying homage to the past as well as to the top modern extravagant dimensions—luxury in a semi-public setting. An educated and conservative South Scandinavian looking back on two centuries of radical change would probably have read Tacitus with satisfaction. He would have recognised primordial Germanian virtues, but also understood that the up-rooting 1st century practice of the Roman elite, falsely clinging to the very traditions it meant to obliterate by paying lip service to the Republic, had infested his leading countrymen. Such echoes of a false imperial practice explain why there are two trestles only in the Uppåkra hall. From a LRIA or MP point of view, it is a small house, but being a house with free-standing posts only, it is a large one. Needless to say, or technically speaking, one trestle in centre of the Uppåkra hall, and one in each short end would have been enough to support the roof, but that would have been unarchaic, since it would have deprived the visitor of something very essential—the long free span of the side beams between the trestles and the classical order
of the room with the hearth in the centre, the very model of a golden age when every man had the right to form his own household.

In the 6th century farms at Bulbrogård (Tissø) and Fredshøj (Lejre), tradition and modernity in terms of enhanced hall dimensions and lavishness takes yet another turn. These two initial one-phased farms are almost identical. They have a large enclosure and c. 40 metre long main houses with a layout similar to the Central Scandinavian house. They are something new and so are their halls, which are half the length of the main houses and constructed with three free-standing trestles. Similar to Upplåker, they are an interface between the magnate and his guests, but they are nearly twice as long and they lack PRIA references.

Although the rooms in the NDQ varied in size, their width always equalled the width of the house. The small rooms therefore would give a narrow impression, emphasising the space closest to the short c. 2.2 metres high outer walls, while the large rooms in contrast were felt to be capacious because their orientation followed the main axis of the house and because they were dominated by the high partition walls. The smallest room was the one closest to the short end, and still in those days its proportions were the result of the way the roof was constructed. For centuries, the short end was hipped with a small upper gable that forced the HT to act as a ridge support for that side of the roof which sloped towards the wall of the short end. Because most houses were no wider than 5.5 metres and because the width of the mid aisle in those days was a little less than half the inner width of the house, the rules of thumb governing the construction of the roof in the short end made it difficult to place the first trestle more than 2.5 metres from the short end. More often than not the distance was closer to 2 metres. Although the wall of the short end could be a straight one at right angles to the axis of the house, it was frequently shaped as an apse—a form which allowed the hip to give the house a better lengthwise support, distributing the pressure on the greater length of a curved wall, which is in itself is much more difficult to overturn than a straight one, Fig. 75A–C. The room therefore was narrow and marked by its technical solutions with a low roof pitch and two thirds of its wall-length consisting of outer walls. The ratio between the volume of the room and the sum of roof and wall surfaces was low, implying high costs for little space. Needless to say, the room was cold in the winter and hot in the summer. This part of the house also existed in the PRIA, albeit without being separated from the hearth room and without the apse-shaped short end walls. This wall shape pays homage to architectural and perhaps to technical needs of a much larger house construction, but it also suggests that the room in the short end was not a regular dwelling room in which the spatial order was crucial.
This room therefore is the result of a roof construction, a PRIA invention and a progress that moved the first trestle a little further away from the short end, and made the space in the this part of the house somewhat more useful. In well preserved houses from the latter part of the PRIA, the function of this part is hinted by finds in the side aisles of the bed and some of the storages of the farm-owning nuclear family. This indicates that originally these parts of the compact PRIA living were slightly more private and secluded than the dwelling and work area next to the hearth. Introducing the chamber above the hearth made the room in the short end less attractive. Inventing the apsidal form, which indicates the need to support a more capacious house construction, must be seen as an additional step in the marginalisation of the room, probably enhanced by the introduction of the fourth, outer, dwelling room in the NDQ.

During the MP, the need for apsidal short ends disappears. Constructions change, the ridge-supporting posts are moved into the short end wall and the gable, perhaps with a small upper hip, is introduced, Fig. 75C. This makes the room in the short end comparable to any other room in the dwelling part and it can be sized much more freely. From the time when the post pair closest to the short end, i.e. the legs of the HT, was first moved further into the house and away from its BA position in order to create a small space where one could stand upright, it took some six hundred years of little by little improvement to overcome the impact of the roof construction on this room. On Zealand, the gable resulted in the integration of the small room in the short end into the chamber above the hearth, thus saving a pair of posts. These two rooms therefore became one compartment and the partition wall probably invisible (archaeologically speaking), because it was not built in connection with any roof-supporting posts186. Later, this development was taken even further e.g. in Scania, Fig. 75D.
Fig. 75D–F. (D) House 78 from Lockarp (cf. Heimer, & al. 2006 p. 46) is relatively small and uncommon for being a farm house and thus generally speaking a representative VP building. As a typological pattern, moreover, it is typical VP because of the narrow mid aisle and the sparsely set trestles. In terms of absolute chronology it belongs to VP because of a calibrated 14C date which falls between 550 and 770 CE (2σ). The house is supported by six trestles, one in each short end and four in the interior. The distance between the gables, i.e. the outer trestles, is 64 feet and the length of the house thus c. 26 metres (the foot in this case equalling 33.5 cm). From west to east, the trestles are set 12, 16, 12, 12 and 12 feet apart. As tentatively suggested on the plan, we should nevertheless imagine the houses as consisting of six rooms, the NDQ, the entrance room and the byre. (E) The house from Herzsprung Based on Schuster (2003). (F) The Ragnesminde house. Based on Fonnesbech-Sandberg & Boye (1999).

The order of the three other rooms of the NDQ is given by the fact that the central room is always the hearth room which, historically speaking, is the room that preserves the functions of the original kitchen-dwelling and behind this we find the chamber. The NDQ therefore, are characterised by the addition of a fourth room, and although we may well explain the introduction of this room with reference to the farms once again becoming larger and thus managed by a greater number of people, the fact that it does not disappear when the farms change again and become smaller in the 5th and 6th century, indicates that the change held some social qualities that farm owners were not prepared to give up. The fourth room is a pendant, albeit below the hearth, to the chamber and
bedroom that was added above it in the beginning of the CE. This means that the two reforms of the RIA farms—the one in the beginning of the first century and the other in the end of the second—were each characterised by a new dwelling room.

Technically speaking, it can be argued that the added rooms are constructed by means of splitting the first and the second of the two original dwelling trestles lengthwise and drawing the halves apart, thus making two trestles out of one, Fig. 73. This way of thinking leaves the central hearth room untouched by the changes in layout although it is indeed enlarged to become more capacious and impressive. When some of the functions once fitted into the original hearth room expand into rooms of their own, what we can do in the common room becomes more limited than before and as an arena, the room becomes more formal and less intimate.

Nevertheless, the hearth room is still the kitchen and the centre of life in the dwelling part of the NDQ and so is the hearth, although there is a tendency to move it a foot or two westwards towards the chamber and thus also slightly out of its century old focus in the diagonal cross between the four posts of the kitchen-dwelling. This means that the centre of the house is moved in such a way as to create an upper and a lower part of the room and consequently of the house. The fourth room therefore would seem to serve to reflect the changing structure of the farm creating seclusion and privacy in the western and indeed upper part of the house. Introducing the fourth room therefore enhances the characteristics of the western room as the chamber belonging to the farm owner or the leading family of the household.

Since the new room was created when the number of inhabitants on the farm grew, this asymmetry of the living quarters is probably a separation between owners and non-owners, or servants, bringing the latter closer to their work area, i.e. the byre and the barn and the outhouses. This idea of a social stratification visible in the NDQ is at par with the overall social change during the RIA when individualised and dominating couples and families headed by a farm owner become more and more essential to society. In terms of farm layout, this development is signified by the introduction of the freestanding hall, a building representing the farm owner’s interface between the private and the public. The hall is a hearth room and a dwelling, but not a kitchen, where the hall owner, his family and his guests, but not his servants, may take a seat. The social implications echoed by the changed layout of the LRIA dwelling are probably more significant than we can imagine, but they are also paired with a more subtle and abstract way of organising space.
the even simple ones of the PRIA. The latter could probably have been built by means of common-place and relative rules of thumb, similar to those guiding the construction of the short ends. The NDQ are large, easy to recognise and widespread and we can therefore suspect that planning and building them could be a case of a more formal approach to architecture. This hypothesis can be checked.

To figure out the way the new dwelling was laid out, we can put together a sample of archaeological plans of 3rd to 6th century houses from southern Jutland, because here the house material is large, homogenous, relatively well published and complex. Norre Snede, Mørup, Vorbasse, Prætvesten, Drengsted and Hjemsted can supply us with a plan material that can be enlarged and measured, because the publications contain plans that were originally produced in a larger scale before they were reduced to fit the format of journals and books. There are some other helpful circumstances, such as the houses in question being placed on relatively levelled grounds and excavated by the same methods. In spite of these similarities, measures cannot be considered very precise and the point in the investigation must be to recognise a planning procedure rather than reconstructing a metrological system of ells, feet and fathoms.

Planning a dwelling poses a problem with a number of stages, but they are all dependant on a prehistoric practice which can be attested already in Grøntoft. Among the many house remains from Grøntoft there is one structure consisting of walls only and thus no interior postholes. This is not a matter of bad preservation; on the contrary, the existing remains of this ‘house’ were well preserved and with deep foundations. Without these obvious wall foundations the structure would not have been found, and we can conclude that the pattern came about because no postholes were ever dug in the interior of the house, Fig. 76A–D. A similar unfinished post-less house wall with door openings exists in Vorbasse, and in the Eketorp ring fort, the walls are obviously primary in relation to the posts, inasmuch as the whole layout is based on the laying out of the walls. This situation, although difficult to find, owing to the often shallow wall foundations, will of course occur from time to time when a building project halts in the small time span between wall trenching and posthole digging. Because it has happened, we understand that the house walls were built before the roof-supporting constructions were put into the house. This way of building changed in the MP and VP when a trestle was incorporated in the short end and roof support integrated into the wall. In this way, the old tradition disappeared and builders stopped seeing the walls of a house as a screen with almost no supportive function. It is nevertheless easy to connect this EIA tradition with the more long-lived and parallel way in which prehistoric ships and boats were built: the hull went before the frames just as walls and house shape, albeit not the roof, were prior to the supporting trestles and ridges inside it.

Because the entrances are part of the wall, their position, and thus the primary division into dwelling and not-dwelling, must be defined in order to fit the posts into a house with a preconceived basic layout. When it comes to the
large NDQ, this relatively complicated situation allows us to see some of the Tford qualities of the original PRIA house: Without bothering much about the precise length of the house, fitting no more than four, and always just four, pairs of posts symmetrically into a symmetrical frame made up by the walls and central entrances solved all problems of stability and layout. The fact that it was symmetric meant that it needed two rules only: one for fitting in one pair of posts in relation to each short end; another for fitting in a pair of posts in relation to the entrance. The PRIA house was a model of simplicity and IKEA mentality191.

**Fig. 76A–D.** (A) One of the more than 200 houses at Grøntoft, House E XXVII, is peculiar because contrary to all other houses the remains consists of nothing but the wall foundations. Normally, preservation conditions have left us with the reverse: the holes for the roof-supporting posts are preserved while the wall foundations, which are indeed more shallow, have not survived. The plan therefore indicates that the holes for the roof-supporting posts were never dug, because that phase in the construction of the house was never begun. (B) Since the walls go before the roof posts we can sketch the first phases of the erection of the house. To begin with, we pace or rather foot out the house as a 36 by 16 square by our own foot. (C) The doorway measures 4 feet in the centre and the two parts of the house, dwelling and byre thus no more than 16 by 16 feet each. (D) This done, the time has come to dig the holes for the entrance posts and the wall foundations. We can make the trestles for the door so high that we can enter upright and build the walls as high as our shoulders. Then we turn to the roof-support. First we make the posts so long and the holes so deep that the trestle we are going to anchor in the holes will be twice as high as one third of the breadth of the house. In order to figure out where the post should be placed we concentrate on the short ends and dig our four holes one wall height from the short end and two third of a wall height from the nearest long wall. We put in the last two trestles as we please, one on each side of the door, and both in line with the trestles in the short ends. Having come this far, we can put up the ridges and roof the house before we turn to partition walls and doors. Based on Rindel (1997).
In our Jutish examples of the NDQ, the answer to the problem of how to divide the house into its two halves and further into rooms is solved by means of a foot of c. 31 centimetres. This foot, whether precisely defined or not, is in other words common at least in this part of Jutland and in itself a sign of a will to adhere to some kind of general standard within a region.

A measure of the total length of the dwelling can be taken at several points in the construction, but for analytical purposes, we will take it from a line touching the eastern edge of the western entrance post in the southern, i.e. the main entrance and a line touching the eastern edge of the westernmost post in the western short end. In well-built houses, it does not matter whether we proceed from the southern or the northern door, but in less well-built houses it is obvious that the position of the posts is related to measures either in the southern or the northern side of the house. That this is the case can of course only be seen when the axis of the entrance doors does not cross the central axis of the house at right angles.

This primary interior measure seems to be a relatively precise one and more often than not it equals an even number of feet i.e. 48, 50, 52 and so on, rather than 49, 51, 53, … . Since an ell equals two feet, the overruling measure may thus have been defined in ells. We have no way of knowing exactly between which points this measure was taken or to know what elements the points represented, but the fact that it is precise when measured in an extreme situation—both measuring points are at the same edge of a construction element—indicates that the measure was indeed taken at certain points, Fig. 77A–B.

Knowing the total length of the dwelling part, our next task must be to fit in the HT, the one closes to the short end and the ET, the one closest to the entrance. The first trestle it needed to construct the short end, the last to allocate some space for the entrance room and together they define the combined size of the three major dwelling rooms, the central hearth room and the upper and lower chamber. It would seem that in most houses, the distance between the short end and the first trestle can be understood as a certain number of feet and applying this number to the plans the measurement falls in the eastern edge of the first pair of postholes as indeed it should. Similar to the position of the first trestle, the fourth is situated at a certain distance in feet from the entrance line. As a consequence of this formal attitude to planning the distance between HT and ET is also defined in feet.
Fig. 77A. The more or less precise measurements signifying the room structure of NDQ, see Fig 77B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>0-5TH</th>
<th>1ST-4TH</th>
<th>0-1ST</th>
<th>4TH-5TH</th>
<th>1ST-2ND</th>
<th>2ND-3RD</th>
<th>3TH-4TH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VB79p88</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p92</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p95</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p98</td>
<td>45.99</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p99</td>
<td>45.09</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p101</td>
<td>54.07</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB79p101</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSp175</td>
<td>37.91</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSp175</td>
<td>43.99</td>
<td>32.19</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSh66</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSh61A</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSh36</td>
<td>42.99</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DShX1</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DShA1</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DShO1</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>33.95</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DShAD1</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>38.95</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75/25</td>
<td>63/37</td>
<td>56/44</td>
<td>44/56</td>
<td>44/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The best foot unit is 30.94 cm long. The quality of the measurements is either (1) Satisfactory, i.e. <= +/-15% from correct, or (2) Unsatisfactory, i.e. > +/- 15% from correct. By chance therefore 30% of the measurements are satisfactory. The penultimate line of the table gives the percentage Satisfying/Unsatisfying. The last line gives the balance between even and uneven numbers in the total length.

Fig. 77B.
The last task is to fit in the second and the third trestle, DT and CT, between the first and the fourth in order to create the three main rooms. The positions of these trestles, and the partitions walls that they represent, could of course be planned in feet too, and in some houses this is the case, but in several other ones it is not. We can observe these misfits when a hypothetical room length in feet reaches from the edge of one trestle posthole to the middle of the next. The relative inexactness of the second and third trestles indicates that the planning has reached the end of its formal stage and entered one of convenience. The measuring rod may of course have been used freely in this stage too, but its major units, in their capacity as indeed units, did not rule the planning. Despite the opinion expressed by several archaeologists, the rooms themselves are not modules. Instead they are thought of as larger or smaller or more or less similar, and as modules only inasmuch as they were the ‘hearth room’ or the ‘upper’ and ‘lower chamber’.

In our material, the most formalised plans belong to the large farms at Vorbasse, which are in all probability representatives of relatively prosperous farms. This should not come as a surprise. It is only natural that in formal planning, the conscious ability and economic strength to carry out the planning covariate, because it is time-consuming and thus expensive to plan and to supervise when it is not obvious why one should adhere to formal planning. One reason for doing so, besides showing off one’s wealth, is nevertheless the benefits that one might get from the development of a building trade with common norms. A hint that such a craft could be a reality is indicated by identically planned houses separated by relatively large distances such as the sixty kilometres as the crow flies between Vorbasse and Drengsted, Fig. 78. Such examples are relatively uncommon, but they exist and testify to a similar abstract understanding of the dwelling as space, despite the fact that the details of both houses are a
little different—a difference that is in all probability the result of time related and/or local preferences. In our example, the house from Drengsted has a vertical short end at least up to the height of the side ridges, while the house from Vorbasse is one of those in which one of the posts in the second trestle is not anchored in the ground. This post probably stands as a so-called king post on a piece of timber which acts as a tie connecting the trestle and posts in long walls. Similar to the short end from Drengsted, this solution is an example of a wish to fit walls and roof-support into the same construction. Since the height of the long walls in Vorbasse during the 3rd century is a little more than two metres, this arrangement makes it possible to put a door where otherwise the post would have stood. The only reasonable explanation for moving a post that is incorporated into the partition wall and thus out of the way is indeed to make way where it stands. At first sight, this could well be an obvious case of much ado about nothing or indeed very little, but knowing that this oddity is a habit contemporary with the period in which the hearth is moved closer to partition wall in question, there may have been a practical point in moving the door from its traditional place at the centre of the wall. Moving it, moreover, makes the partition between the hearth room and the upper chamber more significant and particular because it interferes with the traditional roof support, thus adding to the seclusion of the top of the household. The furnishing and decoration of the chamber is perhaps also improved when the door is moved.

Nevertheless, some technical matters are purely conventional. It is thus often observed among excavators that the depth at which an LRIA trestle leg is anchored, i.e., the bottom level of each of its post holes is flat and identical in absolute terms down to the centimetre. This balance is characteristic of each pair, but not necessarily between two pairs, thus indicating that the levelling of the trestles is based on some kind of spirit level and of course on prefabricated trestles with identical legs and a specific height. The pattern moreover, indicates that the conventions of the craft ruled that trestle legs must be equally long and holes equally deep and equally flat. The legs must be vertical and the beam horizontal. In the PRIA, no builder bothered much about such conventions.

The new organisation of the dwelling represents a broad change in the whole of South Scandinavia. In Denmark, the dwelling pattern can be also found on Fyn193 and in Sweden in Scania, Halland and on Gotland194. But when we proceed further north, e.g. to Ringerike in Norway, House I from Veien does not fit the pattern. Also in Uppland, the house is missing when for chronological reasons we would have expected it to occur, such as in House 19 from Teckenten-Björkgården. In these regions, however, the LRIA main house is occasionally very much longer than earlier, reminiscent of the situation in South Scandinavia when some of the new outhouse functions were integrated into the main house and the dwelling quarters enlarged.

This kind of mixture between LRIA affinities to a wider over-regional area and local traits, can also be found south of the Baltic, e.g. in the settlement area at the Lower Oder. This coastal land, which extends c. 350 kilometres between
the rivers Tolense and Łebu, covers c. 30,000 square kilometres and its coasts are formed by the Baltic and the Oder. The area is sparsely settled compared, e.g., to Fyn or Öland, but similar to the Central Scandinavian coastland it is an expansion area where natural resources can be exploited. The LRIA is characterised by a number of mostly female inhumation graves with an often very rich equipment that link these graves to South Scandinavia and to northern Germany. The character and distribution of these graves makes it likely that they inaugurate prominent families in the process of establishing themselves on dominant farms. In the present area, this also means that the graves signify an expansion of economic and social success, inasmuch as Jan Schuster’s status groups sort themselves in relation to their distance from the coast. On average, ordinary graves are situated c. 20, middle status groups 3–5 c. 35 and high status groups 1 and 2 c. 60 km respectively from the coast, indicating an economic development. This successful colonizing effort and social manifestation resembles the one in South Scandinavia, but it expands into more virgin lands where the need for LRIA inaugurations graves is greater than in the coastal settlement regions, Fig. 79.

There are few modern settlement excavations in the area, Herzsprung being the exception. This farm was situated only 13 kilometres from the Oder between Berlin and Stettin. It is one of several fenced farms in a riverine settlement dating back into the ERIA. Its expansion, however, is significant during LRIA and EMP and thus in line with the overall EIA development. Burning lime, casting metal and manufacturing objects are essential parts of the economy on the farm. It is quite a large farm and the way it exploits the natural assets in its surroundings, not least wood, strikes one as a Gene situation, albeit on a larger village scale that calls to mind iron-producing communities such as Snorup or Drengsted. From an architectural point of view, a house introduced in the last phase of the settlement is interesting because it shows affinities with contemporary houses from Zealand and Scania. Here, the loss of the HT closest to the short end in the dwelling part of the house is interesting. The somewhat earlier house from Ragnesminde on Zealand and the later one from Lockarp in Scania belong to the same building tradition with archaeologically invisible partitions walls. As expected, Herzsprung falls between the two other ones in both chronological and technical terms. There are more trestles than in Lockarp, but unlike the situation in Ragnesminde, a trestle has already been moved into the gable, Fig. 75D-F. This building is a new component in the Herzsprung farm and it testifies to an over-regional component in the settlement where the other traditional buildings represent a local tradition.
Fig. 79. Three maps of the distribution of LRIA graves between the rivers Tolense and Łębu according to Schuster (2003). The graves are shown in relation to a 25, 50 and 50+ km coastal zone based on the Oder and the Baltic. (A) The distribution of ordinary graves; (B) the distribution of middle status graves and (C) the distribution of high status graves. Although all three status groups are represented in all the three zones, the relative number of high status graves grows with the distance to the coast.
Although we shall have to wait for new excavations to clarify the settlement picture in the coastal areas of eastern Germany and Poland, it seem a viable hypothesis to conclude that despite widespread similarities, South Scandinavian farms signified by the NDQ are also marked by local traits and different economic characteristics. However, this cannot conceal the fact that the NDQ in themselves represent a repressive society. Choosing and reproducing the segregated standards of the NDQ as a framework and a scene for most of the daily life, despite a number of regional differences, indicate a high degree of uniformity in the understanding of the social norms that regulate daily life and social stratification. Staging reproduction this way, while simultaneously beginning to apply abstract rules for the spatial regulation of the dwelling, underlines a growing degree of formalisation rather than informal practice when it comes to defining social rules. In a pre-industrial society, an over-regional organisation of housing as sharp as NDQ would seem to reflect a common ideology in terms, e.g. of religion or government, and the conclusion we must draw from the success of NDQ should therefore stress the ideological strength of LRIA and EMP society, because the success shows a tendency for an over-regional distribution and maintenance of similar forms of inequality.

The Hall

We can speak of kind of outstanding if not magnate farm already in PRIA, when a settlement area is dominated by a one-household farm with a roofed area considerably exceeding that of the average one. The original Pøel farm north of Grøntoft and the original Hodde farm are cases in point. These farms are not only large, they are also temporary or instable, inasmuch as they may be divided up into smaller farms like Pøel or become challenged in their dominant position, like Hodde; however, similar to the Hodde farm they can of course also come into existence. These farms have no dwelling room other than the traditional one-room kitchen-dwelling and although there is a smaller house next to the Hodde main house, that house is difficult not to see as an outhouse.

This PRIA situation indicates that the development of the social arena of the hall runs parallel to RIA and MP change in farm structure and in basic rights in the rural IA society. It also runs parallel to the development of large estates and to the development of magnate farms that in their turn are characterised by halls. Therefore, tracing the hall element and its relation with large farms back in time will serve as a way of mirroring the development of one of the essential arenas on the magnate farm—the magnate’s interface between a public and a private sphere. But there are also insights to be gained from the fact that during the same centuries, the halls became essential also to rulership in the Imperial Roman world. In Rome, the hall, a basilica that forms a part of the upper-class domus as a building complex, is also an interface between the hall
owner and his guests who represent a public sphere around the aristocrat as well as the emperor.

In this capacity, the hall is a social arena where profane and sacred events take place. In Imperial Rome, among the aristocracy, the emperor is the foremost hall owner and we can be reasonably sure that in principle, his use of halls sets the standard. There are many ways to make use of halls, but two spheres stand out as the more important ones. They are signified by the words triclinium and consistorium, referring to the emperor’s banquet hall and his meeting room respectively, hosting feasts and conveying decisions being what emperors do to prove themselves in the interface between the private and the public. As a role model, the Roman emperor had a lasting influence on all kinds of leaders and it is thus reasonable to bear in mind the basic components of Imperial hall life also when we discuss the introduction of this social room among the lowly Germani.

The word aula, which started out in the beginning of the 1st c. CE denoting a fenced rural and agricultural area, i.e. the basic denotation of the ‘court’, develops with the empire. Already by the middle of the first century, the word covers the notion of the emperor’s house, household and household life on his courtly premises. But prior to the reign of Domitian (c. 90 CE), the emperor in his hall doing lip service to republican ideals, continued to prefer the role of a primus inter pares—’foremost among equals’—when lying among his guests or presiding in front of his standing audience. At the end of the first century CE, the power of the Imperial Court, Aula Caesaris, started to grow significantly and the official image of the Republican magistrate living up to aristocratic standards became mixed with that of an Imperial demigod. Eventually, in Late Antiquity, ‘Christ as art’ could be seen to dine like an Emperor in his model Imperial hall. From the 4th century and onwards therefore, the hall owner metaphor befits Constantine on earth as well as Christ in Heaven. The archaeological and textual material suggests a similar development of the owner of the Scandinavian hall, albeit on a very modest scale—a distant echo of the role model rather than an imitation. Nevertheless, the transformation of a term with rural connotations into a metaphor for the new Imperial centre of power must have stood out as a model to any powerful man in a rural society. Not least when this society, in the process of stratifying itself while restricting landowner-ship and sizing farms, needed a space where mimicry of social order could be staged.

Although halls will eventually, in the LIA, become the emblem of the uppermost upper classes, they are to begin with no more than a non-kitchen and an extra dwelling room on farms where the owner is rich enough to break up the traditional way of organising daily life. They have a proto phase, represented e.g. by Feddersen Wierde and Tjørring, where formally the possible hall rooms are made up of an ordinary, but extra room in an ordinary house, a reception room next to the traditional kitchen-dwelling in the main house of the EIA farm. Except for its additional short end entrance (especially significant at Tjør-
ring) there is nothing outstanding about this room, Fig. 64. It is an ordinary one with four posts in two pairs each supporting their trestle and the usual clumsy hip construction. Not least in Tjørring where the room is a modest addition to the normal main house, the possible hall is humble or ‘Pre- Domitian’ in appearance. There are not many hard facts to support the hall interpretation, but in principle the point in the addition is the possibility it gives the farm owner to entertain his guests at home without guiding them through the kitchen and past his bed, i.e. without disclosing his private quarters. That as it happens is a cardinal quality also in Rome.

The LRIA and EMP see the invention of the freestanding hall, a specific architectural form and a relatively small one-roomed building. This building is either in concrete terms an interface between the private and the public fitted into the fence of the dominant farm or a separate house within its fenced yard; Wijster and Vallhagar or Uppåkra are cases in point. This hall takes representation out of the main house and makes the hall owner singular, detached from the abodes and labour of subsistence economy, and thus somewhat more outstanding and less at par with his guests, a ‘post-Domitian’ albeit not yet ‘Constantinian’ figure.

This development presents us with a number of source critical problems, because most of the settlements that we know of are no more than ground plans consisting of postholes and wall trenches, which hardly show the more subtle ways of breaking up traditional farm behaviour. Halls may in other words be difficult to recognise. To begin with, the hall is not introduced as a building with a certain ground plan or construction or position. On the contrary, it is a small or middle-sized building somewhere within the fenced farm yard. Owing to preservation conditions, this building does not always exhibit all the traits necessary to define a hall given what we know today. This is especially true of the 3rd and 4th century, when free-standing halls are new to the settlement pattern and when they often lack the typifying characteristics also of the individual traits. Halls e.g. are capacious buildings, but what does capacious mean when the building is still as small as an outhouse? Moreover, to begin with, halls belong to a broader spectrum of farms than they do later, probably because hall farms are linked to dominance over land and other farms and thus a phenomenon that grew more and more exclusive parallel to society becoming more stratified. There is a tendency already in the RIA for a village at least during limited periods to be dominated by a specific farm, but that does not mean that there is only one hall farm. Gudme in LRIA and EMP is a case in point with one clearly dominating farm, but in addition to this, some of the lesser ones such as Stenhøjgård could still afford to have a small hall. In relatively small villages such as Nørre Snede there was also to begin with a hall farm of modest dimensions. Here the economic base for a hall farm must have been slim and unstable, but the social pressure on a dominant farm all the more weighty. The reason why hall farms exist is in other words both economic and social.
During the EMP, there is a tendency for the original hall consisting of one room only, to become a dwelling house with several rooms and thus also part of the permanent living quarters of the dominant farm owner and his household. This function is additional to the original function of the hall as an assembly room and an interface, as well as a room where overnight guests could camp during their visit. This development indicates that the concentration of social and economic power is growing when more space must be maintained to keep up one’s status. Fewer farm owners will be able to take part in this competition and that will diminish the number of halls, Fig. 80B.

Fig. 80A. Long roads were constructed to secure the right also of very small farms to access grassland.
Fig. 80B. Map of the Övetorp farm on Öland, showing the two stages of the hall and the need to maintain this symbol of status also when it is threatening to become ridiculously small; in this case when the farm was divided into two households with each their very small hall room. Based on Herschend (1997A; 2001).

With this kind of competition going on between the well-to-do in MP, we can find halls such as the one from Uppåkra, a small but impressive one room building, lavishly furnished and highly marked by the ritual activities that will traditionally take place in a hall also if it is someone’s private premises. Uppåkra is a chieftain’s hall and thus a well-known room also among those who were never invited to visit. It adheres to original hall values with little to remind one of a permanent dwelling, Fig. 81. But contemporary halls can be widely different from the one at Uppåkra. The small hall at Vallhagar is by no means lavish and not a great interface between the public and the private, but it is original inasmuch as it is related to the largest farm in the small village, Fig. 82. It is also more modern, since the artefact distribution suggests that the inner part of the house was indeed a dwelling room also for the daily life of the farm-owning family.
Looking for an extremely modern 6\textsuperscript{th} century hall and hall farm, we can point to the Østergård farm in Southern Jutland, Fig. 83. Because this site is rather badly preserved, structural analysis must be used when describing it and that means bringing the architectonical traits to the fore.
Fig. 8. The Østergård farm in two phases, (A) with the shorter main building and (B) with an emphasis on the hall and the NDQ of the main house. Based on Ethelberg (2003).

Østergård can be analysed contrasting two somewhat different phases or farm generations. Knowing that phases are but artificial sections through a continuous period of repetition and change, such an analysis could be problematic, but at Østergård the contrast that the phases bear out between a beginning and an end is nevertheless significant of the changes that took place. Østergård is a typical large fenced farm on Jutland and its relation to the structure of the LRIA farm is obvious. Nevertheless, because it is a 6th century farm, the planning is not as strict as we would expect the structure of a 4th or 5th century farm from Jutland to have been, Fig. 83. Not least the pear-shaped outline of the fence and its haphazard rebuilding in order to accommodate the enlarged version of the NDQ stand out as deviant compared to RIA and EMP farms such as those from Vorbasse, Nørre Snede or Torstorp Vesterby. Perhaps even Vallhagar could be said to have a more orderly layout. The lavish manor at Bulbrogård and Fredshøj (i.e. Tissø and Lejre) on the other hand are outstanding contemporary examples of formal planning. But Østergård is not the most loosely planned large farm of this period; Mørup e.g. has a much less composed spatial organisation in spite of more regular buildings. In Østergård it is easy to see the hall, partly because of its curved walls, partly because of its detached situated in the middle of the farm yard parallel to the main house, a position later to become even more prominent e.g. at VA Vorbasse or LVA Lisbjerg. One can of course wonder whether the excavation plan is enough to support the interpretation, but two traits in the connection between hall and main house are nevertheless supportive. First, we may point to the fact that the barn in the middle of the main house is very large, almost 18 m long, and in itself the size of a large outhouse. Second, and true to MP fashion, the main house is long and in its second phase even longer. In the first phase, and despite the traditional char-
acter of the house, the dwelling part in the west end does not follow the rules that define the NDQ. On the contrary, two pair of posts and thus two rooms are missing. Consequently, this enormous house looks like a small ERIA building in its dwelling part, notwithstanding the obvious need for farmhands. Such marked imbalance is a strong argument for the second house, the hall, to also be a dwelling and thus the house of the owner and his family rather than that of the farmhands. It is reasonable to infer therefore that part of the household, i.e. the farm owner and his family and perhaps some servants have moved into the hall and out of the two rooms they would previously have occupied in the main building. When left behind to take over part of the household, the farmhands have moved one up towards the short end of the house above the hearth, taken over the hearth in the main house and left their old quarters, the two rooms closest to the entrance. To begin with therefore, Østergård is planned for a division between the dwelling of the farm owner and that of the rest of those who work on the farm.

In the second phase, things are restored to normal at least when it comes to the dwelling part of the main house, Fig. 83. This part, although badly preserved, is rebuilt and made to fit the style of the NDQ, and by now, in the LMP, the main house has become a traditional one. This layout with a large free-standing hall as well as large dwelling quarters in the main house, instead of the small ones, means that compared to the initial phase a new group of servants have moved into the main house. We may therefore speak of at least three layers of inhabitants on the enlarged Østergård farm: (1) the owner’s family who lives in a part of the hall; (2) the family of the mayor of the household (a kind of steward), who lives in the western part of the NDQ and (3) the servants, whatever their social status, who live in the main house and the NDQ, albeit in the lower chamber next to the entrance room.

Even on the much smaller 6th c. Vallhagar hall farm, the household system would in principle have been the same, because here as well, the owner has established himself in his hall building, thus turning it into an additional dwelling in relation to the main house. This means that the village leader at Vallhagar, the owner of the Østergård manor as well as contemporary Merovingian kings could among them have discussed the character of their mayors of the household and the pros and cons of adopting this Roman idea of management to their estates. Structure therefore is not all when it comes to adaptation and comparison. Although more difficult to see at Bulbroård or Tisso, the same split between a main-house dwelling and a hall dwelling could well be the case here as well, even if the halls were to be empty during periods when the farms were not visited by their owner.

Moving permanently out of the main house into the hall stands out as a significant symbol for the end of the first half of the first millennium CE, in which to begin with, this was not an option. We can also conclude that it takes the breakdown of the Roman Empire and the disappearance of the Romans from large parts of Europe to make it possible to adopt some of their most interesting
economic ideas about property and how estates could be managed and used. For this reason, despite their very different size and economic value or strength, farms like Vallhagar and Østergård should both be called manors because, in principle, their owners do not need to live on their farms to have them run, although they can if they want to. The owner is no longer the daily leader of his estate and that means that he can be the owner of one or more other farms, managed by stewards. By means of stewards and supervision, this new type of farm owner can build up his revenue based on several farms. The development of the hall and the invention of oddly situated farms such as Tisso show us that irrespective of the breakdown of the Roman world and its world economy followed by a serious dip in pillage economy on the part of the Scandinavians, social stratification related to rural life and landownership could continue in Jutland as well as on Gotland and become prominent on Zealand. The ideology controlling this steady and long-term pace towards a repressive order must have been quite a forceful one.

TO SUM UP: In the middle of the first millennium, the hall owner and his closest family move permanently into the hall. This is not a step backwards towards Feddersen Wierde or Tjørring; on the contrary, it signifies the fact that the hall owners and their family are now totally separated from the burdens of subsistence, and the seclusion of the owner has become more outspoken. This said, there is nevertheless something distinctly non-Roman about this new step because it emphasises the married couple and indeed the farm owner and his nuclear family. Given the fact that this change belongs to a period safely out of touch with any imperial culture, it seems reasonable to suggest that it is true less to Roman than to barbarian ideals. This kind of hall is the one that eventually develops into a situation in which the room- and building metaphors found among boat or ship graves can be fitted into the plans of large halls indicating that the hall has become part of a marriage: in their privacy on each side of the hall room ruler and consort dwell in their personal semi-divinity (Freya- and Frey-related as they sometimes were) and when they meet in the hall room, the hall becomes an interface also between the two sides of the divine, merged into the unit of the couple, as well as an interface between the human and the divine. This is the ‘Beowulfian’ hall paying homage to and combining Roman as well as Scandinavian ideals. It stands to reason that the nuclear family of the mid-millennium upper classes could echo the one that dominated LPRIA society. Similar to the humble abode of the PRIA, the Beowulfian LIA hall is a room for all seasons: for warriors, for communion, for ruling, for ritual, for sacrifice, for ladies with a mead cup, for wedding, for preaching, for battlefield etc, etc. The cardinal difference however, is the absence of the references to subsistence that dominated the kitchen-dwelling.

In LVA society, the separation between worldly and heavenly powers becomes more outspoken and the need for a dwelling-free hall is once again felt.
This is a development that can easily been explained as a result of a renewed and somewhat reformed Roman influence based on the idea of the palatine where several buildings, and several halls and temples/or churches, make up the palace, irrespective of the religious qualities of the rituals performed in the halls. We can point to cases such as Tissø, Järrestad and perhaps Lockarp. The LVA branching of halls into profane and sacred ones is a revival also of RIA ideals, inasmuch as the first churches are similar to the dwelling-free halls of RIA.

Præstestien

Although we know few details about the village called Præstestien, since it was not possible to make a total excavation of the site, we can still see the effects of a radical change imposed upon a small informally planned settlement. The original settlement conformed to the typical LRIA village, inasmuch as it included among its farms at least one larger complex, probably characterised by a small hall. Houses 61b and 66 and their different phases and forerunners could well be the main house and the hall on such a somewhat larger farm. The length of house 61, c. 37 m, suggests that this house was indeed as large as one could expect the main building of a dominating hall farm to be, and house 66 meets several of the criteria designating a small hall, Fig. 84A&B.

Fig. 84A&B. (A) Map of RIA Præstestien. (B) the possible remains of a hall farm. Based on Siemen (2000).
The settlement pattern of the LRIA village is traditional and made up by a group of farms consisting of one or more east-west orientated houses surrounded by a fence. One of the houses, the main house, is a long building with several functions. Their dwelling part reveals that they are examples of the NDQ of the LRIA in southern Jutland. When rebuilt, the houses on the farm were
moved around a little and also the fences would now and then be changed and shifted.

This loosely planned village was radically transformed in the 5th century, when it was designed to become two metrically arranged parallel rows of farms separated rather than united by an open square some 175 metres wide. In this new village or these two new villages, the farm houses occupied the short end of their plot and courtyard facing the square. A large house fills this space and creates a façade together with a gate; a small one, characteristic of the EMP when some main buildings loose the easternmost section of the main house, but not the characteristic suite of the NDQ, will be incorporated into a fence together with the gate. The direct access to the farmhouses from the open space between the rows, introducing the front door, represents a break with the seclusion of the traditional farm of the LRIA, Fig. 85A–C. From a rational point of view, the position is deviant because it does not allow the inhabitants to enter their courtyard from both the doors of their main house. Instead, it limits the access to the yard as a workspace and does not allow the inhabitants to organise themselves in the most practical way.

**Fig. 85A–C.** (A) Map of MP Præstestien. (B&C) analysis of the planning with the plots defined in feet, green lines. Based on Siemen (2000).
A closer look at the fencing of the northern row of farms shows that the original fences in the new layout consisted of pairs of post between which the fence itself was placed. These fences are relative light constructions and in many cases they were replaced by stouter ones in a trench, Fig. 86. Despite this, the fencing was none the less widely different from the more massive structures normally surrounding a LRIA farm. In MP Præstestien therefore, the fences were not primarily meant to enclose the farm; instead they marked out a plot that equalled the share of each farm in the row. They did so according to a number of rules. Because in reality, defining a share and defining it according to an ideal does not in the long run correspond well to each other, inasmuch as practise tends to alter any theoretical model, we will start our analysis with the three central farms in the northern row, where the match between reality and ideal is the best. The first rule that we can infer tells us that the farms are to be placed in a row and that their main houses, together with a fence and the gates in the façade, must create a front, even though this position of the main house is impractical. The second rule stipulates that the plots should have the same widths. The third defines a gap between the plots of each of the farms.

The point in all this uniformity, except uniformity in itself, is the definition of the farms as a length in a façade between two points marked e.g. by stones or poles. In all kinds of disputes this definition could be pointed out and referred to as consequential. This way of doing things is in other words an example of a formal approach to making a lasting order, because by pointing to the patterns resulting from applying the rules, future discussions are in principles made void. If the farms were not expected to cooperate, i.e., if there never occurred a situation in which one would reasonably refer to the size and position of the farm in the community and its row, then there would be no point in applying the three rules. Indeed at Præstestien, similar to Hjemsted, or Vorbasse or Nørre Snede or almost any village, they could have continued to live the way they had always
lived next to each other behind their fences without creating a formally defined front or façade.

At Præstestien, they nevertheless went for the rules and applied them quite strictly, especially when it came to making the width of the plots the same. This width is c. 37.5 metres and that equals 120 feet. Historically speaking, a Danish foot is c. 31 centimetres and so is the foot in this case as well as the one used to layout the NDQ. The distances between the plots, the boundary-clearings so to speak, are not equally well defined, but we can still see that ideally they ought to have been 8 feet. The whole idea of making a space between the farms is in itself a most formalistic approach to planning. It costs you an extra fence just to make the boundary between the farms unnecessarily wide and fenced enough to become indisputable. This, ‘the indisputable’, is no doubt the point and it means that when a fence is being repaired someone other than yourself or your
neighbour should see to it that the correct boundary clearing is preserved. There is no simple rationality behind the narrow clearings, but little doubt that those who planned the village expected and wanted to check e.g. trespassing, which would inviolate the rules laid down in defining the village as indeed a row of similar units. Moving the farms further apart would of course have solved this problem without the measuring rod, and therefore, refraining from this simple solution, indicates that the definitions within rows and façades reflected the indisputable proportional division of the farms and the land surrounding the village—an example of the rule which states that ‘the toft is the mother of the selion’, signifying that the division of a village into a number of spatially defined properties is mirrored by the division of the village itself into plots that are proportional to the size of these properties213.

If we leave the central part of the northern row, uniformity becomes less marked. It meets the eye that to begin with, the westernmost farm was indeed 120 feet wide, but it looks as if the next farm in the row is separated from the first by a 24-foot gap eventually filled up by the courtyard of the westernmost farm. The solution to this problem is a development in which the first farm was the westernmost. It was laid out as a 120-foot farm. However, when the other farms were laid out the original farm was resized and became a 144-foot farm. This is no doubt an odd way of handling a surveyor’s ideals of serious planning meant to result in a number of equal-sized farm, because it means that at some stage you have in practise broken a rule and created an uneven façade. This kind of confusion is the result of introducing several conflicting aims in the planning—an issue which has in all likelihood frustrated surveyors from their very first day in the field. The planning problem consists of the following: to begin with there was a need to define the westernmost (entrance) point of the settlement, thus defining the length of the façade. Then somebody introduced an ambiguity about the size of the westernmost farm: would it become a 120- or a 144-foot farm? But the westernmost point could not be moved and the 24 feet must therefore find room to the east of the original plot.

Looking further east from the central farms in order to find the easternmost corner of the settlement, we find one attached to a farm and another one a metre or so outside this. The latter is just an unconnected corner shaped trench—a ‘loose angle’ so to speak. Between the central farms and these two corners there are three farms, but there is not room enough for three 120-foot farms. Nevertheless, there are indications that the farm closest to the three central ones was indeed 120 feet wide. Next to this farm, the planning seems to have lost the space that ought to have existed between two plots. Incorporating this space in the plots is no real solution to the problem, because there is still room for one 120-foot farm and one 96-foot farm only before we reach the eastern corner. In other words, something has restrained the whole settlement and that would seem to be the easternmost corner, or rather its significance.

The solution to this puzzle is in all probability the distance between the loose corner in the east and the outermost corner in the west. The former cannot be
moved because the latter is already fixed or vice versa. The distance between the corners equals 888 feet and ideally speaking that is the same as seven farms. Had all the farms been equally large, they would in principle have been 120 feet each and the narrow passage between them 8 feet (120 x 7 = 840)+ (6 x 8 = 48) = 888. In conclusion therefore, we can suggest that the planning started with a row of plots between the corners and the rules were clear enough: the carrying capacity of the village and its lands equalled the length of the seven farm façades and uniformity was the guiding principle. Then uniformity became disputed when the need for a larger farm at the entrance to the village was introduced. This need, however, would not change the overall capacity of the northern part of the village, so when it was decided or became a fact that the westernmost farm would be 144 feet wide, then the 24 feet added to the standard of 120 had to be compensated in one of the other farms bringing it down to 96 feet. In terms of its carrying capacity North Præstestien therefore was thought of as a 7 times 120, i.e. an 840-foot village, Fig. 87. Had this not been the case, the difference in farm size could have been regulated e.g. by means of saving 4 feet on each of the clearings.

In his report from the excavations, Palle Siemen argues that the South Præstestien is indeed a younger settlement than North Præstestien and he would like to see the former as a sequel to the latter—South Præstestien replacing North
That there are traits in the southern settlement that could be younger than comparable structures in the northern one may well be correct, even though some of the differences are marginal and based on a small number of observations. However, it is difficult to argue against a very large overlap between the two villages, in which the houses as well as the planning of the settlements are very similar. Nevertheless, South Præstestien is less rigidly planned than North Præstestien because it was not felt necessary to make an 8-foot boundary-clearing between the plots. Even in North Præstestien as we have seen, the rigid planning concept was hard to drive home to the farmers. South Præstestien therefore consists of four 120-foot farms separated by a fence only. In that respect it is in other words more uniform.

As indicated by the irregularity in the planning of the westernmost farm in the northern row, part of the fencing at Præstestien was probably prior to the erection of the farms. This is also indicated by the fact that several of the fences are not built to provide the farm with a yard, but only to make up a north-south demarcation between them. It is conceivable in other words that the fences have been standing for a while before the plots and their façades were filled up with houses.

By and large, it would seem plausible that Præstestien was a planned settlement built out over a period of time. Those who built the village followed plans relatively strictly, although somewhat changed. Eventually, there were 11 farms in two villages reflecting a division into two of the whole agricultural environment. If we suppose that the better land in the Præstestien area is the slightly higher and thus better drained grounds, it is not unreasonable to think that those who cultivate the northern part of the surroundings had better land at their disposal. There is thus something rational in planning North Præstestien as a larger village than South Præstestien.

The ideal plans of the two Præstestien villages take their point of departure in an assessment of the carrying capacity of the environment and in land ownership. The result of the assessment is expressed in the organisation of the settlement, and that completed, the colonisation of the land can start. But already at an early stage, there needs be a change of plans. The original idea was one of equality and uniformity and this principle should be evident at a glance. Today, we may find this a reasonable idea and structure when we develop an area, but in a LRIA context it is odd, because nearly all villages consisted of smaller and larger farms and often included a large and dominant one, as did Old Præstestien. Introducing uniformity, therefore, is a radical step, so radical in fact that we may suspect the large westernmost farm to reflect the necessity to structure the village in the traditional way with a large and dominating farm and consequently at least one smaller farm. When the original plans were changed, it signifies a way of abandoning an essential part of the original notion, defining all farms as equal. This change of plans should not come as a surprise, because we are already acquainted with the development of Vendehøj, where reforming the farms, although it was introduced to re-establish parity between the surviv-
ing ones, could not abate the dominant farms. Balance, as it were, was not a viable notion.

Præstestien proves that the village model that includes a dominant farm is difficult to bypass. On the other hand, trying to reform Old Præstestien and turn it into an egalitarian village is in harmony with the overall aim also of the earlier reforms. Despite the ongoing social stratification, the notion of equality, albeit among a very limited number of farms, was still nourished as late as the MP. We may look upon the idea as naïve, but also point out that at Præstestien, equality was something the large landowner(s) sought to impose upon their tenants or dependant farmers. In the magnate’s world, stratification is a social concept that structures society at large while equality befits the members of the lower strata. Down there, people do not agree and we may thus conclude that stratification is likely to be an overruling concept at work in all parts of society.

If Præstestien had been a traditional RIA society in the process of moving its farms, simultaneously giving itself a new structure, this clash between planning ideals, i.e. uniformity with a front vs. stratification and individuality, would hardly have occurred. The village was already structured as a small hierarchy within a larger society, and twice during the preceding 500 years it had showed its ability to reform itself without giving up stratification and rational farm layout. Instead, we must conclude that the power that ordered the village lay outside it. Given the fact that the planning reflects the overall carrying capacity of the village, those who introduced the formal planning were probably also the owners of the land or those who controlled it. It is only fair to assume that as outsiders, these owners and planners consider all the settlers intended for Præstestien as uniformly dependant or indeed equal on an inferior social level. In the event however, these dominant remote actors could not defend their point of view and had to back up their power by means of copying the traditional society in order to keep control. This means that the dominant landowner(s) were represented in the village in order to secure or enforce their rights by means of a steward in all probability put up in the 144-foot farm. This arrangement was carried out at the expense of some of their power, because in the end they had to share whatever revenue there may have been with someone, i.e. the steward, whom they must have seen as a kind of middleman.

Running a farm as a tenant in this brand new and well planned model society close to what is advertised today as the attractive and child-friendly Hjerting Beach, probably came with a price. But to collect it, the landowners or -holders or -lords, contrary to their first intentions, had to be represented in the village by means of an appointed village leader.

As a radically changed once informally planned settlement, Præstestien resembles the slightly earlier 4th c. development at Wijster in Drente. However, in Wijster, the village is taken over by a large farm owner who chooses to settle in the village and make it his home and centre. Wijster therefore adheres to the traditional hierarchic structure of the LRIA village. As a dominated village, i.e. dominated by non-present owners, Præstestien bears some resemblance to con-
temporary Vorbasse. In the Vorbasse case however, the village was moved away from its dominating farm, leaving this farm in splendid isolation and dominance separating it from the daily life of the village. The situation in Vorbasse was the result of a variation of the structural movements of the LRIA farm, and at Vorbasse the dominant farm was rooted in the lands of the village itself\textsuperscript{215}. Compared to the owners of Wijster and Vorbasse, the landlord(s) of Præstestien went one essential step further and marked out ownership as something more abstract or formal and non-present than it was before.

The manor in Vorbasse was created by means of moving the village to give the dominant farm a space and land of its own. The situation may thus remind us a little of the 500 years older situation in Galsted. In Vorbasse, however, we are entitled to believe that the large farms had more effective means of controlling the village. The freedom that the Vorbasse village gained from being moved away from the manor was in other words marginal compared to the ERIA situation. Creating manors the other way round, i.e. colonising a piece of land by building a manor on it is not surprisingly much more usual. Østergård, Mørup, Tissø, Lejre, Järrestad or Valsgärde are LIA examples of what was indeed a fashion phenomenon\textsuperscript{216}.

Needless to say, the Præstestien experiment failed; the village did not last long and the VA settlement returns to the ideal of the not-so-organised village at the traditional southern part of the site\textsuperscript{217}. In the event, the dream of abstract uniformity could in other words not be realised, but nevertheless, starting with a small and sleepy RIA village, the social engineers came a long way at Præstestien.

Præstestien is planned as a 1320-foot village (144+96+(9x120) = 1320) and that means that the land of the village can be seen as 1320 units. Such a measure is relative to each individual village, inasmuch as the carrying capacity of their environment will always differ a little, but also rather arbitrary. Instead of the series 96-120-144, the surveyors could have preferred 72-96-120 without changing the carrying capacity of the village. Defining Præstestien as a 1320-village therefore tells us something about a conventional definition of the capacity of its lands, i.e. about the number of people and farms and thus also of the profit that can be made by the landholder from the leases paid by his tenants. From a formalistic point of view, such a unit is at best an informal one, because it is an assessment based on many not so strictly defined variables. Referring to Præstestien as a 1320-village therefore in other word a way of saying that the village has been assessed: that calculations can and have been made. With no central power to tax farmers, there are no general rules for land assessment in terms of taxation value; instead, every landlord makes his own evaluation or forces it upon a village whose farmers pay their leases collectively. The point is the principle: assessments have been made and consequently rent can be defined. The 1320 units therefore remind one of the peculiar anonymous units that we hear
of e.g. in *Beowulf*. This poem is also a historical tale and in its descriptions we should expect something old-fashioned and bygone, e.g. when it comes to the concept of ‘land’, nevertheless the poem is a *plea* for the landowner, in these cases a king, and for the King’s right to give away land to a warrior as payment for military services rendered. When the concept of ‘land’ is first introduced, we are told about it in the following way:\(^2\):

\[
\text{Þæt hē on Bīowulfes bærm ālegde,}
\text{ond him gesealde seofan þūsendo,}
\text{bold ond bregostol. (vv 2194–2196).}
\]

That [a sword] he put on Beowulf’s lap, and gave to him seven thousand, hall and high seat.

From the context, we understand that the 7000 are something ‘of land’ and Beowulf gets this gift as a reward from his king Hygelac. The King has good reason to recompense Beowulf for what he has done: he killed the monster Grendel as well as his horrible mother saving King Hrothgar and forming an alliance of friendship between Geats and Danes. Later on in vv 2994-95 we hear of Eofer and Wulf who get as much as ‘100,000 of land’ each, but then they had brought about something even more valuable namely a glorious Geatish victory over the Swedes. It is not a farfetched idea that giving someone Præstestien would have meant to give someone ‘1320 of land’, i.e. a village where the land had been assessed and where there are rents to collect. In that case Beowulf would have got the equivalent of perhaps 5 villages or 50–60 farms for his successful mission to Denmark. Since the gift included a hall and a high seat, King Hygelac establishes Beowulf as a landlord, converts his farm to a hall farm and makes Beowulf a hall owner. Since Beowulf was already a landowner by inheritance, it would seem that the King’s gift made Beowulf a magnate and his original farm a manor with a hall and a number of villages attached to it.

After this happy land-giving event, the reader expects Beowulf to enter his hall, sit down in his high seat, look out into the world and fall in love with a woman, like King Sigebert in real life Metz or Frey in the paragon of Asgárd. When a hero understands himself to be at this point in life, sensitive listeners wait for him to send out his suitor, i.e. the shining image of himself, to propose and bring home the maid to the hall for Beowulf to marry and herself to give birth and bring up some truly ‘wulfine’ offspring. Romance however, is not on the poet’s agenda, far from it. In the next nine lines he finishes off Hygelac, makes Beowulf his unwilling successor, lets Beowulf rule for 50 years unmarried and introduces serious trouble in the form of an angry dragon—everything done in order to make us suspect the formidable crisis of the Geatish society. Be this as it may, Østergård and Præstetien as well as *Beowulf* testify to that kind of
ownership by proxy which will eventually support both royalty and upper classes in Early Medieval Europe. And we may conclude that no crisis or turbulence in mid-millennium Europe or South Scandinavia could reverse this step in the development of ownership, although ownership by proxy may well have lost considerable momentum.

The Eketorp Ringfort

Ölandic limestone ring forts with vertical outer wall faces were planned and erected during the 4th and 5th century CE. Their main purpose was dual: they provided (1) protection and (2) additional living quarters to an otherwise unprotected albeit crowded rural society. When permanently settled, these ring forts are typical of the richer southern part of the island. They are peculiar also because they display a number of the characteristics of a township, but in essence they are but a number of households that sustain themselves interacting economically with the complete farms in their surroundings. As dependant economic units, however, they are not unique; on the contrary, located in the low-productive grassland around several of the Ölandic villages we find solitary houses with a household that, similar to the ones in the ring forts, must have survived on a livestock economy in cooperation with farms in the villages. In a way similar to the households in Eketorp, these peripheral households benefit from breeding livestock, but they are nevertheless dependant economies situated on communal pasture. In Eketorp, judging from the artefacts, people lived a decent, albeit not luxurious life situated on communal lands next to a wetland area with a traditional and small, but old offering site in the form of a spring (turned into the well of the fort) and a pond, Fig. 88A–C.

Solitary farms and ring-fort homes serve to optimise the exploitation of the open Ölandic landscape, when arable land and the better meadows have already been occupied by traditional farms. This situation allows us to infer that in the still expanding LRIA society, there was a need at least on southern Öland to construct a number of households without cutting up any farms, or building any new farmhouses. Solitary farms and permanently settled ring forts are thus the end of a settlement expansion signifying the exploitation of the most peripheral grasslands. There were better open areas, e.g. between settlement agglomerations in the vicinity of Björnhovda, but these were out of bounds; they were needed as grassland and could not be overgrazed. In principle, the contrast between unsettled better areas and settled peripheral grasslands demonstrates the limits of the rural system and the need for a land reform.219
To begin with, the Eketorp ring fort, the only totally excavated fort, was meant to hold temporary abodes only, but in the 5th century it was necessary to create a permanent settlement based on dairy production and herding—adding the defence of the ring fort as an obligation to its inhabitants. When this housing project was built to reach its highest degree of perfection combining cattle breeding and defence, there were 26 small households in the ring fort and a population of c. 150 persons. At the same time, the defence of the walls demanded 50 odd persons, i.e. one man each fifth metre at the parapet and some extra men at the gates. The fort was constructed with a portcullis gate of the kind which signified civil Roman defence systems. This gate would allow those living in the surroundings to enter the fort even when an enemy ravaged the country and laid siege on the fort. Eketorp was a communally defended society, organised as a village with a village leader and a hall. But the settlement was planned and ruled by its planning, which was essentially a planning of its façades. The idea to create a partly self-sustaining rationally
planned and organised stone-built strongpoint for the security of a surrounding population would seem to imitate one or two of the characteristics of the fortified Late Roman towns in the outskirts of the empire. As a denotation of this town-based concept of security, Eketorp and the Ölandic ring forts stand out as a very modern and almost anachronistic phenomenon in its South Scandinavian day and age.220

Nevertheless, as a regulated and façade-planned settlement with room for an expansion and subjected to outside domination, Eketorp reminds one of Præstestien. Because we know so much more about Eketorp, we can also see that the blunt social engineering behind the planning that laid out Præstestien or Eketorp may in fact cover a good measure of social responsibility rather than exploitation: there are 26 homes in Eketorp, albeit of course in a repressive society. In Eketorp the excavations uncovered the first proof of people living in the byres and the status of these inhabitants is signified by this fact and by the name of one of the thralls in the Rigsthula fragment: Fjose—the man who lives in the byre among the animals.221 There is in other word a parallel between the byre scene in Eketorp, Fig. 89, and that of Nørre Tranders, Fig. 8. Both sites seem to signify some sort social crisis producing dropouts and human tragedy.

Fig. 89. Plan of the byre dwelling in Eketorp House Ac. Based on Nordström & Herschend (2003).
Because of the limestone walls, it is easy to recognise some possible measuring points used to build the fort according to plans. These points fall in categories and they are summarized in Fig. 90A&B. Eketorp is planned according to a façade similar to a geometrical figure consisting of a circle broken by a straight line in 1/8th of its perimeter; the eighth facing the pond and the wetland. In the first, 4th century Eketorp fortress, this geometrical figure is the ideal form of the inner façade of the ring wall. In the second, 4th to 7th century fortress, the circle lines up the façade of the radial houses.

Fig. 90A–B. Plan of the kind of measures taken in order to analyse the planning as well as of the system of the planning in the Eketorp ring fort.
In Eketorp, the basic idea of planning is to divide its geometrical façades into houses, gateways or squares. A sample of measures has showed that the measuring unit in Eketorp equals an ell of c. 47 centimetres. This is the same measure as the East Roman and Byzantine ell of one and a half foot i.e. the *pechys*. The corresponding foot is 31.33 centimetres long and similar, but probably not identical to the foot from Jutland. Foot and ell were originally natural measures from heel to tip of toes and from elbow to fingertips, but in Eketorp and maybe also at Præstestien they were formalised measures utilised in a regulated way.
Measured in ells the radius of the planning circle in Eketorp equals 61 and that means that the perimeter of the circle is almost 384 ells, 383.4 to be precise. Although 61 is an odd number to choose for a radius, 384 and even ‘almost 384’ is a very practical one because it can be divided e.g. with 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 12, 16 …. This makes it possible to divide the perimeter in a suitable way and allot a space for the different needs in the ring fort. The standard house unit in the radial house façade, i.e. the length of a house façade facing the street is 9 ells. Eketorp is a piece of pragmatic planning rather than a subtle geometrical construction.

The radial houses in the fortress are uniform, but in the central quarters, houses are larger and this is where the largest farm with a small hall room was planned into the settlement, Fig. 91A&B. The houses that make up this household are not very much larger than the others, but the differences are nevertheless there and together with the hall they signify that Eketorp and Præstestien alike ended up displaying the usual stratified RIA social structure.

**Fig. 91A–B.** (A) The position of the hall farm in Eketorp (Houses 02, 03 and 04) and (B) plan of the hall, House 03.
In a way much more obvious than at Præstestien, the households in Eketorp are dependant on the farm owners surrounding the fort, because self subsistence economy is impossible around Eketorp, inasmuch as there is no arable land in the area. Instead an emphasis must be put on cattle breeding. Moreover, it is unlikely to think that the inhabitants themselves had the means to construct the fortress, and therefore reasonable to suggest that at least some of the obligations for those who lived in Eketorp were to take part in the defence of the settlement, and see to it that it gave protection also for those who lived in the settlements next to it. It takes a good measure of Roman military experience to erect the fort and manage its defence and portcullis gate. Not surprisingly, in the 6th and 7th century, when the opportunity to be trained in the Roman army disappeared, the sophistication of the ring fort and its defence deteriorated.

This said, the great difference between Eketorp and Præstestien is the number of households. Eketorp echoes the PRIA when the right to form a household was still widely accepted despite the existence of slaves or tenants. Instead of viewing this as backward and insular, it is more rewarding to point to the egalitarian component of RIA reforms. Irrespective of the differences between Vendehøj Phase 2, Præstestien and Eketorp they all exhibit a measure of equality in the way they were intended to solve a problem. Seen in the event, there is nevertheless something genuinely fraudulent (and Roman) in the way the powerful in the first centuries CE adhere to lost ideals and bygone social contracts while at the same time they strive as best they can to make them null and void.

The planned and dependant settlements at Præstestien and in Eketorp are significant of an advanced formal understanding of society that we do not find in South Scandinavia during the LIA, although it does reoccur in the planning of the first market place in Ribe at the very beginning of the 8th century. Essentially however, this kind of thinking belongs to the VA and later periods. It is nevertheless important to notice that ownership and obligations could be linked to formal planning and social engineering before the Roman Empire lost its dominating position in Europe. Intellectually speaking, South Scandinavia was in other words on the brink of becoming a literate society, inasmuch as numerical literacy is literacy in a prime form. Svante Fischer has stressed the importance of the military experience as a gate opener for literacy and it is thus not surprising that Eketorp is an example with a military connection. It is important, however, to point out that there is a model of group discipline behind the military ideal that involves literacy. This ideal of literacy is thus more difficult to find in the warrior ideals brought down to us in heroic lays, although it does exist. The notion of literacy adheres to the disciplined character of the military organisation as well as to administration. Nevertheless, in South Scandinavian areas closer to the Empire numerical literacy, as it was applied e.g. to Præstestien, would seem to have gone one step further and civilised itself, despite the fact that ownership must in some way or other be enforced before it can be accepted. Be this as it may, with the withdrawal of the Roman Army, South Scandinavians were cut off from a cardinal didactic and educational set-
ting that seems to have been a necessary prerequisite for keeping up such things as formal planning.

If ever there was a society, ironically stumbling rather than simply falling into the graves it had helped to dig for others, it was South Scandinavia in the 6th century. It took this society some 200 years to climb its way out of its hole and while down there, it would seem that a considerable number of heroes fought it out between them.

Conclusion

Linking the notion of ‘place’ to formal concepts such as measurement, and furthermore, measurement to social dominance and dependency as well as ownership, results in a new way of organising the landscape. However, in South Scandinavia, this notion did not survive. It stayed a Jutish phenomenon or one related to the odd military relationship with Latin culture as in the case of the Ölandic ring forts. Not until the LVA did the formal landscapes eventually become dominant. Nevertheless, there are still RIA landscapes left to investigate.

Let us add an example from Zealand in order to see how the RIA settlements fit into larger landscapes. Surveys, field walking, and excavations have given us a good overview of the Boeslunde area in the south-western part of the island from the early Bronze Age till today, Fig. 92. There are some general conclusions to be drawn from this case study226. Boeslunde is a hilly area with a number of small lakes and bogs in a relatively elevated position surrounded by flatland. There is a clear combination of hilltop, lake and forest in this landscape and that gives it some sacred qualities with a primary value in relation to the settlement pattern. Megaliths and BA mounds with an elevated position in the landscape and Bronze Age offerings in the small lakes among the hilltops are the first manifestations in Boeslunde. In terms of archaeology, they inaugurate the hills as burial grounds and the hilltops as sacred, and this sacredness shows in a kind of holiness which prevents people from occupying the hilltops with farms when the area becomes settled in LBA and EIA. The settlement is in itself a kind of intrusion into the sacred, but instead of occupying the hilltops, the settlements encircle them at a lower level c. 30 metres above the sea. In this way, the centre of the area, the hilltops and the offering lakes, remain unsettled. The settlement expansion in the EIA is obvious also in Boeslunde, as is the stabilisation of the settlement in the first centuries CE. In the 5th century, there are some indications of a high status farm, but the essential change belongs to the EVA when the settlement is concentrated to two villages that have moved upwards in the landscape and closer to the sacred lakes. This development is fulfilled in the EMA, when the church is built on the top of the hills and a defended manor constructed in one of the former offering lakes next to the church. The two villages are now also located on the hilltops. Today, these two settlements have grown together and become one. The manor has disappeared, but the church is
still there. This church is not a simple parish church; on the contrary, it is a large pilgrimage church related to a holy spring and consecrated to the Trinity. It was a religious centre in its own right and in all probability an example of a Christian church occupying an already established holy and communal place related to water and hills.  

Fig. 92. The settlement pattern at Boeslunde on Zealand. Dark blue settlement areas date to the EIA. Light blue settlements date to LRIA and MP. The red settlements and the church belong to the EMA.

The development in Boeslunde is an outline only, of the most simple stages and general traits. We know little in detail: when was the first manor built in the hills and where and when was the first church built? These and many other unanswerable questions block our in-depth understanding of the development, but we do see the general change from a settlement landscape respecting a central topographically defined holiness to a landscape occupying this holiness and dominating it with buildings. It is not a matter of the holiness having been forgotten; instead, it is indeed occupied or invaded and domesticated by neighbouring man and church. Judged by the offerings, the forested hills and their lakes were recognised as holy some thousand years before our era and two thousand years later they were brought under control, and at the same time enhanced and centralised by means of a church. Once, in the more nuclear family-based PRIA society, the sacred was respected and visited only. But little by little, ushered forward by social stratification and dominant landowners, the sacred was occupied and settled by the more secular society. The hall no doubt also became a bridge to the church as a sacred and social space in the landscape.
The general pattern of the development in Boeslunde in the centuries around the beginning of the CE is the same as the pattern found in Jutland. A similar development can also be found in Scania, e.g. at Fosie and in the results of the excavations carried out in connection with the Öresund link. Although they are but sections of the Scanian landscape, they corroborate the general pattern: during the Iron Age, the human landscape is stabilised and relatively speaking, settlements in higher elevations become more frequent. The population grows, but the number of farms and settlements become fewer.

The original relation to the sacred during this period is no doubt strongly connected to water as a medium in which to offer, but also as a place to offer by. To fit the IA landscape, offering places must often be somewhat peripheral in relation to the settlement and communal offering sites, moreover, are places of natural qualities employed for some reason in connection with offerings, e.g. Röekillorna, Kärringsjön or Abbetorp. The occupation of the sacred, which happened late at Boeslunde where the early offerings are indeed magnificent, could however happen already in MP as in the odd Eketorp case, but then again, this settlement was a very modern one. The lack of dryland offering sites is partly a matter of land usages working against the preservation of these sites when they lost their importance, but also a matter of ritual dryland sites being related to settlement and cemeteries. Nevertheless, in landscapes characterised by prominent impediments, excavations now and then reveal ritual dryland sites, such as Unnered near Gothenburg, Lunda near Strängnäs, Roteberg north of Stockholm and Helgö east of Stockholm. In the long run, these offering sites are brought into some form of burial connection without becoming cemeteries.

NOTES
167 There is a discussion on the Ölandic ring forts and Ölandic settlement structure in Fallgren (2008).
168 Adding to the present discussion, fenced villages such as Grøntoft, Borremose, Lyngsmose, Hodde, Galsted and Priorslykken can be looked up in Jensen (2003).
169 Even if they produce iron, there is still in the PRIA no system of trade with commodities that will allow a specialized craftsman to survive and thrive without some kind of dependency to a larger farm. Not until the LRIA do we see independent farms surviving on a large non-agricultural production. Not surprisingly, they are Jutish and well distributed in areas with access to central places such as Dankirke (Jarl Hansen 1991; Jensen 1991) or Dejbjerg (Hansen 1991), as well as roads (in Eastern Jutland) facilitating transportation and market production. Production would seem to have come to an end c. 600 CE, cf. Nørbach (1997; 2003); Hambro & Nørbach (2003:99 pp.); Rasmussen et al. (2006).
170 Next to the Galsted village, there is a large and in all probability dominant farm. But this is hardly the beginning of the new village with a dominant farm among the dependant ones. It is more likely to be a situation similar to that of Grøntoft, in which the village is accompanied by a solitary large farm, i.e., the farm Poel. Galsted, on the other hand, is a fine example of the fact that the farms are getting fewer and larger in the beginning of CE.
171 This Central Jutland perspective is backward and old-fashioned already if we look at Sonderjylland, where already in PRIA there is room for variation and individual solutions, cf. Ethelberg et al. (2003:159).

173 The concept of land right that can be deduced from the archaeological material continues to be cardinal and we find an example of this in the end of Beowulf when the men who did not come to the assistance of Beowulf when he fought the dragon are told that they will hereafter walk around deprived of their land right, i.e. without the possibility to settle. The example shows that in society there are obligations to fulfil and if we fail, we lose our rights. It would seem that in order to make this kind of selection work on a more general basis, there should be some economic obligations towards the collective linked to having land right. That this is the case is indicated by the text on the Fora Ring, cf. Brink (1996) and Sundqvist (2008:164 pp.).

174 For Tjørring see Steen (1997) and Olesen & Rostholm (2004).

175 Trying to get out the animals from the byre in Nørre Tranders (Nielsen J N 2002) in Siggard, Dommerby, (Aabo 1994:165), in two houses at Ginderup (Kjær 1930:28 & Fig.2:688; perhaps also Hatt 1935:Fig. 5 & p. 45)) as well as in Solbjerg and Tholstrup (Hatt 1928:Tab. 1 & p.221 & p. 242) created the pattern of the rescue work being most successful in the outer part of the byre.

176 Villages do not move en bloc instead their farms shift position one by one or couple by couple within their subsistence area cf. Mads Holst (2004A & B). This way of shifting stands out as an echo of the earlier pattern of settlement movement and of the allotment of land to each farmer.


178 Waterbolk (1975:391 pp.).

179 See Jensen (2003:136 pp & 268) for an overview.

180 Fabech’s and Ringtved’s perspective of a landscape that centres on rural as well as social geography can be illustrated by the following references: Fabech (1994A & 1999A); Ringtved (1999A & 1999B); Fabech & Ringtved (1995 & 2007).

181 For Hedegård by Henning see Madsen (1992:2; 1995:183; 1997:5).


183 Bulbrogaard is described in Jørgensen & al. (2004:50-65) and Fredshøj so far is only mentioned on the web, e.g. by the excavator Tom Christensen. http://www_roskildemuseum.dk/Arkaeologi-Bygherreraaproporter/Bygherreraapproporter%20ROM%202290.pdf. Last visited 2008-05-05.

184 Wall planks used in a well at Vorbasse have provided us with the wall height 2.2 metres, cf. Bonde (1991:261).

185 The development of Iron Age architecture on Zealand is in many ways different from that of Jutland and may conveniently be said to be less traditional and less formal. A comparison of the short end of just three houses suffices to show this cf. Boye 206 p. 109 houses 1 and 2 and the house on p. 57. In this way houses from Zealand are similar to the ones from Scania, cf Heimer & al (2006:46). Traits that will eventually stand out as innovations or change therefore occur earlier in the Eastern and peripheral parts of South Scandinavia. The even and sparse setting of the post pairs, common in LIA houses, is a case in point since occurs on LRIA Zealand, cf. Boye 2006 p. 171 and p. 148.

187 On the planning of Eketorp see Näsman (1976) and Herschend (1991b:159 pp.).

188 Although easy to see when understood and vice versa, it took the expert boat and house building craftsmanship of Jon Bojer Godal (1990) to point out the similarity between the room between the frames of a boat and the room between two trestles in a house and between fitting the frames into the hull and the trestles into the wall frame.
Jørgen Jensen (2003:261) illustrates the simplicity of the components in the roof-supporting PRIA constructions.

The distance between the ETA and the HT as indeed a precise measure can be compared to the primary measure in a boat, i.e. the length of the keel or the first strake, and the whole length from the entrance to the shortened as the total length of a boat (cf. Godal 1990:59, the measures ‘l’ (keel) and ‘L’ (total)). The fact that the trestles in between, ETA and HT, are not always possible to fix in ells of the primary measure indicates that measuring a room could be a matter of either measuring between the middle of the trestles or indeed between them as in a boat. That both kinds of measures are possible is again a parallel to boats where the middle of the boat is the middle measured in ells while additional rooms in a boat are measured as a space between the rafts. (cf. Godal 1990:62 p.). On the notion of ‘modules’ see e.g. Ethelberg (2003:180f.; Fig. 53).

The house also exists on Fyn, e.g. at Rynkeby. See Henriksen (2005:90).

In Denmark also the islands, e.g., Brønndsager, Fonnesbech-Sandberg (2004:fig. 5 p. 61); Scania e.g. Järrestad area B house 8 (Söderberg 2003). In Halland e.g. Trulstorp 1:8 (Carlie 1999:54 pp. & 134 fig 63) and a variation from Brogård (Carlie 1999:125 fig. 59 third from above). See also Streiffert’s overview (2004:Fig. 4, pp. 208-212 from House L and onwards). Note the specific construction of the short end in Halland indicating, e.g. in houses X, Y and A, that there is no room between the westernmost post pair and the two corner post. From Gotland, e.g. Vallhagar houses 11 (Biörnstad 1955) with the entrance from the short end characteristic of Gotlandic farms.


Cf. Herschend (1998a:fig 2) on the difference between South- and Middle-Scandinavian houses. There is a very instructive example from Halland, Skrea Backe showing both an expansion and a land use during RIA similar to what can be found all over South Scandinavia, however in its specific Halland variety when it comes to farm structure, i.e. main houses with a small byre, Wranning (2004:151 pp.).


The situation in Tjørring should remind one of a similar and contemporary one at Feddersen Wierde Haarnagel (1979:189 pp., houses 12 & especially house 35) and a similar solution in 4th century CE Wijster van Es (1967:57 pp. House XV).

  (1) They belong to large farms, i.e. large in terms of fenced and roofed area,
  (2) They consist of one room with a minimum of posts, i.e. the posts are visible and not totally of partially hidden in the walls.
  (3) They are singled out by their position of the farm, i.e. they are related to, but separated from the main house. Several houses with different functions may however adhere to such a position.
  (4) Their hearths are neither used for cooking, nor do they facilitate handicraft.
  (5) The artefacts found in the house are different from those found in the dwelling part of the main house.

See Haarnagel (1979:189 pp.) on Feddersen Wierde; Olesen & Rostholm (2004) on Tjørring and Sørensen (1994:29 pp.) on Gudme. At Gudme the large building House I is the main building. It is a very large house but nevertheless a traditional main building however with a separate entrance to the byre part of the building. The halls at Gudme are the six consecutive buildings just south of the main building. Similar to the situation at Uppåkra halls tend to be rebuilt and re-erected again and again.
For Gudme see Sørensen (1994:Fig.5 & 1995:Fig.2, the house to the north-west); for Nørre Snede see Hansen (1988). See Herschend (2001:48 pp.) with examples from Öland.


207 Such as Mørup, Borg i Lofoten (Herschend & Kaldal Mikkelsen 2003), Skäftsö (Fallgren 2006), Västra Skälby (Onsten 2008).


211 Here the interpretation in Siemen (2000) is favoured over the one in Stoumann (1996).

212 Siemen argues that these planned settlements start in the 6th century, e.g. Siemen (2000:131 pp.), but better dated houses from Hjemsted would seem to favour a date in the 5th century.

213 For this concept tomt är tegets moder—'toft is the mother of the selion' see Göransson

214 Palle Siemen (2000 e.g. 131 pp.).

215 Weijster, see van Es (1967); Vorbassee see Hansen & al. (1991).

216 On the VP farm at Valsgärde see Norr & Sundkvist (1995).

217 Siemen (2000 e.g. 27 p.).

218 For the concept ‘land’ see Herschend (1997a).

219 Fallgren (2006:Fig.58, compared to Fig. 59) shows that in the middle of the island, 45 to 65 kilometres from the southern tip, the settlement agglomerations are separated not because the remains have been destroyed by ploughing nor because of wetland or limestone areas. This indicates that it was the need for grassland that prevented an unbroken coverage of settlement in these parts of the island. The demographic pressure on the environment is demonstrated by the settlement of marginal areas and instable subsistence systems such as Möckelmossen on the Great Alvar cf. Enckell & al. (1979).

220 On the Eketorp ring fort see Näsman (1976); on the size of the Ölandic population see Edgren and Herschend (1982); on the Roman influence on the fortification (among other things the portcullis gate) see Edgren & Herschend (1979) and Herschend (1985).

221 The link to Rigsthula and the situation in Eketorp is discussed by Nordström & Herschend (2003:72 pp.).


224 On the Ribe market place, see Jensen (1991) and Feveile (2006:73 pp.). Summing up excavations and earlier interpretations Feveile demonstrates that the strict facade planning was something that was imposed upon the market place perhaps five years after it started. It was in other
words a way of controlling the place. In the series covering the first decades of the site: foundation, regulation and introduction of nominal coins, the Wodan/Monster sceattas, the latter two would seem to express the local ability to make a profit by controlling a market.

225 Beowulf as it happens is disciplined in comparison to the Danish king, hero and madman Heremod, see Beowulf vv. 710-1007.

226 For Boeslunde see Nielsen, H (1997).

227 See Hermansen & Nørlund (1938:753). The church is a Holy Cross church next to a holy cross spring—a popular pilgrimage church and spring.

228 Björhem & Magnusson Staaf (2006:247:Fig. 103).


On densely populated Öland, the scarcity of woodlands and thus also of timber during the LRIA and MP forced people to use limestone in most of their buildings and fences. In the long run, using stone as a building material becomes disadvantageous because stones, among other things, are difficult to recycle. In periods of dynamic expansion, this is hardly a problem, since during such periods there is by definition means for quarrying new ones, investing in new buildings and in rebuilding, in expansion, renewal and demolition\textsuperscript{231}. However, when the community behind such a settlement pattern is being reduced to its core activities and eventually forced to reshape itself completely, the effect is visible as well-preserved ruins, exactly because the costs for removing obsolete fences and buildings are too high. There is an abundance of blocks in old settlements and little to gain, e.g. in terms of arable land, from piling them somewhere else. Owing to the limestone, the Ölandic settlement landscape has become a model of instant stagnation without necessarily being more stagnating than other South Scandinavian areas where building materials were easier to recycle or demolish. The outstanding phenomenon on Öland, therefore, is the still visible and widespread results of RIA and MP dynamics caught in stagnation and loss of value, eventually resulting in abandoned farms. It is a society made visible as ruined fences with a total length stretching hundreds of miles, and remains of well above a 1000 ruined houses still there for the naked eye to see.

This notion of abandoned ruins strengthened Mårten Stenberger in his opinion that the Ölandic settlement remains were the result of something dramatic enough to be called a disaster or a catastrophic period, but several studies from the last thirty years have showed that the fast development of something catastrophic does not fit empirical observations. Today, the limestone settlement is considered here and there to be in use, albeit not expanded, well into the LM- or VP\textsuperscript{232}. This prolonged stagnation is matched by signs suggesting an early stagnation in the settlement pattern such as farms literally divided into two, creating a northern farm and a southern farm by means of a stone wall. Such a quasi-salomonian solution, dividing farms rather than creating new ones, is indeed a sign of stagnation\textsuperscript{233}.

During the last five decades, instead of a catastrophe a number of explanations have been forwarded in order to explain how this stoppage in the development of society was brought about. They point (1) to the more or less
permanent effects of climatic change, (2) to crop failure, famine and depopulation caused e.g. by the cooling effect of worldwide clouds of volcanic/meteoric dust or (3) to epidemic disease. All these factors, present in what may be termed ‘the cold-summer decade 536–545 CE’, have a considerable explanatory force. But there is more to stagnation: (1) it is a long-term phenomenon eventually broken and (2) the explanatory force of stagnation overrides temporary effects that would hardly have led to giving up far more than half the MP farms on Öland for good. The Ölandic population is large and not even the death of half the population will seriously depopulate the island for more than two or three generations. On the contrary, those who survived would have stayed on their farms and after the temporary collapse, new generations would again have filled the empty farms starting with the best ones. In principle, as pointed out by Malthus in his *Essay on the Principle of Population*, the size of a population will double in a generation if on average a couple by the time they turn 25 have produced four children, who in their turn will grow up and become 25 years of age. With a sufficient number of abandoned farms at their disposal, i.e. with access to sufficient means of subsistence, one or two generations will in other words restore population density as well as stagnation if the economic system is not reformed. In marginal societies, especially if they are already marked by stagnation, settlements may well have been permanently abandoned. The miniature example, the farm on Lurekalven in Southwestern Norway, is a model case.

In early modern times, Öland experienced a period of change that was in some respects similar, and in others dissimilar, to the one c. 500 CE. In order for us to benefit from this comparison, we can start by pointing to the situation in the late 1720s. After the plague 1710–11 and the wars of Charles the XII, more than one third of the population on the island had died. In these decades, the large number of deserted farms may thus be compared to the prehistoric ones, which disaster was thought to have emptied in less than two decades. In contrast to what happened in the MP, these deserted 18th century farms were resettled already within a couple of generations. The settlement structure was in other words refilled rather than reorganized and the crisis, a horrible suffering for the population, was but temporary despite reoccurring wars with Russia.

Already in the late 18th century and in the beginning of the 19th, Per Åhstrand as well as Abraham Ahlqvist described this situation on Öland and compared the census registers before and after plague and war. Moreover, from their descriptions we can infer that the land revision in 1682–83 was aimed at restoring the number of homesteads within the village system with an eye to improving rural economy, as well as a wish to make the agricultural system more effective, in order better to support a growing population. The ulterior purpose of the revision was to increase rents and taxes to the Crown. By 1683, the Crown had made itself the dominant landowner, holding c. 65% of the land (25 and 30% respectively in 1635 and 1642), but during the 18th century this basis for, or step towards a land reform came only to the occasional land
consolidation, probably because of the temporary depopulation in the beginning of the 18th century. Owing to plague, wars and marauding Russians, there was no need for any land reform, or any means to pay for it. However, already in the beginning of the 19th century (Malthus too noted the rapid growth of the population 1751–99238) such a want of reforms was pressing and this time, not least because lasting peace with Russia became a fact in 1809, reforms were indeed carried out. On Öland, this land reform, the consolidations termed Enskiflet and Laga skiflet, were brought to a close in the 1830s, resulting in new farms and an expansion of areas occupied by fields and meadows. This expansion, backed by an agricultural revolution, lasted almost a hundred years with a maximum of agricultural land recorded in the statistics for the year 1927. By far the better part of several hundreds of settlement-related Ölandic gold hoards from LRIA and MP were found during the ploughing, harrowing and thinning brought about by consolidations and reform. Nevertheless, it was impossible to eradicate more than half of the abandoned MP house remains.

During this century, 1830–1930, the settlement system also expanded. Population grew and benefited from the distributions of farms and from the intensification of the agricultural systems, but not without migration and noticeable checks on the population such as the famines of the 1870s. They were caused by draughts and became particularly disastrous on northern Öland, where the soils are sandy, and where growing grain for export had escalated while livestock plummeted. On Southern Öland, where soils are better, the economy continued to be more diversified including shipping and migration239.

If the economic development of the 19th century had been less dramatic, less surplus orientated and less dependant on manpower, the reformed system would have served the Ölanders better, developing the new agricultural system more slowly and perhaps creating a more stable balance between production and reproduction. Be this as is may, the first conclusion to be drawn is the one that says that (1) depopulation did not change the Ölandic settlement system, overpopulation within a specific system did. The second conclusion to be drawn indicated that (2) overpopulation and inability to change the rural system may well lead to temporary catastrophes such as famine, war and plague triggered by the social situation itself or extreme climatic situations such as draught. However, on Öland, catastrophes were encapsulated into a development that spread out over more than one century, when stagnation turned into temporary crisis before reform could eventually be instigated.

The character of the stagnation, therefore, is in part the result of a long-term inability within a larger region to handle the imbalance of an economic system. If the general mid-millennium stagnation in South Scandinavia was caused by a temporary catastrophe similar to crop failure, warfare or disease only, i.e. by temporary depopulation, we would have expected the stronger economic regions to soon regenerate and take up their old style of living and the weaker ones to have been depopulated. Instead, it would seem that the change, which marginalized some settlements, developed earlier in the more densely populated
South Scandinavian regions, thus indicating change to be portended by a period of stagnation rather than continuous regeneration.

The demographic pressure in mid millennium South Scandinavia stems from the RIA pattern of reproduction that included bringing up a number of sons that could be invested in external acquisition and beneficial warfare. When engaged in these activities, a number of young men would die before they had formed a family, their death thus keeping down population pressure. The system occurs also in the VA on a much larger scale. In prehistoric societies, warfare, as it were, is a demographic substitute for the kind of urbanism that cannot reproduce its population. During the 5th and the very beginning of the 6th century, external acquisition ceased to be beneficial much faster than any system of reproduction, which cannot rely on the needs of urban communities unable to reproduce themselves, can be expected to change. Since internal warfare probably continued to be politically necessary, there would have been no immediate reason to change a pattern of reproduction that favoured sons.

Owing to the demographic pressure resulting from this situation, and because towns were not an option, the economic mid millennium reform needed in South Scandinavia would have been one that favoured arable land over pasture, reducing the number of grassing animals while increasing plough land. Had it been possible to bring about a reform along these lines, society would have sustained more people in a peaceful and balanced economy. Such a far-reaching reform would have changed much, introducing a less meaty diet and more intensive workdays in the fields with more ploughing and more weeding, i.e. laborious tasks that those supposed to perform them, a large group of farmhands, are not likely to immediately embrace as virtues. But without the safety valve of external acquisition, which provides wealth and takes its toll in young men dying abroad, the demographic surplus must be disposed of internally. This can be done in several ways: (1) there are life quality solutions, such as the ones we practice today in Europe, where birthrates are low. (2) There are solutions consisting of reoccurring and perpetuated crises. (3) There are the ones based on a more efficient subsistence system that will be able to care for a larger population. All three may be combined, but the last one reforming the means of subsistence is undoubtedly the most attractive one in prehistoric times, despite its being problematic. The alternatives too have their drawbacks: (1) changing birthrates is a very long-term undertaking and (2) permanent crises are traumatic because they are difficult to handle and difficult to get rid of. In practice, (3) changing the subsistence system is nevertheless a demanding task and more often than not it will involve a period of crises or failure. The formal planning at Præstestien may be an example of a reform that aimed at exacting fees in kind from tenants, forcing them to put in more work time in their farming, but inasmuch as the village did not last, it is also an example of a failed reform. Be this as it may, eventually, when the reforms instigated in South Scandinavia were brought about, they did deprive farmers in peripheral areas of their livelihood, thus helping to create a more permanent
peripheral crisis. This happens in areas within the South Scandinavian settlements themselves as well as to marginal farms such as the Gene farm in Ångermanland or the deserted farms in Hälsingland241.

In the mid millennium when stagnation commenced, the settlement system was lifted into a state of crisis owing to the breakdown of external acquisition. This is not a synchronous phenomenon. On the contrary, it starts earlier in the West than in the East, where acquisition went on up and until 500 CE. The diachronic character of this change in external acquisition not doubt prolongs the aftermath of crisis and stagnation before reforms can be made242.

The general idea of the South Scandinavian LIA reform is the contraction of the widespread, still somewhat unstable, pattern of farms and villages to positions where fields can be made larger. This is not just a matter of soils and topography. It also involves the resettling of farms and a redefinition of land similar to the organization of Præstestien. In some places such as Vorbasse this is a small problem, because the village structure is already there, the areas needed available, and demolition and recycling relatively simple. The Vorbasse development therefore is more a reflection of the general problems of stagnation in a larger perspective and the short-term crises accompanying stagnation and reform. Here the settlement was formed early in agriculturally suitable surroundings and the ownership/power structure a simple one with a large dominant farm and a number of dependant ones. Rosendal on Öland, Fig. 35A&B, on the other hand is an example of a settlement that could not survive reforms because it was a late old-style colonization of marginal agricultural lands with small heavily fenced fields. Although the principle of the social structure, one large and a number of dependant farms, was the same as in Vorbasse, we may expect the whole settlement to have been dependant on the much larger Fagerum settlement. If the whole of South Scandinavia had already been organized along the village lines known from southern Jutland, problems would have been few, but vast areas such as Fyn, Zealand and Scania are organised in ways much more reminiscent of the Ölandic system, where it was necessary to move and concentrate farms in agriculturally more prolific situations. The problems of the organization of the settlements on the Danish isles are difficult to assess, because it is difficult to excavate sufficiently large prehistoric and modern densely populated areas. Nevertheless, it would seem that at Boeslunde and perhaps in the Brønnsager area already in the 5th century CE, settlements began to move into situations closer to the VA and MA settlements and to stay there to the end of LIA, preparing themselves for the VA and the revival of the external acquisition practiced in the LRIA and EMP243.

In the Kyrsta-Vaxmyra area in the Mälar Valley, the settlements contract to Kyrsta, while one of the original settlements, Vaxmyra, is abandoned for good. As indicated by the analysis in the previous chapter, this contraction of the settlement did not occur without a loss of farms. Contrary to the fast shifts in farm structure during the RIA, the mid millennium shift was slow and reluctant. The difference is that between change in a dynamic and a stagnating society
respectively. The latter is vulnerable to war, famine and disease, i.e. to short term plagues that will ease the immediate population pressure, make land available, call off reforms, encourage families to bring up more children, and thus bring back community on the track to crisis.

The outcome of the reforms, i.e. the LIA situation with formally defined estates settled by free farmers and tenants, does not belong to the focus of this study. Instead, the emphasis is on the mixture of progress and setback that society experiences before reform became the only way out of stagnation and mayhem.

One example of the deep roots of stagnation has already been mentioned: the obvious loss of grave finds except in settlements that we may expect to be the result of late expansions, such as the Rosendal village, which stands out as a satellite to the larger Fagerum settlement. Here, there were no ERIA graves among the excavated ones, only LRIA and MP graves. Otherwise, MP graves must by definition be extremely rare, since the need for graves, cemeteries or monuments lessened already in the LRIA. By then, settlement patterns were usually so aged that there was little obvious reason to demonstrate ownership and status, because the cemetery patterns reflecting the settlements had been established hundreds of years earlier, and stagnating societies do not have much to commemorate compared to their dynamic origin.

Only those wise in the event will of course see that the disappearing graves are a sign of stagnation. Those who lived in the stagnation would have favoured other explanations. Nevertheless, since the need for graves did not disappear, inasmuch as it was revived during the LIA and VA, we may conclude that it was a lack of sufficiently memorable events, characteristic of a stock society, that let to the stagnation of burial manifestations.

A similar lack of investments, this time in new settlements, can be seen in the development of the permanently settled and fortified MP Eketorp ring fort, Fig. 93A & B. To begin with, this settlement was a typical dynamic investment, planned and built out to harbour 25 odd households characterized by compact living and founded on what would turn out to be a somewhat shortsighted husbandry economy. When this investment had been accomplished, there was still a need to house more people and by compacting the layout and rebuilding houses it became possible to move in more and more people, when byres and outhouses were converted into dwellings, Fig. 93B. However, this development took place at the expense of the original plan of social engineering and housing, and it shows a lack of dynamic investment, e.g. investments in a new and larger ring fort or a new village based on large fields. In the Eketorp case, this stagnation, overpopulation or crowdedness, which was paired both with a need for investments and at the same time with an apparent lack of means, developed during the 6th and 7th centuries.
Disappearing graves is a somewhat earlier phenomenon, but that is no more than can be expected, because the settled ring forts are late additions to the
settlement landscape. It fits the larger picture, therefore, that no ring fort has a
cemetery next to it. Irrespective of the well above 2000 people that died in
Eketorp, the settlement was not entitled to have a cemetery. Lack of graves
therefore is an early warning. They are the first signs of overpopulation, the
settled ring fort a slightly later one, and the crowding development of these
forts a very final one.

In this perspective we must also fit in the solidus import to Öland in the
460s and 70s, because this import, e.g. this external acquisition, is based on
blackmail, tribute payments and wages; it depends on a supply of young and
armed men able to take part either in blackmailing the Romans or serving as
their soldiers. This export to the Late Roman world is an indication that birth
control was not yet a big issue in the 5th century. On the contrary, investment
in external acquisition, i.e. in pillage, stands out as the result of a way to exploit
a population surplus in an external enterprise that is prone to result in over-
regional confederations to enhance manpower. In the middle of the 5th
century, therefore, Öland is characterized by at least two kinds of investments
involving a population surplus: raids and ring forts—one based on external
acquisition, the other on the carrying capacity of the prevailing economic
system. Earlier on, a population surplus would more often have resulted in the
addition of new farms to the old ones rather than raids on the Continent or the
construction of densely populated ring forts.

Investments in ring fort are large collective undertakings, but investment in
men is primarily a matter of raising more than one boy in the family. The
former is based on a surplus invested immediately in a specific task, the latter,
given the grown up boys, is a smaller investment that could easily be shared by
many and pooled; bringing together men, gear, food and boats from a large
area. The different coins and their distribution on Öland, Gotland, Bornholm
and the Mälar Valley, i.e. the success distribution of the raids with a more or
less constant toll in terms of men losing their lives on the Continent, shows that
this was exactly the way investments in external acquisition came about.

Investments in raids and military service are risky, but their dividend is
tangible and the expeditions take weight off the subsistence system. Raids are
easy to understand. Investments in ring forts are much more complex, the
outcome is not obvious and their costs a burden on subsistence economy. This
interpretation is in line with the fact that major investments, e.g. in ring forts,
are uncommon on Northern Öland where Roman gold coins, contrary to other
forms of gold, are relatively speaking frequent. In those parts of the island
where we may expect early examples of overpopulation, owing to a weak
agricultural system and sandy soils, we thus also find the first indications of
stagnation and a population surplus, i.e. men taking part in the external
acquisition bringing home Roman solidi instead of building new farms, let
alone ring forts. In the rich and sparsely settled southern part of the island, this
kind of overpopulation is postponed by means of investments in ring forts and
thus in model societies based on husbandry. Here on the other hand, solidi are
relatively uncommon, because they do not represent much gold, while other forms of gold are relatively frequent, indicating that gold more often found its way into these economies in other ways. In between these extremes, the middle of the island would seem to benefit from a relatively strong local economy and access to a population surplus among their neighbours on the northern part of the island. In the middle of the island they are thus able to build ring forts and also to organize successful raids to the Continent, Fig. 94.

In the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century, raids come to a halt and ring forts start to

Fig. 94. Map of the solidus: bullion index on different parts of Öland and the distribution of ring forts with vertical limestone walls. Based on settlement reconstruction by Edgren and Herschend (1982) and Herschend (1991).
become crowded. Both phenomena are connected and they signify a loss of dynamics and a step into stagnation obviously accelerated by the fall of West Rome and Byzantine disinterest in paying tributes to Barbarians. As a pattern therefore, the settlement on Öland is a picture of a complex expansion and eventually a social structure that ceased to develop.

Loss of dynamics in the ordinary community does not *per se* mean crisis, and if it does, this may be because a crisis is the only way out of the economic problems. But it does spell stagnation and no doubt the distinction between ‘crisis’ and ‘the road to recovery’ is a fine one, as we gather from the present day recovery of the East European economies. East Germany stagnated during a period of heavy funding, while some of the countries in the Balkans are still in a deep crisis maintained by unemployment (technically speaking, that is overpopulation) and non-existent investments.

Compared to other South Scandinavian settlements that we have seen divided into phases and different cemetery patterns, Öland seems instead to comprise everything in one badly erased palimpsest, where time depth is easy to detect. The pattern, however, allows us to see the typical RIA order of the Ölandic settlement and its villages with dominant and dependant farms. Dominant farms have a relation to cemeteries in their vicinity, the other farms rather to cemeteries surrounding the village. Beyond these cemeteries in the open grassland, there are small solitary farmsteads with a specialised economy raising cattle and sheep. The base of the subsistence system, fields and fenced meadows, are closest to the dominant farms, and the base for the surplus production, the grassland, and the large fenced meadows are further out. This may not be much to point out or just a consequence of the organisation of the land closest to the farms, but it could nevertheless be inferred from one of its peculiar consequences.

As pointed out in the previous chapter, on some parts of Öland the settlement agglomerations are quite large and thus relatively close to each other. Still in between these agglomerations or large villages there are some areas very suitable for establishing a farm; notwithstanding these sites are unoccupied, Fig. 95. Given the compact structure of the existing settlements, cumbersome road systems and the odd example of a divided farm, Fig. 80A&B, this emptiness is astonishing, if we do not presuppose a regulation of the open grasslands preventing people to settle as best they wish. Not surprisingly therefore, the surplus economy mirrors a wish to order the landscape in its totality, allowing only the occasional solitary homesteads to settle far out in marginal grasslands or indeed in model societies, such as ring forts, which link in with surplus production rather than self subsistence.

The asymmetric structure and the regulated means for producing a surplus in the form of livestock and hides are the most typical patterns of the Ölandic society, and the goods produced as a spin-off from livestock breeding: wool, hides and probably leather, are similar in value to goods produced during the same period on Jutland, such as iron. In Jutland, iron production shows signs of
being adapted to a market production, but investments such as the Eketorp ring fort, with an economy specialised in livestock, are comparable to investments in specialised iron-producing settlements such as Snorup or Drengsted—they are undertaken to exploit assets originally used for subsistence only.⁵²⁴

These traits—dominant/dependants farms, and a landscape organisation structuring subsistence as well as surplus production—are the main characteristics of the social and economic landscape of the LRIA. Moreover, the surplus production is based on the exploitation of regional commodities, grassland being abundant on Öland and iron ore a Jutish commodity. Add to this, the relatively good communication over land in Jutland and by sea from Öland, and exploitation will stand out as beneficial compared to taking up new fields.

The overall reason for the development of the open or perhaps barren Ölandic landscape would seem to be a conscious or unconscious tendency to link-in with the Roman world economy and also benefit from letting out a population surplus into the Empire. Even if the economic links are not direct, they do exist, and even if emigration is not seen as a demographic safety valve, it acts as if it was, inasmuch as it was trigged by the combined forces of commerce and external acquisition, i.e. an enterprise that will lead to a certain waste of

Fig. 95. Map of two settlement areas in the Björnhovda region and the unsettled area separating them. In between these settlements, the topography is suitable for farms, but there is evidently something that prevents people from settling here, although they are prepared to settle at less attractive sites. IA settlement remains are black lines. MA villages are open squares and their infields are marked green. In between, there are areas of lime stone bedrock (Sw: Alvar) and wetlands (grey). Based on Fallgren (2006).
people. The reason we may draw this conclusion rests on the following: It is unreasonable to suggest that the vast number of livestock on Öland as well as the furnaces in Jutland were aimed at satisfying household needs only. Household production of iron and livestock were typical of most South Scandinavian regions and any two neighbouring regions engaged in occasional barter could fulfil their needs. Yet, estimations suggest that for every two inhabitants on Öland, one cow and two sheep could be slaughtered every year leaving twice as many grassing the land\textsuperscript{246}. If overpopulation is a problem in that kind of society, then problems will be solved simply by turning a meadow supporting two sheep and one cow into a field producing cereals. This however, is not easy to accomplish, because it requires a work input much larger than breeding two sheep and one cow. Although such an input would be rewarding, it does not stand out as an obvious prehistoric solution likely to be commemorated in Eddaic poetry.

The Ölandic economy c. 500 CE is in other words markedly askew, and only if we infer a link, and most probably an indirect one, with the Roman world economy can we give a rational explanation of the oddities of this subsistence economy and its surplus of men and livestock. If external acquisition and trade are jeopardised or blocked, a temporary decrease in the population will take place and the need for a reformation of the subsistence economy will make itself felt. Seen in the event, therefore, ring forts are costly risk investments in an already doomed economic system. They make up a contrast to the information obtained from pollen diagrams, which tell us that plants belonging to the edge of a wood become more frequent c. 600 CE. This change is the expected one and we must conclude that the expected is indeed a change in the use of the landscape brought about by reducing the number of grassing animals\textsuperscript{247}.

The Ölandic experience is a typical peripheral experience and in a way a most successful one because in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century it actually led to the acquisition of Roman solidi and Roman expertise. To the average Ölander, pillage must have stood out as the success of bravery, but also as the success of an economic system producing two strategic surpluses, animal products and young armed men.

The Siwan Example

The Qureishet-Zaitun settlement area belongs to the Siwa oasis in Sahara 300 kilometres south of Mersa Matrouh and the Mediterranean coast. In pre Roman and not least Hellenistic days, Siwa was a well-known oasis due to its Zeus Amun oracle, and although influenced by both Nile Valley and Greek Mediterranean societies, Siwa, or \textit{Ammonium} according to written sources, was a realm or a political unit in its own right. Owing to the absence of Roman fortifications or camps as well as remains of actual towns, as far as we know, this oasis was in effect situated outside the Roman Empire, but well inside its sphere of
influence. Eventually the Greco-Roman administration appoints a strategos who is responsible for the nome or administrative area that explicitly includes Siwa. It is nevertheless doubtful whether in praxis this step means that Siwa becomes part of the Roman Empire. Likewise, comparing Siwa to the neighbouring Dakhla oasis 350 km southeast of Siwa and 250 km west of the Nile Valley, the lack of significant Late Antique monuments as well as towns such as Amheida or villages such as Kellis, should convince us that Siwa stands out as marginal and the Qureishet-Zaitun settlements as marginal even in a Siwan perspective. The marginal character of Siwa in relation to the Roman Empire is also mirrored by the fact that Hadrian, the emperor who valued classical culture enough to travel his empire in pursuit of a memorable past, did not visit Siwa, despite the fact that the oracle would have matched his ambitions. Moreover, since Hadrian visited Dakhla where he patronized a temple, the detour to Siwa would have been all the more reasonable had the oasis been part of the Empire.

Marginality as it were is the reason for examining the Qureishet-Zaitun settlement, because it is meant to illustrate how a marginal production system structures itself, consciously or unconsciously, when it is brought in contact with, rather than included into a dynamic economic system such as the Roman.

The importance of the oases in relation to proper Roman-Egyptian areas in the Nile Valley and along the Mediterranean coast is their agricultural capacities. Judging from written and paleobotanic evidence in Dakhla, there would be economic interests among Roman citizens in the production of a wide range of crops as well as in landowning and thus also an administrative and educational interest in the oasis. In Siwa however, these economic, administrative and didactic interests typical of the Late Roman period cannot be proved. This situation, as well as the lack of ruins, may of course be explained by unknown source critical factors, but nevertheless more easily with reference to the independent Siwan society organised already in late dynastic Pharaonic and Hellenistic times when the fame of the oracle was worldwide. Fame and importance faded in Roman times and to the best of our knowledge, Siwa is indeed marginal.

Siwa is the largest in a series of oases stretching from the northwest to the southeast between Al Jaghbub in today’s Libya, and Sitra between Siwa and Baharyia. In its turn, this latter oasis, the so called ‘Small Oasis’, is situated c. 250 km west of its administrative centre, the town Oxyrhynchos, in its turn situated on the western edge of the Nile Valley. In Late Antiquity, when it comes to trade, we may venture to say that Oxyrhynchos was one of the towns where desert trade started and ended.

Herodotos describes the oases west of the Nile Valley as an archipelago in the deserts of Northern Africa and since then, likening an oasis to an island has become a worn-out metaphor. Nevertheless, initially to most of us when entering such a place from the desert for the first time, it is an appealing metaphor with an explanatory potential, the overseas insular being an obvious oasis life component. Owing to its position, Siwa is en route if we travel east-west from the Nile Valley, i.e. from the town of Oxyrhynchos, over Baharyia and
Siwa following the islands as far as Ghana in West Africa or vice versa. Nevertheless, Siwa is also an important point on the northwest-southeast bound route from Mediterranean coastal towns such as Cyrenaica and further on to the oases Farafra, Dahkla and Kharga continuing to the Upper Nile, Nubia and the Sudan, Fig. 96.

Fig. 96. Map of the Western Desert with relevant sites.

Going directly southward from Siwa was never an option until today’s Land Cruiser tourism because of the enormous dune area known as the Great Sand Sea, where there is no water and very little but sand, geology, fossils and the odd Stone Age dune site to be found for more than a thousand kilometres. Contacts with the Mediterranean coast north of Siwa was either to the northwest and the Cyrenaica, or to the north directly to coastal area around Sallum and Mersa Matrouh (perhaps passing the Gara oasis), or to the northeast, passing Gara and following the edge of the Qattara depression before turning north to Al-Alamein and Alexandria or continuing to Wadi Natroun northwest of Cairo, eventually ending in Muhandesin, where in historical times the slave market was situated.

In connection with the long distance east-west or north-south trade, the Siwa Oasis has two advantages: (1) its size and its position on along the route. Siwa is a large oasis with ample water supplies, able to produce a surplus of
food. It is situated c. 300 kilometres from Jalu in Libya as well as from the Mediterranean coastland and Baharia or Dahkla in Egypt. This means that from the last stop in a large oasis or well-supplied place there is a seven-odd-day travel by caravan to Siwa. Owing to the small oases in the Siwa archipelago, to wells and to water cisterns along the coast, there is no more than c. 150 kilometres between water supplies and Siwa. (2) This means than when your party, your animals and your slaves reach Siwa after the long and trying travels from the west or the south, you have also reached food and a place where you can feed yourself and your merchandise, i.e. slaves, selling some of it before the last laps to the large markets. Travelling in the other direction, Siwa is the place for buying food and selling some of your goods. If this is the position of the oasis in the long distance or caravan trade, there is also a short distance trade with the coastal area and Baharyia. In historical times, this trade is linked to the yearly cycle of the coastland and the nomads who spent the winter there and took a harvest of barley during spring. The rest of the year, owing to their being pastoralists, they settle a wider zone, including the Siwa area, allowing them to trade between the oasis and the coast. Before the middle of the 20th century, the nomads trading with the Siwans were the Awlad Ali—i.e. the Children of Ali. At present, nomadism is prohibited and Ali’s Children have become sedentary. The last trade, the one between Siwa, the production area, and the Nile Valley, the consumption area, was of little importance in historical times because the gardens of Baharyia could easily meet demands.

In Hellenistic times, when the Ammon oracle in Siwa was popular enough to attract Alexander the Great in his quest for securing his divine origin — as it happened, Ammon (i.e. Amun/Zeus) turned out to be his father — contacts with the Mediterranean coast can be expected to have been more lively than links to the Nile Valley, without the latter being unimportant. Although Alexander on his way to Siwa travelled the shortest way through the desert from the Mediterranean coast near Mersa Matrouh because he came from Alexandria, and although he went back over Baharyia, the connections in Hellenistic times with Cyrenaica were probably close. The whole idea of an oracle in a far-off oasis society is easier to develop in a Greek and Semitic cultural area such as Cyrenaica than in Egypt and the Nile Valley. In Hellenistic and Roman times, Siwa was known as Ammônia, a reference to the specific ram-shaped Amun, Jupiter Ammôn or perhaps Baal Hommon associated with the temple of the oracle. Despite the fading reputation of oracles, except among the odd Emperor raving over the classical era, Mediterranean and Egyptian contacts were important. In fact, historical sources together with the scarce archaeological evidence suggest that these links were more firm in Roman times, 30 CE and onwards, than earlier. Despite the Roman disinterest in oracles, there seems to have been an economic interest in the oasis. In sum, Siwa/Ammônia is an oasis realm in between Cyrenaica in the northwest and Egypt, Baharyia/Oxyrhynchos in the east. Although the small westernmost oasis Jaghbub is virtually unknown, exca-
vations have established the easternmost oasis, Bahrain, as indeed the eastern border of the Ammônia. Siwa is supposed to have suffered depopulation and isolation from the 6th to the 11th century CE, indicated among other things by a radical change in building style, that seems to show an escalating influences from the cultural sphere of the Berbers or any non-Roman influence when Roman influences died down. During this period, mud bricks, typical of Roman period architecture, were abandoned and so was the settlement structure: both examples of a development that Romans would have attributed to a Berber, i.e. barbarian, development. The vastly spread Roman-period settlements consisting of single farms and hamlets or villas were given up and replaced by nucleated and easily defended (قصر) qasr settlements, organized on and around small mountains that often contained earlier graves. In Classic Arabic, the root qasara or qasr means to force or coerce, which makes it likely that when used in Egyptian in the sense of fortified settlement, qasr is a loanword from Latin, castrum, meaning a fortified or at least inaccessible settlement. The diminutive castellum meant tower in 3rd century Egypt. From Arabic the word came back to Spanish e.g. as in the place name Alcassar.

In Siwi, the spoken-only language and Berber dialect systematically opposed by the Egyptian authorities, i.e. the mother tongue of everyone in Siwa and Gara, such settlements are known as a (شالي) shaly, i.e. ‘a home’ and the walls of these compact living quarters were built of (كرشيف) karsheef, rather than mud bricks. Karsheef is a clay or silt deposited in the salty waters of the oasis lakes and ponds. During the summer when the lakes dry out, this salty material can be collected in still humid areas close to the shores. When mixed with water and shards of limestone, it is easily packed and shaped into walls. If allowed to dry up and kept dry, karsheef walls will form a salty concrete-like material. In the compact nucleated settlements where houses tended to be increased with several floors, eventually towering eight stories high, this material has great advantages because one can vary the shape, breadth and supportive capacity of the wall according to one’s needs, and fit the walls to any irregular ground plan or any available space. Because karsheef walls are stout, interior walls tend to be cool in the summer and warm in the winter. Overall, the material is a suitable one. However, karsheef cannot withstand heavy rains and exterior walls are eroded, albeit slowly, by sunshine, strong winds and sand. Like most low-technology building elements, they depend on regular maintenance and today they are often considered too cumbersome, except by those engaged in NGOs and eco tourism, to which karsheef represents something genuinely Siwan.

The nucleated settlement pattern was not broken until the end of the 19th century when the Senusí brotherhood was able to establish relatively peaceful living conditions even in Siwa. Under their rule and protection of society and trade, people were able to move out of the nucleated settlements without risking their worldly belongings and lives. This process, moving out of the nucleated settlements, literally opening up the community, is still today an ongoing
although nearly completed process. Modern transportation, new drilling methods, sinking wells a 1000 metres deep, in addition to a peaceful and orderly society with an influx of settlers and workers from the Nile Valley, have caused communities as well as country houses in new and old gardens to crop up all over the oasis, raising production and the number of inhabitants. These factors, combined with an increase in tourism are radically changing lifestyle and society, threatening traditions and language as well as their documentation. In principle therefore, today’s settlement pattern resembles the one abandoned 1500 odd years ago with spread out settlements and a large number of springs, as well as tourists visiting the oracle site, ancient monuments and the centre of the oasis. Egyptian and in effect foreign landowners and their villas are part of this new pattern, but predictably, they have also created a small vogue renovating a shali house in order to spend their holyday in ‘The Old Town’.

Seen in a larger perspective, the main stages of the settlement development during the last 1500 years are the same as the ones e.g. on Öland. After the Mid-Millennium, nucleation of the prehistoric settlements were also in fashion on Öland, and they stayed so until the land reform in the 19th century, somewhat earlier and far less radical on Öland than in Siwa, but nevertheless. Even locally based industries, on Öland based on limestone, in Siwa on the tasty mineral water found the odd kilometre below the surface, would seem to become a phase in long-term economic exploitation. Siwa is somewhat lagging behind; its population is still growing, its agriculture not yet very mechanized and tourism just at its beginning, but on both these marginal and fertile islands, long distance trade, over-sea or over-desert, came to an end in the 20th century. Siwa has become a part of the Mersa Matrouh Region and Öland a part of the Kalmar County.

**Qureishet-Zaitun**

The settlement pattern in the eastern part of the oasis, Qureishet-Zaitun, a separate community in the greater Siwa Oasis, is an outskirt reflection of change and general development. Its topographical *raison d’être* is a ridge stretching east-west with the Zaitun Oasis Lake to the south and a low-laying wetland area to the north. The ridge can be said to act like a dam separating the water producing wetland with its artesian wells and the lake basin. If we manipulate a Landsat image to contrast sandy, and consequently relatively speaking more uplifted areas against all other qualities in terms of topography and vegetation it become obvious that this settlement pattern consists of a narrow broken ridge between the Zaitun Lake in the south and a wetland area bordering the dessert in the north, Fig. 97A. This picture is a mirror of the hydrographic situation where water will eventually find its way from the higher levels of the wetland into the shallow basin of the lake. There is a similar settlement pattern south of the lake, but here the remains are situated on a much narrower
ridge and covered in sand that blows in from the Great Sand Sea. The settlements are more distinctly shore bound, but contrary to the sites north of the lake, the southern shore would seem instead to have been a vast silt area, suitable for cultivation. Today, this area is still virtually uninhabited and the ancient monuments intact. Land reclamation, however, threatens these parts of the Late Antique settlements. With no place name tradition at hand, the example in Fig. 97B, ‘Express’, has been named after the expedient corporation that destroyed the site.

Fig. 97A. Landsat map of the Qureishet-Zaitun area singling out the ridge, the oasis lake and the wetland north of the ridge.

In Zaitun as elsewhere, there are two sides to water management: (1) supplying gardens and fields with water and (2) protecting them against too much water. The latter means getting rid of surplus water and in Zaitun that is a matter of seeing to it that surplus water runs into the lake, thus keeping the water table as low as needed to keep the land productive. Date palms in particular will not survive a high water table. Today, for two reasons the latter point (2) is the major problem.
Fig. 97b. Photo of a bulldozer constructed road crossing right through a small rock that once served the ancient settlement in the background as its cemetery.

(2:1) First of all, the amount of water reaching the surface has escalated owing to the large number of new and very productive high pressure springs, which take their water from the deep-laying reservoirs of fossil water some 1000 metres below the present day surface; a depth from which earlier on, practically no water was brought up by the artesian wells. Although a number of old and thus comparatively shallow springs have clogged up or been sealed and thus stopped pouring out water, the ample supplies from new springs would have caused the water table to rise, had not water been drained into the lake to evaporate. For this very reason—too much water running into the oasis lake—the water table in the central part of the oasis is actually rising and there the solution to this problem has been more drainage and pumps pouring and wasting fossil water into the desert south of the oasis. In this process, water is lost because it is not used for agriculture or gardening, let alone for washing out salts from fields and gardens.

(2:2) Second, a wish to make the wetland area north of the Zaitun ridge drier and more fertile than the natural balance between the lake and the wetland would allow, has compelled water engineers to construct dikes deep enough to lower the water table. The modern project, when it comes to water management, is in other words set both at lowering the water table north of the ridge and to pouring more water into the basin south of it. To fulfil this task, one has built dams along the shore of the lake and allowed the road from Siwa to Baharia to run on an embankment that cuts off the two easternmost natural
outlets from the wetland into the lake. Instead, surplus water is drained into deep canals designed to lead most of the water to reservoirs and a pump station just east of Abu Sherouf, where the water is collected before it is poured into the lake, Fig. 98. There is another station just west of Qureishet linked to the western part of the wetland that today is almost dry. This new wetland system has cut off and made redundant most of the old drainage systems, except for a few restored old canals, which can still be spotted on the satellite images owing to the moderate amounts of sediments they pour into the lake, Fig. 99.

![Fig. 98. Satellite image on which today’s main drainage system in the Zaitun area is marked.](image-url)

In this drainage pattern, we also see the difference between the modern and the earlier systems. Prior to the modern one, which has lowered the water table, there was a small fall or a slight difference in altitude between the wetland water level and the level of the lake, large enough none the less to transport water and sediments into lake. The wetland area therefore was kind of water reservoir. Today, the water table north of the ridge is lower than the oasis lake and water must consequently be pumped out into the lake. All water, and that is but very little, running from the ridge and out into the lake comes from wells on the ridge or at its southern edge.
Fig. 99. A close-up of the partly natural, partly excavated, partly fossilated outlets separating the settlement islands in the eastern part of the Zaitun area.

Studying drainage, we see four types of media: (1) The straight 20th century post-revolution (i.e. after 1952) canals dug out by excavators; (2) the topographically more sensitive modern canals from the 19th and 20th century, constructed by men with spades; (3) the remains of the natural streams which prehistoric times have broken through the ridge from the wetland falling out into the oasis lake; (4) the Late Antique and perhaps originally Hellenistic adjustments of these natural outlets. Now and then, all these activities overlap in the same zone of an outflow. Behind the modern picture, there is in other words one of a natural drainage by means of small brooks running from the slightly elevated wetland water level towards the somewhat lower level of the oasis lake, where a good deal of the water evaporated during the summer: drainage type (3). There was a balance between (a) the topographical depression, (b) the production of water in the artesian wells kept open by the Siwans, (c) the use of water in agriculture, and (d) evaporation. The long-term objective of this water management balance was to secure that the cultivated and productive land was sufficient and that the sedimentation of salt took place in the lake. This objective may be described as an unstable balance. However, comparing the
cadastrial maps from 1929–30 to the Quickbird images of today, the arable land 75 years ago amounted to no more than 1 or 2 square kilometres between Qureishet and Zaitun. Today there are well above 20 square kilometres around the ridge, not all of these however are under continuous cultivation.

Owing to drainage and road construction, the original Late Antique water management system has been fossilised in the eastern part of the area, and we can relate this system to what was once the natural outlets from the wetland. As seen in Fig. 99, traces of the water flow give a complicated picture and reveal that some of the lower parts of the landscape, today relatively dry parts, must earlier on have been wet or temporarily flooded areas.

No doubt the first canals were dug in connection to and in the natural outlets in order to make low-lying parts dry, and some slightly elevated parts fertile, by draining off water from the wetland north of the ridge. These canals therefore were carrying off water as well as supplying cultivations. When we look at the shorelines in connection with the outlets, it becomes obvious that there is more than one. These partly diminutive shore banks or high water marks indicate that earlier on, the water level was higher. The movements in the water, needed to create these features, probably stem from the strong south-westerly spring winds, the ( Winds). There are three shorelines: (1) the maximum, Fig. 100, red, would seem to be prior to the Late Antique settlement, because it was destroyed by some of the fields that belonged to this settlement. In most places, this shoreline is a very clear steep bank, over half a metre high, indicating that it was formed during a period when there was much more water in the oasis lake eating into the low ridge. This might mean that the embankment dates to a period more than 7000 years ago, when it was still raining in Siwa, and thus before the depression stood out as an oasis. The odd lithic waste suggests that man used the ridge as early as that. (2) The second highest level, Fig. 100, blue, is later than the settlement that destroyed the first shoreline, since this is the upper limit of a water flow that washed out some of the earthen walls protecting the fields that once destroyed the upper shoreline. (3) The third shoreline, Fig. 100, green, dates to modern times, i.e., the maximum before the rapid lowering of the water level in the eastern part of the lake, when the drainage was cut off by the road and directed to the outlet just east of Abu Sherouf, i.e. post the 1950s.

The second shoreline, the blue one, should be seen as a result of abandoning water management together with the settlement in the mid first millennium CE. When the farmers left, water continued for a while to pour out of the artesian springs without being used in agriculture. This would cause the water level rapidly to rise to a small maximum, and stay there for a while, before the springs would start to clog and dry up. When this happened, the water began slowly and continuously to withdraw until the phase indicated by the green shoreline, i.e. a new balance based on a few constantly productive well, was reached probably after the resettling of Abu Sherouf in the 1920s. Eventually the production of these wells was drained off by today’s arrangements, thus
creating the present landscape and an even lower water level at least in this part of the lake.

Fig. 100. Photo with interpretation showing the three shore lines in Zaitun, the red, the blue and the green.

Fig. 101. Satellite image of preserved fields and canals at Zaitun.
While most canals broke through the ridge, some did not, Fig. 101. Instead, these were dug into the ridge, probably until they reached an artesian well or the water table dammed up by the ridge, thus creating something similar to a well. From this point, the canal led water southwards into the lake. Today, nearly all these small canals are completely dried up and partly filled with sand. The primary purpose of such a canal was probably not to drain but rather to supply water, possibly in connection with growing olives and wheat.

When it comes to settlement remains, there are two distinct layers in the area, the upper one being the modern. The first of the modern settlements is the model Zaitun village created in the late 19th century by the Senusi brotherhood. This settlement is not a shali and it has only a few reminiscences of the earlier qasr-settlements. However, similar to the shali settlements that were built around mountains full of cave graves, Zaitun is also linked to ancient grave monuments and perhaps even small burial temples. However, these were free-standing and only the two or three easternmost and prominent ones of a whole series of grave buildings were incorporated into the settlement. It is obvious that the central and ideologically coloured part of the village is the southern one, containing graves and a mosque and the occasional three-storey building, while production-linked installations such as olive presses and the yard where the date harvest was dried and sorted were situated in the northern part of the village, facing its production area north of the ridge. It is clear that when the Senusies created their settlement, they still had a model in mind, which meant that their settlement was a nucleated one connected to the past, inasmuch as it incorporated significant ancient monuments, Fig. 102A&B. When the Zaitun settlement was closed down in the beginning of the 20th century after the First World War, which saw the end of Senusi influence, the Abu Sherouf settlement was created. This settlement also occupies an ancient site and it has survived and expanded to become the principal community in the area. Today, there is no outspoken centre in the village, but for various perhaps irrelevant reasons, the school and the water factory is relatively close to the most prominent ancient monuments. In turn, they are close to the ancient spring, which is close to the centre of the old settlement. In Abu Sherouf as well as in Qureishet where there is no modern settlement, excavations have revealed Late Antique olive presses.

Later in the 20th century, more settlements were created, solitary farms and hamlets as well as planned settlements with some 70 houses. Today these farms and households are abandoned except the easternmost, which is a settlement for Bedouins in the desert a few kilometres or so east of the Zaitun village and the Late Antique settlement area. In principle, these Bedouins have become something as odd as sedentary nomads and pastoralists. At present, a new land reclamation project settles people from the Nile Valley even further away at the eastern shore of the Zaitun Lake, where agriculture has been made possible by means of newly drilled wells. On the ridge, therefore, most of the settlements in the modern layer, except for Abu Sherouf, are in ruins, although one or two families may live in some of the otherwise abandoned
houses. Owing to the propensity for 19th and 20th century settlements to occupy ancient settlement sites, these settlements can indeed be seen as a layer and it is obvious that when they do not occupy an ancient settlement site it is because land reclamation based on deep wells has made other locations, more rational at least in the eye of the social engineers who planned the villages. To begin with, the modern occupation exploited more or less the same sites as the Late Antique communities.

Fig. 102A&B. (A) Photo of the Zaitun village from the West with graves in the foreground. (B) Photo from within the Zaitun village with the most prominent grave, which marks the entrance to the Zaitun settlement area from the East, incorporated into the historic settlement.
Excavations in Abu Sherouf and Qureishet, the two largest settlements in the ancient pattern, have shown that here occupation ended in Late Roman times around 400 CE. This roughly dated end phase is not contested by the surface finds that have resulted from extensive unauthorised excavation pits on most of the other sites. Although there may have been an aftermath somewhere in the Zaitun settlement area, we are still entitled to say that it stagnated and that it was eventually given up being a truly peripheral and sparsely settled area exposed to plundering and thus in need of peaceful conditions to thrive. The sites in the Late Antique pattern are more widely scattered than modern settlements, and the landscape can be said to consist of nine small settlement islands in a chain, Fig. 103 & 104. Only between Abu Sherouf and Qureishet does a large piece of arable land separate two islands from each other, separating the large Qureishet settlement from the rest.

*Fig. 103. Overview of the settlements, graves and cemeteries, and major springs in the Qureishet-Zaitun area. The conditions for site preservation around the modern Abu Sherouf settlement are bad compared to areas that has not been settled during the 20th century. Both the sites marked with ‘?’ have been destroyed by 20th century settlements and are indicated by the occasional potsherds only. Graves are marked in blue, the small dots indicates isolated mounds. The principal springs are marked with yellow dots.*
Guided by satellite images, field-walking the area have revealed a series of settlements, most of them facing Lake Zaitun, but when a settlement island was relatively speaking broad there was also room for the occasional settlements facing the inner wetland north of the ridge, Fig. 103, place name Hatiah. It is doubtful whether all settlement units in the area have been preserved. (1) First, the modern settlement on a low hill East of Abu Sherouf may have destroyed a settlement and/or a cemetery connected to Abu Sherouf. (2) Second, a settlement may perhaps have existed north of or below the historical Zaitun settlement, a site which in that case was destroyed by the cultivations or the 19th century village. However, even with these unclear points in mind, the general character of a densely settled topographical niche meets the eye.

The settlements vary considerably in size and character and they can be graded by their use of stone architecture, i.e. their investment in edifice and monument. In Abu Sherouf and Qureishet there are buildings with walls made completely of dressed limestone. They are considered to fulfil ritual or ceremonial functions perhaps as graves or temples or both. In Qureishet, where the preservation is the best, there are several stone buildings and they seem to have been both secular and sacred. They form the nucleus of the settlement. In nearly all settlements there are one or two relatively large houses with a high
stone foundation and some dressed white lime stones indicating that above the foundation, the walls were made of mud bricks, with some decorations such as lintels, door frames or corners in stone. These houses differ in layout and they often come in pairs or, if alone, they are situated next to a burial mound. It is reasonable therefore to see them as constituting the centre of a settlement by means of pairing off the sacred or the ceremonial with the secular. In settlements with a ceremonial as well as a secular central house, there are also building complexes with low stone foundations and several rooms. These buildings probably had two stores and a roof used as part of the dwelling. Settlements with only one large stone house lack these complex buildings and they have probably been surrounded by mud brick houses. In part, pebbles and probably some of the potsherds lying all over the sites are material that was once used to temper the mud bricks. In one or two small and low-lying settlements west of Qureishet, pebbles were the only settlement remains. The houses themselves had not survived the rising water level following the abandonment of the Late Antique settlements, nor had their bricks, but the pebbles once mixed with the mud before it was moulded into bricks, can still be seen on the ground, which otherwise consists solely of a sediment of brown clay or mud, Fig. 105A&B.

Such settlements were probably temporary abodes only, and they are of course impossible to see on the slightly more elevated and mixed grounds where settlements are normally situated. Still, the settlement west of Qureishet can be considered to be a solitary household, albeit perhaps a temporary one, engaged in production.

Based primarily on the buildings, therefore, we can make the following graded series of settlements from the simplest, most temporary and less significant, to the most central and permanent ones, Fig. 103: (1) mud brick houses only, perhaps with a stone sill (e.g. Qureishet West; Zaitun 3); (2) one house with stone foundation next to a burial mound (e.g. Hatiah); (3) two houses with stone foundation and the occasional outhouse (e.g. Ghaitaminz 3); (4) two houses with a stone foundation and a complex building (e.g. Zaitun 1); (5) two or more stone houses and several complex buildings (e.g. Abu Sherouf; Qureishet 1). This way of grading the houses is in tune with the way status in housing sorts itself in 3rd century Oxyrhynchus, the nearest Nile Valley town and the centre administering the Baharyia oasis. Type 5 settlements are uncommon, difficult to destroy and easy to find, while settlements with nothing but type 1 houses are almost impossible to detect, although they were probably very common.
Fig. 105A&B. (A) Photo of the pebble site, Qureishet West. (B) View from the East and the dried-out lake towards Qureishet West with the rock cemetery behind the settlement.
Graves and cemeteries are used in three ways in the area: (1) as the counterpart of a dominant house (e.g. Haitah), (2) as a cemetery related to a settlement (e.g. Ghaitaminz 2) and (3) as a way of creating a border zone or sign for the whole of the settled area (e.g. Qureishet West or Zaitun 19th c. village). Because communications through the larger settlement area follow the ridge, a number of the cemeteries can also be said to have been track bound, although no tracks or roads are preserved. The purest examples of the third kind of cemeteries was originally somewhat separated from the settlements in the east and the west, thus demarcating the whole ridge settlement stretching c. 15 kilometres between Qureishit and Zaitun. The one in the west consisted of a large rock with graves; the ones in the east were made up either by a number of small mounds (Zaitun 3) or by the Zaitun-village cemetery with the more prominent grave buildings. Both cemeteries were situated several hundreds of metres from a large settlement. In the end, however, two of the three border-defining cemeteries, Qureishet West and Zaitun 3 (and perhaps also 19th century Zaitun) have attracted a small settlement of only a couple of houses. Closer to the more central settlements, there were other cemeteries (related to type 2 settlements) situated between the settlements and the wetland. The only settlement that lacks a cemetery pattern is Abu Sherouf and here we must expect the modern settlements to have destroyed most of our possibilities to observe any trace of burial mounds without the help of excavations. The point in using graves and cemeteries in this way is of course to create an orderly human landscape, in which dwelling and grave balance, mirror and support each other on all levels in the landscape: (1) house and grave/temple; (2) farm/villa and cemetery; (3) settlement area and border cemeteries.

Modern activities have destroyed most of the Late Antique gardens and fields, but in Zaitun, thanks to modern drainage and the asphalt road that cut off the water flow, we can still figure out the structure of the agricultural system and combine this with some of the excavation results in Abu Sherouf and Qureishet. These characteristics should be related to six different crops. Referring to the 4th century account book from Kellis in the Dakhla oasis, it is fair to suggest that also the Late Antique Siwans produced the following within their subsistence economy: wheat (field), barley (field), straw (field), fodder (field), olives (garden), dates (garden) and grapes (garden)\textsuperscript{258}. Among these, olives grown for more than household purposes are attested by the olive presses found in both Qureishit and Abu Sherouf. The main divide between the listed products is that between garden and field products. Field products are mainly related to self-subsistence, while the garden products can also be grown to become a surplus. Although fodder could also be produced in the garden, e.g. in the basin around an olive tree, the Kellis account book indicates that it was indeed mostly a field crop.

There is work to do on a farm in order to process the harvest and in both Abu Sherouf and Qureishet a number of olive presses have been found next to or as a part of the farm centre. In the Zaitun settlement, we see the remains of a
small building with several small rooms and apartments to the west of the main building and this is probably a house for processing the harvest. Moreover, we find a large yard in the centre of this settlement facing the garden system. It would seem to have been a date yard for drying and sorting the harvest. The gardens are difficult to observe on the ground, but aided by a satellite image they can be seen and understood as an area of small squares divided by small earthen walls creating the small basins c. 4 by 4 metres that could hold an olive tree, as well as now and then pomegranates or figs. Grapes could also be fit into this overall pattern. When it comes to the canal system in these gardens, there is not much to see, except the slightly larger canal that brought water to the low-lying fields, as well as surplus water into the drainage system and eventually into the lake. However, there is also at least one depression in the system which may have held a well or a spring. Whether dates or olives or both were grown in the gardens is difficult to say, but because of the yard, dates would seem plausible. Given that there is a good water supply in Zaitun, olives, which need regular watering, were probably also grown here, (زابتون) Zaitun meaning ‘olive’ in Arabic. The place name, however, is modern and probably it was considered suitable, because olives will grow here at several places without maintenance.

Growing field crops in Zaitun is a matter of being able to soak the fields. Wheat e.g. would traditionally be grown as spring wheat during c. 100 days between March and the middle of June\textsuperscript{259}. In the case of spring wheat, the field, which needs between 60 and 100 mm of water, would be soaked some five times from just a day or so before sowing, up until two or three weeks before the harvest. In a similar way, it would be possible to grow barley and fodder. As expected, the Kellis account book, which is based on the agricultural year, shows that in the Dakhla oasis and thus probably also in Zaitun grain was produced to be collected from the tenants in early summer.

It is still possible to make out some of the fields rather than garden plots operated in Zaitun during Late Antiquity, because they were watered by the canals which also led water into the lake, Fig. 106A&B. All fields were situated low in the landscape next to the oasis lake. They were enclosed by small earthen embankments allowing the fields to be watered from the canal. The waterfront position of the farmhouses is as typical as that of the fields, because the prominent farmhouses use the brink created by the highest shore level to gain a relatively uplifted breezy position by the lake. This would no doubt have been used for communication at least during the winter. One of the small islands in the lake may actually have been inhabited. The orientation towards the lake characterises most of the settlement in Zaitun and together, the farms must have made up a pleasant waterfront, Fig. 107. It is between this front and the lake that we find the fields, and the structure of the settlement is in other words one that underscores and forms a link between subsistence and the household.
Fig. 106A. Interpretated satellite map of the Zaitun villa. The use of the high resolution satellite image is a simple case of the value of the aerial view allowing us to overview and zoom in on the same virtual tour above the world. In O. G. S. Crawford’s terms, the Zaitun site is a shadow site as opposed to soil sites and crop sites, because the pattern reveals itself in the oblique morning or evening light. The interpretation is brought about when the satellite view is combined with field walking or again in Crawford’s terms, when the cat’s view of the carpet pattern it matched by man’s (cf. Hauser 2007:123 ff.).

Fig. 106B. Uninterpreted satellite map of the Zaitun villa.
Fig. 107. Photo of the Zaitun villa from the seaside.

Fig. 108. Fields next to the dried-out Canal H.
In Zaitun, the fields were watered from two canals, the most important one transected the ridge and the other ran up at the ridge itself. Today, this second canal is filled with sand, Fig. 108, and 101, but the first canal is still more or less open and it has been used in modern times although not to water the slightly higher ancient fields east of it. In all probability, the modern fields to the west of the canal concur with ancient ones. Today, the new drainage system has deprived the canal of most of its water.

The Zaitun settlement is organized as a main settlement with three dependant satellites—two to the southeast and one to the north of the dominant one. The satellite to the north and its grave, face the wetland area. It consists of a house with a stone foundation next to a burial mound and the place was also settled in modern times. It is hard therefore, to differentiate between Late Antique and 19th or 20th century remains of gardens, karsheef and mud brick buildings. Geographically speaking, the dominant farm is situated at the western border of the settlement island between the canals, above the fields and along the shore at the centre of subsistence economy. The satellite settlements to the east are connected to canals as well as to graves, the eastern one representing the easternmost border point of the Qureishet-Zaitun settlement. The largest cemetery of the whole settlement is the one upon which 19th century Zaitun was built, but this modern settlement covers only the eastern part of the cemetery. The rest consists of a series of small squared mausoleums stretching westwards from the modern settlement. The eastern part, however, contained the most monumental graves signifying the beginning of the Zaitun settlement for those who came from the east and the south, i.e., from Baharyia and the Nile Valley.

Zaitun, Fig. 108, is reminiscent of a village, spread-out along the shores of a lake, with a number of dependant farms and a centre expanding its domains to the east and the southeast by means of cemeteries. The settlement is small compared to Abu Sherouf and Qureishit but its structure, visible thanks to limited modern settlement activities, seems to be typical of the area: A strong farm centre taking care of production and self-subsistence, and satellites probably engaged in surplus production. The satellites would seem to be the result of an expansion from the main farm with its more optimal position in relation to subsistence and surplus production.

As pointed out, finds of several olive presses in Abu Sherouf and Qureishit have proved the production of olive oil and the discovery in the latter settlement of hoard of well above 250 Romano-Egyptian Imperial coins (tetradrachmae) dated between Augustus and Commodus, BCE 27 to 192 CE, testifies to a certain long-term economic success. This hoard is not dated by its youngest coin, rather this coin reflects the time when currency was debased also in Egypt. Concerning the composition of the hoard, it would seem unlikely that a fortune composed by coins minted over a 200-year period, more or less reflecting the coinage frequencies of the period, was put together during a short period in the 2nd century CE. Instead, the Qureishit hoard stands out as a profit that may...
have been accumulated both before and after 192 CE. Together with the coins, Roman commodities such as glass are indirect proof of the successful export of the Siwan products. Direct proof of products that reached the Nile Valley market is attested from Oxyrhynchus, where a 3rd or 4th century CE letter informs us of expensive olive oils: ‘Ammoniac oil’, i.e. oil from Siwa, costs 220 drachmas while oil ‘from the Oasis’, i.e. Baharia oil, costs 200. This difference in price is a measure of the quality of the Siwan olive oil in relation to the oil from Baharia. Transportation costs are part of the price, but these costs alone cannot explain the price one pays for the Siwan oil despite the distance from Zaitun to Baharia being c. 300 km, the equivalent of a 7–10-day caravan transport through the desert. We can draw this conclusion because of the relations between the figures given in Deocletian’s Price Edict from 301 CE. In these lists, we are told that 0.5 litre of the best oil costs 40 denarii (the normal quality is 24 d.), but we are also told that its costs 5 denarii to move a camel load, i.e. c. 200 kilo, 1.5 kilometre. Therefore, transporting 200 litres of oil c. 300 km will cost c. 1000 denarii. If the quality of the two kinds of oil were the same, and good in order to at all merit transportation, the value of the oil will equal 40x400 = 16000 d., and transportation costs thus c. 6 % (1000/160 = 6.25). Since Siwan olive oil fetches a 10 percent higher price. Thus the value of its quality over the oil from Baharia exceeds transportation costs.

In Zaitun, where only stray surface finds can be recorded, glass sherds are the only unambiguous signs of economic contacts with Roman economy.

---

Fig. 109. Overview map of the eastern part of Zaitun. Settlements are marked red and graves and cemeteries blue.
Öland and Siwa

Despite the over-obvious differences, there is a general correspondence between the settlement pattern on Öland and the one in Siwa. The abandoned settlements at Fagerrum-Rosendal and the ones in Zaitun are cases in point. They are both marginal economies that could not survive the economic decline and the social change in the 5th or 6th century. The correspondence reflects a similar socio-economic organisation of land and an expanded and stagnated settlement belonging to the middle of the first millennium CE. In terms of dominant and dependant farms, some settlement units are large and dominant, while others are small and thus in some way dependant ones. There is a tendency that no settlement unit, whether it is a village- or villa-like agglomeration is larger than the carrying capacity of its surroundings. The small solitary homesteads are nevertheless very small and thus strongly dependant of other settlements and their economy probably lob-sided. They are in other words part of the whole unit and its carrying capacity.

When it comes to the relation between cemeteries and settlement, we find the same categories in both areas: border zone cemeteries perhaps with a road or track affinity and cemeteries reflecting the farms. In Zaitun, the scheme is stricter than on Öland, because nearly all farms in Zaitun have some kind of sacred monument next to its main house. On Öland, this linkage is related to the dominant farm only. In central Zaitun, the link to a temple rather than a grave can nevertheless be said more closely to reflect the South Scandinavian situation, in which the halls and their ritual and ceremonial functions relate directly to the major farms. In both cases, the secular centres need to be reflected in the ceremonial monument and by virtue of this reflection, the centre becomes both economic and ideological.

When we look at the spatial organisation of the farmland, we also find some similarities, e.g. concerning the distribution of areas primarily related to subsistence and surplus production respectively. Dates and olives belong to the garden area stretching further away from the settlements centre in a fashion similar to grassland being situated beyond the fenced fields on Öland. Nevertheless, the situation of the grassland far from the centre of the farm does not apply to peripheral settlements with a more one-sided economy. On the contrary, they are located in the middle of the grasslands with no fields attached to them. Correspondingly, the easternmost settlement in Zaitun seems to have lacked fields.

These similarities between two so widely separated and different settlements are by no means intentional or based on mutual insights among Ölanders and Siwans; instead, they must be understood as similar adaptations to similar economic and ideological conditions. We are used to such grand scale similarities when it comes to different modes of subsistence such as hunter-gatherers or farmers, but not to specific similarities when it comes to local or regional spatial organisation. It is nevertheless reasonable, and indeed simple, to understand the
situation as the result of a mode of production triggered by a world economy with a central sphere that requires all kinds of different goods. The existence in Siwa and Öland of similar rural centres matches the fact that the mode of production in these two peripheries is rooted in self-subsistence. Without departing from the basic subsistence character of the production, some parts of it are nevertheless enhanced to form a surplus that is not locally needed. The Ölandic farms produce more hides, wool and leather than necessary and in Zaitun, gardening produces a surplus of olive, wine and dates. Similarly, in Jutland more time is invested in iron production on predominantly rural estates than needed. These commodities can hardly be sold in the local community where almost everybody produces such goods. Selling one’s surplus is thus not always a simple undertaking, despite the existence of a distant market and a system of transportation. As a surplus producer, one can in other words be forced to store one’s products for a considerable period of time before any opportunity occurs to transport the goods to a market and sell or exchange them for whatever commodities needed. Small landowners are hardly able to invest in such storage and never in quantities large enough to bear the costs of transportation. The raison d’être of the system is in other words the large landowners who can feed a number of farmhands engaged in surplus production without risking the self-subsistence of his farm. With that kind of economic strength, the farmer can eventually organize the transportation to a market place. Naturally, he can invite dependant landholders to join.

It stands to reason that buying up goods, taking goods into commission and forming a company for transportation, safe journey and sale is a natural way for landowners to organize their enterprise. The mutual point in the organisation of the Ölandic and Siwan landscape is in other words the settlement pattern, which indicates that the large landowners situated themselves in the middle of their resource area. This is a system in which the large farm benefits, because landownership is still centred on the large farms themselves. In a similar, but more developed system, we would expect a manorial economy where the landowner had tenants who cultivated his often widely separated holdings from which he collected a surplus. That is what the Kellis Account Book is all about, and we cannot relate the rents in that book to any large local farm, only to a landholder who probably lived in Hibis, i.e. present day Kharga. In Zaitun, the system may have been the same, but in that case, the settlement structure betrays the original system in which the optimal farm site was also the centre of the settlement. To a certain degree, a manorial economy could have developed on Öland as well as in Siwa, but the point is that the old structure—gathering a surplus from the surroundings of a large farm rather than collecting revenue from a network of farms—can still be seen. The pattern therefore shows us that in Siwa as well as on Öland we are on our way from self-subsistence to surplus production because of the possibility to transform goods produced within self-subsistence to a surplus. The historical situation is the same in both peripheries: Non-benefit self-subsistence finds itself in a situation where a profit can now
and then be made by enhancing a specific part of the subsistence production such as olive oil, dates, hides or wool. The success of this approach to surplus production strengthens the larger landowners in Siwa as well as on Öland, where landowners invest in their farms as centres collecting goods and radiating power.

The comparison between Öland and Siwa indicates the enormous impact of the Roman economy also on the most peripheral and traditional of societies. In part, this economy structures not only the economic, but also the social landscape. Yet it is obvious that if we could look into these communities in any detail, the Siwan society would differ very much from the Ölandic and vice versa. Had this not been the case, Classical authors to their utmost astonishment would have noticed more precise similarities between the peripheries and not just pinned their faith on topoi. Economy is instrumental when it comes to pointing out the direction of development. For that reason, the periphery stagnates or meets with a crisis that must eventually find an economic as well as a social solution when the Roman economy collapses. The Zaitun-Qureishet settlement being the more peripheral, vulnerable and Rome-dependant economy, simply disappeared for almost 1500 years and some of the even more peripheral sites, e.g. in the oases el-Araq and el-Bahrein 100 and 150 kilometres east of central Siwa, are still uninhabited.

In the middle of the first millennium CE, both the Ölandic and the Siwan landscapes are stock. They have stopped developing along the lines they used to, and that is not a result of a dynamic situation, but the result of a stagnating one. They are in want of structural reform and there are peripheral settlements such as Zaitun and Rosendal that cannot survive reforms. The comparison has showed that this situation can be explained by the collapse of the Roman world economy. This is not the collapse of the core of the Roman economy because that is not something that breaks down completely, inasmuch as the Mediterranean economy does not disappear; instead, the collapse of the peripheral networks, facilitating productions and communications brings down the peripheries. The similarities between the situation in Siwa and on Öland show that a number of the worldwide effects of the Roman economy of the first five centuries CE, which helped to establish these similar situations, cannot not survive the middle of the millennium. No system can bring what is surplus from a subsistence economy in Siwa and on Öland into a chain of trade that allows such products to become valued commodities, rather than surplus to requirements. Although climatic change cannot explain the situation in Zaitun where there is an abundance of sweet water from the wells, temporary phenomena such as plundering, rather than famine or an atmosphere infested with volcanic dust, could easily have played an important part in abandoning the settlements.

What we see in both Siwa and South Scandinavia is economic loss and stagnation. This situation probably has many causes and effects, and some are linked to the opportunity for large landowners to amass, store and exchange commodities for prestige goods. With the loss of these prospects, we may expect
large landowners in Siwa as well as on Öland to be among the first to feel the immediate loss both economically and in terms of prestige. To begin with, they do not lose their landed property since there are but few incentives to own more land.

The comparison between Siwa and Öland suffices to show that the impact of the Roman World is far-reaching and to a certain degree also setting the scene favouring one kind of socio-economic organisation over another in widely different and separated societies. Because of simple practices when it comes to rural production and exchange, the rise of the Imperial Roman world triggered dynamic change, its decline, fall and stagnation. Irrespective of their differences, societies such as the Siwan or the Ölandic had to cope with the functions and dysfunctions of this economy. In South Scandinavia, an essential part of coping with the situation meant warfare, which again indicates a social dysfunction that we believe to be the traumatic backdrop of social change. Warfare nevertheless is also part of the dynamics of the South Scandinavian society during the first part of the 1st millennium CE.

NOTES

231 Not surprisingly, excavations of Ölandic farmyards, although uncommon, reveal a number of posthole patterns belonging to totally demolished stone wall houses (cf. Edgren & al. 1976:24 pp; Fig.11&13), Beskow Sjöberg (1977:28 pp.) or Hagberg (1976).


233 See Herschend (2001:49 pp.).

234 Climate change as an explanation was favoured as a principle explanation over catastrophe by Almgren (1955) and Nylén (1962). Today, based on Gräslund (2008) we can summarize the empirical situation, a mixture of climate crisis and social change, as follows: Short-term climate change 536-545 CE can be observed: (1) in the global spread 536 CE of SO4 in the stratosphere, cf. Traufetter & al. (2004); Larsen & al. (2007). (2) In the almost complete and global lack of tree ring growth in the years 536, 538, 539, 540, 541 and 545 CE, cf. Scuderi (1990); Briffa et al. (1990 & 1992); Baillie (1994 & 1999); Eronen et al. (1999); Hughes et al. (2001); d’Arrigo et al. (2001A & 2001b); Gunn (2000); Larsen et al. (2008). Written sources, cf. Arjava (2007), allow us to conclude that this short-term change started with a three year period when there was virtually no summer—the empirical base for the Norse concept fimbulvetr—‘the mighty winter’ cf. Gräslund (2008). In northern Europe ‘the cold-summer decade’ 536-545 CE is at the beginning of a period lasting several generations during which the landscape becomes more forested owing to the lack of human exploitation, cf. Welinder (1974:253pp.); Andersen & Berglund (1994); Berglund (2003). This period of stagnation is thought to be the result, at least in part, of a decreasing population. The decrease would seem to have been triggered by the cold-summer decade. In addition to this short-term demographic impact with long-term consequences, we must also expect a 200-year period of recurring bubonic plague starting c. 540 CE and named after the Byzantine emperor Justinian, cf. Strothers (1999); Keys (1999:18).

Among archaeologists especially Gräslund (2008) and Axboe (1999; 2001) have pointed to these factors and argued that the cold-summer decade is in itself sufficient to explain the general character of social change during VP or LMP. For a long time, however, there has been no need to argue either for a catastrophe or a change in human life, cf. Herschend (1980:44).
Writing after the French Revolution, and in the beginning of the 19th century in the English tradition of ‘principles’, that started with Newton’s *Principia* and included not least a number of principles of political economy (David Ricardo 1817, George Poulett Scrope 1833; John Stewart Mill 1848), Malthus as well as Lyell, i.e. ‘Principles of Geology’, re-edited their principles a number of times. Today, several of these editions are faithfully digitalised by Google providing direct links to famous quotations such as the one in question, i.e. Malthus second proposition: 2. *Population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, unless prevented by some very powerful and obvious checks.* This quotation can be found on page 23 in the sixth edition of the essay Malthus (1826:23), and that by the way is the one Charles Darwin read.

See Kvamme (1988) or above Note 129.

See Petter Åhstrand (1768) and Abraham Ahlqvist (1822-27). On the character of the Ölandic village and of the land revision 1682-83 and its effect on the layout of the Ölandic villages, see Göransson (1958; 1971:6 pp.). On the general development of the rural landscape, see articles in Forslund (2001). Ahlquist (1822-27) quotes the land registers of 1635 and 1642 as well as the revision 1682-83, i.e. *Landt-Rewisions-Commissionens Jordransakningar.* This allows us to conclude that in 1635 c. 20 % of the land was not settled or used in an optimal way within the existing system. By 1642 most of this land had become the outfields of the free peasants, while at the same time the number of homesteads, irrespective of type of owner, had grown by 10%. This means that the system used 20% of the lands to support but 10% of its population. That in itself is a reason to reform the land use. Eventually when the change in ownership without a growth of homesteads making the Crown the dominant owner came into effect by 1683, the scene was set for reforms in the 18th century instigated by the dominant landowner. Instead, plague and a new war delayed reforms in as much as they made them temporarily redundant.

Malthus (1826:291-92) quotes numbers he received from the economist Prof Nicander when visiting Sweden.

On migration and the more diversified economy on southern Öland, see Herschend (1991A:42 pp.) and Högfors Hong (1986:84 pp.).

Judging from 11th century VA runestones in Södermanland, 25 percent of those commemorated on the stones died abroad sword in hand. Since their crew often died with them we can expect a large number of men from social strata that could not afford a runestone also to have died abroad, cf. Herschend (1994A:78 p.).


The solidi found on Öland are typical examples of a relative small number of external acquisitions, cf. Herschend (1980:160 pp.). Fischer & al (2009) have analysed all coins found in Scandinavia and developed better chronological tools and die identity analyses, thus being able to refine earlier interpretations linking the import and the coinage more precisely to Roman and Byzantine history.


See Fischer & al. (2009).

On iron production, see Rasmussen & al. (2006).

Edgren & Herschend (1982:19) have the numbers. On average, each of 763 farm and 1526 households with 8 to 11.6 family members each had 1 horse, 12.6 cows, 4 calves, 29.7 sheep, 3.3 goats and 4.0 pigs (in the article ‘2.5 pigs’ is a miscalculation). The total on the island being between 6100 and 8900 inhabitants, 800 horses; 12,600 cattle; 22,700 sheep; 2,500 goats and 3,900 pigs.

On the impact on the landscape, see Königsson (1968) and Berglund (1966).

On *strategos*, *nome* and outskirt situation see Bagnall (2004:271 pp.). Before Alexander, in the 4th century BCE, the Ammonaic monarch invested in a temple in the Bahrein oasis east of Siwa.
and an inscription that served as a signpost to the Siwa oasis, (cf. Gallo 2006:16 pp.) and although we know very little about the antiquities of the oasis Al Jaghbub to the west of Siwa is seem plausible that the graves at Ain Melfa (Wright 1997:33 pp.) are the indication of settlement fulfilling a similar Siwan checkpoint function. Strabo says that in his day and age Egypt stretches as far in to Lybia as the oases and later on he tells us that there are three Egyptian oases west of the Nile. By three he must mean Kharga, Dakhla and Bahariya (cf. Strabo book 8 chp 1:5 & chp 17:42) He also describes the large oases Augila, today’s Jalu c. 400 km west of Siwa, and Ammon/Siwa as regions south of the territory of Cyrene, with tribes living in between these region (Strabo 17 chp 1 sec 6). Ammonium therefore is a realm in its own right and not formally part of another realm or territory. Needless to say its political and economic dependency is a matter of negotiation.

Generally on the Western oases, not least on Siwa, information can be found in Willeitner (2003:114 pp.) which is a well-annotated up-to-date description. For general descriptions of Siwa and its antiquities one can refer to Ahmed Fakhry (1944 & 1973) and Aldumairy (2005); for a popular and well-informed account see Hägman (2006). On Roman and Late Antique Siwa, see Kuhlmann (1998). There are two major Ethnographic descriptions of Siwa Rusch & Stein (1978, popular version, and 1988) and Bliss (1998) and one representing the local perspective (Malim 2001). Most of the studies mentioned above refer to the European explores from Browne in 1792 and onwards, who for a variety of reasons visited Siwa. However, after the Fist World War when these days were over there was a period when foreigners lived in Siwa as officials. One of these a Camel Corps and District officer C. Dalrymple Belgrave stayed two years and wrote a splendid account of the oasis with a good measure of what would today be called participant observation (1923).  

The difference between inside and outside the Empire becomes apparent when Siwa is compare to the Dakhla oasis. See publications from The Dakhleh Oasis Project e.g. Bowen & al. (2003:131-382) with 15 articles on the Ptolemaic–Roman period at Kellis. Especially written sources and settlement structure such as the Kellis village cf. Bagnall (1997), Warp (2004) and Hope (2004:5-28) and the temple erected under Hadrian commemorating his visit to this oasis are notable differences. There are no comparable Siwan sites with that kind of structures not even in the eastern part of the oasis, at Khamisa and Balat el Roum, where on the other hand there may perhaps be some signs of Christianity and where there is a relatively late temple with at least one Greek inscription.  

On this metaphor, see Herodotos (Book 3 Chp 25). In the end of the 1st century BCE, Strabo compared Egyptian oases to islands in the open sea, see Strabo (Book 17 chp 1 paragraph 5). In modern times, Theodore Monod in his book Méharées, i.e. riding camels (1937) took the metaphor to something of an extreme given the fact that the author, who loved this metaphor, actually started out as an oceanographer eventually to embark upon the ships of the desert and their long convoy like caravans. Ferdinand Braudel (1972:185) sees oases in the same way. In his book The Empire Ryszard Kapuściński (1995) relies on the strength of this metaphor when talks about the oases of Central Asia.  

249 See Rusch & Stein (1988:80 pp.).  
250 On the desert trade routes see (Fakhry 1944:3); Kuhlmann (2002).  
252 Bellgrave (1923) has describes the Senusi brotherhood very well at different parts of his book which is supplied with an index. A summary on the Senusi brotherhood is given by Rusch & Stein (1988:135 pp.).  
253 On Stone Age Siwa, see Hassan (1978).  
254 See Fakhry (1944:79 pp.).  
255 On Stone Age Siwa, see Hassan (1978).  
256 See Fakhry’s (2007:52 pp.) description of houses with reference to relevant texts testifies to this. In Oxyrhynchos, moreover, a prominent residence had tower(s) i.e. freestanding buildings in
several stores. This emblem of status, the more the better, is depicted in a rural scene in the famous Palestrina mosaic (Gullini 1956) or Meyboom (1995: 28 pp). We cannot prove the existence of towers in Zaitun although the volume of one of the unexcavated buildings in Qureishit is at least sufficient to represent a building with several floors.

258 On the excavations in the Zaitun Area, Qureishet and Abu Sherouf, see Fakhry (1944:73-76) and Aldumaire (2005:75-78) on the crops in Dakhla as given in the Kellis account book see Bagnall (1997:35 pp.).

259 On the agricultural patterns see Rusch & Stein (1988:31 pp.) and Fakhry (1944:2-3). I owe my knowledge of the watering of cereals in the oasis to Abdallah Baghi who was kind enough to inform me in these matters. Today, when no cereals are grown in Siwa owing to subventions having made them redundant, few people remember the techniques still in use 50 years ago.

260 See Aldumaire (2005:75-77). The coin hoard from Qureishet consists of Alexandrine coins only. The coin once thought to be from Cyrene is in fact an Alexandrine coin minted for Nero.

261 This letter Oxyrhynchos, (36.2783) can be found in several publications such as Oxyrhynchos, Volume. Papyros 36.2783. Search for 2783 at the online text database: http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/ (Last visited 2008-05-15). See also Tibiletti (1979) and Parsons (2007:133) who comments upon it.

262 See Lafffer (1971) on Diocletian’s price edict 301 CE.

263 The four stages theory implies the idea that societies express themselves in similar ways according to their mode of production and subsistence emanates from the Enlightenment, in the 1750s, notably with Turgot (1913:114-142) or Meek (1973:65 pp.) and Adam Smith (1776), cf. Meek (1976:68 pp; 99 pp.). The four stages theory is at the roots also of the analysis of world economic systems. World-systems analysis, however, is not a theory, but an approach to social analysis and social change developed principally by Andre Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein, with major contributions by Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Christopher Chase-Dunn, Peter Turchin, Andrey Korotayev, Janet Abu Lughod, Tom Hall, and others. World-systems analysis is derived from two key intellectual sources, the neo-Marxist literature on development and the French Annales School, especially Fernand Braudel. See above Note 2 p. 24 for references.

264 See Bagnall (1997:70) concerning the landlord.
CHAPTER VI

THE LANDSCAPE OF WARFARE
Introduction

WARFARE MAKES ITSELF present as the horrors of war, but also in a more metaphorical, ambivalent or latent form as monuments or sites commemorating strife and battlefield or simply bringing warfare into presence as recollection or remembrance in a clarified and bearable if not refined form. Putting all parts together makes up the presence of war in peoples’ minds and in society. On the other hand, with the hindsight of a comparatively short period of peace, believing ourselves to see the beginning of the end of armed European conflict and the dawn of future concord, drowning out war and fading out remembrance is nothing but human.

Studying South Scandinavian Iron Age in southern Denmark, notably Jutland, war began to make itself present in the wider sense as conflict and remembrance already in PRIA, and its presence escalated during the first centuries CE. Eventually, it reached an omnipresent state in which, after millennia of regional warfare, we could still be living, although we feel that the peace that we have enjoyed the last sixty-five years is indeed the beginning of the end of armed conflict. We hope to be the first to live in European reconciliation and lasting appeasement based on a solid understanding of the mechanisms of a society at peace—with workout sessions in practical world-conflict management under the uniting blue flag of either the UN, NATO or EU. We are about to succeed, not least while after the Second World War we have moved much of the economic albeit less of the ideological justification for war to take place outside Europe. With this, of course, the most outrageous horrors and atrocities—give or take suicide bombers and the odd prison in Poland or Romania.

Warfare Offerings and Central Places

Although the habit of offering weapons in lakes would go far back in prehistoric times, the idea of picking out something to commemorate battle or combat, and indeed war, developed in the RIA and continued into the early EMP with the occasional peripheral revival in later times. The tradition can be said to come to an end in a number of sites in Västergötland c. 550 CE or in dry land offerings such as the one at Uppåkra. If dry land war offerings became the norm in later centuries, it makes sense that our knowledge of the tradition is inade-
quate because of unfavourable preservation conditions\textsuperscript{267}. The prime objects to be sacrificed were javelins and lances, destroyed in such a way that we can argue in assessing terms that they were pacified as weapons and later securely buried, rather than neutrally speaking disposed of. In the beginning as well as in the end of the South Scandinavian tradition, these once deadly points and edges, the weapons of unprotected in-fight, are the more dominant ones or in some contexts the only objects.

Destruction, although not cardinal down to every single item could take place in several ways and once and again it involved burning the spoils. This indicates that lowering the equipment into the water was but the last stage of a more elaborate ritual practice. Commemorating the destruction of a fighting capacity and finalising the destruction is the essence of the lake offerings in RIA, and the rituals can be said to make burial and silence the obverse of cacophonic and violent death—a balance that befits EIA ontology. Burying someone in water is a well-known EIA habit and slightly later written sources would seem to testify to the very final character of that kind of burial\textsuperscript{268}.

When we recall the awe that memorable swords could inspire in the heroes of epic poetry, but also the almost human mentality and occasional weakness of these weapons together with the care and company they required, if they were not to lose their cutting edge and deceive or trick their human brothers-in-arms, then there seems to be more than a factual statement in any description of the damage done to weapons\textsuperscript{269}. Swords, like heroes, can be rare individuals, strongly marked by their persona and the myths created by the man who made them, and by their martial career in the hands of owners and co-warriors. But in RIA warfare, next to the hero, the uniform character of one and each of the men in the ranks and their anonymous weapons are part of a collective character at par with the hero and of equal importance.

Heroes and swords alone do not win the battle. They are fighting against the backdrop of the collective EIA fighting spirit kept up by the unprotected men in the ranks and their javelins and lances. If we are to believe Tacitus, who is at least describing a specific rite unknown to Romans, this spirit is linked to fate and it can be expressed in a kind of singing in chorus, a \textit{barditus}, sung by Germans before they decide to engage or disengage themselves in combat. Everybody sings and listens, because by doing just that the outcome of the battle can be foretold\textsuperscript{270}. Similar to casting lot and single combat, singing \textit{barditus} is a way of undoing a ‘twisted’ reality.

Today, we would consider the song to mirror the sentiments or innermost feelings of the men, rather than the fateful. But we can agree that there was probably a strong feeling of collectiveness at the bottom of the strife as well as in the sacrificial idea during the whole of the offering tradition. It seems plausible that something of this collective tradition, singing the essential outcome of a future struggle, is preserved in some of the runic inscriptions found in the late warfare offerings, albeit in a more elaborate form than the early one described by Tacitus. In the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, the song is put into the mouth of an \textit{eril}, i.e. a
person or a superior with a rank similar to that of a cult leader or a commander, a kind of leading figure with several functions in relation to the collective. Whether in this case the *eril* acts as fore-singer (OE *fore-singend*) or sings alone as an officiating clergy, depends upon how far from its origin the custom had moved in the 4th century CE. Nevertheless, the characteristics of LRIA sacrificial offerings reflect the introduction of a more heterogeneous and specialised army, and thus also a more formalised military command structure. We may believe this situation to be the result of South Scandinavians being introduced to Roman warfare, and we may well be correct, but primarily we see the character of warfare as well as the army changing from an amateur and animated state, where everybody has a say, to a slightly more professional one, commanding fate and men rather than listening to them. Whatever the construction of the scene, it is easy to imagine that battle started and ended with rituals that began by calling attentions to its horrors and ended with some kind of reconciliation.

The poetry about the Battle of Finnsburg, being a case in point, starts with the ominous and terrifying words of the fighter Sigeferð before the battle begins, and ends with the beer offered the victors when eventually their tough battle is over. This structure may well be seen as the equivalent of arousing fear about the outcome and spreading calm in the event—signalling ‘before’ and ‘after’ in connection with battle. In the Eddaic poems we also see reminiscences of turn on/turn off situations before and after battle.

When it comes to destroying and burying weapons, two things matter: (1) the breaking of the collective spirit infested in men as well as weapons, and (2) the celebration of victorious, in its day and age, modern warfare and its leaders. For this reason the last verses of the first part of the catalogue poem *Widsith*, vv 45–49, make good and more than just factual sense:

```
Hroþwulf ond Hroðgar heoldon lengest  
sibbe ætsomne, suhtorfædran,  
sipan hy forbigeat Wiginga cyrn  
ond Ingeldes ord forbigan,  
forbeowan at Heorote Headbeardna þrym.
```

Rolf and Roar, nephew and uncle, held the peace between them for a long time after they had driven off the Viking tribe and bended Ingeld’s spear (and) cut down the Heathobards’ force at Heorot. (cf. Malone 1962).

The expression *Ingeldes ord forbigan* literally means that ‘Ingeld’s point (putting a part for the whole taking *ord* to mean spear[head]) they bended out of form’ (i.e. *forbigan*, where the unstressed prefix *for-* implies that the doer has completely neutralised or spoiled the object, despite the fact that it is still recognisable as a weapon). The description signifies the weapon, but it is also a metaphor for the king’s men, the equivalent to ‘force’ and ‘tribe’, i.e. the simi-
larly neutralised *cynn* and *þrym* in the escalating series: *cynn, ord, þrym,* matched by the three *for*-verbs *forwræcon, forbigdan, forheowan* – where the Vikings are the lesser matter compared to Ingeld’s men and the even greater Heathobard forces. The ‘bended spear’, besides being a spoiled point, is Prince Ingeld’s dead men; the collective or retinue that he mobilised in vane against Hrothgar and Hrothulf and their command of their men.\(^{274}\) Comparing this late metaphoric account to the fact that javelins and lances are the core offerings, we can venture to say that the broken and destroyed or burned arms are the complement or counterpart of their slaughtered brothers-in-arms, i.e. the counterpart of the men they once served as weapons. You kill and dispose of both the man and his arms thus ending his life as well as his weapon-dependant fighting spirit when you find it necessary to do so, and when you can. Given the RIA development of warfare moreover, there is an element of triumph over antiquated ideas in one’s victory because in a sense, those who lose tend to be outdated by the victors.

In addition to singling out weapons, we should point to all the components of the sacrifice and note that the buried artefacts consist of all the things in the equipment that in a given situation could be said to be infested with condemnable and outdated warfare. Rather than triumph and booty, the essence of the sacrifice is war and warfare and thus the craft behind the material expression of the sacrifice is to know which objects symbolise the prevailing essence of the notion of war. It may be a belt, a shield or now and then a boat, a horn or some bullion; nevertheless, the sacrifice always contains what is understood to be the heart of the matter, i.e. javelins and lances. When the tradition developed in the second and third centuries, more and more came to belong to the sphere of warfare, although there were always things that could perhaps also have been included: the gold of the leading man in Ejsbøl is there, but such things as he could have been expected to use between battles, e.g. his sleeping quarters, drinking cups and tableware, let alone his food, were not included. Nor would it seem that his or anybody else’s clothes were ever so contaminated by war that they had to be sacrificed. It did however seem to have happened now and again at Thorsbjerg.

There is in other words a clear contrast and just a small overlap between the material sphere of the burial of arms and that of humans and it makes sense that the inner qualities of typical human burial objects such as food, tableware, jewellery and dress were not considered a core part of the military doctrine that lost the battle. However, in the Ejsbøl case, bullion was contaminated, and in Nydam, a horn. Both cases are unique, although horns and bullion were in all probability part of any grand-scale military operations. Yet, this RIA lack of uniformity is not surprising, because at some point in an escalating and changing stage of warfare, it could well be fair to draw the line between bullion and drinking cups, but not between shield and horn\(^ {275}\). The sound of the individual horn, similar to the sound of a specific *barditus,* may be thought to contain the essence of the war spirit and thus a quality worthy of being broken, but its sound might as well be understood as the herald of a new structure of com-
mand and events also in peaceful ceremonies. In that case, the horn is no more than a neutral medium without the capacity to evoke the right spiritual qualities, if but a little. Be this as it may, the grey zone of what should and should not be offered is characteristic of the LRIA, and that in itself signifies the changing notion of warfare. In other words, a number of things must be balanced before something can be sacrificed. We owe the situation to the fact that the essence of warfare is found both in the collective and in the individual. Likewise, it can exist in the fateful as well as in the professional. Moreover, in any artefact, its essence may to a greater or lesser extent be inherent or perhaps developed.

When we have carried the day and look at the battlefield and its spoils we shall have to ask ourselves some rather formal questions: should this or that artefact be destructed, sacrificed or taken as booty? Spearheads are no problem; they are collective and fateful and infested with warfare. They must be destroyed, i.e. if we do not for some odd reason need their spirit. Most often they are destroyed. Nor are glass cups problematic; they are individual, peaceful objects found in camp rather than battlefield and if employed in warfare they have little to do with the fatal side of the notion. As long as camp is not battlefield it is difficult to nurse and develop an essence of warfare in them, although it can perhaps be done. Still they are not destroyed. Judging a horn, on the other hand, its individual qualities, its tone and volume, i.e. its sound when it comes to giving orders, may of course in the hands of a certain person be fateful enough and we could suggest burial—but should we perhaps adopt its qualities for our own purposes?—i.e. if the former owner has not already infested the horn with an attitude that must be destroyed, because it cannot be neutralised or nursed to become a virtue. The list of pros and cons could probably be made very long when it comes to bugles.

That which makes itself present in these highly ideological offerings, designed to contrast the battle, is that part of a man’s warrior persona which is embedded in his equipment. That this equipment and its qualities are becoming more differentiated during the first four centuries CE is obvious, and the development reflects the escalating presence of warfare. Whether wars or battles are actually becoming more frequent is beside the point. Instead, what should be argued is that the destructed weapons are destructed in the same way as their owners, partly during the battle, partly afterwards by means of formal rituals or by becoming war booty and serving new masters. Similar to men, surviving gear can probably be managed and perhaps enslaved or sold.

Earlier on, in Chapter II, when the lack of burials was discussed, an example from the Finnsburg Fragment indicated that not everyone was buried, even though they were placed on a pyre. Burial rituals covering up the pyre and constructing the monumental mound that are so important in the end of Beowulf, when the hero himself dies his honourable death—fattely wounded by the dragon he killed—are conspicuously lacking in the case of the battle of Finnsburg, where people are killed in a most commonplace hall fight. As readers, we
tend to supply their grave mounds mostly because we find it natural and decent to bury the dead in graves. Besides implying that no actual grave or graves were made for the dead, the quotation can also be taken to describe the destruction of weapons and dead warriors after the strife. There is nothing but just that, dead warriors and weapons, on the pyre. In the Finnsburg case, the fighting ended in a draw that brought friends and foes alike to the pyre and a temporary end to the wars. In the Finnsburg episode, therefore, heaped on the pyre we find the gear and its human counterpart, about to enter the first stage of a ritual, involving an offering and disposal ceremony (burning the gear and the dead) similar to the warfare offerings. After setting fire to the essence of the battle, to the dead men and their arms, the ritual could have come to a close, but it could also proceed in different ways, e.g. collecting the arms and burying them in water perhaps together with the ashes. The point in the Finnsburg episode is to tell us what happens after a battle, not necessarily what happens after someone’s death. Dying at the battlefield, be it a field or a hall room, calls for the disposal of those who took part, men as well their arms. In the Finnsburg case, the poet tells us that the destruction by means of fire sends the spirit of the men and their arms out of this world. What is left, the residual, must be disposed of but not necessarily in monuments. Burning the dead immediately after the battle was also a Roman practice; however, with less resemblance to the pyre than in Finnsburg, inasmuch as the dead were thrown into a mass grave, cremated there and covered with earth.

Accordingly, if we choose to keep rather than sacrifice an artefact, its spirit stays here, and similarly, if we do not dispose of the man by means of ritual, his spirit stays here too. The Finnsburg example can also be said to show us that the rites that go before a sacrifice in the lake could centre on the pyre, similar to the pyre centring on the battlefield. After the battle, weapons are collected, the deceased are burnt (perhaps with some of their gear) and the enemy’s weapons are sacrificed in a lake. Weapons belonging to dead friends were not sacrificed in the lakes, other than by mistake.

If we look for different kinds of ritual, there are some that meets the eye e.g. in Nydam, where there are examples of an offering rite that results in a bunch of spears being driven down into the ground on the shore of the offering lake. This dry land memorial in Nydam could signal that the battlefield was not far away, inasmuch as it could have been a visible monument rather than the traditional sunken heaps of gear. In fact, weapons visibly buried on land may have reminded people of the heaps of arms that Germanicus for one piled up in commemoration of victory. The same could also be said of the find from Vallerbæk on Jutland. Vallerbæk is a dryland site with a pot to accompany the weapons, 10 odd spears and swords in a 0.5 x 0.5 metre bunch. This kind of installation with weapons stuck vertically into the ground or rising from it with a pot next to them would seem to commemorate battle in an altar-like form, although not in connection with wetland. Vallerbæk may be a place in the vicinity of a battlefield, but next to it there are also some graves and we may
therefore suggest that Vallerbæk was a cemetery with weapon deposits. The graves are probably few and the ensemble, buried weapons and a few buried people, could thus still commemorate a specific strife. Be this as it may, cemeteries attracting weapons are nevertheless a specific phenomenon in Northwest Germany and West Denmark between PRIA and MP, Bregentved on Fyn being a case in point.

Recent investigation has shown the settlement area to be typical. A scattered not very stable PRIA settlement structure in the area S, W and SW of the Ringe Lake is slowly transformed into a stable settlement on four or five hills and slopes adjacent to the Bregentved cemetery with the occasional peripheral settlement to the SW. Burials are also concentrated to Bregentved. To begin with, this cemetery was on the eastern margin of the settlement area, but there was also a cemetery c. 2 km to the WNW and perhaps graves also c. 1 km to the W. When the structure of the settlement changed Bregentved became the main cemetery in the area as well as a reflection of the farms on the nearby hills. On this the second largest cemetery on Fyn (c. 200 graves) the northern front, i.e. the one facing the former Ringe Lake, is characterised by weapon depots or buried weapons. These ‘weapon burials’ are fitted in between the human ones. The lake, where there are no war offerings but some traces of other offerings, is situated 250 m north of the cemetery. Some of the ‘weapon burials’ may represent one man’s equipment; others must have been made up by weapons collected from several men, and we may venture to say that these deposits introduce a specific theme: commemorating both personal and collective weapons belonging to the armed men at Ringe and thus to strife, the soldier’s craft as an individual, as well as to collective trauma linked to death and monument or a cemetery with a view to a lake. For chronological reasons, the depots/graves represent a tradition rather than a specific war or wartime and given their situation in the landscape, it seems unlikely that weapons buried this way during LRIA belonged to enemies.

The weapon pits at Nydam, Vallerbæk and Bregentved are reminiscent of the post-battle life of the battlefield, irrespective of their lack of battlefield connection. Because the greater Ringe area, where Bregentved is situated, is a central settlement area compared to any war offering, but still not in the very centre of the realm (which is Gudme), pits and burials are indicative of a series of events in which war and battlefield are transformed into metaphorical and ritualised expressions of war in more central settlement areas on the axis Gudme – Bregentved – Kragehul. Similar to the dryland pits on the shore of the offering lake, i.e. the somewhat deviant Nydam case, there are also a few weapon pits closer to Gudme, two to be precise. However, at Møllegårdsmarken, the central cemetery at Gudme and the largest cemetery on Fyn, there are no weapon pits or human graves with weapons, merely thousands of other graves. Among cemeteries, Møllegårdsmarken is as unique as Gudme among settlements.

In the landscape or realm perspective, Bregentved seems to commemorate Gudme warriors in a way similar to Roman monuments, e.g. a tombstone
commemorating a soldier. In the Empire, such stones were put at the forts where the soldier served, i.e. in the garrisons, not in Rome and not on the battlefield\textsuperscript{281} Bregentved was hardly a garrison, but among the families and people living there, professional warriors may have been more common and manifest than elsewhere.

*  

In the RIA, a number of things run parallel, among others the building-up of central places of size, wealth and power. These three characteristics of the centres, size, wealth and power, predispose them to be linked to the military operation that ended up as warfare sacrifices and memorial cemeteries such as Bregentved, inasmuch as wars are investments, and offerings a waste, justified by its ideological value, or at best a negative investment indirectly escalating the value on what is left. Warfare is both economics and ideology and a case of ‘freakonomics’, in which to begin with attack and defence and acquisition and destruction and colonisation and emigration can be expected to be equally important incentives for organising warfare\textsuperscript{282}.

Nevertheless, the size of the lake offerings, as well as the spectrum of objects denoting war, grows during the RIA, simultaneously with hall farms and centres; we see that society, as well as farms, becomes more hierarchic and politically competitive. Essentially, this leads to two forms of aggressive warfare: (1) plundering or (2) conquering and they both involve emigration, colonisation, defence and destruction. In both cases, moreover, there would be a point in attacking a centre or it’s, hopefully, wealthy surroundings, irrespective of one’s political motive being acquisition of power or wealth and irrespective of the war band or the small army migrating or campaigning. In practice, such dichotome distinctions were probably difficult to define.

Since some of the weapons in the offerings were produced at a great distance from the bogs where they ended up, they were in all probability also carried off a long way by their men-in-arms to a mutual destiny\textsuperscript{283}. In contrast, weapons buried at places such as Bregentved seem to end up much closer to home. When it comes to warfare sacrifices, we should in other words imagine a complex pattern of warfare and a geography which could be both local and regional in scope. In this perspective, there are two specific characteristics of the lake offerings: (1) they are situated close to the coastlines, closer than one would expect even in Denmark; (2) they are situated far away from the major centres, which in their turn are nevertheless situated very much like votive sites, i.e. but a few kilometres from the coast and sometimes in the vicinity of a suitable offering lake. During the EIA, this situation, despite some exceptions, is indeed the preferred one for the majority of the smaller centres in South Scandinavia, i.e. a landscape in which super-regional communications are bound to exploit waterways\textsuperscript{284}. Future finds may change the distribution maps and we do not know whether centres are disappearing or shifting status as well as political strength and range. Hedegård in Jutland and Hoby on Lolland, to name but two, could be examples of
status-changing centres that did not survive far into the RIA. Hoby, a coastal centre on Lolland fits into the model during the beginning of the Common Era; inland Hedegård does not, despite the trouble they took at Hedegård to equip their cemetery with a boat grave. Be this as it may, there are strong indications than one should start to understand RIA, and more so LRIA South Scandinavia as divided into regions that make up a pattern consisting of a handful of major centres in small realms\textsuperscript{285}. Öland, with its relatively well preserved settlement from the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century CE, is one well-known example with the Björnhovda area as a probable major centre; another possible centre is the Over Jerstal Area with Dankirke\textsuperscript{286}. On the map Fig. 110A–C, all sites signified by warfare offerings have tentatively been set up against a number of possible major centres, despite the possibility that some of these may have been wrongly included among the major ones. On Zealand, a major centre in the Leire environment should perhaps be favoured over possible centres in the Himlingøje area, but I follow Näsman’s model and consider Lejre to be a later super-regional centre\textsuperscript{287}. In Jutland, moreover, the number of centres is difficult to judge.

Fig. 110A. A map of South Scandinavia showing warfare offerings. Sites less than 50 km apart have been linked with a straight line.

Fig. 110B. A map of South Scandinavia showing warfare sacrifices and tentative centres.
On a very general level, the model seems to hold true and make up a foundation for a new political geography in South Scandinavia built on economic power and warfare, rather than e.g. the distribution of jewellery in graves. Yet, such realms were probably kept together in all sorts of ways, not least by families, gift giving, bonds, defence, war offerings or external acquisition.

Cynically speaking, we can describe the warfare offerings as a living South Scandinavian tradition and call it essential and paradoxical, because it bridges significant social change in society and because it escalates when peaceful centres are established, farms reformed, weapon graves disappearing, and memorial cemeteries starting to appear. The offerings testify to warfare being a cultural spine as well as a trauma in its own right during the steady transformation of society in the first part of the first millennium CE.

A Close-up of Fyn

One of the areas in which we could benefit from a further analysis is Fyn. Next to Over Jerstal and Öland, this would be the third example with a slightly more thorough understanding of the relation between sacrifices and central places. On Fyn, the votive finds are quite many, the centre in Gudme obvious, and the number of settlement indication relatively large\(^{288}\).

In Denmark, the register *Fund og Fortidsminder* (FOF) – ‘Finds and Ancient Monuments’ lists all sites and stray finds datable in part or in their entirety to a certain period, e.g. RIA\(^{289}\). The material in the register, although not perfect, makes it possible to reconstruct the settlement structure of the period as a general pattern. With such a distribution map at hand it becomes easier to understand the overall social geography of the island.

However, in order to get a full picture of the whole period characterised by the general settlement structure of the RIA, experience e.g. from analyses of the Ölandic settlement structure, advise us that the distribution map should be
based on remains from LPRIA PER 3 up and until the MP i.e. the Early Germanic Iron Age in the terminology of the Register. The reason for this rests with the fact that in relation to major phases of settlement structure, what we have defined as the RIA is an expansion phase that cannot be synchronised with the traditional framework of IA chronology. As a settlement period therefore, RIA starts before the beginning of the CE and ends just after the ‘Fall of Rome’, CE 476.

In general terms, what we can map is thus only the maximum distribution of the settlement elements before the stagnation of the pattern²⁹⁰.

Graves and settlements as well as pits, fireplaces and stray finds should be mapped. The latter three categories, however, are relevant only when they can be considered to reflect a settlement rather than an insignificant one-time event in an otherwise uninhabited area. Solitary grave finds in a shore-bound position as well as votive gold finds situated at headlands, such as Elsehoved or Vormæ, or in the open wetlands between settlement concentrations such as Boltinggård Skov, Brangstrup and Vestergård (in semi-peripheral Bregentved) have been left out. They do not mirror the settled area, but rather events outside the settlement²⁹¹. On different scales, they are part of the overall manifestation of border rather than settlement. Some votive finds, such as Rynkebygård, nevertheless, fall within the borders of the settlement area and they are included although they are often marginal. Similar to other votive finds, the war offerings in the lakes can be said to indicate the edge or the border zone of a settlement area.

Fig. 111. A map showing the Iron Age settlement distribution and regional division on Fyn.
Having decided which points should be mapped, and having mapped them, Fig. 111, they must in some way or other be transformed to represent a settlement area. Generally speaking, it is fair to assume that the points on a map represent more acreage than their own scaled surface. On the other hand, the remains of a settlement would seldom in themselves represent more than a limited period of dwelling during the centuries represented by the map. If therefore a point is in someway solitary, it must be considered so in time as well as in space, because only several points close together can be taken to represent a continuous settlement area. For the present purposes, moreover, ‘settlement area’ means both houses, farms, fenced fields and meadows, i.e. the area in which all the elements of a settlement are erected, fenced, pulled down and moved around.

The methodical solution to this problem can be outlined in the following way: to begin with the diameter of a find spot is not assessed. Therefore, in order to transform these dots to settlement areas, three rules have been applied.

(1) If a dot is solitary, i.e., if it is more than 1 km apart from its nearest neighbour, the size of the dot is considered to represent a small settlement used during a part of the whole period in question. The dot therefore is given a diameter of 500 metres to indicate the settlement area that it represents. Of course the settlement was not in use during the whole period. On the contrary, it was temporary in a sparsely settled area where our chances of finding its few predecessors and successors are small. Therefore, what this kind of dot represents is a solitary settlement existing in most of the period in question somewhere in the area, if not exactly on the mapped spot during the whole of the period. It is mapped because by and large, we can consider the most widespread pattern to be the most correct one when it comes to understanding the structure of the settlement pattern.

(2) If two dots are more than 500 m but less than 1 km apart, then they are considered to be two points within a larger area and therefore their diameter is set to 1 km.

(3) On Fyn, moreover, there are a number of areas such as Gudme that have been excavated or investigated as settlement areas. They are mapped as they have been mapped in FOF and to their perimeter, a zone of 500 metres has been added in order to represent them more fairly as settlement areas in the sense used in this kind of mapping.

Applying these rules to the map transforms the dots and areas to a pattern that consists of a number of continuous settlement areas and circles representing solitary settlements consisting of either one circle, or two, three or a few times four circles close together, Fig. 112. This is no doubt a very schematic picture of the settlement distribution and its character, and we suspect that it is enhanced in such a way that a complete lack of settlement could be somewhat underestimated. For the same reason, the tendency to create larger areas of continuous occupation is overemphasized. Small isolated settlements are easy to miss and although they may well be represented as areas by the transformed
dots, their situation is probably not. All in all therefore there is a tendency for the pattern to look denser than it was. The map stands out as an enhancement of the basic pattern in which there was a continuous land-use within a common settlement area, but a shift in the precise distribution of the farms. Therefore, a site such as the one containing the Rynkebygård votive find may well have been situated outside the settled area when it was deposited, but at the edge of it at an earlier or later period. Nevertheless, the division between densely and sparsely settled areas is visible and it would seem to fit in with the partly contemporary settlement pattern on Öland, Fig. 88A²⁹².

Fig. 112. The map showing the relation between the Gudme centre and the war offerings.

In principle, a pattern such as the one on Öland or Fyn is a reflection of the need within the prehistoric subsistence and surplus economy to differentiate between those areas that could be built on and fenced and those which needed to be open resource areas. In the latter, settlements were an exception and in most cases probably temporary one-generation abodes. Seen from an economic point of view, the structural similarities between Öland and Fyn should not come as a surprise, because they are nothing but yet a reflection of the force of
the Roman economy upon the peripheral subsistence systems which rely on a mixture of agriculture and stockbreeding—stockbreeding being the possible surplus producing part of this rural economy. On Öland and Fyn, contrary to some parts Jutland and Scania or the area around Kalmar in Småland, iron production could not be seen as shaping the settlement pattern²⁹³.

That said, and similar to the pattern on Öland, the settlement pattern on Fyn can be understood in four sectors bordering a large and common more or less central unsettled area. On Fyn, a north-south axis through this area is easy to see and even an east-west axis may be inferred, resulting in a division into four parts that may conveniently be labelled NW, NE, SW and SE Fyn. On Öland, the sectors are labelled N, MID, SE and SW. The shape of the island, topography, hydrology and natural resources are some of the outer factors that make up and define the sectors. Nevertheless, rural economy and the social ability to keep communities together at different social levels related to space, such as village, pasture or thing communities also contribute to the shape and size of the sectors. On Öland, e.g., we can imagine that another social and economic organisation in another historical situation would have favoured a ‘South Sector’ combining the three southern sectors without being much restrained by the landscape. In early modern times, before the exhaustive consolidations, cattle from all villages on southern Öland roamed freely on the common grassland, as there were neither shepherds nor fences between the villages. In the autumn, each village herded the animals grazing in its surroundings, and when on inspection, stock from other villages were found, the animals were herded back to their owners.

There are considerable differences between the four sectors on Fyn.

(NE) The northeastern area is the largest one and the one most densely settled. The population was no doubt dense, but lack of open space also indicates that the surplus per settlement acre would have been low in terms relative to production. Relatively speaking, the situation is comparable to the similarly settled northern part of Öland, which is poor in comparison with the more sparsely populated areas in the south. Still, Fyn being Fyn and not meagre Öland, there are some rich graves in the area, e.g. the early find from Skrøbeshave and the late one from Årslev together with some gold hoards²⁹⁴.

(NW) The northwestern sector by contrast, has fewer and smaller settlement concentrations. Despite the fact that there is no lack of open space, there are still no exceptionally rich finds in the area. Here, instead of being too large we may suspect the population to be too small or politically too weak to benefit from the resources in the open land. The position next to Lillebælt, moreover, is a vulnerable one.
(SW) In the southwestern part, there are in essence only two settlement concentrations: a small one in the east and a slightly greater one bordering the Kragehul offerings. The latter is rather large, but similar to the northwestern sector, the southwestern one is not very prosperous.

(SE) The southeastern quarter exhibits a more or less optimal balance within a large settled area divided into settlement concentrations and open land. Gudme is situated here, but also a number of exceptional grave finds and hoards. To the qualities of southeast Fyn, we may add the open coast and thus the short coastline towards Storebælt. Contrary to the western sectors, it is difficult to approach this area without being observed, e.g. by the Beowulfian coastguard. This strategic advantage is moderated by the waters on the south shore, in which it is much easier to hide.

Let us add the indications of war to the settlement map, i.e. the warfare sacrifices, the Bregentved cemetery and the barrage that seals off Nakkebølle fjord, Fig. 113.

Fig. 113. The map showing the relation between the Bregnetved cemetery and the war offerings, the barrage at Nakkebølle and Gudme.
Looking at these sites, we may conclude that, generally speaking, tradition tends eventually to have pointed out some lakes or bogs as more suitable for warfare offerings than others. However, tradition alone is not enough, because topographically speaking and in relation to the settlement pattern, these sites must also be said to occupy the edge of densely populated settlement areas. Topography and settlement pattern, i.e. strategical considerations on the part of an aggressor, moreover, indicate that the lakes have been reasonably close to battle zones and indeed the battlegrounds. For an attacker, Odense fjord, Kerteminde fjord, and Kertinge nor as well as Nærå vig are splendid passages into a profitable war zone. When a fleet enters Odense Fjord, it is not altogether obvious where it will land. For that reason, dividing one’s army into two or three parts in order to be able to meet the enemy wherever he lands may not be a wise defence strategy. Having stated this, one must nevertheless emphasise that there are many strategic landing places along the shores of Fyn, not least in the northwest sector, and a number of adequate war zones with offering lakes or bogs at a convenient distance not least in the Gudme area. This boils down to saying that there is a lack of offerings where offerings should have been expected and consequently, not every battle won, and not even a random sample of victories, was celebrated with a lake offering commemorating warfare.

Sealing off Nakkebølle Fjord shows the far from banal ability to actually do so, but also the real or imagined fear that someone should chose these waters as their operational base. Although there is not much pillage available in the sparsely settled area around Nakkebølle, an enemy fleet harbouring and spending the better part of the year at the fjord is nevertheless a double threat. A base in Nakkebølle could be an advantage for pirates as well as for an enemy planning to land armed forces and launch an attack e.g. on the Espe or Gudme area. Sealing off Nakkebølle Fjord therefore is a defence measure by a power based on southeast Fyn and it is unlikely that the small settlements closest to the fjord were able to build and maintain the barrage on their own, let alone attack those who sought shelter in the fjord.

Warfare sacrifices, the centrally placed Bregentvd/Ringe and the Nakkebølle barrage should in other words be seen in relation to the war zones of their days. Warriors at Ringe are well placed; the barrage is a rational measure and a response to a threat, built only where it was needed. The offerings in their turn are the result of a choice and a response to an ideological rather than purely rational situation. The offerings and their sites were meant to make a historic moment live on as memory.

The picture of the warfare sacrifices sketched in the introduction to this chapter pointed out their proximity to waterways and their distance to major EIA centres. This pattern is borne out by the closer look at the pattern on Fyn. Islands with their natural shoreline borders are relatively easy to analyse and therefore Bornholm and Öland are the most obvious parallels. Sorte Muld is indeed as far away from the Bornholm warfare offerings as one can possibly get, and on Öland there is a significant distance between the prominent centre at...
Björnhovda and the warfare offerings at Dalby and Skedemosse. The lack of warfare sacrifices in the vicinity of major EIA centres has in other words become so outspoken that it prompts an explanation.

It is difficult to believe that in reality no victories were ever won near the outstanding settlements even though centres were perhaps better defended than the outskirts of a realm. The sheer wealth of the sites must have been tempting and if one could contemplate an attack through Odense Fjord into densely populated, but not outstandingly rich areas, some armies or fleets would most certainly also have tried their luck at the major centres. Eventually, centres, such as Dankirke, Gudme, Sorte Muld, Ravlunda, Uppåkra, Helgö and Björnhovda came to an end or a significant loss of importance, but it is hard to picture these ends as results of the very first attacks, let alone examples of beginner’s luck on the aggressors’ part. There ought to have been some forerunners where the defenders of the centre were successful. The Nakkebølle barrage, moreover, would seem to confirm the interest once taken in attacking and consequently defending more central parts of the Gudme realm.

Keeping the centres void of warfare offerings again raises the question why there are warfare offerings in the first place. To come to terms with this question we must put ourselves in the centre of the realm and add to the fame of this centre the value of a manifestation in the border zone of failed attacks, glorious battle and home victory. The offerings make sense if they are seen as secondary manifestations of strength linked to a political unit, covering several districts of the island, which makes a point of commemorating the defence of its borders. In fact, before one can contemplate a warfare sacrifice there needs be a centre and a border zone, then comes the opportunity to risk battle and lastly the successful defence. Yet, in the long run, peace is always the preferred condition and this is the point in the offerings: they commemorate victory with a modification, because they remind those who live in the border zone that they could equally well be said to live in a war zone. In the RIA, warfare offerings testify to the virtue of border zone defence in the small realms. On Fyn, therefore, we can conclude that the western sector and parts of the northeastern one is outside the realm, a buffer zone or at least a zone difficult to defend. This is hardly an advantageous situation, but it implies that the area of the realm and its borders comprise and cut through several districts in the countryside. Even if the realm does not emerge solely from war politics, it benefits from them.

Seen in the geographical perspective of the realm, the stress on its borders is similar to the traditional stress on borders of the village and we may venture to say that burying wars in the periphery makes up a place similar to the border-defining cemetery of the PRIA village or local society. The difference between the scales is also one of time: the offering lakes continue to now and then attract a burial ceremony, while the border-defining local cemeteries become obsolete in RIA. The reason for this is no doubt the character of the realm as a politically young and less stable structure than the village: in the RIA, the realm may need confirmation and authentication more often than the village. Predictably, offer-
ings will in the mid-millennium, eventually follow graves to settlement-reflecting sites, but prior to this shift, war offerings and centres are mutually dependant.

The Geography of Conflict

The pattern discussed so far has showed us a small realm under attack from an inferior enemy commemorated for trying in vain to penetrate its borders. At the same time, these attacks are employed in helping the realm to define itself in such terms as ‘centres’ and ‘borders zones’. This pattern would seem to fit into a more general geographical structure attested by some written and material examples that mirror the relationship between people in a wider sense.

Lotta Hedeager has noted that in southern Denmark during the very beginning of the 1st century CE, a number of people were buried with some extraordinary elegant Roman drinking vessels and corresponding tableware. These grave equipments demonstrate a positive relationship with Roman culture, at least when it comes to ideologically loaded drinking habits, which are often thought to designate the difference between the civilised and the uncivilised. Romans or the representatives of any supposedly superior culture have always got drunk in a responsible way whereas barbarians, foreigners and neighbours have always been known to soak themselves. Roman depravation as depicted in popular books and TV series is our way of paying back the Romans, corroborating our moral high grounds while tickling ourselves a little.

South of the Danish border, although we approach a zone of much more dominant Roman impact on Germani, there are no such contemporary grave finds exhibiting affinities between Germanian and Roman ways. Convincingly, Hedeager explains their absence with reference to hostile feelings towards the invading and prosecuting activities of the Roman army. When we single out this oppositional pattern in Germano-Roman relations, we can also put ourselves in the position of the Romans and sketch a small political geography dividing the world into three. The good guys, in this case the Romans, live in the south. North of them, in what must by definition more or less be a conflict zone, we find the barbarian bad guys, i.e. Germani defending themselves against the Roman project of civilisation. Further north in South Scandinavia there are some nice albeit primitive guys who embrace Roman culture, despite their barbaric level of civilisation, at least when it come to drinking. This geography mirrors but a specific political situation because the world is divided into two: Romans and Barbarians. Nevertheless, a model of antagonists and allies (i.e. people who could be induced to attack your enemies from behind) seems to have been introduced by the Romans when dealing with the barbarians, and thus diplomacy with a measure of divide et impera to which the Germani did not object. Although this model was introduced during a famous and short-
lived 1st century period of conflict, it would seem eventually to have had wider connotations in the Germanian view of the world.

In the 9th century CE, what the Northman Ottar or Othere from Helgeland, in what is today northern Norway, told King Alfred, indicates precisely this. Othere is a border man, the most northernmost of all Northmen. He tells Alfred about those who live even further north and we are given to understand that they are people he exploits and he knows of no one beyond them. His description is quite detailed and he is aware of the problems linked to his exploitation of different tribes or people. Contrary to this, those who must have been Othere’s neighbours to the south are hardly mentioned at all. Othere’s information about this part of the world is mostly concerned with the breadth of its coastland. The widest and best parts are southern Norway; further north, the country becomes narrow in all respects. Othere points out the time it took him to sail through narrower Norway on his way to South Scandinavia, i.e. Skiringssal and eventually Haitabu. This, on the other hand, is where Othere has his connections, and part of his goods, their market. As recent excavations have showed, Kaupang is indeed more of a South Scandinavian outpost than anything else and reading Othere’s story, we understand that reaching Skiringssal is indeed to reach civilisation south of an anonymous country. Kaupang feels very much Denmark, or at least a bridgehead in a Danish sphere of interest. As the Northman he considers himself to be, Othere sails to civilisation through Norway and such a relatively important area as Trøndelag does not figure in his geography, given that Alfred bothered to give a faithful account of Othere’s story.

Viewed from the southern centre of civilisation, be it Kaupang, Hedeby or Wessex, Othere is a partner or a friend who lives north of Norway. Although he does not put his travels into a political perspective or one of antagonism, we still see the division of the world into three: (1) the civilised who belong to the south; (2) their neighbours, however their attitude, outside or just north of civilisation; (3) our friend beyond our nearest neighbours further out or further to the north. This role of a friend from further north, a friend beyond Alfred’s potential enemies among Danes and Northmen, is pursued by Othere when he presents his gifts and his story to Alfred. Othere’s perspective is peaceful and his loyalties, which are built on the notion of being beyond something else to which he is at best indifferent, are nothing more than personal. He expresses but a minimum interest in any of that kind of prejudice that lies at the bottom of an ethnic understanding of the world.

There is archaeological evidence to support the principle behind the structure of Othere’s worldview, inasmuch as one of his closest neighbours, the chieftain at Borg on Vestvågøy in the 7th and 8th century, chose to layout the impressive main building on his farm along South Scandinavian rather than Central Scandinavian lines. The extensive display of South Scandinavian luxury in the form of glasses may also be seen as signs of affinity. Inasmuch as designing ones dwelling is a way of pointing out cultural affinities, the chieftain at
Borg sided with South rather than Central Scandinavia. Eventually, in the 9th and 10th century, the layout of the main house was brought in line with a Central Scandinavian style. It has been suggested that the chieftain at Borg, who got his hall smashed in the 10th century, was one of those expelled to Iceland by the Norwegian King when he brought the aggressive south-north conflict into northern Norway. This is perhaps rather improbable, but literary and archaeological evidence suggest that any Norwegian King troubled by Danes would prefer in some way or other to free himself of a Helgeland chieftain.

Framed, on the one side, by what may have been a short-lived, predominantly military understanding of foes and friends in a geographical perspective, and on the other side a late narrative implying a more general way for an active chieftain like Othere to seek affinities as well as a way to order the world outside his own domain, we can turn to Beowulf for a more symbolic, but still relevant way of looking at people, landscape and antagonism.

In the first part of Beowulf, we are told about a conflict caused by the monster Grendel. There are however, a number of conflicts lurking in this royal Danish family, hall and country and thus in reality a host of reasons for all the troubles caused by Grendel as well as a number of broadly catastrophic qualities inherent in the monster. Whatever the deeper meaning of Grendel and the Grendel conflict, its geographical dimensions reflect our model. In the centre and in all probability in the south, we find the Danes and their king, Hrothgar. Danes are the epitome of civilisation despite their being pagan. Sad to say, Grendel and his mother have settled themselves in the inland wilderness just beyond the border of this realm. Not surprisingly, their abode is a mere that strongly resembles an offering site—an underwater world containing among other things old weapons, and after Beowulf’s visit also two mutilated future bog people. From these outskirts, Grendel terrorises the King and his hall, i.e. he attacks the centre of civilisation. In Beowulf, therefore, civilisation is attacked by barbarians who have infested its borders. One would perhaps have expected the neighbours to help the Danes, but that is not the case. Instead of neighbours, Beowulf, who represents the relatively distant Geats, arrives to save the Danes and their King after rumour has spread the news of their troubles. Beowulf succeeds, because he is able to travel between different worlds, although he is not a monster, and able to engage dangerous outskirt inhabitants in combat. In symbolic form therefore, the actual defence of the realm after its hall has been attacked several times, takes place in the border zone next to the votive offerings as it would indeed have taken place somewhere at Kragehul, had the King’s hall stood in Gudme. Beowulf and his men, the friendly visitors, land on the border of the realm, however, at walking distance from the hall on an open coast similar to that of the Gudme area. Since Beowulf is a mid-millennium story, a significant part of the fighting takes place in the hall, and the trophies won by the hero, Grendel’s arm and eventually, his head brought home from the mere, are all put on display, in essence sacrificed, in the hall.
The possible occurrence of a conflict linking in with the geographical model discussed here was anticipated already when Beowulf as a child visited the Danish court together with his father. On that occasion, despite being a child, Beowulf was treated kindly by Hrothgar, who in those days was still a prince. Owing to this first visit, Beowulf sets out to offer his help and since he is remembered by the King, his services are accepted. When prince Hrothgar was nice to child Beowulf, he revealed a good measure of prudent foresight combining a mutually beneficial agreement with the standard geo-political model—making Beowulf his friend beyond his nearest neighbours.

The three cases that we have looked into so far stress the link between geography on the one hand and on the other politics, conflicts and affinities; as well as realm, land or area and individuals representing themselves or a people or a kin. The geographical model creates a space for anticipating and coping with antagonism while trying to solve it by means of allies that are not your neighbours. It is in other words a model for precaution and diplomacy with reference to a certain form of conflict. Foes and friends were probably most often the nearest neighbours and next of kin and thus participants in a conflict that did not easily conform to the model, but every now and then, it would come in handy, perhaps because it modelled the outrageous.

The way Jordanes describes the geographical distribution of tribes in Scandinavia is consistent with the model conflict among communities and it makes sense that the central narratives used by Jordanes were actually about conflict and structured that fit the model, thus making it simple to transform them to a geography of tribes. It so happens that the first tale fits the geographical scale of the Fyn example, because a small realm, in Jordanes’ case perhaps somewhere in western Scania and Halland, consisting of several small tribes or kinship groups, i.e. settlement concentrations or a district in archaeological terms, is attacked by a number of enemies covering a relatively large recruitment area. In principle, this area would seem to fit the geographical distribution of the weapon types found in warfare sacrifices, and a major attack on an area that could well need the support of friends further north, who could help by attacking the aggressors from behind, Fig. 114. However, there are other implications in this geographical model of conflict and alliance.

Consider the following hypothetic scenario: The failed attacks instigated by Gudme together with their Norwegian allies, on Jutland and the Debjerg realm show as offerings at Illerup near Skanderborg. At the same time, the back-stabbing of the Gudme realm performed by the allies of the Jutes, such as people from Zealand, show as prestige goods, i.e. presents from Debjerg, in graves in southeastern Zealand, where it was still important to inaugurate a dominant social position with graves. These gifts were most valued because they reminded people of the drinking cups in the grave from Hoby, the 1st c. diplomatic gifts from the Roman commander Silius to his Germanian friend, chieftain and ally north of the tribes engaged by the Romans when they conducted their punishment expeditions after the Teutoburgerwald. By means of skilled diplomacy,
the powerful men in Gudme prompted a Norwegian attack on Jutland without throwing in their own forces next to the Norwegians. If some Norwegians managed to bring back a Jutish princess as a Wealhtheow, i.e. a foreign booty, and a sign of their successful intervention, her rosetta fibula may be the one found in a grave in Jæren.

Perhaps or perhaps not, the point is to indicate that when we introduce the notion of a realm with a centre and a border, i.e. a defended area investing in warfare and ideological manifestations, and when we link this to the general ideas of political geography in terms of antagonists and allies, the archaeological material in manifestations, such as richly furnished graves, are no longer a simple mirror of local or regional structures. When we introduce political models, befitting the structure of small realms and their power struggle, the traditional archaeological evidence, whether made up by graves or warfare sacrifice, is no longer straightforward.

Even so, we have strengthened the overall model pointing out at least one or two small realms in southern Jutland, one on Fyn, one on Lolland, one on southern Zealand, two in Scania, one on Bornholm and one on Öland. These realms may not have covered the total area, several parts of the region may be outside their sphere of dominance or acting as buffer zones, and there may well have been small or temporary realms that did not need, or were not able, to
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produce a warfare sacrifice. We nevertheless have a number of cases in which RIA realms stand out as centrally ruled areas, defending their borders.

This is essential, because it does not sound RIA at all—it sounds LIA and VA and contrary to the idea that to begin with, the King was a leader of tribes largely by means of his charismatic qualities, i.e. the notion that a king was King of his people, not primarily of country or realm. The poem *Ynglingatal* is a case in point because, irrespective of its date of composition, there is little doubt that from its own point of view, it describes more or less MP kings as roaming warriors. They did not begin to defend their realm until the royal family of this poem moved to Vestfold and the VA. In Denmark, where we would expect the development to progress slightly faster, we would still not speak of the defence of a border until after the construction of defence systems such as Danevirke. In short: during the RIA, we expect tribes to defend themselves as tribes, not as realms or countries. The exception to prove the rule may be Southern Jutland and defence works such as Olgerdiget and Æ Vold.

As the previous pages have shown, this tendency to favour a slow but progressive development of kingship is in all probability to overlook the evidence of the warfare offerings and their landscape in a period of warfare which comes to an end in the MP, only to be revived in the VA. This hint to the revival of a practice also fits in with the gap, albeit a relatively short one, in the dating of the structures related to maritime warfare. As it happens, the LMP introduces a change in the way power is organised and executed.

**Maritime Warfare**

Underwater barrages and warfare sacrifices give us some insights into the maritime warfare of the Early Iron Age, because at least in Nydam, boats were considered worth offering. In a large offering, given that one could expect a force of 500 men to make up an army, we would have expected some 10 to 15 Nydam ships and boats, i.e. one vessel for the equipment of each 30 men. To put this in another way: the captains of the boats were the officers of the invading army. The reason why the officers’ outstanding gear is more common than boats is of course that boats, contrary to officers, seldom were present when the battle started or later on when it came to selecting and destructing the weapons. The boats were probably still on the coast or at sea and one might even consider that some ships were hired for the actual transportation of parts of a small army and rowed away by a fraction of the men they transported. However, as a rule and before the sailing ship, we should assume that those who rowed the boats were also the men who fought the battles. The Nydam site in turn had topographical qualities that made it relatively easy to bring the boats to the offering site and that may be one of the simple reasons why they were also considered sufficiently contaminated by war to be sacrificed. The general picture of offering sites close to the coast and the lack of boats among the sacrificed objects...
suggest that the armies when landed broke the contact with their means of transportation and that they lost tempo completely when they reached land. This is probably not an entirely correct picture because it was in the interest of the defenders to show that immediate defeat befell an army that invaded from the coast. Still some chose to go ashore and we should imagine two types of warfare—the inland conducted by marching armies and the coastal one depending upon boats. The former was slow and relatively easy to contest, the latter fast and evasive. Obviously, a successful landfall was the precondition for the success of inland war.

On the one hand, some of the inland dikes at least in Jutland reflect the successful metamorphosis that some armies must have been able to undergo when they reached the shore and headed inland. On the other, underwater constructions in the Danish waters testify to a maritime warfare and at the same time they are a divide in the landscape that makes up a barrier between the two kinds of warfare.

There are at least two different kinds of barrages in southern Denmark. (1) At Gudsø (barrage D1), Nakkebølle and Jungshoved they block the inlets and prevent the access to bays that could give protection and a strategic advantage to a fleet hiding in the cove. These barrages are part of a plan that aims at neutralising potential naval bases, Fig. 115A&B. (2) Æ‘lej and Margrethes bro in the outermost part of Haderslev fjord protect vast settlement areas from intruders. These barrages are part of a defence system impeding attack, Fig. 116. They were not always successful and from a military point of view also less interesting because it is so obvious why they were constructed. From a warfare point of view, it is much more rewarding to study the first category, because the waters they seal off are only tactically interesting. They refer to a more complex maritime method of war.

The topography of Gudsø vig is elucidating. Looking at the bay on a large-scale map, it becomes obvious that this inlet is not in reality the entrance to a settlement area. Before reaching land, one must pass a wide marshy area, a sike, which makes an attack from the sea virtually impossible. Having crossed the marshy area, the intruders are met by steep slopes, ideal high grounds for the defenders and difficult to climb for those who attack. On the other hand, if the intruders just stay in their boats, they will be protected by the sike, which is equally difficult to pass for those who would like to attack the ships. At the entrance to Gudsø vig, a narrow, in part slightly higher peninsula could be used by those living on the bay as a campsite and an observation post. This peninsula is protected by topography or at least easily defended. Gudsø vig therefore is not just a harbour and a shelter; it could also be used as a naval base, were it not for the barrage. Later in the VA, by means of new protective barrages outside the creek, Gudsø did indeed become a naval base.
Fig. 115A. A map of Gudsø vig and its barrage

Fig. 115B. A map of Nakebolle fjord and its barrage.
Turning to the sea, i.e. Lillebælt, it becomes obvious why there is a point in controlling Gudsø vig. (1) The inlet is close to the narrowest passage along the belt. (2) It is a good place for observations and (3) one’s own fleet is difficult to spot. Pirates hiding in Gudsø vig may choose their victims as best they please without much risk of being defeated by them, as long as they choose to go for pushovers only. Making use of the creek to gather an invading army eventually to be used somewhere else is obviously also an option. There must in other words have been a great point in sealing off Gudsø vig if one represented a responsible and land-based political force in the area, be it in Jutland or on Fyn. The idea of blocking Gudsø vig agrees well with the fact that the barrage itself is made up by whole trees with roots, trunk and branches—this is an obstacle rather than a sophisticated construction allowing people to pass in and out.

In its inner parts, the topography of Nakkebølle fjord is in principle very similar to that of Gudsø vig, but the marshy area is wider and instead of a slightly higher peninsula, there is a small convenient island in the marsh. Around Nakkebølle there is not much to attack on land and consequently no one to attack those who establish themselves in the creek. We know less about the barrage here, but have little reason to understand it as a strategic pier in a harbour.

Instead, we must conclude that the fjord was sealed-off to prevent its inner parts to be used as a naval base.308.

A most characteristic vík phenomenon is the harbour- or jetty-like construction at Stavns in Stavnsfjord (the fjord of the stem) on Samsø, dating back to LRIA, Fig. 117. In these shallow waters, a number of poles were driven into the bottom of the fjord in parallel rows supporting jetties that would allow boats to moor a 100 odd metres from the shore, where they avoided being stranded by
the tide. Today, when there is little need to accommodate for more than a few small boats this design, prompted by the shallow waters, consists of thin rows of poles only.

Stavnsfjord was a strategic hide-away, a base for boat crews, fitted out with suitable islands for camping and outlook as well as a characteristic protective sike area combined with shallow waters. Stavnsfjord has two natural outlets leading to the waters north of Storebælt, one past Langør and another, a narrow one, formed by an opening in the reef, Besser rev, in the eastern part of the fjord. No large ship could use this latter passage, but it would have suited a Nydam boat well. Similar to Gudsø vig, Stavnsfjord is made even more complete during the VA by means of the strategic Kanhave Kanal, which is an outlet from the fjord into the waters north of Lillebælt. This channel dates to the 720s CE, but the preserved and dated wooden walling constructions need of course not be the oldest remains of the channel. When sailing men-of-war and more deep-going vessels become the norm, Stavnsfjord loses some of its strategic values. Nevertheless, in the beginning of the 13th c., there was a royal stronghold on Hjortholm the island opposite the Stavns harbour area. This presence signifies the difference between Iron Age and medieval organisation, since prior to the VA, realms could not invest in protective and manned peripheral fortifications.

Sheltering and harbouring in a ‘vig’ or a ‘nor’ or a ‘fjord’ is a natural thing to do, but the strategic point in doing so depends on three maritime qualities: (1) the outlet should be easily accessible, (2) the creek itself protected by a sike area and (3) provided with an easily defended hills or islands. If these conditions are
fulfilled, such an element in the maritime topography will constitute a strategic EIA naval base where one could live during the ‘boat season’ and be a pirate, or gather strength before attacking something worthwhile. In Stavnsfjord, pirates could shelter and settle permanently.

The new excavations in Nydam have provided a helpful inscription alluding to maritime warfare. It was found in connection with the large Nydam boat and written on an axe shaft. It tells us in poetic measure and opaque words that Wagagastir alu : uhgu sikijar : aibalatar—‘I Wagagastir the sikijar’ who am an ‘oath taker’ (aibalatar) consecrate [something]. The author uses the obscure but probably powerful word, alu, and the more comprehensible but slightly misspelled uhgu, i.e. wihgu—‘I consecrate’. Whatever the more specific meaning of these two verbs in the 1st person singular present tense, they fill whatever they fill with strength. Formally, the axe (shaft and head) speaks and consecrates, but the appellatives would seem also to include the owner of the weapon, because wagagastir means ‘wave guest’ or ‘guest from the wave’ and a sikijar is a ‘sike dweller’ or ‘inhabitant of the sike’. Few appellatives would be more suitable for an honourable gang member pirate and his weapon hiding out in a place similar to a non-blocked Gudsø vig or Stavnsfjord before attacking from the sea. He probably paid his last visit in the environment of Nydam, but the appellatives, his likely death and perhaps even the oath he took, fit a specific kind of warrior with an archaeological background in bays and votive finds. Man, apppellative and axe represent a maritime warrior and maritime warfare.

Looking further into the written sources, we find two more prominent names designating people related to maritime warfare: wicing and se-dena, Vikings and Sea-Danes, i.e. people belonging to or living on a vík i.e. a creek, and Danes belonging to or living at sea. Widsith, the poet who mentions both in his catalogue poem considered Vikings to be an aggressive cynn and people with whom he once travelled, that being what Vikings do. Sea-Danes are simply Danes sailing the sea and spending a considerable time there. A well-known example of the way they spread Danish power is Prince Hnæf’s visit, by boat as it were, to Finnsburg as part of the Danish expansion on Jutland in a period after the RIA when Danes met Friesians. It seems that whether you are wicing, se-dena, wagagastir, or sikijar, you are pretty much the same kind of maritime warrior. You may engage yourself in piracy or plundering or politically inspired warfare, but irrespective of your engagement, the heart of the matter is the strategic use of the waters, the archipelago and the bays and creeks of South Scandinavia. As long as the boats are small, southern Denmark no doubt has the most suitable waters for this kind of warfare, but these waters are also an obstacle when it comes to aggressive political conflict aiming at forming a larger realm. They are difficult to control and thus difficult to use in uniting the small realms already making up the political geography of the region. Larger and better boats, a fleet, good harbours and towns by the coast, the LVA concept so to speak, are needed to keep South Scandinavian realms together and pirates at bay. Putting a stronghold in a creek to neutralise its potential is also a good
idea, and there are several early medieval examples of this practice, the above-mentioned Hjortholm in Stavnsfjord being a case in point.

In the long EIA run, it is impossible to keep up that kind of control, and thus the welfare of the region is at risk when it becomes a more permanent zone of conflict attracting people from afar and threatening the small realms. When this happens, it is conceivable that it will eventually lead to peace in a waste land, but as long as continuing southwards is an option, people from the Scandinavian Peninsula will continue to leave their boats and pass through the area, destabilising South Scandinavia rather than destroying it. People living in the area may also be expected themselves to migrate southwards. Although we only hear of the migrations of people living in the southern and western part of the region, i.e. Jutes, Angels and Saxons, linguistic indications prompt us to expect an earlier migration of people from e.g. Fyn312.

When places such as Dejbjerg, Dankirkke, Gudme, Uppåkra and Sorte Muld are destroyed during a relatively short period, and most of them unable to revive themselves as the centres they once were, then this is a sign of sweeping political change. In political terms, this change creates a vacuum filled by people who in the process of filling it came to consider themselves to be Danes. Already in the 560s, an army, in part consisting of Danes, was destroyed on the banks of the Lahn and drowned in the river, some 50 km north of Mainz313.

The existence of people with a foreign architectural ideal when it comes to the main farmhouse is attested by the initial, mid-sixth century, farms at Tissø and Lejre, the Bulbrogård and Fredshøj farms on Zealand. On these magnate farms, the main houses are Central Scandinavian in their layout, and thus the two farms give a somewhat delayed archaeological support to Procopius’ story about migrating Scandinavians (in Procopius’ terms Danes) invading and settling themselves in South Scandinavia. The reverse, a Southwest Scandinavian (in this case Jutish) main house in a Central Scandinavian context, is attested by the first main house at the magnate farm Borg in Lofoten. This house is contemporary with the ones on Zealand and testifies to the same: the intrusion of powerful individuals with a foreign architectural ideal314. In South Scandinavia, some of these people were predestined to take over the land holdings of the former aristocracy by virtue of their victories that destroyed farms such as Dankirkke and Dejbjerg. In this situation, it is conceivable that people from Jutland, instead of emigrating westwards or southwards, may have contemplated going north. The power struggle may have gone on for a long time, but eventually, when there was no possibility of gaining anything from going anywhere, unrest on a super regional scale came to an end.

The maritime warfare helped to enhance the political geography of the RIA before it helped bringing about its end. Yet, it is easy to see that the maritime strategy is the same that characterises the VA. Not surprisingly, the second stratum of dates from the maritime constructions comes from the LIA, the VA and the EMA. It makes sense, therefore, that irrespective of the political situation, the original Viking strategy lived on and developed in a form of renaissance that
did not survive the formation of the Kingdom of Denmark and the early medieval state.

There is reason, moreover, to believe that the term ‘Viking’ actually designates bands of maritime warriors who lived in or at the ‘viks’ of Southern Denmark already during the RIA. Pirates did not disappear with the Viking Age, but their tactics and their ships did. Nevertheless, tactics could be revived under special circumstances, such as during the Napoleonic war when the Danish fleet, having lost their men-of-war, constructed gunboats propelled by oars and taking advantage of the shallow waters in southern Denmark in a kind of partisan war with the English fleet and its ungainly men-of-war, that nevertheless dominated most Danish waters.315. Indirectly, the strong link between the strategy and the waters it fits becomes apparent when reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and its account of what we call Viking attacks. When these started to occur the word ‘Viking’ had been part of the Old English vocabulary for centuries. Therefore, it is a bit surprising to see that to begin with, in the entries of 789 CE, the aggressors are known as Danes; fifty years later, in 833, they are understood as shiploads of Danes and not until another fifty years later, in 885, they have finally become Vikings, as well as shiploads of Danes. This analytical series indicates the progressive understanding of the phenomenon: (1) language-defined aggressors, (2) an abstract martial body and (3) a behaviour-labelled aggressor. However, it also demonstrates that people attacking over the North Sea were not immediately understood to be Vikings. Knowing the environment in which the maritime warfare developed in the EIA the reluctance of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is understandable because it is not original Viking behaviour to cross the North Sea. Since better boats, the emblem of the VA, need not change the genuine essence of a traditional lifestyle and those who practice it—it makes sense that Scandinavian warriors who adopted and revived the original way of life when they were still ploughing Scandinavian waters would have found the term appropriate, also when they expanded their naval capacity. Nevertheless, it took them a hundred years to introduce themselves and their upgraded identity.

In the LIA, development in Scandinavia changed the meaning of the word and it was thus reintroduced in English loaded with a somewhat different meaning. Interestingly enough, this happened once again, but this time in Danish during the 17th century, when the warfare doctrine and its accompanying lifestyle had been out of use for centuries. The word was introduced from Icelandic in the form ‘Viking’ and with new antiquarian connotations. Had it continued to be used from the RIA and onwards into modern times it would have become ‘Vijing’ in modern Danish in the same way as ‘vik’ changed to ‘vig’ and ‘sik’ to ‘sig’. The weakening of the k-sound in wícing is testified already in Old English through the spelling wicēng.
War on Land

The war offerings and the barrages corrupt our view of the landscape of war, because primarily they reflect specific martial strategies and political situations typical of the RIA and EMP. On the other hand, since they present the picture of a distorted context, this picture becomes interesting in itself, inasmuch as it does not show us armed conflict in a general Iron Age perspective. In such a social perspective, as far as it is reflected in the archaeological record, aggression is linked to the defence of places and in some cases defence of an area. As we have seen, remains of defended places, some fortified settlements and defence structures meant to protect village areas, are known already in the PRIA. The settled places, such as Borremose or Priorsløkke are a mixture of stronghold and civil settlement and Ceasar’s lilies at Grøntoft and elsewhere are a form of village defence. Such temporary defence systems including dikes have probably been common, not least while they are few compared to multiple-purpose defence works in areas rich in stones and unproductive land where nobody would bother to erase a stronghold from the surface of the earth.

Eventually, during the RIA all farms, which were by then the home of many more people than the members of the nuclear family of PRIA, were surrounded by a fence and frequently a stout one. Despite the large number of people living on these farms, the relation between the perimeter of the fence and the number of possible defenders tells us that these settlements were indeed farms behind a fence or perhaps a palisade, but not defended farms. Nevertheless, against smaller parties there is protection and seclusion behind a barrier, not least if it is guarded. In general, therefore, society was protected, gated not fortified.

In the RIA defence structures there seems to have been dikes, barrages and the odd ring fort. These structures could of course be applied in a border defence or protection system and there are tendencies to use barrages and dikes in that way in southern Denmark, but strictly speaking, fortified borders rather than dikes within an area are a post RIA phenomenon.

Dikes are difficult to date, but in their IA form, they are strongly related to Jutland. It is difficult not to see this as a result of the peninsula’s relations to the Continent. In a similar way, ring forts rather than dikes are a rational device although perhaps a too costly one on an island such as Öland where landing is possible almost anywhere along the coast. The Jutish dikes are interesting because they do not have one common orientation or an obvious spatial distribution related to any specific human geography. The enemies therefore do not come from any specific place, as they tended to do later on, and they are not headed anywhere special when they are engaged or stopped. Similar to the Ölandic case it is easiest to explain the character of this loose pattern with reference to roaming and plundering armies now and then stopped by means of dikes.

Had we been able to map all the dikes belonging to the RIA we would probably have got a picture of the major points of conflict with a weak ten-
tendency to concentrate in the Hårvejen corridor of communication running north-south through the landscape, but otherwise we would have found dikes in most places except along the east coast. In all cases but one, Porskjar/Vingsted, we would not have found any dikes in the immediate vicinity of a warfare offering. In effect, this means that the dikes are situated inside the realms representing places that may have repeatedly been worth defending. In southern Jutland, dikes and war offerings are complementary similar to the way inland and coastland warfare match each other.

The second group of RIA fortifications are the ring forts. Except for Gamleborgen on Bornholm and a number ring forts, or ring fortifications erected in PRIA, ring forts constructed during the RIA and the very beginning of the MP refer to nine limestone forts with vertical façades on southern Öland. They are densely organised settlements. In economic terms, they comprise everything from temporary sheds with no short ends, over temporary houses, to ideally planned societies with a primarily rural economy, although strongly marked by a military presence. With a usage so diversified, a measure of ideology behind the investment is probably essential and a common denominator when constructing a ring fort. These ring forts are situated in such a way that part of their perimeter faces either a water-locked area or in one case the edge of the Ölandic limestone escarpment, but they also fit a situation where the settled and fenced rural landscape meets the open grassland. Given the fact that their vertical limestone walls and parapets have a total height between 5 and 10 metres, their position in the flat Ölandic landscape becomes most prominent and each fort a landmark in the area to which it belongs. If manned in a proper way, i.e. one man per each five running wall metres, nearly all these fortifications are impossible to storm without the use of artillery, given that nobody opens the gates. Essentially, it takes a Roman way of laying siege and an organisation able to do so, i.e. military insights much closer to Roman than Germanian doctrine, if we want to conquer such a ring fort. There is nothing to suggest that any of these forts were successfully attacked before their secondary use in the Middle Ages, and we may safely conclude that they exhibit an unnecessary martial sophistication. They are indeed a show-off meant to point out security. It is telling that the portcullis gate at the Eketorp fortress, in itself a paragon of impressive fortification, is as yet the only gate of its kind build outside the Roman Empire. The gate, which is in principle always open to friends fleeing towards it even under a siege, is an emblem of security.

In military terms, the Ölandic ring forts make it possible for people to bring themselves and their belongings into security, if society cannot or has not had the time to call out the armed forces and engage the enemy in battle. Also in this way, the ring forts are strongholds similar to Roman fortifications and with their situation in the Ölandic landscape, they are easy to reach. Such a stronghold is of course an advantage, but especially so if you know that something like the Roman Army will come and rescue you. If that army is engaged elsewhere, another one shall have to do the job.
This means that Ölandic ring forts need to be part of a larger military organisation. Even as civil organisations, whether temporarily or permanently used, their role can be fulfilled only in close cooperation with the surrounding society, i.e. the society which erected and invested in them and thus in effect dominated them.

Since the only totally excavated ring fort is the one at Eketorp, this is also the only place in which the military element can be elucidated with any clarity. The Eketorp community is organised as a hall-governed society, and in the hall, the military element is made obvious by the finds of arms and fragments of armory. Equally important, however, is the absence in the hall of artefacts relating to the female part of hall-life in a rural setting. The hall in Eketorp therefore is not a first hand reflection of family life or temple-like ritual.

The ring fort settlement is an early case of compact living and the households are small and many in relation to the area covered by the fort. This relation is necessary because there must be people enough to carry out everyday life and subsistence economy as well as hands enough to undertake the defence of the fortress. The economy moreover, is not complete from the point of view of self-subsistence, inasmuch as there are no fields in the vicinity of the fortress and thus no agriculture on which to survive. The nearest fields, not surprisingly, belong to the nearest farms one or two kilometres north and southwest of the ring fort. Wheat and barley, which are present in the fort, must in other words be obtained from the surrounding farms. Instead of agriculture, the households are engaged mostly in husbandry but also in handicraft. In some cases, dwelling, husbandry and handicraft are stuffed together in the same house, indicating a very poor household indeed. To complete the picture of poverty we can add those people who lived in one of the corners of the byres.

The crowded poverty of the ring fort should not come as a surprise, but as a confirmation of the balance between the needs of the defence and the needs of the households. In Eketorp, this means that at least some 60 men are required to man and defend the walls. In a crisis, one can of course add people to the garrison, but in a small ring fort, it will always be difficult to make ends meet.

Eketorp therefore is something between a planned village and an urban area, in terms of its being densely populated and fortified like a township. It is a civil settlement as well as a stronghold and indeed, from a theoretical point of view, something very Roman. Were we to defend the wall and master the northern portcullis gate this Roman dependency would have become apparent, inasmuch as it takes military professionalism to do. In terms of drill, the defenders of Eketorp—60 men defending the parapets and perhaps 20 defending the two gates, the portcullis being difficult to manage—would seem to have had much to do, especially after the Roman Army closed down its permanent educational program in the 5th century.

As soldiers, therefore, the defenders of Eketorp were at least in part highly professional, as long as the defence system was intact. They were a permanent garrison, although organised within a semi-civilian society, and they were only
one side of the local Ölandic defence, since they needed to cooperate with the field army. The largest ring forts form a barrier around the Björnhovda centre situated between the centre and the warfare sacrifice at Skedemosse or Dalby further out. In this series of five fortresses: Mossberga, Ismantorp, Gräborg, Kalkstad and Bårby, thousands of people from the Björnhovda area could find a safe-hold within a couple of kilometres, Fig. 88A&C320.

By the end of the 6th century, the portcullis gate in Eketorp has been blocked and the southern gate simplified. The settlement starts to lose its economic differentiation when nearly all houses are rebuilt as dwellings, and by the middle of the 7th century, there is no reason whatsoever to maintain this kind of settlement. It is abandoned and pulled down in good order, probably to prevent squatters occupying the abandoned houses. Some squatters, nevertheless, settle themselves in makeshift abodes in the ruins along the ring wall321.

The pattern on Öland suggests that in the 4th century it has become a viable option for a relatively speaking wealthy settlement area to invest in limestone fortresses. In the 5th century, there were further investments in these forts and they grew in size and sophistication, but by the 6th century, such investments came to a close, and eventually the fortresses became obsolete.

Defending Öland is in essence a response to the same kind of warfare that haunted the whole of South Scandinavia. Some societies were able to invest in warfare offerings and fortifications such as dikes or fortresses and they are both in part inspired by Roman fortifications. On Öland, the easily quarried limestone made it possible to copy a more complex idea, namely that of a country scattered with farms supported by strongholds combining civil and military needs, the equivalent, albeit humble and wanting, of the fortified township in the Late Roman Empire. Nevertheless, the idea of the field army with access to ships was the main military doctrine.

**Battlefield Preserved**

A fortress such as Eketorp is something deviant in EMP. Deviant because it was planned as a defended settlement with fortification architecture hitherto unseen on the island or anywhere in South Scandinavia. It was also deviant because it took trained soldiers to uphold the defence. In Eketorp, the architecture was governed by the needs of the fortification as a stronghold and its function as a safe-hold for those settled in its surroundings.

Being such a thing as a planned and settled fortification and thus erected in view of a threat to the Ölandic society, it is odd that Eketorp shows no sign of ever having been attacked. During its ruined state in the VA and in its medieval version, such signs are abundant322. Did the threat not exist? Was the fortress too strong? Or have all the traces of an attack been wiped out? Be this as it may, Eketorp is deviant because it is in principle inaccessible to an army that does not use artillery to demolish the parapet. Contrary to Eketorp, RIA settlements
in general are accessible but they too show few signs of having been attacked even though the occasional house may have been burned down. There is, however, no reason to doubt the armed conflicts of the period and the plundering and devastation that go with it. That in its turn means that there is a considerable lack of RIA battlegrounds.

Strife no doubt is a precondition of the battleground, but for a battlefield to be preserved, there are a number of other things to take into consideration. First, one must have the will to preserve it and not just a wish to clean it up and erase it from the surface of the earth and consequently from any future archaeological record. This latter reaction seems to be a human response to battlefield, and that is no doubt what has happened in all the villages that were attacked in South Scandinavia. The RIA therefore, was a dynamic period that left no ruins behind to commemorate disaster. Settlements were pulled down and cleared, because in South Scandinavia no land was deserted; on the contrary, the settlement expanded and normalcy and order came to be the archaeological outcome of the period. Winning a battle in your own settlement area would probably not result in a battleground for anyone to see, except for a short while, because a battleground is indeed a horrible sight. Moreover, even when we see the reflections of war, in contexts such as warfare offerings or Ölandic ring forts, the image of a strong society taking care and coping successfully with conflicts is not far away, despite the obvious presence of warfare.

Nevertheless, excavations as well as literary sources make it clear that there was from time to time a great point in preserving and in enhancing the horrors of the battlefield and hand-killing. Two examples will suffice to point out the main reasons for this. Excavations at Kalkriese and the literary description in Tacitus’ *Annales* of a place known as the Teutoburger forest match and complement each other. Here Varus’ legions were annihilated in the year 9 CE, and six years later, Germanicus on his punishing expeditions into Germania Libra visited the place. It was obvious to the Romans, and later to the archaeologists who excavated parts of the site, that this was indeed an installation of defeat in an ambush, a Roman disaster exhibited with slain men and officers, mutilated copses and atrocities as well as disgraced symbols of power and small altars composed of spoils.

There is little doubt that the Teutoburger forest, confirmed by the excavations in Kalkriese, was an installation consciously constructed by the victorious Arminius for everybody to see and contemplate with horror or relief or whatever, as long as the impression was significant and impossible to forget. Since Arminius, himself a Roman cavalry officer, was well versed in Roman ways, he probably knew when he understood the width of his victorious ambush that the Romans would return to the site, although he may not have envisaged the success of Germanicus’ punishing expeditions against the Germani. Therefore, Kalkriese is a way of showing, among others, the Romans, that the Germani can be as cruel as the Romans when it comes to triumph. One must not forget that it was an unadulterated Roman pleasure to throw unarmed prisoners of war to
the lions and watch the animals kill them\textsuperscript{324}. Whatever Arminius envisaged, the Romans did come back and the installations did make an effect, because seeing them it became obvious that Varus’ legions had not just disappeared. Owing to the installation, which made devastation visible, Varus’ defeat and the width of his shortcomings went down in history, but the most significant feature when it comes to Kalkriese is its situation, which is conveniently out of the way. It is outside the borders of society and in that respect, most similar to warfare offerings. Kalkriese as it were, is offering and battlefield in one and the same installation. Kalkriese points out the affinities between Roman, Celtic and Germanian tradition when it comes to offerings in connections with battlefields\textsuperscript{325}

Even in South Scandinavian warfare offerings there are a few subtle hints to battlefield behaviour. When Ilkjær and Lønstrup had showed that weapons in different depositions tended to be of different geographical origin, a number of analyses of the iron in the weapons were made in order to corroborate or falsify their interpretations\textsuperscript{326}. The material consisted of 10 knives that were not associated with any specific personal belt, 4 lances and 1 spearhead. All the artefacts came from the same offering, i.e. Illerup Place A, Fig. 118. The analyses showed that when a weapon was a characteristic one, such as lance or javelin, then the chances were good that the morphological and metallurgical origin corresponded, but simple weapons such as knives could be local equally well as foreign. Indeed, the chances were more or less fifty-fifty, although nine out of ten objects were actually made from iron with a characteristic composition. Only one knife was forged by a mixture of different metals.

To begin with, and simply enough, this means that (1) commonplace weapons are simple and not easy to determine by their looks. The following-up conclusions however, become more intricate, inasmuch as we must ask ourselves why half the South Norwegian warriors, whose weapons ended up in Illerup Place A, had Jutish knives? The answer is that their knives were not Jutish, because there are only very odd reasons for suggesting that they were. Instead, we must think of all the weapons at Illerup Place A as (2) selected from the battlefield with the purpose of being sacrificed. Selected, i.e., from a hideous scene where anonymous knives clearly contaminated by war could not easily be said to have belonged either to an enemy or to a brother-in-arms. When we select our material to be offered, it is obviously not a matter of taking only that which belonged to the defeated, e.g. unbuckling and collecting their belts with what was hanging on them. Instead, the idea was to select the right categories and a sufficient quantity: it was cardinal to collect and sacrifice a correct quantum of knives! Take knives (the weapons that come out when spears and lances are no longer useful) even if you are not sure who their owners were! (3) Within the offered objects, we find the denotations of concepts such as the enemy, the battlefield, the defeated, the unlawful, the contaminated … and together they make up the concept of ‘warfare’ and its connotations.
If Arminius took art installation to an extreme that few modern artists would dare to reach out for, then the Romans at Heldenbergen managed to create a lasting battlefield, i.e. their burned and ruined *vicus*, scattered with dead Germani and their arms. This arranged context of defeat, which nevertheless signified a destruction of the *vicus* in the first part of the 3rd century, was left as a field of the slain for 150 years before the place was tidied up. Heldenbergen is a revolting battleground and a Roman settlement abandoned because it was attacked. Here the dead, partly covered by debris in the ruins, were left to be eaten by animals and to a visitor the scattered equipment would have suggested that the dead were indeed barbarians, rather than Roman forces.

Heldenbergen was not in the middle of nowhere; on the contrary, it was just an hour’s walk on the road from the Limes fortresses Altenstadt and Marköbel to Mainz. The battleground therefore would have been a memento for all who passed by. Had it not been a comforting sight for the Romans, they would no doubt have covered it up. Silently, but nevertheless, we may in other words
conclude that the maimed bodies and scattered weapons in the burned ruins made up a frightening scene for non-Romans because it looked like a Roman victory, which it may well have been, despite the fact that the *vicus* was given up. In the 3rd century, cutting Germani to pieces may have been more essential than defending a *vicus*.

When successful, both the Kalkriese syndrome, arranging the battlefield as a monument of atrocities with offerings and altars, and the Helderbergen syndrome, leaving the battlefield as a pattern of Gehenna for barbarians or antagonists to contemplate and Romans to hail, are two extremes to measure against. In comparison, and slightly ironically, the first extreme shows a social responsibility at the heart—the other, irresponsibility or indeed incapability. In the mythical mid-millennium universe that we are approaching, the first is the result of a Beowulfian violence, hanging up Grendel’s arm as a trophy under the top ridge of the King’s hall signifying the limit of the hall and strengthening both the building and its ‘border zone’. This is archetypical behaviour, moving the war offer from the lake at the border of the realm into settlement and hall. The other is the result of Grendelian violence destroying the hall farm, killing its inhabitants and leaving things at that. This difference is also indicated by other finds. The remains at Vædebro of hundreds of slain men thrown into lake Mossø close to the Illerup war offerings hint at communal rituals related to the EIA battlefield, recalls the Danes later drowned in the Lahn, and stress a liminal situation. Not least the wooden image from Vædebro, ‘the Goddess’, would seem to be mirrored in a piece of information found in Germania (7.2) *From their sacred groves they remove certain images and symbols that they carry into battle*. The dead men under the collapsed wall of the burnt down house next to the hall at Uppåkra on the other hand remind one of a wish to force the living to continue their lives in the middle of the hall-centred MP battlefield.

Since Beowulf is the hero and Grendel the monster of the poem, the hall itself cannot end up a Heldenbergen scene. Archaeology nevertheless show us that that may well have been the end of several halls, because smashed and abandoned halls are by no means infrequent in the 6th and 7th centuries. They are not yet as frequent as warfare offerings, but with every other year, their number grows.

The chronology is significant not only because it tells us that we have entered a period in the middle of the millennium in which halls were smashed, but also because by then, the strategy of defending the realm at its borders was no longer successful. Not only was it no longer successful; by attacking the centre, the attackers obtained their goal, the heart of the realm and the hall. This, however, was not just a purposeless Grendelian campaign, because it did not mean devastation only. In all probability, it meant conquering land. In fact, the central buildings only are destroyed and the settlement continues although it may have lost its significance in the process.

The hall is the symbol of realm and power and the point of destroying it, rather than making it one’s own, is to erase its former owner and his power.
base. Whatever the character of the defence—a field army or a chieftains retinue—the option of the war has become another when the halls and hall farms become the prime target. The point in this warfare is to make sure that power is removed and in all probability replaced by the victor or someone loyal to this hero.

The second point about attacking halls is wasting them, inasmuch as the point was to smash them with all their luxury. If the hall owner had met his end in a battle at the borders of his realm there would have been plenty of time to hide and disperse with the goods and time for the leading families to reorganize. When this is not the case, we must suppose that the hall was attacked and insufficiently defended. The enemy is literally speaking knocking at your door and that means that your field army has been so passive, feeble or otherwise engaged that in reality is has seized to exist. The scale of the war therefore has changed and it has become similar to strife about leadership and power among the elite. In this situation, there is a point in preserving the destroyed hall and hall farm as a battleground, because it represents the defeat of foul and old impotent leadership and the triumph of a new and capable one. For ideological purposes, the new lord creates a monument of defamation signifying that a wanting old lordship has been uprooted and crushed. There may still have been great battles, but there was also simple power struggle within the elite aiming at reducing the number of prominent hall owners. This is what the general phenomenon of the smashed halls tells us and there is support for the interpretation in written sources, but there is an even more essential support to be had from archaeology.

The Hall at Uppåkra

When projects centring on central places started to become popular in the 1990s, the Uppåkra project was funded and soon it turned out to be one of the most successful ones. There is long continuity at the place, but also a very prominent phase of destruction, which would seem to have changed the status of the place from one at the very top to one among a group of top ranking sites. In this perspective of destruction, the hall series that ended with House 2 at Uppåkra must be brought to the fore. The excavators prefer to see the house as an enigmatic one, which could be a hall as well as a temple or vice versa. Although it may well be difficult to define a temple in religious and practical terms, it would seem that such a difference between temple and hall was relatively small in the middle of the first millennium, with the ceremonial similarities being more striking than the differences. As late as in the 11th century, tempulum and triclinium signified the same thing in Uppsala and even though that may have been a backward place, Uppåkra c. 500 CE would hardly have been past this communion-befitting combination. Perhaps these mixed qualities of the hall are especially true in Uppåkra where the hall, owing to the find of a
drinking cup and a fine example of a mead bowl beneath the floor, would seem to fit a mixture of ritual ceremony, offerings and communion.

The hall as a room and the hall as a building however, are two different things also in the archaeological record. To begin with, but after the PRIA proto hall rooms at Feddersen Wierde and Tjørring, the hall is a small one-room building with a mixed function as the sitting, dining and reception room of the hall-owning family. This room was no doubt ideal for religious ceremony in a private setting with invited guests, but it was not a public room and not the dwelling where the daily life of the family took place and not the ‘officers’ club’ at Eketorp. As long as this character of reception room and interface is the main function, the hall is still a small one-room building, even if the ceremonial purposes were relatively room-consuming. We should remember that the number of persons meeting in Heorot, the hall of the Danish King Hrothgar, were no more that c. 40 persons, according to what can be figured out from Beowulf. Even though the building in Uppåkra is a relatively small house, there is still room for some 30 persons and a ceremony. At Gudme, the hall is larger but still a small house. The situation is the same at Gudme and Uppåkra as well as in 6th century Bulbrogård and Fredshøj: the hall is a small house next to impressive main buildings, Fig. 119A&B. It is in other words a sign of authenticity that it did not occur to the Beowulf author to exaggerate his numbers when halls of his own day and age, e.g. at Lejre, would have looked half empty with only 40 guests.

As pointed out above, with the examples of Østergård and Vallhagar, the hall as a building grows during the MP and becomes the dwelling of the hall farm family containing a number of other functions centred around the hall room. This would then seem to be more of a templum, triclinium or officers club only, i.e. the interface between different high status agents in society. Eventually in the VA, it is possible that part of the ceremonial hall functions are moved into small freestanding buildings such as the ones found in Tissö and Järrestad, and perhaps Toftegård and Lockarp. In those cases one would think of a kind of temple and church, similar perhaps to the freestanding house in the Yeavering complex. Here at Yeavering, the capability of the hall to at least temporarily uphold the function of a church room is nevertheless attested by written sources, telling us that Paulinus held a sermon in the hall. Generally speaking, all the formats of speech, such as prayer, sermon or consecration, as well as the stratified arena and events such as communion, i.e. the functional and social elements needed in a church, exist already in the LIA hall.

When the ceremonial functions of the hall buildings are separated from the household of the hall-owning family and moved into a house of their own, it becomes easier to see them as public and consecrated to a deity and thus formally belonging to the house of this deity. A developed church organisation, moreover, will prefer to have its public sermon and mass performed in houses consecrated as public churches, albeit mainly for a specific congregation and used for religious purposes only. The private church, open to invited guests from a surrounding community, be it a room in the large hall or a separate house next to it, was a passing phenomenon.
Fig. 119A. Plan of Gudme showing the large main house and the small hall. The latter has been rebuilt a number of times on more or less the same spot.

Fig. 119B. Plan of Uppåkra with the small repeatedly rebuilt hall in the centre. The large houses next to the hall are not yet completely excavated, but they are larger than the hall. The western house, contemporary with the hall, is the burnt down house in the ruins of which several corpses must once have been visible.
There is in other words a kind of similarity between the RIA/EMP and the LVA, inasmuch as the hall function tends to be more exclusive or indeed free-standing in these periods than earlier on in the PRIA proto phase, as well as in the LIA. That said, the great difference is the fact that in the VA the sacred part of the hall function is isolated and subtracted from the original concept, i.e. from the hall owner’s arena and interface between public and private spheres. This makes it possible to give the house to the deity and its servants—to God and his priests. Contrary to slightly later churches, such VA hall/temple/churches hybrids can rarely be found in the landscape, because they still need the support of a large farm with a differentiated hall building.

Sometime in the transition between the EMP and the LMP, perhaps in the beginning of the 6th century, the small hall building in Uppåkra was destroyed or pulled down without immediately, or as usually, being rebuilt, Fig. 49. There are clear signs of a new house having been erected on the spot, House 2, but it did not last long, and may well have been preceded by a hiatus and a ruin period, in which there was a floor layer on the spot but no sign of a roof-supporting construction or a fireplace. Instead, it is the earlier houses 12 and 14 that represent the destroyed hall. These are halls that have been smashed, their posts dug out and stripped of their ritual ornaments, iron fittings torn apart, and a ceremonial mead bowl and drinking cup buried in the floor. These buildings are contemporary with the latest warfare offerings at Uppåkra, Uppåkra 1, which consists of the heads of javelins and lances. If we sort them according to Ilkjaer’s typological system, and in one case Nørgård Jørgensen’s, we can date the find to period D1 or perhaps c. 500 CE, Fig. 120A. We may however wonder whether the dating of one of the arms, Nørgård Jørgensen’s lance, type L1, is correct, when we compare it to the other types, or whether it is a later contamination of the find, or indeed part of later sporadic sacrifices. The main point, however, is the overall chronological distribution which emerges if we apply a rough index giving us the relative number of javelins and lances per year between the 1st and the 5th centuries, weighed against the length of the main chronological periods B, C1, C2, C3 and D1. We assign the concluding sixth period, i.e. 460–560, the value 1.0 just to make it visible in the diagram, even if it is doubtful whether the weapon in question belongs to the find.

Be this as it may, the chronological distribution is clear enough and it resembles a hoard of coins, inasmuch as most weapons are contemporary, whereas some stand out as a tail of older weapons. Bearing this in mind, we may ask ourselves whether the distribution mirrors our immediate impression: a hoard of javelins and lances, or perhaps a combination of several offerings. If we compare Uppåkra to the Illerup offerings, Fig. 120A–C, i.e., if we put the javelins and lances from Illerup into a diagram with chronologically sorted types, it becomes clear that weapons offered on one occasion represent a limited number of chronologically speaking very narrow types. It is in other words easy to split the totality into its parts, because the spearheads sacrificed at each occasion tend to form a peak in the distribution. That, however, is not at all the case in the
Uppåkra 1 distribution because, similar to a hoard, even if it has been collected at a relatively small number of occasions, it tends to squeeze out some but not all of its older items\textsuperscript{339}. Comparing Illerup C to Uppåkra 1, the difference becomes evident. Illerup C shows us the weapons that were used in the beginning of the fifth century, when Uppåkra 1 was deposited and it is obvious that Illerup C has a very limited number of types, precisely as we would expect a well-equipped army to have\textsuperscript{340}. By comparison, Uppåkra 1 displays a completely different kind of distribution. One might say that similar to a hoard, the material in Uppåkra 1 seems to come from a context that tended to continue to bring along the time depth of its accumulation, albeit stressing the latest acquisitions. This interpretation of the find as indeed a hoard and a deposition of a collection is supported by the fact that types produced at widely different points in time are seen laying next to each other in the concentration.

Fig. 120A. The chronology of the weapons in the warfare offerings at Uppåkra. Grey columns represent the date of the different types. Black columns represent an index relating the number of weapons to the number of years within a wider period. These periods are 0–150; 150–250; 250–320; 320–390; 390–460 and 460–560 CE. Types dated to two periods are weighted fifty-fifty, e.g. C3–D1.
**Fig. 120B.** The chronology of the weapon types in the deposition Illerup place C (black) compared to the warfare offerings at Uppåkra (grey).

**Fig. 120C.** The chronology of the weapon types at the two chronologically distinct Illerup offerings, place A and C (black) compared to the warfare offerings at Uppåkra (grey).
Consequently, the distribution should be interpreted in the following way: Having defeated the defenders and conquered the hall, the victorious attackers collect the weapons belonging to the slain and captured, together with arms from the hall and the king’s armoury, in order to break them before they were deposited next to the battlefield, i.e. next to the destroyed hall. The hall is smashed and the position of the offering place nearby is no doubt a well-known place to anyone who survived the battle. Ritually speaking, Uppåkra combines battlefield and sacrifice as a manifestation of the end of an era. These spears are the equivalents of King’s men and arms and perhaps his personal spear or lance conquered after his defeat in the battle of his hall. The smashed hall deprived him of his hoard of weapons as well as his insignia. The hall was eventually built up again, but it hardly belonged to a place as central and dominant as before and probably to someone who, contrary to earlier lords, did not mind having the memorial battleground and the offerings next to his hall. To him it commemorated victory rather than defeat. During the summer of 2007, excavations at Uppåkra uncovered the so-called Brandhuset “The Burnt House”. In this house, at least three slain or wounded persons were caught in the flames and buried in the collapsing house when it was set on fire. Afterwards, they were left to rot in the ruins. There are remains of many more people in and around this house, and those who were not completely covered by collapsing walls were left exposed for everyone to see and contemplate. These new finds add a Heldenbergen dimension to the character of the defamation installed in Uppåkra when the mid-millennium scene was exposed as one of arson, battlefield and victory at a conquered central place.

Whether there are any well-known old spears and friends of Gungner’s in the Uppåkra collection, let alone the hall owner’s own, is hard to know, but it is not unlikely that some of the spears had a reputation, because they were spared in the first place, although soon outdated. Indirectly, the Uppåkra find tells us that a king or lord had an armoury at home as part of his hall farm equipment. In addition, the weapons in the hall at Eketorp, where parts of weapons were found in the hall room, tell us to expect weapons to be kept there. The same situation, weapons in a specific room seem to befit also the somewhat later hall at Helgö, which in a typical LIA way combines a hall room with a permanent dwelling room.

One wonders how the spears ended up in Uppåkra in the first place, and it would of course seem that, like many of the other luxury finds in the Uppåkra hall, they could be gifts or spoils. Such a conclusion is not farfetched, because, as already noted, not everything an army brought along was offered in the warfare offerings: some things were no doubt taken home to the victor’s hall to remind visitors of the victory, the way at least the javelins and lances in Uppåkra would seem to remind one of earlier wars and battles. The spoils from a victory can therefore be said to be divided into three parts: (1) the things that were left on the battlefield. This is the equivalent to what one finds in the hall ruins at Uppåkra, and the burnt down house next to it, these houses and their
surroundings being themselves the battlefield, and thus a field for sacrifice and installation; (2) the things that were sacrificed in the lake, or in the Uppåkra case at the nearby offering site; and lastly (3) the things that the victors brought home in triumph, i.e. some of the treasures once brought home to the Uppåkra hall as spoils, i.e., both some of the things that were found, but also things that were removed by the victors when they in their turn destroyed the Uppåkra hall and returned home.

The function of the spoils in a hall is partly to support the recapitulation of the history of the site and its owner combining each spearhead or trophy with an historical event. In this way, a hoard of weapons is the equivalent of the series of names recited by the poet Widsith in the beginning of his poem. Their function is that of putting the poet and his days into a correct historical perspective. Owing to their similar mnemonic qualities as remainders, only a few items in a hoard of spears or coins or names refer to a very distant past whereas recent days are frequently touched upon. Spears, names and coins, and eventually during the LIA luxurious grave equipment, employed e.g. in boat graves, are hoarded in the same way and sorted to become historical records and the stuff that tales are made of.

In a recent analysis of the ‘object-as-history’ in boat graves, Svante Norr has shown how the material metaphors depicting the past in the graves equal the literary ones presented to us in Norse and Anglo-Saxon poetry. As material installations, boat graves becomes metaphors for a vast number of concepts such as ‘warrior’, ‘traveller’ or ‘ruler’ and to all these concepts, there is a historical dimension expressed in the old objects interpreted as gifts and heirlooms used to furnish the burial with the past. Some artefacts grow old just because of the fact that they are precious, but in VP boat graves, most of the old artefacts are simply old weapons; fine rather than outstanding and gilded rather than golden.

When such antique boat-grave armoury was first described, ‘oldfashioned’ and ‘useless’ were thought to be appropriate terms. Today, when the value of the past has become a general one, characteristic of also of the past itself, old arms should not be thus dismissed. On the contrary, when collected, they represent the past as a hoard supporting a narrative. At Uppåkra, the points could have been expected to tell a grand story similar to the one told by Widsith, but the armoury in a boat grave is more likely to tell two stories: (1) the grand narrative of people and places and (2) the heroic narrative of the deceased linking in with the first.

As outlandish funeral guests at Valsgärde, we point to the helmet and we are told (1), what context it belonged to and (2), how the deceased got hold of it. Needless to say, everything could be gifts and heirlooms, but if travelling warriors as the ones in Valsgärde were those in habit of destroying other people’s halls, a hoard of significant old and new armoury might well be collected among the spoils and enhanced by the occasional gift bestowed upon any powerful man. It is only natural that when halls become military targets, the souvenirs of a warrior’s life end up as a significant collection of arms in his grave—
they were his victories also when he was presented with them. In happy cases, when there is a need for grave monuments as well as a boat grave ritual, we can understand smashed halls and loaded warrior boat graves to be two sides of the same coin. Needless to say, *Beowulf* is fiction and so are boat grave and battlefield installations.

### Conclusion

Between 200 and 600 CE, the landscape emphasising warfare changes from one kind to another. The difference between the two is one of essence and scale. The first kind comes down to us in the archaeological record as the defence of a settlement area, region or realm commemorated in border zones. The other is signified by the attack on the hall farm i.e. on the central point of a power. Consequently, this is also where they are commemorated. When it comes to the latter kind of warfare, the archaeological record and the early poetic narratives correspond in essence and scale.

There are two kinds of foes: neighbours and foreign war bands—armies or gangs roaming by sea and sand. With warfare becoming hall-centred and thus politically motivated in a struggle of power, the need for large armies is reduced. If the notion of land ownership had not been developed over the first centuries of the first millennium, eventually introducing the steward, conquering a hall would have meant no more than conquering the hall estate itself and thus only limited economic and political power. However, since the notion has indeed changed, the potential outcome of conquering a hall means conquering several estates.

The stratification of society and the reforms of farms and villages during the RIA was a precondition for building small realms based on and comprising several settlement concentrations. Judging from the settlement examples from Öland and Fyn, the realms centring on Gudme and Björnhovda could easily have raised armies of 500 to 1000 soldiers and that means that they fit the warfare indicated by the warfare sacrifices. Likewise, the limited number of battle-contemporary javelins and lances sacrificed at Uppåkra correspond to the small amount of men needed to attack and destroy a hall and conquer the estate belonging to it.

Whether intended or not, the social development during the RIA, in combination with endemic warfare, opened up for a power struggle among the upper classes, where landholdings tended to become constant and landholders shifting. On an economic macro level, the dynamic effects of the Roman Empire helped creating the small realms, despite escalating warfare. Consequently, with the downfall of the Empire, the shrinking possibilities for external acquisition on the Continent contributed to the *raison d’être* of the mid millennium power struggle. The change in the landscape of warfare indicates that the notion of the realm, and a central place governing the realm, gave way to a notion of a hall-
based aristocracy dominating and owning the estates and villages that were their source of revenue.

Although the notion of ‘land’ and profitable ‘measures of land’ play a role in the poems, farms do not have a prominent position compared to the heroes and halls that depended on the income yielded by the estates. Moreover, when it comes to warfare, the poetic analysis of its day and age seems anxious to cover up or at least pretend to be unaware of the economic realities behind the fighting. This is what makes the quotation from Widsith, which introduced us to mid millennium warfare, so significant. Let us look at the lines once again and keep in mind what we know from Beowulf:

\[
\begin{align*}
Hroþwulf & \text{ ond } Hroðgar \text{ heoldon lengest} \\
\text{sibbe atsomme, } & \text{ suhtorfaedran,} \\
\text{síþþan hy forwræcon } & \text{ Wicinga cynn} \\
\text{ond Ingeldes ord forbigdan,} & \\
\text{forheowan at Heorote } & \text{ Headbeardna þrym.}
\end{align*}
\]

Rolf and Roar, nephew and uncle, held the peace between them for a long time after they had driven off the Viking tribe and bended Ingeld’s spear (and) cut down the Heathobards’ force at Heorot. (cf. Malone 1962).

Ingeld is the son of Frodo who is King of the Heathobards. Heorot is the hall of the Danish King Roar and this splendid house marked his inauguration as a ruling king—the equivalent of one of the new halls at Gudme or Uppåkra. We are told about the beginning of his reign, i.e. in bygone days when Rolf and Roar were still working in tandem and faithful cooperation in order to stabilize the realm and build a lasting peace. We know that animosity, i.e. power struggle, will soon follow.

The realm is under a series of escalating attacks, but we may also say that in order to come to grips with this situation, the two Danish Kings follow a scheme. They start by getting rid of the Vikings. Then they turn to Ingeld and defeat him before they successfully defend King Roar’s hall in the centre of Denmark against the invading Heathobards, whom they managed to cut to pieces. A forceful king with an outstanding nephew, Roar solves all the problems a new king will run into: small problems with Vikings, slightly larger ones with rival kings such as Ingeld, and the great and dangerous ones signified by an attack by the force of a people on the hall in the heart of one’s realm. The escalating splendour of their victories is comprised in the series of neutralising forwards: *forwræcon, forbigdan* and *forheowan*. Vikings operate in the waters outside a realm as pirates. They are thrown out. Ingeld and his men may be taken as a roaming king with a retinue impinging on Roar’s realm. They are crippled. Roar in his youth, by the way, was the same kind of roaming prince, albeit a successful one contrary to Ingeld who is a loser. The Heathobards are the force of a rival tribe practicing its ethnogenesis while attempting to avenge their
prince and dethrone Roar. They are butchered. Vikings are a nuisance, Ingeld is campaigning and the Heathobards are genocidal. Geographically speaking, the Heathobards are living south of the Danes and in this poem, they are seen as aggressors, but in a larger perspective, we have good reason to see the Danes themselves as expansionists pressing southwards. Most probably, the Heathobards in *Widsith* and the Friesians in the *Finnsburg Fragment* and the corresponding *Finnsburg Episode* in *Beowulf* are both striking back trying to prevent the expansion of the Danes.

The point in this small story is the threefold variation and escalation putting the hall and its King, Roar, who came to power by virtue of his military success, in the very centre of everything. This is odd, because it is odd that there is no realm in the tale, no lake offerings, no central place, no Gudme-equivalent area, no defence system, no market place by the sea, in short, no Roman Iron Age – just a hall, swarming pirates, roaming princes and self-proclaimed, desperately ethnic war bands.

If we bring *Beowulf*, part one, into the picture, hall centricity escalates and we lose the past, because time depth is but a couple of generations, and more or less the present. One of the few hints at a more remote past, a hint we must infer ourselves, is Grendel’s mother who live a Nerthus-like life in a mere with rusty arms (for being a Nerthus figure, her sex is conveniently instable inasmuch as she is now and then called ‘he’). From her hall in this sacred lake amidst sacrificed arms, she and her devilish son launch their attacks, and, lo and behold, they represent the greatest threat ever to society and civilisation. This literary MP society has no roots in the past at all. In fact, *Beowulf* is a tale of the rise and fall of civilisation in no more than a handful of generations. The analysis in *Beowulf* is in other words so biased that in all probability it conveys exactly what the author intended: a conscious break with the RIA analysis of the world and a radical change in upper-class mentality.

The MP is presence without a collective history, or to put it differently, an outbreak of modernity linked to a strong sense of easily identified objects and individuals as history. We should not be all too convinced that it was as traumatic as described in *Beowulf*, because that and many other poems are composed with the hindsight of the medieval kingdom supported by Christian law and order. As landscape archaeologists, we can see some of the precondition for such a shift in mentality introduced with the MP, but we must still ask ourselves how did it come about? As of lately, three archaeologists have presented each their interesting explanations.

Lotte Hedeager sums up her discussion of the Hunnic connection thus:

*There are systematic and recurring traces in the material culture of Scandinavia that indicate a structured transmission of symbols with affiliation to the Huns. In the North they became contextualized in a process of cultural and institutional invention. This short his-
torical period of the fifth century and the establishment of new institutions for gaining political power might have opened up new ways of thinking and new perceptions of the world, as indicated by the institutionalisation of a new symbolic system. This ‘episodic transition’ represents a decisive and conscious religious change that sustained the rise of a new Germanian identity in opposition to the declining Roman West and its new Christian faith.

Ulf Näsman describes the period in question and its ethnogenesis thus:

Late Roman Iron Age, Early Germanic Iron Age and Early Late Germanic Iron Age. The period is characterised by a long course with many wars and eventually it results in a fusion of tribes in fewer and fewer tribal confederations with an overlord and dependant regional kings. The written sources points to the Danes as leaders of the tribal confederation, which achieved hegemony over South Scandinavia during the 6th century.

Svante Fischer outlines the character of kleptocracy in the following way:

Kleptocracy initially suffers from an overload of knowledge production. At its onset, it has all the necessary intellectual ingredients to reproduce a fairly complicated state apparatus. But this is not considered a top priority in relation to the harsh economic and political realities. Given the clumsy approach to economic development, knowledge production inevitably suffers. This means that literacy becomes less important when the economic surplus to support such a luxury disappears. This chapter is divided into sections that discuss: 1) the Roman roots of Germanic kleptocracy; 2) how society suffers a regression from this criminal social order; 3) how Germanic literates sought to express themselves in a kleptocratic technolect.

It would seem that all three agents, Huns, Danes and Kleptocrats, as well as what has been pointed out in this study about the way Scandinavians acted in the middle of the first millennium, are compatible and that between them, all four perspectives support the interpretation of the period around 500 CE as a period of stagnation and revolution. There is no doubt a revolution among the upper classes creating a number of new mental and social structures. The hall is transformed to the home of the aristocracy, the rulers, being hall owners, are also demigods. Civilisation becomes hall centred. Journeys between worlds become a sign of civilisation and problem solving. The importance of orality grows at the expense of literacy. Leadership related to an area gives way to leadership of a people. The upper classes start to define themselves in terms of being ‘good’. To begin with, none of these changes are linked to the kind of agricultural reforms that signified the RIA. The large estates are probably kept intact, but the rural landscape is stagnating. The MP revolution is an ideological change, imposed sword in hand upon an existing society in which an old eco-
onomically dominant aristocracy is replaced by a new one. This modern aristocracy is ethnic, kleptocratic and heroic inspired by the Hunnic notion of geographical network dominance rather than the realm. Warrior ideologies have been latent during the whole period of external acquisition and pillage economy targeting the Continent. The MP ideology, nevertheless, is so coherent and so anti-Roman that it takes the organised Roman Christianity to neutralise this landslide in mentality and ideology. With no such Christianity at hand, South Scandinavian culture developed very much in its own right and that brought about a larger measure of economic stagnation than in societies exposed to a more immediate Christian impact. New heroes and upper classes accompanied a substantial change in the expressions of material culture in which the most significant South Scandinavian outcome was stagnation and the subsequent MP revolution. Nevertheless, the idea of landownership that developed as a result of the economic contacts with Roman world system was not threatened by the turbulence.

NOTES
265 There is a good deal of general knowledge on the subject to get hold of in Otto & al. (2006) and Claessen (2006) writing about the connection between war and state formation finding the former often partaking without being a necessary or sufficient cause for the latter. See also Steuer (2996), whose argument makes it possible to see some similarities between state forming events in Middle Europe and South Scandinavia respectively. See also Hedeager (1990:136 pp & 184 pp.).

266 Prisons located near the small airport Szymany in Poland and Michail Kogalniceanu in Romania (Paglen & Thompson 2007:112 pp.). In their book Torture Taxi, Paglen and Thompson describe CIA’s rendition flights and the network of prisons between which the organisation moved people whom it had unlawfully seized and tortured. The structure of this case of torture-as-policy, allows us to see the globalisation of torture and the resulting transportation of victims. We get a glimpse of the capability to violate human rights and national and international law, i.e. state terrorism, and understand it to be important in itself. Together, structure and policy result in strategic values, such as a civilised homeland surrounded by a brutalized world and suitable confessions made up by the tortured victims, in order to save themselves. The false, but nevertheless conclusive information about Iraq’s alleged weapons of mass destruction, emanated from such a confession.

267 Lønstrup, Jørn (1988) has summed up and corroborated the Worsaae-Müller-Brøndsted interpretation 1865 & 1940 (cf. Ørsnæs 1969:XXII pp.): The offerings are part of the spoils and the equipment belonging to a foreign army. The lakes were holy revisited places (Brøndsted). Lønstrup discusses the later on more popular interpretation that the offerings were part of the spoils brought home by the victors (cf. in modern times suggested by Andrén and followed by Jørgensen (2002:15, quoting Andrén) and finds it less likely. Around 1990, Ilkjær (summarised in 2003) demonstrated the large area of provenance behind the weapons in the offerings and Fabech in a series of articles (1991A; 1991B; 1994A; 1994B) saw weapon offerings, wet- or dry-land in a larger perspective of social change. This large-scale change is not distinct, but rather the result of a slow process balancing individuality against the collective. The lingering wetland tradition was emphasised e.g. by Hedeager (1999:) and Zachrisson (1998:93 pp.). Herschend (2003) has suggested that the offerings are not weapon offerings but war offerings. Näsman 2006 has summarized the warfare scene in the first half of the first millennium CE and put the offerings
into their larger political setting (see also Jørgensen 2001b). Stygar (2008) has brought back the character of the Norwegian army in Illerup in relation to the stratification of contemporary weapon graves from SE Norway seeing an army abroad and an aristocratic retinue at home. The ranks, so to speak, are missing. This is logical, given the fact that the offerings commemorate war, while the graves commemorate warriors dying at home, similar to a Roman tombstone, cf. Hope (2001:84 pp.).


268 On bog people, see Glob (1971), and on capacity of water to ensure that appalling people disappeared for good through death by water, see Herschend (1998:129 pp.).

269 Beowulf’s sword Hrunting is mentioned in vv. 1457, 1490, 1659 and 1807 and his sword Nagling in v. 2680, see further comments in Klaeber (1950) on the character of swords.

270 On Germania and Barditus, see Herschend (2005b:95 pp.).


272 On fore-singing, see Bosworth & Toller (1921:b0307).


274 The way these lines are to be understood has earlier on caused some discussion. In this chapter, however, it will be argued that today, owing to the growing archaeological source material, it is most reasonable to read the sentence as it stands.

275 On Ejsbøl, see Hans Chr. Andersen (2003:246). On horns, one found in a well the other in the Nydam offering, cf. Ilkjær (2002:27). The man who was cut down by a sword and probably hit by an arrow, but nevertheless splendidly buried in a chamber grave at Ellekilde (Iversen 2008:5) had his horn with him in the grave, but no weapons. Again therefore, the horn is ambiguous with military as well as civil connotations.

276 In an analysis of the tools of Viemose, Arne Emil Christensen (2005) has pointed out the close connection between the Roman soldier and the craftsman of an army. Christensen argues the parallel between the self-sufficient organisation of the Roman army, independent of civil craftsmen, and the equipment in Viemose. This is an interesting example showing how woodworking tools, which are in principle neutral, become infested with warfare.

277 See Ulf Näsman (2006:217 pp.) on warfare and Härke (1900) on weapon graves as not primarily linked to warriors.

278 On the scarce sources to Roman military funerals see Gioecelli (1995:236) and Hope (2001:87 p.). These articles refer to the relevant quotation from Roman authors.

279 On Germanicus see Tacitus Annales (II:18 and II:19) where it says:

‘It was a great victory and without bloodshed to us. From nine in the morning to nightfall the enemy were slaughtered, and ten miles were covered with arms and dead bodies, while there were found amid the plunder the chains which Germani had brought with them for the Romans, as though the issue were certain. The soldiers on the battle field hailed Tiberius as Imperator, and raised a mound on which arms were piled in the style of a trophy, with the names of the conquered tribes inscribed beneath them (Annales II:19). That sight caused keener grief and rage among Germani than their wounds, their mourning, and their losses.’

On Vallerbæk see FOF SB 33 Karup sogn, Lysager herred, Viborg amt. and Nydam see FOF Sb 30 Sottrup sogn, Nybol Herred, Sønderborg amt.

280 Recent investigation has been reported by Moesgaard-Christensen (2007). Weapon deposits, or buried weapons or ‘weapon graves’ as it ought perhaps to have been called had this term not been usurped by humans, are known from northwest Germany, Niedersachsen, cf. Wegewitz (1964:27; 1972:171 & 233) and Schleswig-Holstein, cf. Bantelmann (1971:14) on ERIA cemeteries, and from Fyn in LRIA contexts, cf. Henriksen (1989:71; 1991:9-11).

281 See Hope (2001:84 p.).
The neologism ‘freakonomics’ was coined by Lewitt and Dunbar (2005).


All war offerings are not sea-bound some like Finnestorp in Värstergötland are just border-bound. Non-war offerings such as Kårringsjön (Arbman 1945) can also be border-bound, in fact most wetland offerings are. Most centres, but not Uppåkra, are sea-bound or withdrawn just a few kilometres from the shore. Some LIA centres such as Tissø are markedly different from EIA centres. Hedeager (1990:138 pp.) sees the distribution of the votive offerings somewhat different and in a different geographical perspective more guided by the grave material and with an emphasis upon LRIA when it comes to the changes in the settlement structure. In this perspective, MP stands out as a calm continuation of LRIA (1990:195-206). In the present study, the emphasis on settlements leads to a more spatial interpretation of power and MP stands out as change.

See Näsmann (2006). He suggests that there are super regional centres linked to the ethnogenesis of the Danes (2006:Figs 5 & 6). He sees the emergence of these centres at the expense of the earlier regional ones discussed here. Per Ethelberg (2007) uses part of the model when discussing the border zone between the war offerings Nydam and Ejsbøl with fortifications such as Olgerdiget and Æ Vold.


Fund og Fortidsminder can be found on the address dkconline.dk, last visited May 2009. At FOF, one can also locate the place names related to the discussion on the following pages.

On iron production in South Scandinavia, see Lund (1991); Voss (1991); Nørbach (2003) and Stensvik (2003).


There are few gold finds, very little per hectare and only one rich grave (from ERIA) cf. Hedeager (1992 Figs 3.34, 3.36, 2.18 and 2.19) which illustrates the poverty of both the northwest and the southwest sectors.

On defence systems see Nørgård Jørgensen (2001; 2003).


A new annotated edition of Ottar’s voyage can be found in Bately & Englert (2007).

‘Wealhtheow’ means she who has been taken from abroad, see Klaeber (1950:Wealhtheow) and Enright (1996) on the meaning of the name Wealhtheow. The point is that Wealhtheow is well brought up and irrespective of her married off to Hrothgar of free will or after having been captured, her status as a Queen depends on the fact that she is a foreign woman, that being the ideal consort to a ruler, cf. Herschend (1998). See also Storgård (2003) for the hypothesis that brooches are the sign of political marriages and influence areas.
On the problematic naïve hypothesis in RIA archaeology, see Randsborg (1986).


This attitude was the point of departure for the Danish project Fra stamme til stat—From Tribe to State, see Mortensen & Rasmussen (1988 & 1991).

See Ethelberg (2007).

Fischer (2005:164) suggests that Gotlanders were responsible for transportation. The idea is partly based on the ornamentation from the Nydam boat found in the 1990. On the find and the boats see Rieck (2003:302f.; 1998).


On Gudsø vig, see Nørgård Jørgensen (2003), but also Rieck (1992) on the old sound that could have let boats into Gudsø vig from the North or indeed vice versa.

Along the shores of Veje fjord and Lillebælt there are a number of creeks that may serve as harbours or naval bases such as Rands Fjord (MA defence), Gudsø Vig (IA barrage, VA defence), Eltang Vig (VA defence, MA shipwreck), Ansig (VA finds), Bankel Nor (MA defence), Pugemølle Å (MA defence) and Emtekær Nor. See FOF for the sites. A similar defended VA site is Helnæsbugten on southwest Fyn, See Henriksen (1997).

See la Cour (1972:129 pp.).


Herschend (2007) on Vikings and maritime warfare argues that philologists can put their doubts to rest when the meaning ‘living on the creek’, i.e. on their boats in the water, has its archaeological support. Sike-, creek- or sea-dwellers are different terms covering a general phenomenon that later boiled down to the notion of the Viking. Fridell’s (2008) interpretation of the inscription on the 5th century stone from Möjbro in Uppland, Frawarada ránahai, i.e. ‘Frårád on the há’, where há means creek, has added another sea-dweller to the stock of proto Vikings.

In Seebold (2003) there is a rather convincing linguistic support for RIA migrations from Jutland towards Friesland.


On the war in Danish and Norwegian waters 1807-14 see Wandel (1915).

See Jensen (2003).

See Ethelberg (2007).


See Fallgren (2008).

See Näsman (1976) and Nordström & Herschend (2003:62 p.).

See Borg (2000) and Weber (1976:103 pp.).

The first example is Kalkriese, see Tacitus (Annales 1:61) and Heather (2006:46 pp.), the second is Heldenbergen, see Czusz (2003).

Civilised Romans thought it perfectly all right and fun to see barbarians being fed to beasts on the arena. Cf. Heather (2006:67 pp.).

The Greek origin of the Roman sacrifice and the Celtic influences on the installations made e.g. by Germanicus in the second decade of the first century CE have been pointed out and discussed by Picard (1957:101 pp.).

Jørgen Ilkjær has analysed the weapons from Illerup and not least the equipment belonging to the belts (Ilkjær 1993: belt types pp. 117 pp. & knives pp. 258 pp.). In 1994, he and Jouttijärvi published the metallographic analyses of the weapon sample.
Czysz (2003:180 pp. & 239 pp.) has described and interpreted the destruction phase of the Heldenbergen vicus. He also shows that the bodies were injured even after the battle was over, the warriors’ death thus testifying to the ugly dressing of the battlefield.

Because it has been taken for granted that King Roar left his hall building before Grendel came, there has been some confusion as to whether Grendel’s right arm and hand were hanging inside or outside the building. The King, however, does not leave the building just because he goes to sleep with the Queen. His hall building is similar to the one in Lejre and that means that from the hall room he goes to his own quarters or to those of his Queen. It is from one of these rooms (probably the Queen’s) that he returns in the morning and sees Grendel’s arm hanging under the golden roof in the central hall room. This installation is similar to the archetypical memorial where you decorate a tree with bodies and arms belonging to the defeated enemy, cf Hope (2003:80) and Picard (1957:120 p.).

The finds from Vædebro are presently being excavated, see FoF Dover sogn Skanderborg amt SB 208 & 281 as well as http://alken.dk/vadebroyudgravning.htm On Uppåkra see http://www.Uppakra.se/


Francois-Xavier Dillmann (1997) has clarified the meaning of triclinium. Adam of Bremen’s use of the word temple has been clarified by Hultgård (1996).

See Herschend (1992:151 p.).

See Larsson & Lenntorp (2004:Fig.25 area E).

Tissö, Järrestad and Lockarp have already been mentioned. Attention must also be drawn to the oddly constructed house 1 at Toftegård, see Tornbjerg 1998:Fig. 3). For Yeavering, see Hope-Taylor (1977).


Contemporary MP hoarding practices are attested by the Ölandic solidus hoards, cf. Herschend (1980).

See Lars Jørgensen’s discussion on army and equipment (2001B).

For the time being, this house is described only in the excavation diary in an exemplary way published on the internet during the summer, http://www.uppakra.se/ublog/Frameset.html last checked 2007-11-10.


In his analysis, Norr (2008A:176 pp.) refers to the relevant discussions concerning the age and the origin of the antiques in the graves.

See Näsmann on Danes (2006) and Herschend (1997B:40 pp.).

See Klaeber (1950:com. v. 1260) on Grendel’s mother being called ‘he’.


On Hunnic way of organising society, see e.g. Hedeager (2007).
CHAPTER VII

SYNTHESIS
P UNTIL THE BEGINNING of the Common Era, house, farm, village and settlement area were tied into the same balanced settlement system or indeed a balanced cognitive landscape with points of nodal, focal and central qualities. Prior to the 2nd century BCE, this system was to a certain extent still primarily a floating and nodal one. The nodes consisted of individually situated farms within a spatially defined rural community or settlement area, Fig. 121. In part, the social control of these communities came to the fore in the character of the farmhouse. Ideally the life length of this house was one human generation and the result of the social norms that governed society’s reproductive motor, the nuclear family. Society built on this entity and the layout, size and situation of the house reflected a balanced household in a balanced community of families. Among a relatively uniform set of households, a few were none the less extended and significantly larger than the average.

The general tendency not to build a house next to an existing one or one just pulled down, created the floating character of the settlement pattern in which houses in the human landscape would seem to rise from the ground, stand for a while and die down again as new ones grew up. The system would seem to be floating, inasmuch as it was fluctuating.

Because at least some of the pulled down houses continued to live on as a kind of house hillock (buried houses representing the passed ones) each generation lived its daily life on a scene where history was present as a spatial lineage leading down to the present from one house hillock to the next. In parts of northern Jutland, however, this tendency was completely reversed, a model of structural inversion as it were, so as to result in village mounds where people strove to build their new houses on top of old ones after having sealed their floors and concealed the remains the house and its household. Instead of living among past generations, people lived on top of them: the present parental house growing out of the past rather than cropping up next to it. Irrespective of the character of attachment to one’s predecessors, the general point of the PRIA settlement system was to build separate households and to bury the remains of old households, thus generating a concept of a settled and rooted neighbourhood within a larger subsistence area. We can choose to see the differences between the two expressions, but the common denominator, each household tying in with a collective past in a history of generations, is nevertheless the meaning of both.
Fig. 121. At Drengsted, as pointed out by Mikkelsen and Norbach (2003:16 pp), the LPRIA farms come in pairs. Moreover, they belong to a balanced pattern between large and small farms. It is easy tentatively to imagine a stepwise development of the balance. In step 1, the farms are situated at an equal distance and that also goes for the less obvious step 1.5. However, when a second generation of farms is needed, the second large farm moves away to secure its need for an empty surrounding, while the small farms move only a small distance within their close environment. Someone has decided that this is the pattern of balance needed in LPRIA Drengsted. Moreover, some are more restricted in their choice than others. Small farms as it happened could not move to the northern part of the settlement because it was the area of the large farm. Drengsted therefore is an example of the slow transition from a floating and negotiated settlement system to a more stable one. Based on Mikkelsen and Norbach (2003).

After the 2nd century BCE, only the nodal and not the floating character of the structure persisted, now in the form of villages or spatially limited settlements. The floating character would seem to be reduced to small movements within these settlement or village nodes. Little by little, respecting earlier house hillocks or village mounds will be old-fashioned and instead, pulling down, recycling and levelling off a house and a plot turning it into arable land or pasture will become standard procedure in LRIA.

In addition to the original character of a generation-bound linear settlement rooted in the past, balance was a major issue. In our discussion, the large size of such a balanced LPRIA geography has no other example than the Grøntoft area, for the obvious reason that it is difficult archaeologically to make that kind of investigation and difficult to find areas where just this pattern is legible on the palimpsest of settlement patterns. Probably a floating nodal system based on the right of the individual household will in effect create some kind of balance if applied to a settlement area, but at Grøntoft, care was taken to maintain an elaborate balance on a 100 square kilometre scale. In this area, the balanced
patterns became more prominent when the floating character disappeared. Even in less consciously arranged settlement areas and villages, such as the earliest phases of the Vendehøj settlement or at PRIA Drensted, farms were seen to form pairs. We can venture to say that there was a tendency to let ideas of balance continue to play a part, even though development resulted in households being grouped together in some kind of agglomerations. Also the Hodde or Galsted organisation, a fenced village settled along its fenced perimeter and defining an open central space while incorporating an ancient mound, contained a form of balance. At Hodde, moreover, the shape of the fenced village and that of the neighbouring subsistence area mirror each other in a kind of balanced relation. Balance is prominent, long-lived and paradigmatic in the main farmhouse and especially in its entrance room. However, when the same kind of concept is to be expressed in a landscape rather than in a precisely defined entrance space, different ways of representing the concept are needed, inasmuch as most of the pre- or supposedly non-human landscape cannot be created anew. This landscape can be only interpreted and the interpretation, e.g. in terms of balance, adequately expressed in the human landscape. A widespread way of expressing a kind of balance in the human landscape is to define the hilltops as being behind us, the settlement as being around us, and the water as being below us—‘we’ are in other words situated in the balanced middle.

In the beginning of CE, this notion of an overriding order, balancing a number of phenomena important in their own right, is shifting in a way that we can describe as similar to the change that ended the floating character of the settlement system. Perhaps the first sign of this change is the tendency for farms to be organised in rows, as series. This tendency is a fact, but transformation from floating households to organised rows, and not least the development of the notion of temporary balance to one of permanence, is subtle. So subtle in fact that it is difficult to know for certain whether the rows were the result of planning a village or just an effect created by the propensity more often than not to place farms next to each other, in a family-based series related to the generational shift in farms; or close to each other as the starting point of two family-related series. The series, instead of being planned rows, may thus primarily be the result of once vague inclinations that developed in the beginning of the first century BCE: instead of primarily being rooted in the past of a community only, time depth relating to a family or a kin became more prominent. Be this as it may, farms sites became more and more stable while their surroundings and the number of people living on the farm could vary, albeit within narrow limits.

Eventually, and despite its obscure conceptual origin, a pattern emerged which can be described as a ‘headed’ asymmetry, consisting of a dominant farm and, at least in Jutland, planned rows of dependant farms. With this change, the sorted cosmology moved into the settlement: behind us, we have the dominant farm and behind that, the graves and perhaps the hill. Among us, we have our farms. Around and below us, we have the fields, the pasture, the land and the borders with their graves and wilderness, wetland or perhaps water. Vorbasse in 3rd–4th century is a
case in point and ERIA Vendehøj a possible early example. On Zealand or in Scania, rows would seem to be more informal e.g. at Høje Tåstrup. In Halland or on Öland, rows did not exist although paired farms did Fig. 122. This radical change, singling out a dominant farm in a peripheral position with immediate access to a large part of the village area goes on up and until the 6th century and it is linked to at least two waves of reformation of land right, landholding and land use. These two waves, which occur in the beginning of the CE and c. 200 years later, become visible also in the reformation of the farms. Farms became fewer and larger with each reform and eventually more focused on intensive production. A third phase, which would have originated with the formal definition of land as indeed measured land, never managed to grow and become a wave. It was only exemplified by the singular Præstestien settlement.

Fig. 122. Map of the settlement west of the Eketorp village on southern Öland. The layout of the large farm with its T-shaped house is copied onto one of the two small ones which make up a pair and look as if they were scaled down to half the size of the large farm. It would seem that the village came into existence because the small farms were added to the large one.
In a thousand-year perspective, the settled landscape of a community has three parameters. With each their emphasis, they make up a chronological series: (1) the floating short-term settlements which characterize the PRIA; (2) the nucleated stable settlements that belong mostly to the LPRIA and ERIA; (3) the asymmetric, headed, settlement that becomes common in the LRIA and MP. Behind these patterns we see a society restricting land right, i.e. the right for a member of the community to settle and subsist on its land. At the same time, society develops landownership, i.e. the right for a member of the community to use part of its land as he or she thinks best. As indicated by the examples from Østergård and Præstestien, as well as peripherally situated larger farms such as Tissø or Valsgärde, land and land right in the middle of the first millennium CE could be owned by someone who did not live next to it. This means that when the Roman Empire is about to collapse, we see the first signs of an abstract concept of land related to economic and political power, rather than the subsistence landscape. Probably there was for centuries a cost to pay for the support and protection of a lordship with an obvious situation and presence in the surrounding subsistence landscape. What happens in the EMP is the introduction of the invisible or represented lordship.

Our knowledge about the formation of farms and villages, i.e. the permanent socio-economic landscape, is extensive compared to what little we know about the larger political landscapes or regions in which power could be situated in one of a number of possible places. However, we know enough about the main houses on the farms to conclude that contrary to the notion of balance, the asymmetrical understanding of space, separating the power centre from the spatial centre did not start in the main house. Traditionally, this centre was situated in the dwelling part of the house and represented by the hearth. In South Scandinavia, this pattern continued far into the RIA. Instead, the notion of asymmetry began in the organisation of villages, ERIA Vendehøj being the case in point. Social centrality or peer position was therefore originally linked to the notion of land as a settlement area surrounding the village, and not to the organisation of life on the farms. Large farms, whether at Pol in the Grøntoft area, in the small Drengsted agglomeration or in the Hodde village were all laid out as balanced farms and their social dominance was not obvious or permanent.

Not until the LRIA did the asymmetrical understanding of roofed space become prominent in the NQD and it took another couple of centuries before the leading family could separate from the NQD and start living daily life in their hall. In Central Scandinavia, where the development of villages is less marked, owing to the simple fact that hundreds of years into the 1st millennium CE there is often room for expansion on virgin land, there was nevertheless a need for asymmetry. Here it came to show in the layout of the main house of the farm, rather than in the layout of the agglomerations. Behind the structural change in South and Central Scandinavia respectively, there seems in other word to be something much more fundamental than farmhouse and village layout.
With the introduction in South Scandinavia of the hall, and long before it becomes the scene of daily life, we can expect to see the first signs of a regional rather than local political landscape dominated by a centre—the result of competition among the hall farms of an area rather than the farms of a village. We can draw this conclusion if we believe in the reconstruction of the elaborate large scale landscape of the Gudme realm on Fyn. Here Gudme is an asymmetrical centre or the head of a regional cognitive landscape. The Torslunda/Björnhovda area, today’s Färjestaden on Öland can be seen as a similar kind of centre.

The overall distribution of border-indicating votive deposition, gold near the Gudme or Björnhovda centres and war offerings in the periphery of these realms, suggests that most regional centres were indeed peripheral in relation to their sphere of dominance. Moreover, they were coast-related, albeit not shore-bound, i.e. in a position that facilitated interregional communications—a term probably covering a number of activities ranging from warfare and plundering to trade, touring and exogamy.

There is a wide gap in time and size between the Grøntoft Area and the Gudme Realm and for the time being, there are few possibilities to fill this gap with cognitive landscapes, although such landscapes have in all probability existed. One sign that they did and that they were not always asymmetrically ordered can be inferred from the fact that Ölandic ring forts, the Eketorp ring fort being the example, were not organised by one large landowner, but rather by a number of more equal ones. On Öland, that means organised by a number of villages that were typically headed by a large and dominating farm and thus asymmetric in their understanding of space on the level of the village. Although there was a Gudme-like centre also on Öland in the Torslunda/Björnhovda area, the ring forts would seem to be the result of a balanced understanding of the world, creating a new node or ring fort (rather than a centre) to fit a landscape on the 100 square kilometre scale.

Moreover, the overall settlement structure on Öland and Fyn, consisting of four settlement areas adjacent to extensively used unsettled areas, could well indicate that the nodal character of the settlement continued among the village units and their dominant farms in these semi-regional areas such as northern Öland or northeastern Fyn. This in turn would indicate that the economic landscape on the regional scale was still preserving part of its nodal character, while the political landscape was already on its way towards asymmetry headed by a centre. The idea of common land on a regional or semi regional level is demonstrated also by Rindel in his analysis of the long-term change on the Grøntoft hill island. When the PRIA settlements, situated more or less in the inner parts of the hill island, are given up, they are substituted by settlements situated at its borders thus creating a common grassland and resource area in the interior of the hill island.

We can of course argue that the Ölandic situation is just backward, but that is of little consequence when it comes to the origin of the asymmetric land-
scape. The main point here is the fact that the introduction was the introd-
unciation of something different from the balanced landscape, inasmuch as the latter
led its origin from the house and a much more basic understanding of sustain-
ability and reproduction within a constructed and delimited human space. The
balanced landscape emerges from insights into the home and its nuclear house-
hold. The asymmetrical landscape, on the other hand, draws upon an individ-
ual with an enhanced right to land that few others have. There is an obvious
element of landownership, social power and personal status in the formation of asymmetrical landscapes, and thus in the formation of the family structure of the dominant families.

The fact that this development is at all possible, and conceivable as a viable
analysis describing long-term change, testifies to the importance of the land-
scape as an imbalanced social space and thus also to a significant change of the social order. There is little doubt that this system was dynamic, competitive and stratifying.

**Burial Landscapes**

Contrary to the traditional archaeological valuation of material sources, graves
and the construction of burial landscape is secondary, but parallel, to the
change in the settlement landscape. There is a change in the use of graves as well
as in their status comparable to change in the settlement landscape, but by and
large, the burial landscape is a stagnating structure and not a dynamic one. Graves as burial installations, on the other hand, become active ideological propaganda exploiting themes and defining a social order in a strophic and lyrical fashion emphasising the social role of the individual.

To begin with in the balanced PRIA landscape, the relation of graves to set-
tlements could be so close that there were burials in or between the houses. Next, on a somewhat larger scale, a village or an agglomeration of houses would be matched by a group of graves, and lastly some grave groups or cemeteries were nodes that also belonged to a larger local landscape comprising several settlement units on the community/village level. In the asymmetrical RIA village landscape, new graves were often more firmly linked to the dominant farm or the farms of a community and only indirectly, i.e. through the dominant farm, to the village itself. Needless to say, this linkage is obvious in southern Den-
mark and less so e.g. on Öland, where graves are much more of a palimpsest
with several patterns on top of each other. Based on these connections, we may
speak of three kinds of graves with a landscape position related to settlement:
(1) Reflexive graves which indicate the mutual strengthening of grave and set-
tlement as a mirror of each other. (2) Graves as boundary graves which define
the border of a village. In addition, (3) some older grave monuments, which
can be said to represent the past as presence in the wider unsettled parts of the land belonging to a community. These latter graves are often much older than
the Iron Age settlements that they happen to belong to. In a way all three groups are overlapping inasmuch as they are representing, reflecting and demarcating man’s presence and origin in a given space. The need to use graves in one or more of these ways varies with time, landscape and community. The need in terms of a quantum is never great, but speaking in qualitative terms it is cardinal: without graves, a settlement is affiliated and thus not self-contained.

When we look at an early example of a manor, the socio-economic prototype of a rural centre, be it the centre of a village or a small region, we can note the following referring to the peripheral but obvious chieftain’s farm from Borg in Lofoten. Here the excavation showed that the first lavish main house destroyed at least two older graves which probably dated to the LRIA or EMP, i.e. a period after the first agricultural activities on the site and thus probably belonging to a settlement older than the erection of the first main house of the chieftain’s farm. When the graves were disturbed, they were probably more than 100 years old and still visible because they were delimited by a clear line of kerbstones and because the hill was used continuously from the LRIA and onwards. These monuments therefore were destroyed in the process of building the byre part of first main house. Moving the house some 7 metres to the northwest, or adjusting its axis a bit, i.e. undertaking a very minor alteration, would have saved the graves. Although these graves were probably rather insignificant ones, they nevertheless belonged to a context signifying the early roots of a settlement. Therefore, deliberately destroying them shows a certain measure of powerful indifference to this otherwise reasonable context. Incorporating the remains of the graves into the house on the other hand creates an echo of the PRIA fashion of linking the building itself to a burial or to human remains as a form of consecration. Because rulers, e.g. in the shape of the Uppåkra hall owners, could inaugurate themselves with a new hall for each new generation, echoing PRIA ideals of marriage and family, it is only fair to suppose that rulers remodelled society, constantly referring to themselves as the true offspring of the ideological roots of the community. Destroying and incorporating other people’s graves in the process of remodelling the landscape by adding to it a paragon of the South Scandinavian house, was in other words the only correct thing to do.

As archaeologists, we usually point out that the graves on a cemetery have not damaged each other and we draw the conclusion that the graves must have been marked in some way or other, in order for them not by chance to be disturbed by later activities. Yet, graves are sometimes disturbed by settlements, e.g. the ERIA graves at Vorbasse eventually built over by the LRIA farms. However, when this happens, we tend to explain the situation as unintentional and the result e.g. of the graves having lost their demarcations, something that would in turn have led to their position being forgotten. In the Vorbasse case, the graves, moreover, were cremation graves, which may easily become impossible to see after a hundred years or so. Not surprisingly, when we look at the plan of the LRIA village closest to the ERIA graves, we detect a tendency to loosen up the settlement pattern, thus avoiding or respecting at least some of
the graves. It follows from this kind of reasoning that we often find it hard to imagine that graves were indeed deliberately destroyed, and probably they seldom were, because as monuments they represented the past as something common. Nevertheless, the Borg case shows that there were no absolute rules against destroying and removing graves: if graves are in the way, they are disposed of or redefined. Here, some graves were in the way of some master builders.

At Borg, the reason is simple: the top of the hill, once suitable for fields if well drained, later a reasonable choice for graves, eventually became an irresistible borg or ‘uplifted hilltop’ situation for the chieftain’s farm. The chieftain or lord at Borg, the neighbour of that Ottar (or his ancestors) who travelled far enough to tell the story of his whereabouts to King Alfred of Wessex, needed the space for his cows, and incidentally in his house, as well as in the anecdotal Ottarian byre, there was room enough to fill the idle boast of a Norseman with the number of cattle recorded by Alfred. Mocking our source critical scepticism, either Alfred or Ottar had the precise sense of space needed to rate a chieftain’s byre in Lofoten or Helgeland.

In the MP, the hilltop at Borg and probably the whole area, was colonised, in a takeover tradition similar to the one employed at Vendehøj or Vorbasse, i.e. colonised by someone from a nearby or far away outside, who in the Borg case built his house in a South Scandinavian style. He constructed the foremost part of his dwelling, the one connected with the entrance room, as the classical layout of the NDQ, Fig. 123A. This notion of the sudden introduction of a new settlement and a new and foreign South Scandinavian type of house also shows in the destruction and incorporation of whatever grave obstacles the there may

---

Fig. 123A. Plan of the first manor house at Borg in Lofoten. Based on Herschend & Mikkelsen (2003). Although this is a LIA house, it is characterised by the South Scandinavian central entrance room and NDQ. In this case, the total length of these quarters is 40 feet, circa 0.31x40 = 12.4ms, divided into three rooms of 8, 20 and 12 feet respectively. The smaller room was eventually made into a 12 foot room entrenching upon the entrance room, because the kitchen dwelling in the southwestern part of the house could not be altered without rebuilding the short end.
have been on the hill. At Borg, the decision to stratify the dwelling and divide it into two becomes more outspoken in the VA when the farm owner rebuilds his main house in a Central Scandinavian style and moves permanently into his separate hall room. Still, it seems fair to conclude that when large farms are constructed as a form of colonisation as well as the establishment of a dominant economic unit, we will also get examples of disrespect for manifestations of a past that belongs to the colonised society. If going north was a mid-millennium chieftain’s option, so was going south. The Central Scandinavian layout of the main house in the initial Tisso and Lejre farms, Bulbrogard and Fredshoj, Fig. 123B, and the subsequent change of building style testify to this option.

Fig. 123B. The main building at Fredshoj, i.e. ‘proto Lejre’, circa 500 metres north of Mysselehøjgard, i.e. Lejre, with its typical Central Scandinavian post and entrance pattern. The smaller building, the hall, is situated 30 metres north of the main building. Based on Christensen 2008:19.

Earlier on, before the migration of chieftains and their chieftain mentality, grave destruction was not in vogue; ERIA Vendehøj where the cemetery would still represent continuity being a case in point. However, later on, at disrespectful LMP Borg, the situations seen at Vorbasie, Prazestien or Hjemsted, where pre-colonial graves were treated with varying respect, become outspoken because the main house is not a local construction. Obviously the chieftain may well have been born in northern Norway, but that would only have sufficed to make his break with traditions all the more remarkable. There is no way in which the north Norwegian protagonist could have defended the demolition and degrading of north Norwegian graves and ancestors with the sole purpose of clearing the grounds for the erection of a typical South Scandinavian chieftain’s house and its byre. It takes a colonial attitude to demolish and degrade cardinal ideological manifestations.

This means that in the LRIA (and further north somewhat later in the MP) the unfriendly take-over of land becomes a possibility and perhaps a successful habit. Archaeologically speaking, we see this habit as a way of pointing out one’s cultural affinities by means of demolition, and during LRIA also by means of new graves related to the dominant farm. Brødsager in Høje Taastrup where the small hamlet was eliminated to make room for a large farm and its reflective
graves is an exemplary takeover. Finally, by the mid-millennium the understanding of the landscape has changed and the needs of the new and dominant landowners have become more paramount than respect for earlier inhabitants and their cultural notions.

In terms of graves, the complement to the destruction of older graves is the erection of new monuments, and this kind of new grave monuments and cemeteries inaugurating new families are the emblem of the RIA. These monuments belong among the reflexive graves mirroring settlement and society. They were meant to inaugurate as well as anchor a new order in the landscape by means of a manifestation that signifies the roots and the foundation of society. But instead of signifying a society that constantly reproduced itself adding new graves to their landscape, these new ones were singular events that effectively put an end to almost all other graves and thus also to the landscape as a visible record of historical change. With these monuments, the traditional monumental landscape in South Scandinavia had found its final form. Although the success was far from complete, the change was still a major one.

There were many incentives in this development and one at least was economic – allowing the peripheries to interact with the Roman world economy on the basis of pooling assets, in order to create a latent surplus which, thanks to a mixture of chance and intent, could now and then be brought into the market and realised. This economic mechanism was one that eventually failed and thereby it created one of the most genuine features of the MP, the loss of rural dynamics for better or for worse. Wise in the event, we may suggest that the wish to control the monumental landscape and create a permanent situation—a prolonged ‘from here onwards’—as an everlasting monumental backdrop for any future and settled landscape was indeed the first sign of a stagnation creeping in amidst an otherwise dynamic transformation of farms.

The Loss of Dynamics

In the previous chapters, analysis singled out of two major breakpoints signified by a major change in the socio-economic foundation of the RIA farm. Both times, wealth distribution tilted and social stratification grew. Both breakpoints, moreover, supported the same social and ideological change. Although graves became less and less frequent during the EIA, and sometimes oddly symbolic and thematic in scope, the analysis of the exceptionally well-furnished graves with their allusions to an upper-class and an over-regional Roman world space, supported the conclusion that the breakpoints were the culmination of two strong waves of continental influence triggering all kinds of incentives. The first wave did not reach as far into South Scandinavia as the second one.

This metaphor, explaining Scandinavia to be exposed to waves of cultural influence from the Continent disguised as internal change and the influence of these waves reaching further and further to the north and the east, is valid also
today. However, in addition, it makes sense that these waves will now and then create a form of resistance or reaction that takes the form of cultural barriers as well as local and insular cultural patterns and customs. The Hjemsted Hill solution to the balance between settlement, cemetery and family was a case in point. On the level of the farm, it was an example of an economically reformed society, but on the socio-economical community level it linked the subsistence area around the hillock, Hjemsted, to a prolonged PRIA society resisting the waves. In the long and very long run, however, waves are none the less irresistible.

Change in settlement organisation and in cemetery intentions both support the analysis. The first breakpoint occurs in the beginning of the first century CE, and it does not mean a radical change in the farm buildings or the structure of the farms. The main houses are similar in layout to the ones belonging to the PRIA. They have grown a little and their roof-supporting trestles have become six rather than four by means of adding one trestle to each part of the house. It is typical for the breakpoint that large farms, instead of building a larger main house and new additional outhouses, have more of the same, i.e. houses with parallel functions, such as in Hvedsager and Vendehøj. Here, more people than on ordinary farms are gathered behind a fence facilitating a division of the workload as well as the raising of working hours at the expense of the leisure time that would have been the solution on the smaller farms. It also shows in the curious multi household structure of the large farm at Tjørring. This economic change is dependent on a change in attitude to the work one does on farms and in the rural economy amassing a greater surplus on large farms. In a generation or two, this change shows itself in the fact that some farms and their graves put themselves in a prominent and dominant position within their settlement. The first breakpoint therefore tends to establish the first dominant households within a village or the households of the settlement area.

The second breakpoint in the later part of the 2nd century CE strengthens this household, not least its leading male figure. The reinforcement of the leading male individual and his wife or his combination of mistress/mistresses and wife/wives becomes a prominent fact a couple of generations after the introduction of the NDQ and larger farmhouses and farms, i.e., in the wake of the one-room hall building. This change goes hand in hand with a stricter organisation of the villages or settlements in a village-sized settlement area. This stricter organisation does not always respect earlier less formal ways of organising the balance in the landscape between settlements and cemeteries. Vorbasse is a case in point. In other places however, this organisation is no more than a slight formalisation of the traditional tendency to build farms in a row, a pattern that probably signifies the kinship-governed relationship between farms. The dominant farm or farms on the other hand occupy a more isolated position juxtaposing their cemetery. True to old ideas of balance, the large farm and its cemetery balance each other. In terms of space and landscape, the farm and its cemetery form a centre or a power-radiating point. When power is filtered through the large farm, it results in an ordered village consisting of one dominant and sev-
eral dependent farms. Whether any of those who live on the latter ones end up in the cemetery is beyond our knowledge. In essence however, the old generally communal idea of balance has been erased and substituted by a new and stable family-based symmetry in the dominant farm between the living and the dead.

With these changes, the development in South Scandinavia reaches a point at which stagnation becomes a significant situation. The system balances social challenges, crises and possibilities and this status quo, a stagnating situation, marks the three hundred years up and until AD. 500—in some parts of South Scandinavia even longer, i.e., into the 7th century. In these centuries, as opposed to the ones in the beginning of our era, the dynamics of the South Scandinavian society are not able to bring about any major social development. Attempts to remedy and develop social structures such as the Eketorp ring fort and Præstestien turned out to be non-viable solutions.

The reasons for this are mainly practical, because the above mentioned examples show that the principles (the formal definition of land by measurement and the idea of the township), which eventually brings about change, were indeed known. With our knowledge about what was to become the future situation after the 7th century, we understand that a formal and metrical definition of farm and ownership, i.e., the definition of a literate society, can unite the definition of rights as well as obligations of a farm and its farmer in such a way that these formal facts can form the basis of an impersonal practice and an abstract economic landscape. The formal definition make up the basis for an internal acquisition, hard to dispute once it has gained common acceptance. It is the metrical examples from Præstestien and the Eketorp ring fort which reveal that in principle Scandinavians understood this system, but in practice, they could not apply it—or to rephrase: in practice, farmers were able to resist it, except in a few and premature cases. Not until the 8th century can these insights be revived in Jutland, e.g. at Ribe, when the first informal market place is replaced by the one with formal plots defining a share of the market and its value. Eventually we see the metric definition also at Vorbasse. The Ribe case is obviously as deviant as revival is slow, and further north and east, this practice is of an even later date. That some farms must have had obligations in relation to others already in the LIA is attested by large and prosperous households such as Tisso or Valsgärde. These farms are placed in a far from optimal agricultural position that would not have allowed the farms to produce their own surplus, Fig. 124. Such farms therefore are dependant on other farms for their production and their wealth. That the theoretical insights into a formal metrical definition exist without being explored in practice is an example of the loss of dynamics that signifies the MP.
Fig. 124. The position of the Valsgärde farm next to a ford at the River Fyris. The situation started out as a road crossing the river and the Valsgärde hill on top of which a PRIA cemetery was situated. Crossing the river, passing along the graves, we proceed through a border zone into the settlement area south of the Valsgärde hill. Based on Norr (2008b:201).

So is the lack of graves. When we look back at the development during the centuries up and until the 4th century, it seems unlikely that the lack of graves can be attributed to any single, albeit significant phenomenon such as inheritance becoming a regulated situation, because earlier on the grave-producing society was not stopped by such a phenomenon as regulated inheritance. In those days of lavish finds, the 2nd and 3rd century CE, colonisation as well as ‘unfriendly take-over’ were fair methods for reconstructing society and the success of these enterprises were indeed marked out by means of graves, among other things. Instead, the problem of the stagnating society is its inability to live up to the standards of an existing burial tradition, because this tradition aims at pointing out the dynamics and changes in model society. The aim of LRIA and MP grave monuments tends to be the opposite, i.e. a static continuation or a prolongation of status quo.

Likewise, the shimmering gold of the MP is an example of stagnation and a form of crisis, not because society is poor or trouble ridden, but because gold loses its economic and metaphoric value to such an extent that gold is best used when quietly stowed away in the ground, running a potential risk of being forgotten—a risk that many did not seem to bother about. Society is not poor, nor does it lack insights in complex phenomena. It is able to fight itself and its
neighbours, but it is incapable of taking another transforming step in the direction pointed out by the RIA. Stagnation can be more or less traumatic and harbour more or less violent situations. In South Scandinavia, there is an obvious risk as pointed out by Svante Fischer that stagnation will develop into kleptocracy. The example of Uppåkra at least shows that there is a fair chance or perhaps a considerable risk that honourable and memorable warfare became hall-centred and rather dirty in the MP.

This is not to say that ordinary people were not among the most frequent victims of war, but it indicates a logical shift in a period of stagnation from a power struggle concerned with areas, regions and small realms to one concerned with families and individual heads of family and the power invested in them, during the dynamic reformations of the first centuries of our era. There is nothing to say that this kind of power struggle cannot be revolutionary despite its inability to remedy stagnation.

There is little doubt that the fall of Rome played an important part in the loss of dynamics also in Scandinavia. First, we may point to the fact that it became impossible to put up the symbolic investments made by the successful landowners during the RIA, demonstrating a link to the continental world culture. Second, we may point to the definite end that the barbarians themselves put to the opportunities offered by the Roman Empire for external acquisition. Third, we may point to the loss of a market that made possible the exchange of goods. Forth, similar to the Romans, upper-class Scandinavians must also have felt the loss of ideological high grounds, the loss of a world economy and the loss of foreign fields of acquisition. Because Germanian tribes closer to the Empire has more to gain than most Scandinavians, with the possible exception of the Jutes, Scandinavians must have felt a loss that was not compensated for by direct access to the provinces. In fact, Scandinavians were soon completely neutralised and isolated by the fall of Rome and the reshaping of European political geography. Contrary to more peripheral parts of Scandinavia the southern ones had much to lose.

Inability to immediately lowering the birth rate towards a more balanced one in relation to subsistence economy can be expected, and must be considered to be a contribution to overpopulation and turbulence. Eventually, when warfare started to concentrate on halls rather than pitched battles, some kind of balance will be achieved, but we must nevertheless expect economic recession, warfare, overpopulation, plague and the cold summer decade, the short term climatic change (c.536–546 CE), to covariate and escalate stagnation.

The most evident result of long-term isolation and stagnation is the fate of the RIA regional centres Dejberg, Dankirke, Gudme, Sorte Muld, Uppåkra, Ravlunda and Björnhovda. Although some of them survive into the LIA and VA, such as Uppåkra, these periods define new centres such as Tisso, Lejre, Jelling, Mammen and perhaps Tjølling before urbanisation gains the upper hand in the organisation of South Scandinavia.352
Because of this change, we should see LIA and VA as periods of both power struggle at an individualised level and intellectual reformation of a leading upper class. In this period, it was possible to formalise the concept of land and ownership and multiply the size of the realm in comparison to the EIA and MP examples. In this respect, the new centres remind us of the new farms of the ERIA, while the towns with their new types of houses and settlement structure should remind us theoretically of the NDQ and the radically new farm structures invented c. 200 CE. Towns signify new identities and economies marked by a more regular notion of a market in a stratified society. Tenth century towns rather than their 8th c. forerunners are cases in point, and although it did not manage to become an important town, Sigtuna is the most easily understood example.

Landscapes of War

The dynamics of the South Scandinavian society involved a large measure of violence, in the form of outright warfare, but also of force in order to carry out what was probably a turbulent transformation of the settlement structures. Yet, manifestations of war in the landscape have little to do with the rural landscape of production. On the contrary, warfare sacrifices, dikes, barrages and even settled ring forts are peripheral in this landscape. Between the bands of Caesar’s lilies and the occurrence of the first demolished halls, we can say that the landscape of war does not make itself present in the centre of the human landscape. This means that if we were to believe the archaeological sources of RIA, then the landscape of war is another than that of the social order.

In the symbolic dimensions of the cemetery moreover, the use of weapons among the richly equipped men, especially the younger ones, is not the norm after the second breakpoint of farm structure. The grave from Brøndsgård and the one in Skovgårde (1943), as well as the Ellekilde grave would seem to be three cases in point, the latter the more exceptional inasmuch as the man was probably killed in some kind of armed conflict. Although there are some exceptions, e.g. Vorbasse, cemeteries reflecting dominant farms tend to have a peaceful appearance. This picture of the peaceful upper-class male is hardly a fair one, considering the fact that warfare was escalating also after 200 CE. However, on the level of the village it is probably a much more relevant statement, because the turbulent and austere social situation of remoulding, which characterized the local society before the second breakpoint brought stable conditions to the villages. One of the reasons for the change in symbolic burial language and installation is in all probability that the upper classes are distancing themselves from any local problem that could tempt the commoners to fight each other. In a truly symbolic polarisation expressed in sites such as cemeteries and warfare offerings, peace becomes local and warfare regional. This means that on the local level, conflict solution must also be formalised along peaceful lines and
negotiated rather than fought, even if force is an option and sometimes a necessity, as in the case of Hrothgar vs. Grendel that we hear of in Beowulf. With a changing attitude to violence, leadership becomes more intellectually inclined and warfare becomes more large-scale and perhaps also more widespread. Nevertheless, most of all the ritual and thus formal ways of using the spoils in war sacrifices, mirror warfare as a profession—a sure sign of formalisation also when it come to organising the fighting. With ritual entering the hall in terms of libation, the hall becomes a more prominent ritual scene, albeit a secluded one, in comparison with the more traditional open air scene of the war sacrifices.

The changes in the equipment of the graves express the need to point out a formal difference between leadership in peace (in graves) and leadership in war (in offerings), because warfare and weapons are starting to be considered grave anomalies, at least by some. If warrior mentality is relatively speaking kept out of the civilised centre of society, two of the sites discussed emphasised the intermediate position of a warrior identity between the peaceful centre and the offerings. The weapon pits at Bregentved could signify the martial in a geographically speaking intermediate position and the Ölandic ring fort Eketorp and the military presence in its hall likewise testify to a wish to establish the martial, disguised as defence at some distance from the centre of society. Had RIA and MP rulers wished they could have surrounded their halls with fortifications, but probably a ‘fortified hall’ is a contradiction in terms inasmuch as halls are interfaces between the private and the public.

Formalising and partly dethroning violence in the form of defence as well as fighting and warfare, is indeed progress, even though it does not lead to peace in anyone’s time during the first part of the first millennium. On the contrary, the change in the strategy of power struggle in the LMP and LIA favouring hall fighting rather than field battles, indicates a loss of RIA formalisation, and the breaking of rules established during those days. This does not seem to be the result of popular uprisings. Instead, it is in all probability a matter of the upper classes checking themselves by means of fighting each other with the help of their retainers, in order to gain land and power. It is the pattern of destroying halls rather than conquering and robbing them that testifies to an internal power struggle, rather than a quest for a more fair division of prestige goods, halls and means of subsistence.

Falling back on a simplification, we can say that during RIA, power struggle seems to take on two different forms representing two different ideological edges: one concerned with owning land, the other with owning the battlefield signified by what we may call a landlord and warlord respectively and in principle providing bread either through landownership or warfare. These lordships are often intertwined or dependant and in the MP they tend to be antagonistic. Mythologically speaking, these roles are the essence of Freyr and Tyr respectively and in Oðinn, the dyadic relation landlord/warlord develops into one supreme deity. In the long-term perspective of the first millennium CE ideology eventually sides with land owning and peacefully accepted hierarchies. When
this happens the original communion of the hall is split into profane banquets and Holy Communion. Eventually, the church takes over a number of roles once instituted in the hall and the peaceful law-abiding community becomes the paragon of society. Together with communion two of the essential formats of speech that characterise the hall in Beowulf, the sermon and the court case, can move out of the hall room when the Christian Church is established. Correspondingly, war ideology and rituals loose religious if not secular grounds.

In the first part of the first millennium CE, the archaeological landscape splits up in two landscapes. (1) One links in with a generally speaking peaceful albeit hierarchical rural economy on its way to develop a manorial economy and a pattern of dominant and dependant farms. Religion and rituals reflecting this part of society would tend to link in with such qualities as peaceful leadership, mediation or communion—in short with the qualities of the peaceful hall-governed society and some of the formats of talk signifying this social scene, e.g. the moral tale or sermon, and the court case where the hall owner is the judge. (2) The other landscape links in with warfare and also, if we allow ourselves to understand and judge the Beowulf poem, with the evilness of the old-fashioned outdoor rituals and nature. Being a hall panegyric, Beowulf is obviously not trustworthy in its defamation of competing ideologies, but it would still be right to see the manifestations of war as a wish to link in with religious ideas and rituals, i.e. virtues, that are widely different from the ones seen as the ideals of the hall and the subsistence and surplus producing rural economy. Waste, destruction and fatalism are much more characteristic of this non-rural side of Iron Age civilisation. The double-sidedness of the Oðinn figure would seem to reflect this double-sidedness of the RIA, and so would the way the two landscapes start to merge in the MP. Following e.g. Lotte Hedeager, we should see a contrasting Hunnic influence behind the 5th century war ideology and, needless to say, we should see a prior Roman influence behind the peaceful hall ideology. In the LIA, these spheres mix with each other and the mythological character of the Eddaic poems is a reflection of this merge between the two extremes of the ideological spectrum developed during the LRIA.

The Progress Made

Archaeological source material is often arbitrary and incapable of reflecting cultural development or change in a reasonable way. Despite our hopes, burial tradition as it were says little about RIA society although it does tell us about social stratification and a number of social roles. However, graves are more of a distortion than a true representation of society and for some years now we have felt the discrepancy between the past and the way it chose to represent itself, i.e. the textuality inherent in the past as a source material.

In this perspective, it is not surprising that runic inscriptions are the very emblem of an archaeological source material which opens itself to misinterpre-
tations of its own position in society. We are tempted to believe that because inscriptions were very few during parts of the LIA runes were but little used and that is supposed to indicate that inscriptions and text composition were more or less reinvented during the later part of the LIA. In the perspective of the present synthesis, there is no such thing as a radical loss of one of the intellectual capacities necessary to bring about the change we see in the VA. Nevertheless, runic inscription must be interpreted as odd manifestations rather than texts.

The frequent use of measurements in buildings and in settlement planning, something which is hard to imagine without the usage of measuring rods, testifies to an unbroken use of numerical literacy, arithmetic and abstraction. This means that although stagnation may have deprived us of a source material, what the material signifies during the RIA and EMP needs not have disappeared with the temporal loss of sources. This indicates that there was indeed progress made which did survive the period of stagnation.

What then should we consider progress? Labelling specific events ‘progress’ is not a viable solution, because every major event or its results and consequences will immediately or indeed ‘in the event’, be judged negatively by some and positively by others. Progress therefore is something more abstract, an intellectual current introduced into society. In this way progress is a phenomenon above good and evil bringing help as well as causing harm in the process of being lived-with in society and everyday life. Progress however, tends to find forms that are eventually considered in need of reformation.

In our case we may venture to say that the introduction of regulations and formal systems are examples of major progress, because they are indeed easy to live with today and thus neutral as phenomena while at the same time in need of reformation. There are, moreover, a number of themes that may be discussed in a synthetic way in relation to this perspective on progress during the first centuries CE. I will point out but three: gender, literacy and ordered landscape—they too are in need of being reformed.

**GENDER.** Sex plays an important part of any gender definition, but turning again to the symbolic installations, such as the richly furnished graves, e.g. in Skovgårde, we see what is possibly a new and more age- and role-dependant definition of gender that will function as a preparation for the role that women are eventually to play in the LIA hall. In graves, fertile women are the more decked out ones, but in the way these graves were furnished, there were clear tendencies to represent womanhood as a number of complementary roles varying with age. There may even be a difference between the newly married or marriageable women and the mothers, if we venture to compare the 15–20 years old in Skovgårde with the c. 25 year old representation of motherhood in Torstorp Vesterby.

Likewise, the loss of weapons in men’s graves, and of grave goods in the graves of older men, signals a changing attitude to the concept of being a man.
Knowing the emphasis upon individuality, rather than gender, that will come to the fore in LIA and VA when it comes to the graves of the upper classes, we may suggest that men already in the RIA are about to lose a gender definition that can readily be expressed by grave equipment and installation. Or to put it the other way round: there is less iconic gender to expose and bury when it comes to men. Probably they need not be defined or decked out, because they are already defined more by their actions than their age, looks and outfit.

It is only fair, moreover, to suggest that the buried couples, e.g. at Vendehøj, are the early signs of the complementary upper-class couple with well defined social roles reflecting their sex as well as their gender and their individuality. Even though there may still in the LIA hall-governed society have been a tendency to understand women as frightening and gruesome Nerthus-like sexually instable figures, nameless whores, or Grendel mothers—echoes of abominable beliefs—this mostly suffices to show that there were indeed other gender-dependant ways of understanding womanhood.

In principle, the will to express gender and individuality, e.g. in burial installations and thus publicly, is a sign of progress. If the RIA expressions are indeed expressions of novelty, i.e. if the PRIA lack of such expressions is indeed correct, then that too is a sign of progress inasmuch as it is a life quality to be able to express one’s personal and social qualities in public. There is little doubt that men seem to benefit more from the development than women, who are still fitted into conventional roles and expressive grave installations more often than men.

**LITERACY.** It is very unlikely that the runic inscriptions known to us are representative of those texts that existed in the first part of the first millennium CE. However, runes are introduced in the material grave culture that we single out in connection with the new farms, which represent the second breakpoint in the rural economy, and that may well be significant. Nevertheless, in richly furnished graves runes are a passing phenomenon only, more passing than the lavish graves themselves. In these contexts, runes are a sign of male presence, inasmuch as they represent male names in female graves. This indicates that the symbolic value of runes, i.e. the value of the male in a burial context, is soon consumed when it comes to burial practices mirroring the peaceful rural society. The outspoken construction of male presence in female graves seems not to be a lasting issue, indicating but a weak example of gender emancipation, in a period when it becomes more and more difficult to bury male gender.

The use of runes on weapons and on objects that it was thought fit to make part of warfare sacrifices—an outspoken male context—are much more frequent and that can be explained with the affinity between literacy and the commanding structure of the Roman army, an affinity which in itself could explain why runes disappeared from female graves and eventually from any
The most interesting feature in connection with the runic inscriptions is nevertheless the turn they take when they start to become metrical in form. When they start to occur in some kind of measure in the 4th and 5th c., they also return to objects that befit upper-class contexts, notably the hall, without disappearing from warfare sacrifice. It is typical of the early metric inscriptions that the writers have been keen to write formally correct, whereas they express a feeble interest in the meaningful relevance of their message. The footstool from Fallward, the gold horn from Gallehus and the large bracteate from Tjurkö are all inscriptions centring more on form than on contents. The two last ones have often been commented upon, but the first is still often discussed as a linguistic phenomenon. Be this as it may, if it is read as is stands, its odd choice of words (starting with Latin), its message (which must be obvious to anybody standing in front of the inscription) and its form (hiding the stressed vowel $a$ in $algu$ – i.e. elk) are all taken on in order to compose a correct line alliterating in $sk(a)$ (and to the best of our knowledge there are not that many proto Germanic words in $sk(a)$: $skamela$ $'lguskaði$ – the foot stool of the elk hurter (read a line of six syllables, suitable for lyrics, two stresses and two alliterations: $SKA-mel-lal-gu-SKA-þi$). This probably means that the man sitting in the chair with his feet on the stool when we genuflect and come to read the inscription in front of our nose is indeed a man who hunts moose—‘hurter’ and ‘moose’ being taken in a factual as well as in a wider sense. The Fallward inscription seems to indicate that already in the 4th/5th century, poets were prepared to go a long way to get it formally right and to indicate their intent in literary form, relying on Latin and dropping disturbing vowels. Nevertheless, these runic inscriptions are a sign of progress, because they show the ability to write formally correct measure—an essential point when it comes to literacy and also something that unites people in the hall and on the battlefield. Valuing the formal as such and as measure is one of the progresses of the first half of the first millennium CE., be it in poetry, house planning or weight systems.
In this connection, it is worth noting that the inscription at the horn from Gallehus:

\[ Ek \text{ Hlewagasti} \text{ holtija} \text{ horna tawido} \]

and the one from the Tjurkö bracteate:

\[ Wurte \text{ runo} \text{ an walha kurne'} \text{ Helda} \text{ Kunimundiu} \]

Together, with but two inscriptions, both the standard epic meter (Gallehus, fornyrdislag) and a basic shift in lyric meter, i.e. between a long line with four and a consecutive line with three stresses (Tjurkö, a kind of ljothhattr) have been invented and expressed in pointless sentences.

These 4th and 5th century formalities should be compared to the formal metrical way of planning settlements in which a farm or a house is defined by one measure only.

Metrical form supports the oral epic tale and there are other material expressions that do the same. They come to our knowledge through different kinds of hoards or collections. The poem that we call Widsið being a hoard of names, gives support or a kind of backbone to a historical tale, and there are other hoards that can fulfil the same purpose. Cemeteries, i.e. hoards of graves, such as Skovgårde, weapons, coins, bracteates, the images on the golden horn from Gallehus in Jutland, or the ones hidden in the animal style of relief brooches or on neck collars and so called guldgubbar give thematic and/or chronological support to tales, as long as their composition, characteristics, iconic form, texts and themes are recognised. The context formed by those guldgubbar that were in all probability fitted on to the north-western pillar of the hall at Uppåkra must therefore be suspected to make up such a supportive collection of persons and personal names figuring in tales. These contexts go hand in hand with the literacy of the LRIA.

**ORDERED LANDCAPE** Even though much is going to happen to the human landscape also after RIA, the stable systematic character of its rural topography is one of the major progresses of the period, because it is the most fundamental example of systematic and formal organisation. It shows on the house level in the layout of the NQD. It shows on the farm level, where fencing and plot definition are introduces. It shows on the community level, where the manor or dominant farm is introduced. Despite the fact that there was indeed order in the PRIA house, formal order became outspoken only in the centuries that followed. This ordered landscape shows its strength on the settlement level inas-
much as a village formed in the 3rd century CE, such as Vorbasse, despite having moved around, can still today occupy the same settlement area.

Together, the ordering of the landscape and the insights into the value of the formal make up the most essential progress in the EIA up and until the 6th century. The use of literacy and the construction of gender as well as religious contexts are lesser landmarks in comparison. These latter cultural manifestations, on the other hand, seem to signify an intellectual preparedness to take up and to transform Latin or Roman World elements. This goes for the weight systems, which are in essence Roman, for lyric meter, which has affinities with Latin meter, as well as for the allegorical qualities of the thematic cemeteries such as Skovgårde (‘womanhood’) and Torstorp Vesterby (‘motherhood’). There is nothing to support the view that other periods were less intellectually prepared, but it is nevertheless characteristic of the RIA that in those days people were capable of executing their ideas in a form that could become a quite sophisticated human landscape and archaeological material.

NOTES

348 Kaldal & Herschend (2003:plan 2)
349 The notion of the new large farm that breaks into an existing settlement without respecting graves has more examples, a prominent one being the manor farm at Almdala in Lockarp Heimer & al. 2006 pp.152 pp. This late 10th century colonisation was erected on a Late Bronze Age – Early Iron Age cemetery that had for a millennium or more constituted a border zone separating the hilly area northeast of Lockarp from the more prominent agricultural area south of the village.
350 Borg means ‘hill’ and refers to an uplifted site in its topographical as well as social position. See Wolfram (1988:101).
353 On Sigtuna as a market town with a settlement identity, see Tesch (1992).
354 The close links between hall communion and holy communion is seen in a strophe by Kormak Ógmundarsson quoted by Snorre Sturlason, cf. Herschend (1997b:61 pp.).
357 Svante Fischer (2006) has argued this case i.e. the link between runes and Germanian experience of the Roman Army.

*Argricola*, see Mattingly 1970.


Beowulf, see Klaeber 1950.
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