

AmS-Varia 60
Arkeologisk museum, Universitetet i Stavanger
Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger

Constructing identities

Structure and practice in the Early
Bronze Age – Southwest Norway

Knut Ivar Austvoll

Stavanger 2019

AmS-Varia 60

Arkeologisk museum, Universitetet i Stavanger
Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger

Redaksjon/Editorial office:

Arkeologisk museum, Universitetet i Stavanger
Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger

Redaktør av serien/Editor of the series: Kristin Armstrong Oma

Redaktør av dette volumet/Editors of this volume: Kristin Armstrong Oma og/and Lisbeth Prøsch-Danielsen

Formgiving/Layout: Ingund Svendsen

Redaksjonsutvalg/Editorial board:

Kristin Armstrong Oma (leder/chief editor)

Wenche Brun

Lisbeth Prøsch-Danielsen

Ingund Svendsen

Linn Lillian Eikje Ramberg

Utgiver/Publisher:

Arkeologisk museum, Universitetet i Stavanger
Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger

N-4036 Stavanger, Norway

Tel.: (+47) 51 83 26 00

E-mail: post-am@uis.no
arkeologisk.museum.no

ISSN 0332-6306

ISBN 978-82-7760-184-7

Opplag/Printed editions: 200

Stavanger 2019

© Arkeologisk museum, Universitetet i Stavanger. Alt innhold er opphavsrettslig beskyttet. Gjengivelse eller formidling av hele eller deler av denne boken, elektronisk, mekanisk eller annen metode kjent eller senere utviklet, er ikke tillatt uten skriftlig tillatelse fra forlaget. Dette inkluderer fotokopi, opptak, lydopptak, eller i lagrings- og gjenfinningssystemer.

© Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Forsidefoto/Front cover photo: Terje Tveit. Regehaugen in Sola.

Baksidefoto/Back cover photo: Terje Tveit. Lønshaug in Randaberg.

Omslagsdesign/Cover design: Ingund Svendsen

Abstract

Austvoll, K. I. 2019. **Constructing identities. Structure and practice in the Early Bronze Age – Southwest Norway.** *AmS-Varia* 60, 80 pp. Stavanger. ISSN 0332-6306, ISBN 978-82-7760-184-7.

This book explores the construction of regional identities in the Early Bronze Age through the temporal variation in burial practice in Southwest Norway. Earthen barrows from the regions Etne, Karmøy, Jæren, and Lista are used as the archaeological source for this study. How historically constituted structures together with external practice form part of an open-ended process of identity construction is investigated. Previous research has often used a set, rigid definition of identity, and earthen barrows along the coast of Southwest Norway have therefore frequently been portrayed as part of a southern Scandinavian culture. These perceptions are not necessarily wrong, but neglect the complicated processes that give rise to groups. In this study it is argued that patterns found in the material remains, both unintentional and intentional, express regional variation. Through a quantitative methodology based on a selection of focus points and spatial analysis in ArcGIS the multifaceted process behind identity construction is showcased. As a result, the southwest coast of Norway during the Early Bronze Age can be seen as a more complex and dynamic region. Although many similarities between regions are shared, they are also clearly divided and competitive.

Knut Ivar Austvoll, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo,
Blindernveien 11, 0315 OSLO, NORWAY
E-mail: k.i.austvoll@iakh.uio.no

Keywords: Early Bronze Age, group organisation, boundary maintenance, identity construction, burial mounds, sociopolitical organisation, Southwest Norway.

Content

Preface	5
I. Introduction	7
2. Burial mounds and ‘identity’ in a research historical narrative	9
2.1 The establishment of a Bronze Age in Southwest Norway	9
2.2 Burial mounds, identity and Norwegian Bronze Age research	10
2.3 Conceptualizing the burial mound	11
2.4 The mound in a maritime perspective	12
2.5 The Southwest Norwegian Bronze Age in a wider context	13
2.6 Summary and preliminary outlook	14
3. ‘Identity’ as a theoretical and methodological framework	15
3.1 Defining identity	15
3.2 Towards a theory of practice	16
3.3 Applying a theory of practice	18
3.3.1 The data	18
3.3.2 Structure of analysis	19
4. A brief regional overview of Southwest Norway	21
4.1 The burial mound – a short presentation	21
4.2 Etne	21
4.3 Karmøy	21
4.4 Jæren	22
4.5 Lista	22
5. The archaeological data – the burial mounds	23
5.1 Etne	23
5.2 Karmøy	24
5.3 Jæren	29
5.4 Lista in Farsund	35
6. Structuring the archaeological data	39
6.1 Landscape	39
6.2 Burial construction	43
6.3 Cairns	44
6.4 Treatment of the deceased	46
6.5 Gender categorisation	47
6.6 Artefacts	48
6.7 Summary and preliminary results	48
7. Constructing identities	51
7.1 Theoretical ideas on social identification	52
7.2 A practical outline on social identification	54
7.2.1 The female traveller – Period II	54
7.2.2 The male traveller – Period III	55
7.2.3 The multispatial cairn	57
7.3 Re-considering social structures in the Early Bronze Age	58
7.4 Concluding remarks	59
References	60
Endnotes	68
Appendix I: Catalogue of graves in Southwest Norway	69
Appendix II: Recalibrated 14C-dates	78
Appendix III: Distribution maps	79

Preface

This book is based on a revised manuscript of my master's dissertation, which was originally submitted in the spring of 2014 at the University of Oslo. Since then some of the text has been updated and some new references have been added. I would specifically like to thank the editorial staff at the Museum of Archaeology who gave me the opportunity to publish this manuscript, and the two anonymous peer-reviewers who provided some useful suggestions for improvement. Still, there are a number of people who have contributed and advised me during the writing of my original thesis. First I would like to thank my supervisor Christopher Prescott, who was always available, helpful and encouraging of my writing throughout the process, though never short of well-founded constructive comments. I would also like to thank Lene Melheim for always being available when I had questions, needed literature advice, and for continued comments along the way.

A special thanks to Jani Causevic and Kristin Eriksen for help and support with the not so cooperative ArcGIS software. Thanks to Scott Kerr and Sverre Christoffer Guldberg for revising my English. I am also grateful to Julia Kotthaus who took the time to read through and comment on my final draft. Of course, any remaining errors are my own. I would also like to thank Eirik Haug Røe, Marie Amundsen and Isak Roalkvam for comments on parts of the drafts. I am grateful to the staff at the Museum of Archaeology in Stavanger for providing working space during my time there, and to Wenche Brun who took the time to send me the digitised maps by Tor Helliesen. I would also like to thank Sonja Marie Innselset at the University Museum of Bergen who provided me with the necessary documents and excavation reports from Bergen, the staff at the Museum of Cultural History in Oslo, especially Espen Uleberg for providing me with maps and technical support. Thanks to Jens-Henrik Bech, Olle Hemdorff and Ingrid Fuglestedt for providing information and literature advice, and Karmøy Metallverk for allowing me access to their aluminium plant to study Kongshaugen.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and Thea to whom I owe so much, and for their continued support and acceptance of both my physical and at times mental absence during the writing process.

Oslo, August 2019

Knut Ivar Austvoll

1. Introduction

With the introduction of cereal cultivation and animal husbandry in the Late Neolithic (2350–1700 BCE, see Table I) and following the imports of bronzes and new institutionalised forms of social and political organisation by the Early Bronze Age (1700–1100 BCE) the southwestern coast of Norway was drawn in to a wider Nordic Bronze Age culture. This spanned over large parts of Scandinavia (Kristiansen 1998b:68–70), and is seen in the construction of three-aisled longhouses, prestigious bronze artefacts, rock art motifs, and the erection of dozens of monumental burial mounds along the coast. That the southwestern coast of Norway was connected to a wider interaction network at the advent of the Early Bronze Age has long been a recognised ‘truth’ (e.g. Shetelig 1922; Petersen 1926; Møllerop 1963b; Myhre 1981), however, how these local societies operated and interacted regionally has been a less communicated area of study. Critical to understanding this interaction is mapping how local societies perceived themselves and others, i.e. their identity.

Specifically, this book will explore the term identity, and how identity as a theoretical construct can be used to discern social and political choices of past societies. This will be exemplified through the burial practice of the Early Bronze Age societies of Southwest Norway. Identifying variation in burial practices and how the bereaved are faced with different choices when presenting their dead is a crucial starting point for this study. This is linked to their choice, or lack thereof, and is based on the concept that identity – past social practice and forms of action – are trajectories for future practice and events (Wetherell 2009:10). Of course, this is an oversimplification, and most social theorists will acknowledge that identity is both shifting and highly situational (e.g. Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984). Transmitting this concept to archaeology can be challenging, especially considering that material remains often are our only analytical source. Yet, in order to categorise groups and individuals in prehistory, we need ‘identity’

as an interpretive tool for recognizing different aspects of a society. Some may argue that a group identity is not an actual entity, that it is just a social construction and therefore cannot act, i.e. it is not real (e.g. Brubaker 2004:7–27). However, does this justify its inexistence? To quote Richard Jenkins (2004:12): “That groups are social constructions doesn’t mean that they are illusions”.

With this as a backdrop, the book will examine what defined the identities of the Early Bronze Age societies in southwest Norway. Bronze Age societies cannot exist independently from the individuals of whom it is compromised, but individuals are always imbedded within larger groups, and it is the actions of these groups constituted by pre-conditioned practice formed by habitus that should resonate through material remains and enable us to better comprehend the identities of pre-historic groups in the Early Bronze Age (see 3.2).

The burial mounds are an ideal platform to address the issues of identity construction. Situated along the southwestern coast, these grand, man-made monuments that materialised at the beginning of Early Bronze Age are seen as highly structured rituals reflecting both social and political factors. A funeral gives direct access to an individual in prehistory. Nevertheless, it is still the living members of society who imprint their habitual practice on the dead. This enables us to observe distinctions or similarities of a past society’s constructed group identity (e.g. Brück 2004; Hansen 2012).

Burial mounds have long exerted a strong attraction on scholars of archaeology (e.g. Christie 1842b; Bendixen 1877; Worsaae 1881; Montelius 1885; Shetelig 1925; Brøgger 1925b; Petersen 1926; Møllerop 1963a; Säfvestad 1993; Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Goldhahn 2006; Bergerbrant 2007; Wrigglesworth 2011; Bergerbrant *et al.* 2017). However, little research has focused on the construction of identity. The burial mound has often been used as an element to enable other research

Table I: Chronology of the Nordic Bronze Age after Vandkilde 1996.

Period	LN I	LN II	EBA IA	EBA IB	EBA II	EBA III	LBA IV	LBA V	LBA VI
Time (BCE)	2350 – 1950	1950 – 1700	1700 – 1600	1600 – 1500	1500 – 1300	1300 – 1100	1100 – 900	900 – 700	700 – 500

questions, be it economic relations (e.g. Solberg 1994) or cosmology and ritual (e.g. Larsen 1997).

In studying the multifaceted composition of the Early Bronze Age burial mounds of Etne, Karmøy, Jæren and Lista (Fig. 1) this book will examine what defined these societies, and how they defined themselves. Were they heavily influenced by southern Scandinavia and the rest of Europe, or can we find independent societies, eager to form their own identity and social norms? The delineation to Etne, Karmøy, Jæren, and Lista is based on the geographical spread of the earth-constructed barrows and the fact that very little research has encompassed all of the above regions in a combined study. Cairns exist in the region as well, and will be included in the analysis, but it is the earthen barrows that markedly distinguish the southwest coast from other regions in Norway where cairns dominate the coastal landscape.

A secondary objective of this book derives from a current issue in the Bronze Age discourse. Research methods appear to be locked in a tension, or dualism between local perspectives and 'grand narrative' perspectives (*cf.* Prescott 1994:88-89), the latter emphasised by works of Kristian Kristiansen (e.g. Kristiansen 1998b; Kristiansen & Larsson 2005; see also Engedal 2002). The aim will be to break free from this tension by bringing forth the local Bronze Age mounds in relation to a 'grand narrative' perspective, creating a dialectic discourse between the local and interregional (Armstrong Oma 2012:71; Prescott 2012a; Prescott & Glørstad 2012:5-6).

The aim of this book is thus twofold:

- How can we trace collective identities in regional burial practices, and how have external relations influenced them?
- Create a dialectic discourse between the local and interregional relationship, through seeing the local burial mounds in southwest Norway in a wider perspective, i.e. in relation to southern Scandinavia and other external influences.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part consists of a presentation and discussion of previous research (Chapter 2), a theoretical and methodological framework (Chapter 3), and a short presentation of the topography (Chapter 4). Chapter 2 presents previously established theories and discourses in Bronze Age research and highlights the relevance of this study. Chapter 3 moves on to an introductory overview of the theoretical and methodological implementations.




Figure 1. Overview of regions discussed in the study.

In Chapter 4 a short overview of the landscape in the selected areas are presented.

The second part consists of a material presentation and an analysis. Here, the burial mounds are placed in a geographical context before implementing the methodological framework. In Chapter 5 a selection of the best-documented burial mounds are presented and contextualised, starting with Etne farthest north, before moving south to Karmøy, Jæren and lastly Lista. The analysis (Chapter 6) is divided into a selection of subdivisions; landscape, construction, cairns, treatment of the deceased, gender, and artefacts. The study of identity is a multivarious one, and the analysis reflects this by including a variety of contributing elements that could have influenced the construction of past identities.

The third part includes a discussion and concluding remarks (Chapter 7). The discussion presents the compiled data from part two and relates it to the construction of identity in the context of the research aims in Chapter 1. To conclude, 7.3 and 7.4 provide a short presentation of the results and concluding remarks.

2. Burial mounds and ‘identity’ in a research historical narrative

Bronze Age research in Norway has seen a variety of different theoretical innovations and interpretations, ranging from a relatively traditional culture-historical approach to more dynamic interpretations in processual and post-processual paradigms. To place this study in a research historical context requires a presentation of some of the established norms, theories and discourses that have previously figured in Bronze Age research. The main focus will be on previous research on burial mounds in Southwest Norway, with a particular emphasis on how burial mounds have been addressed and interpreted to understand cultural identities. Secondly, past and on-going debates in Scandinavian Bronze Age research is taken into account in order to place this study in a wider research historical context.

2.1 The establishment of a Bronze Age in Southwest Norway

During the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century identity and ethnicity were generally understood as something internally constituted and permanent (Jones & Graves-Brown 1996:4). This is reflected in the excavation of burial mounds, where the representativeness of material remains was understood as cultural distinctiveness (e.g. Childe 1925, 1956). The roots to this view can be said to lie in antiquarianism, a discipline that developed in Europe in the 18th century, with an interest in lost curious objects, often paralleled with nationalistic ideals (see Kristiansen 1981; Prescott 1994:89). A nationalist discourse is central to the understanding of identity during this period, in the way that culture is closely linked to nationalist ideologies and ethnocentricity (Díaz-Andreu 1996:48). As a consequence, during this era identity can be interpreted as a construct within national borders. This is reflected through extensive excavations at the turn of the 20th century, which Egil Bakka (1993:97) has defined as “the age of mound excavation” in Norwegian archaeology.

In Rogaland, priests, teachers and military officers dominated the archaeological excavations (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:36). Burial mounds along the coast of Southwest Norway were excavated in large numbers,

unearthing many of today’s most precious objects from the Bronze Age. However, as a result of brisk, fast-moving excavations, important contextual information was lost (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:36). Yet, in the midst of antiquarianism there was also an appreciation for scientific advancement. In relation to nationalistic ideas, this can be seen as a development towards another discourse, founded in enlightenment beliefs and philosophies forwarded by discipline-defining methods like typology, stratigraphy and comparative studies to understand past societies.

Wilhelm Frimann Koren Christie (1778–1849) was among the first to pursue a more serious archaeological discipline in Norway. He was also the first to establish a Bronze Age in Norway, using the Three-Age System by Christian Jürgensen Thomsen, alas interpreting it as a period after the Iron Age (Christie 1842b; see Prescott 1994:89–90). Likewise, for the Danish archaeologist Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae (1821–1885) establishing an archaeological discipline was imperative (Kristiansen 1981:23). He reinterpreted Christie’s work using stricter methodological approaches such as seriation, stratification, and representation. Excluding the southwest coast, he argued that Norway never had a Bronze Age (Prescott 1994:90; Nordenborg Myhre 2004:36). Overall, the Scandinavian peninsulas’ role was marginalised in relation to the European Bronze Age. For example, Jæren is mentioned as a place with a few mounds that most likely are results of immigration from Jutland (Worsaae 1881:72). These ideas are rooted in evolutionistic concepts, shaped by the enlightenment period. Even in C. J. Thomson’s time, the knowledge of bronze and iron were seen as introductions either by successive waves of immigration, or as a result of “...intercourse with other nations” (Trigger 2006:129). The construction of identities is seen as internally homogenous, with the possibility of change, only accepted through force or integration. Moreover, the material is seen in a pre-conditioned framework, without possibility to transform meaning or ideas within different social contexts. Yet, within this discourse a debate evolved. Borrowing a concept from Kristian Kristiansen (2004), one could describe it as romanticism contra enlightenment, or simply as a

debate of culture dualism (e.g. Brøgger 1925a; Bakka 1973; Johansen 1986; Prescott 1988:68; Bakka 1993:90; Johansen 2000:13; Prescott 2012a:217).

2.2 Burial mounds, identity and Norwegian Bronze Age research

There is a recurring tension in Norwegian Bronze Age research, between heterogeneity and homogeneity, through which material remains are used as attributes to understand identity. Despite not discussing identity in the same terms as we do today, cultures were understood as both shifting and situational. Haakon Shetelig (1877–1955) can be seen as an advocate of much of Christie's work. Although using similar methodological approaches as Worsaae, Shetelig came to the conclusion that Norway had an authentic Bronze Age (Prescott 1994:91). He interpreted the material remains as continuous throughout the Bronze Age, where both luxurious ornamented items and simple everyday objects expressed a common cultural origin (Shetelig 1922:355, 1925:81–83). Even though Shetelig admits a lesser concentration of bronzes than what is found in South Scandinavia, he argued that other aspects of Bronze Age societies needed to be addressed, among them were the burial mounds (Shetelig 1922:356, 1925:90). These ideas can be interpreted in a culture-historical paradigm, claiming cairns and earthen barrows belonged to a common European world of ideas, originating from the Mediterranean, *ex oriente lux* (Shetelig 1925:78, 96, 99).

In this tradition culture or identity is seen as spreading throughout Europe by migration and diffusion, eventually arriving in Scandinavia. Consequently, material remains are seen in a homogenous similarity, encompassing, rather than differentiating. Thus, burial mounds become a new element on the Scandinavian peninsula, reflecting a society that was drawn into a general European development of the period's burial customs (Shetelig 1925:89; Nordenborg Myhre 2004:38). Such ideas are often an attempt to tie together the regional and interregional, as opposed to national separateness (Jones & Graves-Brown 1996:15). Shetelig argues therefore against culture dualism, drawing inspiration from evolutionistic approaches, claiming that Bronze Age societies in Norway developed from a large spatial order in Europe. This stands in contrast to Anton Wilhelm Brøgger (1884–1951), who has often been portrayed as Shetelig's opposite (e.g. Bakka 1993:90; Prescott 1994:93).

Brøgger (1925c:18) argued that the bronzes found in Norway merely were shallow representations, only found in the upper layers of society, and then limited to Lista,

Jæren and Karmøy. Yet, instead of denying a Bronze Age altogether, Brøgger introduced the term Stone-Bronze Age, claiming artefacts of stone, bone and flint were still in use well into the Bronze Age and Iron Age (Brøgger 1925b:104, 130, 1925c:19; see also Gjessing 1944). His interpretation of cultural impact was more radical than that of Shetelig, and is reflected in the title of his book; *The Norwegian people in prehistory* (1925b) (translation by author). The burial mounds along the coast of Lista, Jæren and Karmøy were in his view, part of a southern Scandinavian Bronze Age, not seen elsewhere in Norway. He envisioned a cultural border between earth-constructed barrows and cairns, and claimed cairns were more poorly equipped, usually containing objects of stone, compared to the wealthier earthen barrows along the southwest coast (Brøgger 1925b:105, 207). A dual culture theory sprung from this, between a hunter-gatherer population buried in cairns and an agrarian society buried in earth-constructed barrows along the coast of Southwest Norway (Brøgger 1925b:207). Christopher Prescott (1994:94) describes Brøgger's view as materialistically oriented. Material remains that previously had been held marginal became significant and economy, environment, and technology began to play important interpretive roles. Brøgger did not deny external influences, but was critical to their impact, and argued that cairns were local interpretations of a southern Scandinavian Bronze Age (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:39). Thus, in Brøgger's (e.g. 1925b, 1925c) works on the Nordic Bronze Age, cultures are equivalent to borders. Identity becomes ontological, based on materialistic distinction. A similar attitude towards materialism can be seen in Anathon Bjørn's (1897–1939) work. He shared many of Brøgger's views, claiming only parts of Norway had an authentic Bronze Age (Bjørn 1926). This was also true for Gutorm Gjessing (1906–1979). However, Gjessing (1943:137, 1944:24) argued that societies outside of Lista, Jæren and Karmøy still lived in a Stone Age, but their subsistence strategies were based on pastoralism as well as hunting. This was supported by new archaeological material, found in settlement layers in caves and rock shelters (G. Gjessing 1943; Nordenborg Myhre 2004:39; see also Prescott 1991).

Recent works have also incorporated a materialistic perception of cultural identity. Ørjan Engedal (2010) argues in his PhD thesis that in order to understand cultures in northwest Scandinavia, the material must be approached as a plastic extension of the human mind. This seems to derive from a frustration with an archaeological discipline that has drifted away from its main source, the material. Adopting an actor-network

theory, the material is deprived of any structure of the social, and similarities in type do not relate with common ideas of cultures, however, they are seen as individual acting entities (Engedal 2010:11–12, 21). This approach does not concern itself with the human interpretation and subjective identification of artefacts. The questions get reversed, e.g. “what did bronze do during the Bronze Age?” (Engedal 2010:21).

Engedal’s work stands in contrast to Egil Bakka (1926–1985), whose work is much more subject oriented. Like Shetelig, he questioned if find frequency alone could support a different culture on Lista, Jæren and Karmøy (Bakka 1993:91). Bakka positioned himself in a cultural-evolutionary tradition, emphasising environmental factors as pivotal influences on society (Prescott 1994:95). According to Prescott (1994:95), Bakka’s main response to problems is through source criticism. Bakka demonstrated a natural hesitation towards data, claiming the relatively large find frequency on the southwest coast is, in part, a result of selective choice by archaeologists, but mainly on account of how mounds are placed in the landscape, i.e. destroyed in modern times by extensive building and agrarian activity (Bakka 1993:97; see also Larsen 1996:27). Bakka interpreted the rich concentration of bronzes and barrows on the southwest coast as indications of a powerful chieftom society. These societies are recognised as homogenously bounded, and continuous entities with southern Scandinavia (Bakka 1963). However, the construction of mounds and the successive power that these chieftom-societies held, were, to a certain extent, a result of the large local areas of arable land (Bakka 1993:111–112). Placing Bakka in a cultural-evolutionary episteme together with Shetelig is therefore reasonable (Prescott 1994:96). However, he is also clearly influenced by works of Brøgger and Gjessing, seeing culture through internal elements, and adaptation to the local environment. He interpreted the development of a Bronze Age society both through external and internal elements, approaching a more dialectic mode of interpretation.

Lise Nordenborg Myhre (2004) has also tried to adapt a more dialectic discourse. She imagines the Bronze Age along the southwest coast in a “thirding” perspective. Challenging established theories, she argues that the Bronze Age in Norway needs to be addressed on its own terms, drawing inspiration from both Shetelig’s ideas as well as Brøgger’s culture dualism. In the end, she envisions graves, and rock art in a maritime production of space, developed by elements from both north and south (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:222). Underpinning this interpretation is

the idea that humans and non-humans are involved in a network of heterogeneous relations, an approach drawing resemblance to a symmetrical archaeology (e.g. Olsen 2003, 2010).

In relation, it is argued by Anne Lene Melheim (2012a:4) that studies during the last two decades have tended to focus on myth and ritual construction. This is evident in the handful of MA dissertation that have focused on the burial mound in Southwest Norway (e.g. Ringstad 1986; Larsen 1996). I. Cecilie Larsen’s (1996) dissertation interprets the burial mounds in Jæren as *axis mundi*, a source for understanding the religious cosmos of the Early Bronze Age. She sees the material in graves in a collective symbolism, representing ritual deposits, rather than artefacts of the individual. In this respect Silje Hauge’s dissertation (2007) on the burial mounds on Lista stands out, as it focuses on how power structures and social differentiations are upheld or changed through materiality. Her theoretical framework is Bourdieu’s theories on symbolic power (Bourdieu 1996), enabling her to approach a more active interpretation of the Bronze Age society, where the structure of the elite is seen in terms of dynamic social relations, rather than a fixed relationship of peer-polity interaction (Hauge 2007:16–18).

2.3 Conceptualizing the burial mound

John M. O’Shea (1996:8) argues that most contemporary research on funerary remains can be traced back to a series of pioneering work by Lewis Binford (1971) and Arthur Saxe (1970).

At the most fundamental level, Binford and Saxe demonstrates two basic premises: (1) that there is a systematic relationship between the overall configuration and complexity of funerary practices and the configuration and complexity of the society at large; i.e., that funerary practices do not vary independently of the overall structure and conditions of the society at large; and (2) that the specific treatment any individual receives in death is consistent with the social roles and positions that the individual occupied in life (O’Shea 1996:8).

This study will reflect some of the ideas by Binford and Saxe. However, in their attempt to focus solely on the individuals and individual status, they effectively ignore communal group identities. Their emphasis on the ethnographic record ignores the complex range of information encoded within funerary activities and neglects the archaeological record and its effect on the social reconstruction of society (O’Shea 1996:8–9).

Among the few who have specialised in Bronze Age burials in Southwest Norway, Odmund Møllerop’s (1922–2006) article from 1963 still stands as one of the

most comprehensive studies on the subject. Here he provided an extensive overview over the many burial mounds and finds in the area, and adapted a similar approach to Bakka and Shetelig, “[...] it is his opinion that the burial mounds should be seen in a wider geographical and cultural context” (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:40). Moreover, he divided the burial mounds into three separate groups, each with their own distinct geographical source of inspiration (Møllerop 1963b:41):

1. Cairns; an earth-free mound of stones. A Scandinavian-Baltic phenomenon, with roots back to the Late Stone Age.
2. Cairns with a thin cover of earth. Møllerop has more difficulties explaining this group, but assumes it is a local fusion between eastern cairns and earth-constructed barrows from Jutland.
3. Traditional earth-constructed barrows with a central cairn of stone, covering the grave chamber. The source of inspiration is Jutland.

These three groups are still acknowledged, and used in archaeological research (e.g. Larsen 1996:41–44; Nordenborg Myhre 2004:40; Hauge 2007:34–35). Møllerop shares a similar attitude towards local environmental factors with Bakka. Being critical to Bjørn’s interpretations of burial mounds, where he claimed that the high density of stone in the earth-constructed barrows were a local alternative to burial mounds from Jutland (Møllerop 1963b:42), Møllerop saw this as a natural result from the stone and sand found in Jæren’s soil.

Following up on the burial mound as a common European world of ideas, Møllerop suggested contacts beyond Denmark and thus connecting Rogaland directly with South England, Western France and Ireland. These interpretations are based on constructional elements of the grave, or more precisely the ornamentation found on the grave slabs (Møllerop 1963b:46–47). He saw the ornamentation in relation to ‘*boynegruppen*’, a group with origins from the Iberian Peninsula during the Neolithic. This group used concentric circles, spirals, cup marks, crossmarks and other abstract images to decorate their gravestones. These marks are similar to those found in northern Scandinavia during the Early Bronze Age (Møllerop 1963b:45–47; see also Fett & Fett 1941:128, 1979). A temporal gap makes this parallel challenging. However, Sverre Marstrander (1910–1986) interpreted the ornamentations on the flagstones found in Mjeltehaugen on Sunnmøre as representations of the Bell Beaker Culture that expanded

across Europe during the Late Neolithic (Marstrander 1963:319; see also Østmo 2005:69–70; Linge 2007; Sand-Eriksen 2017). This interpretation is again gaining a footing in a recent article that identifies and links a previously unmentioned dagger-shaped carving on one of the Mjeltehaugen slabs with typologically similar Remedello type daggers from Le Petit-Chasseur in the Alpine region (Sand-Eriksen 2017). Mjeltehaugen is one of the best-preserved earth-constructed barrows in Norway, and marks the border as one of the northernmost barrows (Østgård & Goldhahn 2006:43). Some have speculated if this barrow is from the Late Neolithic, basing their finds on the ornamentation alone (e.g. Østmo 2005:70), but whether it is from the Late Neolithic or the Early Bronze Age, one could consider the ornamentations as reconstructed structures from the past obtained through external influences, i.e. the Bell Beaker Culture.

Bjørn Myhre’s (1972, 1981) studies on the burial mound from Southwest Norway forms an alternative to other theories. In his detailed book regarding the Bronze Age on Sola and Madla in northern Jæren, Myhre interpreted burial mounds as centres for territorial influences. Based on the distribution of burial mounds in the area, Myhre speculated if Sola and Madla were divided into 11–17 political territories (Myhre 1981:87–90; see also Säfvestad 1993). Although Myhre agreed that these are hypothetical ideas, they are nevertheless interesting. If a burial mound is an indicator of family lineage, it no longer becomes a grave for one person, but a representation of a communal identity, structured and restructured throughout decades. These ideas are reminiscent of Christopher Tilley’s work (1994). He sees burial mounds as an entangled part of the landscape, historically constituted in a temporal space. Instead of being a subject of knowledge the burial mound becomes an object of knowledge that can be interpreted as social strategies or mechanisms for internal political control (Tilley 1994:204; see also Barrett 1994). Nordenborg Myhre (2004) continues in a similar tradition and visualises the burial mound as an entangled part of the landscape though underemphasising the more tangible expressions burial mounds can serve to express power, wealth and differentials.

2.4 The mound in a maritime perspective

The sea was a source of inspiration for Jan Petersen (1887–1967). He argued that seafaring from Jutland to Lista, over Skagerrak, was the inducement for the construction of grave monuments along the coast (Petersen 1926:158). This theory formed an alternative to other

theories that connected grave monuments to the dual-culture debate between an agrarian population and a hunter-gatherer culture (e.g. Brøgger 1925a; Gjessing 1944). Marstrander shared many of Petersen's ideas, signifying the importance seafaring and trade had for the establishment of grave monuments. He was critical to the dual-culture debate, claiming it had led to an intellectual drought, suppressing inspiration for new interpretations (Marstrander 1950:63). The connection to the sea would later become an important interpretive theory (e.g. Marstrander 1950; Prescott & Walderhaug 1995; Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Østmo 2005; Kvalø 2007; Østmo 2008). Nordenborg Myhre's theories share many of the same ideas as Petersen and Marstrander. She argues that an oversimplification of the demarcation between the earth-constructed barrows and cairns has governed too much of the research history. She is sceptical of differentiation between the two types of mounds, and their connection to different economic systems. She sees them together, both addressing the sea and linear movement (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:207).

An issue with Nordenborg Myhre's views, as expressed by Frode Kvalø (2007:32), is her assumption that a collection of synchronic and contact related materials express social networks. Kvalø is sceptical of this 'traditional' archaeology, in that it does not reflect cultural processes related to travel. Moreover, it does not communicate or discuss how social practice is constructed through seafaring (Kvalø 2007:33). Kvalø (2007) attempts to see social processes intertwined in a framework of maritime realization and ritual mobilization of symbolic processes, demonstrating an asymmetrical relationship between social communities in Southwest Norway. In this, he sees the ship as a symbol of group identity, intertwined both through ritual and practical experiences (see also Prøsch-Danielsen *et al.* 2018).

The burial mound is seen as a symbolic communication for legitimizing the social power of the elite (Kvalø 2007:43). This point of view is expanded upon in more recent studies (Prescott *et al.* 2018; Austvoll 2020). Here, the burial mounds along the western coast of Norway are addressed as representative of elite control of narrow straits, portages, and harbours, which were capitalised for economic growth and political power.

2.5 The Southwest Norwegian Bronze Age in a wider context

The research historical narrative outlined thus far has primarily focused on Bronze Age research linked to

Southwest Norway, however, this local debate mirrors a wider Scandinavian research history. Research from South Scandinavia has been particularly influential (e.g. Randsborg 1974; Kristiansen 1978; Jensen 1987; Levy 1995; Vandkilde 2007b; Holst *et al.* 2013). The region is renowned for its wealthy burials, and it is estimated that over two thousand burial mounds still survive from the Early Bronze Age in the small region of Thy alone, a density unlike anywhere else in Europe (e.g. Earle 2002:293; Bech *et al.* 2018).

The vast amount of empirical data available to archaeologists in this area has allowed them to go on in a more traditional culture-historical and processual episteme, presenting research based on distribution of artefacts and graves (Broholm 1933; Randsborg 1968; Kristiansen 1998a; Aner *et al.* 2001). A large portion of the research concerned with the Bronze Age in South Scandinavia have focused on network, exchange, trade, economic resources and peer-polity interaction (e.g. Earle 1997:197–200, 2002; Hornstrup 1998; Jensen 2002; Vandkilde 2004; Kristiansen & Larsson 2005:207; Earle & Kristiansen 2010:219).

During the 1970's the term chieftdom became widely used to define the social organization of Late Neolithic and Bronze Age societies in Denmark, which were often defined as kin-based societies, where the social status of a person was based on his or her relationship through the genealogical distance from a senior line of descent (Earle 1997:4–8). These ideas draw inspiration from Anglo-American anthropology, and textbook cases like Marshall Sahlins book *Social stratification in Polynesia* (1958) have been particularly influential.

In the 1980's a theoretical shift came with Structural Marxism. Archaeologists like Kristian Kristiansen (1987) and Helle Vandkilde (1996) saw social organization as more complicated causality between material conditions, social structure, and ideology (Earle 1997:9). In the book *From Stone to Bronze* (1996) Vandkilde maintains that the Late Neolithic and Period IA reflect a social structure dominated by collective groups, and group hierarchy. An increase in metal production emerged during Period IB, along with an individual social elite with a warrior ethos. External relations now lie with high-ranking individuals of the social elite. During this period it is believed Denmark was divided into two zones, each demonstrating their own unique identity towards the other (Vandkilde 1996:306). After 1500 BCE these institutions can be said to cumulate into a general Nordic Bronze Age, made up of burial mounds, a distinct Nordic material culture and two-aisled house constructions (Kristiansen 2010:170).

Lately, more 'social' and theoretical interpretations have been published (Vandkilde 1999; Hansen 2007, 2012). Mette Roesgaard Hansen's article *Expressing identity through ritual in the Early Bronze Age* (2012), takes on the issue of identity construction of male and female burials in Thy. She argues that identity needs to be treated as a theoretical pluralism (Hansen 2012:56; see also Prescott 1995:21). The actions of the bereaved are here portrayed as conscious and intentional, where the homogeneous material found in graves in specific areas are expressed as a distinct group identity (Hansen 2012:57–58). Hansen does entertain the idea that a similar approach might be used on the Bronze Age material in Southwest Norway, but concludes that the material is too shallow for an extensive analysis (Hansen 2012:68). Other more recent works include the monumental publication from the Skelhøj excavation (Holst & Rasmussen 2013), giving a detailed insight into the constructional details of Bronze Age burial mounds that have rarely been excavated since the "boom" of the late 18th and early 19th century.

2.6 Summary and preliminary outlook

The previous sections have provided a glimpse into the history of Bronze Age research. However, it has also displayed a divide in the theoretical interpretations of the past. On the hand, we have Brøgger's ideas that focus on internal material developments (e.g. Brøgger 1925b; see also Gjessing 1944), and on the other we have, among others, Shetelig's ideas that draw on external dynamic influences (e.g. Shetelig 1925; Møllerop 1963b; Bakka 1993). Shetelig based his work on a more rigid chronological framework and stressed features toward a general European development. Brøgger was more interested in human adaptation to different ecological zones (Komber 1987:35). However, both seem to derive from a materialistic oriented interpretation of the past. This view has governed large parts of the research history and is also reflected in contemporary studies (e.g. Aakvik 2000; Engedal 2010). Needless to say, the material will always govern archaeological interpretations of the past and so it should. Still,

the burial mounds in Southwest Norway have on the whole been interpreted in a fixed social framework with southern Scandinavia, based on similarities in the material record. This view is not necessarily incorrect, but simplifies the complex and entangled system that we call identity. As argued by Philip L. Kohl (1981:89) "The term [materiality] signifies a philosophical view of reality that accords greater casual weight to a society's behavior than to its thoughts, reflections, or justification of its behavior".

Kohl's argument is important, as a premise for this study is that societies' thoughts and reflections of themselves and others are visible in the material remains, including constructional elements of the mound. From this the grave can be viewed as an important element, where social identification of a society is expressed by the bereaved. This not only defines the individual, but also the collective identity of the group. The idea that symbols are structured and restructured entities, intertwined in the social identification of a collective group, is not new in Bronze Age research (e.g. Hauge 2007; Kvalø 2007). Some of my research will use established research methods. However, few researchers are concerned with the construction of identity in its entirety. Identity is often seen as a peripheral by-product to explore economic power structures in society (e.g. Solberg 1994) or to present individuals in prehistory. Hansen's research on the subject (2007, 2012) is a fresh contribution to the discussion of identity in the Bronze Age, but her views on the material in Southwest Norway have not been thoroughly explored. A similar framework on the concept of identity as Hansen's is implemented in this study, but the theoretical and methodological approach will be different. As argued by Kristiansen and Larsson (2005:241): "Studies of barrow construction hold great potential for understanding the meaning of burial rituals, but are unfortunately rare". Rituals of the dead is seen as a key component to better comprehend the construction of a group identity, but whether it is a local identity, interregional, or both, will be analysed and discussed in the following chapters.

3. ‘Identity’ as a theoretical and methodological framework

Archaeology consists of a diversity of opposing theoretical approaches. As pointed out by Trigger (2006:497) some may claim that this diversity threatens the credibility of the discipline. Although, as argued by Ian Hodder and Scott Hutson (2003:242–246), if archaeology is to be an independent discipline, archaeologists should be free to forge the links with those disciplines that best enable them to explain the archaeological data. For this study, the theoretical framework will rely on sociological interpretations. This is a natural choice as the concept of identity is deeply embedded in sociological tradition. Drawing inspiration from Siân Jones’ book *The Archaeology of Ethnicity* (1997), and Pierre Bourdieu’s *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977), this study argues that the construction of identity is based on shifting, situational and subjective identification of self and others. Moreover, it is formed both through daily practices and historical experiences, but can also be exposed to transformation and discontinuity (Jones 1997:13–14). Before this is elaborated, the concept of identity needs to be addressed, as it is a term used and incorporated throughout the present study.

3.1 Defining identity

Identity, to know “who’s who” and therefore “what’s what” is an important concept in modern social sciences. It is a multi-dimensional classification or mapping of the human world and our place in it (Jenkins 2004:5). Identity derives from the Latin word *idem*, which means “the same”. This sameness has developed different meanings over the years. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines identity as: “The sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition of being a single individual; the fact that a person or thing is itself and not something else; individuality, personality”. Both John Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (2008 [1690]), and David Hume’s *A Treatise of Human Nature* (2000 [1739]) talk about identity as the individuality of a person, which is something internal and permanent. Later perspectives would include Sigmund Freud who introduced the term *identification* as something that

described the process by which the infant internalises external persons in the process of socialization (Rowlands 2007:61; see also Bourdieu 1977:78–93).

Transmitting this concept to archaeology can be challenging. Being a discipline of both subjective and objective knowledge we are always in danger of exposing our own subjective interpretations of identity onto past societies. It is important to be aware that our own concepts of identity do not necessarily reflect, or hold the same meaning as those of prehistoric societies (Meskell 2002:293). Hans-Georg Gadamer argues that everyone has a historically effected consciousness, which derives from one’s life and culture. Interpretations are therefore established through a fusion of horizons, which involves a circular relationship between oneself and that which is studied (Gadamer 2010 [1960]). Gadamer’s hermeneutic circle will undoubtedly always be part of the archaeological cognitive process and therefore some subjective interpretations are prerequisite. However, one should pursue to achieve objectivity, an intention Bourdieu (1977:72) has called *methodological objectivism*. “[...] It is a necessary moment in all research, by the break with primary experience and the construction of objective relations which it accomplishes, demands its own supersession” (Bourdieu 1977:72). To accomplish this, we must escape from the regular structure *opus operatum*, to the *modus operandi*, the principal of production. Bourdieu argues that this is possible with the *theory of practice*, which is the precondition for establishing a dialectic of incorporation and objectification (see 3.2) (Bourdieu 1977:72).

The concept of identity has always been an important descriptive term in archaeological research, but it was not until processual archaeology started to ask the questions *how* and *why* that identity started to take a different direction (Jones 1997:27). Before this, the culture-historical approach depended on a framework of systematization and classification. Cultures were systematically ordered in space and time, depending on typology and context (Olsen 1997:31–32). This resulted in a mosaic of different cultures, and laid the

foundation for archaeological research today. However, it only saw identity as *primordialistic*, something deep, internal, and permanent, not unlike Locke and Hume's notion of the term. It is argued that within a given group, cultural practices and beliefs conform to prescriptive idealised norms of behaviour. These norms, or rules, are maintained by regular interaction within the group, and will therefore follow the succeeding generations (Jones 2007:45). Gordon Childe (1956:8) argued that cultures would produce and reproduce a socially approved standard type. In this tradition, interaction with different groups that share a relatively homogeneous material can be explained as a similar culture, whereas discontinuities in the material culture can be explained as socially different (Jones 2007:45). All this changed when Fredrik Barth published his edited collection, *Ethnic groups and boundaries* (1969), in which he challenged many of the accepted concepts on identity and ethnicity. He argued that ethnic distinctions do not depend on absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are often the reason why social systems are constructed (Barth 1969:10). Thus, identity becomes a subjective process of classification, which does not necessarily correlate with cultural commonalities (Barth 1969:10; Jenkins 2004:19; Jones 2007:47). Barth's theory developed from a frustration over how anthropology had not problematised how groups had maintained their distinctiveness or reproduced themselves (Jenkins 2004:96). He argued that social identification was a dialectic process of external and internal relations and categorisations. Adopting this theory, processual archaeology saw a shift in its analytical methods. It no longer became constrained by *primordialism*, a permanent way of seeing things. It opened for a more dynamic theory, *instrumentalism* (Banks 1996:39), where the constructions of identity were fluid self-defining systems with political and economic relations. It recognised that there rarely is a straightforward correlation between cultural similarities and ethnic identity (Johannesen 2004:162; Jones 2007:48). This view is also reflected in the works of Marcel Mauss (2016 [1925]) who focused on the reciprocal practice of gift exchange, and argued that different groups are part of a common exchange pattern that is built into a shared social structure between different ethnic identities (Mauss 2016 [1925]:77–78). In this sense, groups are constructed through a shared interest, be it economical or sociological, not through a shared 'materiality'.

However, in archaeology, material and subject have often been seen as two opposing but necessary forces

(e.g. Kristiansen 2004), one is fixed (material), the other is fluid (subject). This is comparable to that of primordialism and instrumentalism. To build a bridge between this dichotomy, the section below argues that Bourdieu's Theory of Practice (1977) can be applied to the understanding of identity construction of Bronze Age societies in Southwest Norway.

3.2. Towards a theory of practice

The social life of people is made up of routine actions. Everyday tasks like preparing dinner, going to work and driving your car are actions that rarely need reflection; they seem self-evident and become structures. This is also true when people interact. Daily behavioural rules can be expressed or agreed on silent contracts, both unconscious or semiconscious (Johannesen 2004:168). This is part of what Bourdieu defines as a theory of practice. "Practice theory seeks to find a path between structuralism and materialism that allow for both structure and action to be determining – actions are simultaneously structured and structuring" (Stutz 2006:95). This implies that an agent's (the individual's) practice emerges from structured social relations but also has the ability to reshape it. This is possible through *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977:72–73). *Habitus* is explained by Bourdieu as "[...] the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations" (Bourdieu 1977:78). In other words, *habitus* is explained as being 'structuring structures' and 'structured structures', it shapes, and becomes shaped by social practices (Jones 1997:117). It is an internal social discourse, which can also be shared by a social group. *Habitus* is also determined by past conditions. Bourdieu calls this the 'forgetting of history', an unconscious part of us that has developed since we were formed (Bourdieu 1977:78–79). Identity thus becomes a dispositional identity, it shows limits in reflexivity, and becomes embedded in embodied habitual social practices (Bottero 2010:5–6).

Bourdieu's theory is described by many as an ongoing attempt to overcome the everlasting sociological dichotomy between a Durkheimian constituted structuralism (e.g. Østerberg 2003:15), and ontological individualism, found in theoretical discourses like phenomenology (e.g. Postone *et al.* 1993:4). It is *habitus'* ability to work as a mediator between structure and action that also makes it applicable to identity construction. A recurring problem in subjective instrumentalist approaches is that it fails to resolve the relationship between an agent's perceptions of identity and the cultural context (Jones 2007:48). However,




Figure 2. Model demonstrating the theoretical process in which identity is constructed. Here primordialism and instrumentalism is mediated by a theory of practice.

objective primordialistic approaches are not concerned with external political or economic influences. It rather sees identity as something permanent and essential, which is directly observable in the cultural context (Banks 1996:39). Applying habitus as a mediator between these dichotomies creates a duality, where the embodied internal habitual process is not just controlled by external forces, i.e. instrumentalism. Neither is it primordial, in that it is passive and internal. It is a

structuring structure and structured structure, shaped by social practice (Postone *et al.* 1993:4). A society with a shared identity (shared habitus), will therefore express themselves through shared symbolic resources (Fig. 2). Moreover, the ritual actions in a society become embodied reproductions, *a priori* for the living (O’Shea 1996:10; Hansen 2012:56).

Another equally important term presented by Bourdieu is *doxa* (Bourdieu 1977:166). Doxa is that




Figure 3. Visualisation of the field of opinion structured either through heterodoxy or through orthodoxy. After Bourdieu 1977:168.

which is taken for granted (Bourdieu 1977:166). These are elements in everyday-life that are self-evident and go without saying. Created by habitus, doxa becomes to such an extent embedded in the social life of people that they take it for granted, and subsequently it cannot be questioned (Naum 2008:65). Doxa is only fully revealed to a society when negatively constituted by the constitution of a *field of opinion*, e.g. faced with external pressure (Bourdieu 1977:168–169; see also Barth 1969:10). Doxa is an important argument against critics who argue that similarities in identity do not necessarily correlate with a shared habitus (e.g. Yelvington 1991:158). This is because a shared identity is created not only through subliminal similarities, but also through a consciousness of difference i.e. a break with doxa (Jones 1997:94).

When doxa becomes questioned, it results in the establishment of either *orthodoxy* or *heterodoxy* (Bourdieu 1977:169). “[...] orthodoxy attempting to deny the possibility of alternatives at a conscious level, and heterodoxy acknowledging the existence of a choice between different forms of knowledge and their evaluation through explicit critiques” (Jones 1997:94–95). Ergo, a heterodox knowledge would be presumed if a society intentionally constructed ritual placements in graves to form a distinct group identity. This will not necessarily be expressed in the material itself, but in artefact placement and other constructional aspects (see 3.3).

Orthodoxy can be explained as the imperfect substitute of doxa (Bourdieu 1977:169). The dominant class in society can use orthodoxy through material and symbolic means, attempting to create a social structure. For example, the elite can use orthodoxy through burial mounds, displaying symbolic knowledge, while maintaining their political power. Over time, heterodox and orthodox knowledge will be reproduced, and consequently it becomes part of a structured disposition of habitus (Fig. 3). Thus, identity becomes part of an ongoing process that is both objectified knowledge and embodied subjective knowledge (Jones 1997:97). John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff (1992:60) explains it like this:

[...] ethnic consciousness enters a dialectical relationship with the structures that underlie it: once ethnicity impinges upon experience as an (apparently) independent principle of social organization, it provides a powerful motivation for collective activity. And this, by turn, must perforce realize an everyday world dominated by ethnic groups and relations, thereby reproducing the very social condition that gave rise to ethnic consciousness in the first place.

3.3 Applying a theory of practice

To apply the theoretical framework outlined above, a practical methodology must be presented. In 3.2 it was

argued that identity is constructed through a multifocal relationship, where the dualism between instrumentalism and primordialism is mediated by the habitual structure in society. When presenting the methodological approach it is equally important that the duality between theory and method is in a reciprocal relationship. In its most stripped down form, methodology can be understood as the means by which theory is adapted to the empirical data (Hastrup 1999:154). To do this, the present study will divide the empirical data into a multi-staged analysis that incorporates various aspects of a person’s life, although, as pointed out in Chapter 2, earlier excavations have left us with a contextually limited reference material. However, in order to analyse burial mounds from Southwest Norway a handful of elements that is considered both general and consistent enough for comparative analysis have been selected in order to uncover social structures in the Early Bronze Age (see 3.3). As Andrew Gardner (2011:17) points out: “Identity is not about abstract concepts or symbols of identity, for representation and labelling are themselves practices. The activities that people undertake [...] are the mechanisms by which people are categorised by others, or themselves, as they interact”. One of the main goals in the analysis (Chapter 6) is to map out these activities that reflect the habitual practice of a group. This is arguably best done through a multivariate, quantitative study that is able to trace patterns in larger numbers.

The study is inter-regional in scope, spanning from Etne in the north to Lista in the south. It has been important to include every known area with earth-constructed barrows from the Early Bronze Age, as previous research has had a tendency to focus on a single region, or based their studies on the best-documented burial mounds, which puts us at risk to misinterpret – or miss out altogether – important elements that reflects social differentiation. The study is also diachronic, analysing the different periods while acknowledging the social and material implications of the preceding phases.

3.3.1 The data

As mentioned in the section above, it is important to include every documented earth-constructed barrow in the southwest region. This proved to be a greater challenge than first anticipated as there were to my knowledge no databases or catalogues which incorporated every earthen barrow from Southwest Norway. Nordenborg Myhre’s (2004) study contributes a great deal of data on Karmøy and larger parts of Jæren.

Museum archives have also been consulted in Oslo, Bergen, and Stavanger, as well as published literature, and digital databases, *Askeladden* and *Unimus*. The collected material was managed and analysed in the database management system *Access*, and used in *ArcGIS* to analyse spatial relationships and distribution.

3.3.2 Structure of analysis

The analysis is based on the theoretical concept that individuals are constrained by internal structures, social and material limitations, making their practices implicit to the structure at hand. However, practice is not a mechanical reaction, neither is it free will; an individual is always structured by their habitus which is determined by past conditions (Bourdieu 1977:72–73). Identity will therefore demonstrate limits in its reflexivity, and become embedded in embodied habitual social practices (Bottero 2010:5–6). When this is applied to the burial mounds in the Bronze Age, a pattern of repeated practice should be seen.

Burials are made for the individual, but they are also collective rituals, originating from an accepted tradition of how one treats the dead. It is a structured collective understanding, an *a priori* of how the ritual actions applied on the graves are preformed, including the composition of the dead and their artefacts. Thus, the variations or similarities found in the cist become expressions of a collective identity, based on repeated structured behaviour (e.g. O’Shea 1996:10; Hansen 2012:56).

Questions we must ask ourselves are therefore: were the rituals consequent heterodox choices, presented in order to ensue a local identity? And if not, are ritual constructions embodied structures, reconstructed from one generation to the next? If so, then we must try to understand when these changes occurred. If they stem from a previously recognised doxa, when did the transformation from doxa to either heterodoxy or orthodoxy occur, and how? Clues to answer these questions should be visible in the form of dramatic changes in the material remains, burial practices, and ritual constructions. These patterns have been mapped through a handful of ‘themes’ that are general enough to incorporate as many burial mounds as possible but at the same time hold a qualitative standard. These are:

- Landscape
- Burial construction
- Cairns
- Treatment of the deceased
- Gender categorisation
- Artefacts

Landscape

The landscape holds a variety of elements that are important for the study of identity. It is a structure that actively affects choices of groups. These can be topographical, affecting how people travelled in the Bronze Age. There can be differences in how the landscape is perceived, local or interregional emphasis, and cosmological connotations.

The placements of burial mounds and distribution patterns will be an important analytical tool to address how burial mounds were presented in the local landscape. Presumably, these were choices made by a group, and will reflect how they wanted the dead to be presented in the landscape, and to the local community.

Burial construction

How groups chose to build a burial mound is an action that is structured through habitus, but it could also have been a heterodox or orthodox choice in order to differentiate themselves from another group. These choices may have changed through different periods, and can provide us with a more distinct picture of regional differences and similarities.

Cairns

The study will mainly focus on earth-constructed barrows. Nonetheless, the cairn is in some way intertwined in the social structure in the Early Bronze Age, and is an important contrast against the barrow. It therefore needs to be analysed and discussed as an active structure in the formation of constructed identities.

Treatment of deceased

Are there differences and changes in the treatment of the deceased? Of particular importance is the emphasis on inhumation *vis-à-vis* cremation graves, and how these have changed throughout the different periods. The treatment of the deceased displays how a group’s attitude was toward the body, and concentrations of a particular burial practice in a specific area will underline a group’s identity.

Gender categorisation

When studying graves one has to acknowledge gender as a primary form of distinction (Skogstrand 2006:43). Objects carry symbolic meaning, and these are inserted into a net of identities linked together by habitual codes (Díaz-Andreu 2005:22). The distribution of female and male graves will be an important tool to map social structures in groups. These can be linked to various

social institutions and roles, like marriage, exogamy, warriors, priests and chiefs.

Artefacts

Artefacts are always interwoven in knowledge, social strategy and practice (Vandkilde 2008:146). Artefacts

in the Bronze Age are often highly standardised; however, choice of artefact type could be linked to periods, region, and ideology. They can also underline social variations and active choices in order to express a certain type of identity. Artefacts also play an important part in the relative chronological dating of burial mounds.

4. A brief regional overview of Southwest Norway

In this chapter a short overview of burial mounds and the landscape in which they are situated will be presented. The geographical demarcation is based on the construction of earthen barrows in relation to cairns found elsewhere in Norway. Cairns are also found in the studied areas and will be incorporated in my analysis. They are, however, marginal compared to eastern and northern Norway where earth-constructed barrows are non-existent.

4.1 The burial mound – a short presentation

Monumental earth-constructed barrows in Southwest Norway emerged at the beginning of Period II (c. 1500 BCE). These can be seen as part of a larger *Tumulus* phenomenon that spanned over greater parts of northern and central Europe (Holst 2013:103). During the Late Neolithic, burials were often made up of smaller barrows or cairns. These were generally inhumation burials, but there is a gradual transition to cremation burials in the Early Bronze Age before cremation burial becomes the norm in the Late Bronze Age. Aside from their absence in monumentality the burials in the Late Neolithic display similarities with the burial mounds from the Early Bronze Age. Equally, as the earthen barrows from the Early Bronze Age demonstrate similarities with Jutland, the Late Neolithic graves are similar to the Bell Beaker graves from the continent, although cairns seem to be a local constructional element, deriving from earlier periods (Kilhavn 2013:47–48).

The earthen barrows from the Thy region in Denmark are mainly built up of turf and earth with a central cist made of standing stone slabs (Bech *et al.* 2018), in other parts of Denmark oak coffins are not uncommon. In Norway the earth-constructed barrows are of a more complex composition. Cists can be divided into two general categories: cists made of standing stone slabs, or cists built in a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs. The central part of the mound is usually a cairn, covered by earth, sand or gravel (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:206). The inner cairn varies considerably in size, and some barrows are in reality cairns, covered only by a thin layer of earth. Other barrows can

be categorised as composite barrows that are a mixture of both earth and stone. These mounds have been related to a hybrid construction, representing elements from both the north and the south (e.g. Møllerop 1963b). Some barrows are encircled by a stone kerb, constructed as a demarcation of the complete barrow. Earthen barrows are commonly found in moraine landscapes, while cairns are mostly placed on rock and outcrops near the sea (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:207). Additionally, though cairns exist in the investigated areas, they are mainly concentrated on the Boknafjord Islands and in Ryfylke, both of which have very few earth-constructed barrows.

4.2 Etne

Etne is the northernmost region featured in this present study. It is a peripheral county, among networks of fjord and mountains, and holds a small concentration of earth-constructed barrows (Myhre 1972:16). Etne is situated south in the province of Hordaland, on the border of Rogaland. There have been few excavations in the area, however, Haakon Shetelig and Johannes Bøe investigated two burial mounds in 1912 and 1926 respectively (Fett 1963:15, 39). In 1969, Clifford D. Long, and later Bente Magnus Myhre excavated the Garahaugen mound (Myhre & Myhre 1970). They are all situated on moraine ridges, overlooking the archipelago at Etnefjord. South of Etne lays the municipality Vindafjord. Several Bronze Age finds have been registered in this area, including an excavated barrow in Skeie.

4.3 Karmøy

Karmøy is the largest island in Rogaland, located in the northernmost part of the province. It is situated between the North Sea and Karmsundet, a strait that throughout history has been an important protective sailing route against the dangerous and inhospitable North Sea. The name Karmøy derives from the Old Norse word “Körmt”, meaning bargeboard, in the form of shelter. However, a cross setting at the northern end of Karmsundet can temporarily create

strong currents here as well, making stays at Karmøy inevitable. Naturally, these would have been favourable conditions for the establishment of a local power structure in the Early Bronze Age (Solberg 1994:122; Kvalø 2007:66). The topography of Karmøy is made up of Caledonian bedrock, but there is a distinct difference between the northeastern and southwestern part of the island (Prøsch-Danielsen & Simonsen 2000a:9). The northeast part contains metamorphosed lava and phyllite, creating fertile soil, well-suited for agrarian activity, while the granite in the southwest gives a more acid, and less fertile soil (Lundberg 1998:69–71). This is reflected in the placement of burial mounds. Cairns constitute a minority, located in the southern part of the island near the shore. Earth-constructed barrows are largely concentrated on the northeastern part of the island. There are four large moraine ridges on the island, all of which are concentrated in the north (Lundberg 1998:76).

Altogether, there are 12 registered earth-constructed barrows on Karmøy, only five cairns have been registered, of them, one can with certainty be linked to the Early Bronze Age.

4.4 Jæren

Jæren is a district with low-lying hills, sandy plains, lakes and wetlands. It stretches along the coastline from Oгна in the south to Stavanger in the north. The low-lying part of Jæren is directly exposed to the North Sea without any protective skerries or islands. The area is covered with up to 130 metres of thick glacial deposits, making it unique in relation to the rest of western Norway. A Late Weichselian erosion caused a mosaic of glacial stratigraphy, resulting in a sub-soil of diverse fertilities well suited for agrarian activity (Semb 1962). Although, due to low relief, the coastline has been very transformative in the course of 12 000 years, with repeated transgression and regression (Prøsch-Danielsen & Simonsen 2000a:9). As a result, beach ridges have dammed up prehistoric fjords along

the coast. Several grave monuments are now situated on these ridges, between the sea and coastal lakes (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:67).

In Norway, Jæren is the largest consecutive area with earthen barrows from the Bronze Age. Compiled data from several authors (e.g. Møllerop 1963b; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004), and personal research in the topographical archive in Stavanger have revealed 56 earthen barrows and three cairns linked to finds. However, there are several more burial mounds that are connected to the Bronze Age based on size, construction, location, and secondary finds (see appendix 1).

4.5 Lista

About 60 kilometres down the coast from Jæren a similar topography is found on the Lista peninsula, in the province of Vest-Agder, representing the southeastern fringe of the coastal heath section (Prøsch-Danielsen & Simonsen 2000b:109). During the Neolithic period, a change in the topography exposed the landscape, which previously had been sheltered by skerries and islands, to the North Sea. Pollen analysis has recorded massive deforestation during this period and into the Bronze Age (Prøsch-Danielsen 1995:26). Correspondingly, the archaeological material suggests a change to agriculture.

I have identified 10 burial mounds from the Early Bronze Age on Lista, three of which are likely from the Late Neolithic. Marstrander (1948) is the only professional archaeologist to have excavated a mound from the Early Bronze Age. It was excavated in 1948, on the farm Øvre Meberg. A bronze sword¹ was recovered, along with fragments of pottery and charcoal (Johansen 1986:38). The region of Lista is, within the research aim of this study, challenging, as barrows and cairns often have few diagnostic finds for interpretation. However, based on the construction of the mounds, empty cists, usually made up of flagstones, together with secondary burials from the Late Bronze Age; it is possible to tentatively date several of them to the Early Bronze Age.

5. The archaeological data – the burial mounds

This chapter will present a selection of the best-documented burial mounds in the studied region. The chapter is structured according to geographical zones, as there are natural geological lines of demarcation between the areas, as well as differences in the archaeological material, which will be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. The following presentation will thus start with Etne farthest north, and then move south to Karmøy, Jæren and Lista. The burial mounds are divided into farmsteads/localities with the exception of Jæren where the burial mounds have been divided into districts, due to the region's size. Each area will be presented with the main 'themes' from 3.3.2 in mind. This chapter's goal is to establish an overall picture of the structural similarities in each region, which will further support the analysis in Chapter 6. The empirical data is based on a compiled dataset, where parts have been obtained from other studies (e.g. Lund 1934; Møllerop 1963b; Myhre 1972, 1981; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 1998, 2004; Hauge 2007), but also from my own research in the museum archives. For a full detail of burial mounds with finds, see appendix 1 at the end of the book.

Every recalibrated ^{14}C -date in this chapter has been calibrated according to OxCal software version 4.2 (Bronk Ramsey 2009), with the calibration curve IntCal 13 (Reimer *et al.* 2013).

5.1 Etne

Sørheim

At Etne (Fig. 4), Garahaugen in Sørheim is part of a small concentration of earth-constructed barrows in the southern province of Hordaland. The barrow is situated on the Støle-Sørheim ridge, and was excavated in 1969 by Clifford D. Long and later that same year by Bente Magnus Myhre. It measured 20 m in diameter and was 1.8 m high. Actual height estimates were thought to be 2.5 m, since a pit at its top suggested a previous 'excavation' (Myhre 1972:13). A cross profile was excavated NW–SE (Myhre & Myhre 1970), exposing the barrow's construction, which was made of several layers of sand, gravel and earth. A cairn was unearthed in the centre of the barrow along with an outer stone kerb. It could



Figure 4. Distribution of burial mounds in Etne. Skeie is part of the municipality Vindafjord (see appendix I).

therefore be estimated that the barrow had an original size of approximately 15 m in diameter. The central cairn, which was made of large boulders, revealed a cist made of standing stone slabs positioned NW–SE, and measured 0.75 m in length and was 0.35 m wide. The northern end wall was missing, but the other three sides were made from single standing stone slabs (Myhre & Myhre 1970). The cist did not contain any artefacts, however, burnt bone and pieces of charcoal were discovered. The existing uncalibrated ^{14}C -sample from charcoal inside the cist is 3330 ± 80 BP (Myhre & Myhre 1970). In the report this date was originally recalibrated to 1460–1300 BCE, however, a new recalibrated test in OxCal v.4.2 gave a date between 1777–1436 BCE. A ^{14}C -sample

from charcoal discovered beneath the cist was dated to 3080 ± 80 BP, and recalibrated in the original report to 1210–1050 BCE. A new recalibrated date in OxCal v.4.2 gave a date between 1516–1111 BCE. Both these dates are significantly earlier than the dates in the original report thereby placing the barrow somewhere between Periods I and II. It has been pointed out that charcoal from inside the cist could derive from old timber, thus resulting in an older date (Myhre 1972:15). Prior to this excavation a bronze dagger² typologically dated to late Period II – early Period III was discovered in a cist at Sørheim that sounds remarkably similar to the cist in Garahaugen (Myhre & Myhre 1970). If the source of the dagger was the same mound it would complicate the dating of the barrow even further. There is of course no possibility of knowing exactly where the dagger came from, and ‘urmaker’ (watchmaker) Pettersen – an infamous grave robber at the turn of the 20th century – was known for his ‘excavations’ in this area around the time when the dagger was given to the museum. The dagger could therefore be from several other burial mounds in the area. Several factors complicate the dating of the barrow, but based on the recalibrated ¹⁴C-dates, a late Period I date or more likely a Period II date seems plausible.

Støle

The Olahaugen mound in Støle lies on the same ridge as Garahaugen, approximately 200 m from Støle church. The earthen barrow was re-excavated by Shetelig in 1912, after a small slab-lined cist was discovered inside the mound. The barrow measured 16–20 m in diameter, and was 1.5 m high. Inside the cist was a vessel containing burnt bone indicating a Late Bronze Age date. The cist was discovered 2–3 m north of the barrow’s centre, which was clearly damaged by earlier withdrawals of earth and gravel. Eyvind de Lange (1912) proposed a Late Bronze Age date for both the barrow and the burial. This is highly questionable, as the cist was not discovered in its centre (Myhre 1972:16), and to my knowledge there are no known barrows the size of Olahaugen built for Late Bronze Age cremation graves. Consequently, the barrow will be tentatively dated to the Early Bronze Age.

Grindheim

The Kyrkjehaugen mound lies west of Grindheim church, centred in the middle of the large Grindheim ridge. The barrow measured 15–17 m in diameter and was 1.5 m high. The barrow held a small slab-lined cist with a vessel of burnt bones³, and a




Figure 5. Distribution of burial mounds in the northern part of Karmøy (see appendix 1).

razor⁴ dated to the Late Bronze Age. The cist was discovered close to the outer layer of turf, and 3 m south from the mounds centre, indicating a secondary burial (Fett 1963:38-39; Myhre 1972:16). The barrow was re-excavated by Johs. Bøe in 1926 but he was not able to find a central cist. He did, however, record the composition of the barrow, which was very similar to Garahaugen, made of several layers of sand, gravel and earth encircled by a stone kerb. An Early Bronze Age date therefore seems likely.

5.2 Karmøy

Reheia

On the island of Karmøy (Fig. 5), situated on a high moraine ridge overlooking the strait to the east, Reheia holds the largest concentration of earth-constructed barrows from the Early Bronze Age in Norway (Fig. 6). When Bendix B. R. Bendixen visited Karmøy in 1876 he mapped out 42 structures on Reheia: seven large and 28 smaller barrows, as well as seven stone settings. Today, the six remaining barrows still dominate the landscape, and are placed on a north to south line parallel with the strait.




Figure 6. B. E. R. Bendixen's map of Reheia, from 1876. Stippled circles and half circles are remains of partly destroyed barrows. The stone settings are visible between mound no. 5 and no. 11. Map: Topographical Archive, Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo.

The Guttormshaugen mound was registered as mound no. 11 by Bendixen in 1876 (Fig. 6). The barrow was a target of an amateur excavation in, or before, 1823, and there is little information about the composition of the barrow or the cist. However, looking at the barrow today it still holds a thick layer of earth, and it is not unthinkable that the cist was made out of standing stone slabs like so many other barrows on Karmøy. It contained a twisted arm ring of gold⁵, pieces of hammered gold leaf⁶, and a now lost bronze sword. No diagnostic information regarding the bronze sword has been obtainable. However, the twisted arm ring of gold is very similar to arm rings found on Jutland (e.g.

Broholm 1943:170). These are usually dated to Period III, and one could therefore assume that Guttormshaugen is from the same period. A similar twisted arm ring of gold along with a bronze sword from Period III has also been found at Hodne in the district of Klepp, further supporting a Period III dating (de Lange 1919). Gold leaf is very rare in Nordic Bronze Age settings. However, in addition to Guttormshaugen, a second burial mound from Reheia has held a couple of gold leaf fragments⁷. The exact position of this mound is unfortunately unknown. In Denmark and Skåne gold leaf has often been found on artefacts made of bronze, the Sun Chariot of Trundholm perhaps representing one of



Figure 7. Fyrstegraven seen from west with the Karmsundet strait visible in the background to the left. The mound is reduced from its original size due to excavations. Photo: K. I. Austvoll, 2013.

the best known examples (e.g. Brøndsted 1939:85–86; Broholm 1944:85; Jensen 2002:277).

The Fyrstegraven mound, registered as mound no. 6 by Bendixen, is situated northeast of Guttormshaugen (Figs. 6 and 7). It was excavated by three students in 1831, and was built of a thick outer layer of earth with a central cairn in the middle. Inside the cairn was a cist of standing stone slabs. The cist was 2.80 m long, 0.80 m wide, and 0.60 m high. When the cist was opened a double layer of birch bark had been laid on top of the deceased (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:150–151). A sword⁸ with a scabbard⁹ covered in calf hide rested on the deceased's chest. In Denmark a few examples of scabbards have been recovered from oak coffins. These are usually lined on the inside with calf hide to protect the sword (Broholm 1944:94). The cist also held pieces of a brooch, three bronze buttons, and a textile fragment from the dress of the deceased (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:151). A recalibrated ¹⁴C-date in OxCal v.4.2 from the scabbard belonging to the sword dated it to 1532–1260 BCE (TUa-168: 3145 ± 60 BP), indicating a burial somewhere between Period II and III. The sword has, however, been typologically dated to early Period III (Møllerop 1963b:53). A spearhead¹⁰, typologically dated to the last part of Period II or the beginning of Period III, was found in the same grave but information about the context of the spearhead is contradictory (see Nordenborg Myhre 1998:77–80). However, based on Christie's (1842a:324) own personal communication with excavator S. Blom, it is reasonable to believe that the spearhead came from the same grave as the rest of the artefacts. To my knowledge only one other burial mound in the region has been recorded with a spearhead: a Period II grave from Rennesøy¹¹. In other parts of Norway spearheads are usually connected to stray finds or depositions (e.g. Bjørn 1926:8).

The Knaghaug mound is situated on the outskirts of Reheia, on the farm Bø. It was excavated by Shetelig in 1907 after a golden berlock and a bronze cauldron from the Roman Period were found there in 1903 (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:153). Prior to this a bronze sword from Period III had been found in the same mound (Gustafson 1893). The central cist was badly damaged by earlier excavations and only scattered stone slabs and pieces of charcoal were found. Based on the construction of other cists at Reheia, the cist in Knaghaug was in all likelihood made of standing stone slabs. A second construction, shaped as an oval ship setting was found south of the centre of the mound. It was 3 m long E–W and 2 m broad N–S. It did not

contain any objects but the construction had an upper layer of boulders, with stone slabs supporting it. Below the slabs, a thick layer of marine sand was discovered resting on another layer of small horizontally laid slabs (Shetelig 1907). A small slab stood at the northeastern end of the structure, interpreted by Nordenborg Myhre (2004:153) as a ship prow. Similar constructions have been found in the Kongshaugen mound at Karmøy, and in the Steinhaugen mound at Klepp.

Mound no. 30 (Fig. 6), one of the largest barrows on Reheia, contained a spoon-shaped scraper of flint. It was discovered in the proximity of grave no. 1 but not on the inside, and can thus be explained as mixed debris from earlier settlement layers. Nevertheless, the construction of the cist is rather interesting. Its outer sidewalls were made from single standing slabs and each end was made of a double layer of standing stone slabs with a layer of small pebbles in-between (Bendixen 1877:106). It measured roughly 80 cm in length and was 30–40 cm wide and contained burnt bones, interpreted by Bendixen to be from a child (Bendixen 1877:106). Cremation graves are rare in the Early Bronze Age, but not unheard of. In Jæren there is one cremation grave from Period I–II, two cremation graves from Period II, and six cremation graves from Period III. However, these are usually small cists found in either small barrows, on flat ground, or as secondary burials in larger burial mounds (Møllerop 1963b:28). This seems to differ from mound no. 30 at Karmøy, which can be categorised as monumental (30 m in diameter and 6.5 m high), the cist does not indicate a secondary burial either. Thus, it seems plausible that we are dealing with a different burial custom with more similarities to Garahaugen in Etne and cremation graves in Jutland from Period II. A general change in cremation graves in Jutland from Period II to III demonstrates that Period II graves are usually represented with cists that are proportionate to the body. In Period III we see a change in the bodily representation of the deceased, where the cremation of the dead is buried in smaller cists (Hansen 2007:35), which is more similar to cremation graves in Jæren, and secondary burials from the Late Bronze Age. The smaller barrows at Reheia hold little information, but those who do have revealed small cists with burnt bones (Neumann 1839). These are in all likelihood from the Late Bronze Age, the same as the stone settings, which will be discussed in the section below.

Stone settings at Reheia

In 1876 Bendixen recorded six rectangular stone settings, each centred south between the two largest



Figure 8. The dry-built cist in Kubbhaug from the excavation in 1905. Remains of a water vole was discovered inside the cist, which had disturbed the original placement of the artefacts and human remains. Photo: Topographical Archive, University Museum of Bergen.

barrows, Guttormshaugen and Fyrstegraven. Today, there are no traces left of these structures and little information of them have survived. However, in a *Haugesund Dagblad* (Hagesund Daily) article on July 7, 1956, Egil Bakka talks of similar structures at Sørheim, Etne (see also Fett 1963:17–18). Related structures have also been recorded at the Hunn site in Østfold and several areas in Sweden (e.g. Widholm 1998:64–69; Kristiansen & Prescott 2000:177; Thedéen 2004). They are described as being made up of smaller stones making up a rectangular setting usually between 2–3 x 4–5 m. In the centre one can usually find layers of sand, gravel and charcoal. Some of them have revealed burnt bones, ceramics, and one particular stone setting at Hjortekrog in Sweden contained a razor dated to the Late Bronze Age Period V–IV. They are all situated in areas connected to cairns within a Late Bronze Age context (see Thedéen 2004).

When Bendixen excavated stone setting no. 21 at Reheia (see Fig. 6), he described its sides as being made up of stones and ditches. The inside held stones, sand and gravel, covering a layer of charcoal. Further down he recovered a pile of burnt bones, charcoal and pieces of ceramics¹² (Bendixen 1877:107–108). Bendixen also described other stone settings that were more oval in form (Bendixen 1877:108). Similar structures have also been found at the above mentioned site of Hjortekrog in Sweden. Based on typological analyses of pottery these structures have been dated to the Late Bronze Age (Widholm 1998:68). Nordenborg Myhre (2004:152) connects the oval stone settings on Reheia to ships,

similar to those found on Knaghaug and Kongshaugen. This interpretation is not unlike Widholm's (1998) views, which sees the oval stone settings at Hjortekrog as symbolizing a voyage of the souls. The rectangular stone settings at Hjortekrog have no outer form that can be interpreted in relation to other structures, but they are always situated in areas connected to oval stone settings and cairns. Based on a diagnostic comparison of the construction and finds, it is highly plausible that the stone settings at Reheia can be tentatively dated to the Late Bronze Age, however, situated within an Early Bronze Age context. One would imagine that the area continued to be used as an important place for ritual practice governed by the presence of ancestral burial mounds from the Early Bronze Age.

Gunnarshaug

Further north of Reheia lies Gunnarshaug farm. Here, Shetelig and Brøgger excavated the Kjørkhaug mound and the Kubbhaug mound in 1905. Located on the same moraine ridge as Reheia and facing Karmsundet they hold a near parallel line with the strait.

Kjørkhaug was 25 m in diameter and 3.4 m high, with a thick outer layer of earth, with traces of red and grey sand, clay and charcoal. In 1897 the blade of a dagger¹³ from Period III was discovered in the same mound, and a missing twisted arm ring of gold is also mentioned (Shetelig & Brøgger 1905). Seven cone-shaped cairns were discovered inside the mound (Shetelig & Brøgger 1905). With the exception of some pieces of charcoal and a few fragments of flint, the barrow and inner

cairns were empty. These have later been interpreted as cenotaphs for missing persons at sea (de Lange 1914).

Kubbhaug is the only earth-constructed barrow on Karmøy recorded with a cist in a dry stone technique (Fig. 8). The cist was covered by a single capstone shaped in the form of a ship. Its sides were made of horizontally laid slabs, with standing end slabs. It contained unburnt skeletal remains including a cranium. It also contained the blade of a dagger¹⁴, a bronze needle from a brooch¹⁵, a button¹⁶, a razor¹⁷ and a pair of tweezers¹⁸, all datable to Period III. A layer of birch bark was discovered at the bottom of the cist. The mound itself was made of a thick layer of earth surrounding the central cairn and cist (Shetelig & Brøgger 1905).

Storesund

Located at the northernmost part of Karmøy, Storesund farm forms the end of the sheltered strait, and used to hold three barrows from the Bronze Age although their location is not known today.

Barrow no. 1 was excavated in 1902 by Fridtjof Øvrebø and is 20 m in diameter and was 2.5 m high. A cist of standing stone slabs was discovered in its centre, aligned NNW–SSE, parallel with the strait. It held the remains of unburnt bone together with a knife¹⁹ and a brooch²⁰ from Period III (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:158). 0.5 m below the surface a flange-hilted sword²¹ was discovered. These are very unusual in Southwest Norway, and it is unfortunate that this one was not found in its original context.

Barrow no. 2 was excavated as late as 1934 by Kristen Lindøe. The mound's location is not known but it was situated 30–40 m from the shoreline. It was 14 m in diameter and was 2.5 m high. Like the other barrows on Karmøy it too was built out of a thick outer layer of earth with a central cairn in its centre. The cist was built of standing stone slabs but did not contain any finds except some unburnt skeletal remains. One of the slabs on the southern side had been moved prior to the excavation indicating a previous raid (Nordenborg Myhre 1998:108). The cist was oriented E–W which is the only known cist on Karmøy that is not placed parallel with the strait. The barrow's composition, cist, and unburnt skeletal remains places the mound within an Early Bronze Age context.

There is little information concerning the third mound. The only information available is a pair of tweezers²² discovered in a mound sometime in, or before, 1872. It was found together with burnt bones in a small cist, indicating a secondary burial from the Late Bronze Age.

Storasund

On the mainland, across the strait from Storesund lies the farm Storasund. When the landowner excavated a barrow in 1904 he discovered a small cist made of six standing stone slabs. It held burnt bones and a knife, datable to Period IV. The mound was badly damaged and one could clearly see a gravel pit dug into its centre (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:158). The discovered cist must have been a secondary burial, and the damages done to the mound's centre must have destroyed a central cist, most likely from the Early Bronze Age.

Ringen

There are very few cairns on Karmøy, and only Kongshaugen at Ringen can with certainty be placed within the Bronze Age. It is situated on a promontory overlooking the Karmsundet strait not far from Høydevarden lighthouse, and measures 43 m north–south, 18 m east–west, and is at least 2.5 m high. When it was excavated in 1963 it revealed an internal cairn containing a dry-built cist of horizontally laid slabs (Fig. 9). It was positioned NW–SE, parallel with the strait. Around the central cist a pattern of circular walls was visible, with the outer wall ending up in a boat-shape construction towards the northwest. The central cist contained unburnt skeletal remains²³ and a bronze




Figure 9. The reconstructed cist in Kongshaugen, aligned SE–NW parallel with the Karmsundet strait. Photo: K. I. Austvoll, 2013.

ring that has later been lost (Møllerop 1963a:241). Five secondary burials were also discovered in the cairn, the latest dated to the Migration Period based on ornamented potsherds (Sjurseike 2001:36–37). The cairn was re-excavated and reconstructed in 2001, which revealed a potential sixth burial next to the central cist. An osteological examination of the skeletal remains was carried out. It concluded that the age of the individual was between 17–20 years, still, it was not possible to determine the sex of the individual (Sellevold 2001). A ^{14}C -sample recalibrated in OxCal v.4.2 from the skeletal remains found in the central cist gave a date between 1131–923 BCE (Beta-159023: 2870 ± 40 BP). This would give the cairn a date between Period III and IV. In 2001 new ^{14}C -samples were taken from charcoal found in cracks below the cairn. These were recalibrated in the original report to 2030–1870 BCE (3582 ± 40 BP). It is unlikely that these dates are connected to the first burial, and it is perhaps more reasonable to assume that the pieces of charcoal are a result of earlier activities from before the cairn was built. Another ^{14}C -sample from charcoal found at the bottom of the central cist has been recalibrated in OxCal v.4.2 to 1532–1386 BCE (Beta-159027: 3180 ± 40 BP). This dates the cairn to late Period Ib and Period II. However, based on the ^{14}C -date from the skeletal remains, and similar constructions from Jutland (Rasmussen & Holst 2004:21) and Skåne (Artelius 1996:57–58) dated to the last part of the Early Bronze Age, the cairn on Ringen is most likely from Period III. It also seems unlikely that the cairn could be of a later date, as there are to this author's knowledge no Late Bronze Age graves with unburnt skeletal remains.

5.3 Jæren

Randaberg

The region of Jæren (Fig. 10) is divided into several smaller areas. One of these, the district of Randaberg, is comparable to a peninsula known for its waterways, lakes and close connection to the North Sea. The landscape north of Vistevika bay holds many prehistoric structures, dominated by the presence of cup mark sites along the bay's shoreline.

The Krosshaugen mound is situated north of Vistevika, on a ridge that overlooks the sea. Helliesen recorded the barrow in 1897 (Helliesen 1900), but it was not until it was removed in 1914 that a central cist was unearthed. The barrow was made of earth and gravel with a diameter of roughly 25 m. The cist was aligned ENE–WSW, the same orientation as the shoreline of the bay (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:115). The southern and western walls were constructed out of regular boulders




Figure 10. Distribution of burial mounds in Jæren. See appendix I for more details.

– the same used for the inner cairn. The northern and eastern walls were both built of single stone slabs. When the cist was opened it revealed a half full cist of earth and beach pebbles, with fine beach sand covering the bottom layer. Remains of an unburnt skeleton²⁴ and fragments of pottery²⁵, dated to the Early Bronze Age, were discovered in the cist. No information about the alignment of the skeleton nor the position of the pottery fragments was recorded (Gjessing 1914:28–29).

Other barrows in the same area hold little information, however, one of the two twin barrows, the Tvihaugene mounds, in Vestre Goa, southeast from Krosshaug did contain a casting mould²⁶ for a socketed axe from to Period V–IV. Burnt bone and a couple of pottery fragments were also found (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:115).

Tananger in Sola

Tananger is a peninsula made up of a low-lying hill, forming the southern side of the Hafrsfjord inlet. It stretches northward from the district of Sola and is exposed to the North Sea on its western side, with its small protective skerries and sheltered bays.

The Sothaug mound is the largest burial mound on Jæren (40 m in diameter and 5–6 m high). It is located




Figure 11. Drawing of the northern cist in Regehaugen, the body was placed with the head by the ornamented stone slab. The cist was centred E–W, and was 2.15 m in length and c. 1 m high. The foot end contained a stone kerb, indicating that the deceased was buried after the cist and mound was constructed. Drawing: A. Lorange, 1882.

on a high terrace overlooking the passageway from the North Sea into the sheltered area of Hafrsfjord. The barrow has not been archaeologically excavated, but when earth was removed from the mound in 1842 a dry-built cist of horizontally laid slabs was revealed. The cist contained fragments of an unburnt skeleton with a bronze sword²⁷ on its chest, dated to Period III. Two bronze buttons²⁸ and a cloth of woven wool²⁹ were also discovered in the cist (Myhre 1981:68, 74). Together with a similar barrow on the opposite side of the fjord they mark the passageway to the inlet of Hafrsfjord (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:104, 115).

The Myklebusthaugen mound is situated south of Sothaug. It is an earthen barrow (19 m in diameter, 2 m high), and was excavated in 1878. It was largely made up of boulders with a 1 m thick outer layer of earth (Helliesen 1901:56). A cist made of standing stone slabs was discovered south of the mounds centre, and held some pottery fragments and sea-shells (*Littorina littorea*). The southern stone slab was ornamented with three pairs of footprints and 12 cup marks. Two other stone slabs ornamented with cup marks were discovered in the debris south of the cist (Helliesen 1901:56–57).

The Store Melhaug mound (25 m in diameter and 3.5 m high) is located further south on the peninsula, with a location that stands out in an otherwise flat

landscape. Anders Lorange excavated the barrow in 1879, uncovering an earthen barrow made of a composition of sand and earth with a central cairn in its centre. Between the inner cairn and the outer layer was a circular wall of trimmed slabs. This was likely part of an original outer stone kerb at the foot of the mound. Three secondary cists discovered in the barrow indicates that new layers of earth had been laid on the mound at a later time. One of the secondary cists held unburnt skeletal remains, indicating an Early Bronze Age date. The central cist was made in a dry stone technique of horizontally laid slabs on the sidewalls, and a single slab on each end.

The Lille Melhaug mound holds little information, but a bronze sword³⁰ from Period III, a button, and a couple of bronze fragments were discovered in the mound in 1834 (Nicolaysen 1876:187). It has not been possible to find information about the cist construction, but the barrow did contain three secondary burials. One burial contained burnt bones and fragments of a knife³¹ from Period V. From a second grave came fragments of unburnt skeletal remains and a bronze knife from Period III³².

Other barrows in Tananger hold little contextual information, although it is worth mentioning the barrows at Tjora farm. Nordenborg Myhre (2004:103)

has dated them to the Early Bronze Age based on size and location. They are all situated on rocky outcrops, following a line that faces Risavika bay further north. The Elhaugen mound is particularly interesting as a spearhead³³ was, supposedly, discovered in the mound sometime in, or before 1885, (Helliesen 1885:140; Nordenborg Myhre 2004:103; see also Fyllingen 2012). However, a new revision of the artefact from the museum archives (UNIMUS) has catalogued it as a razor from the Late Bronze Age.

Sola

Several earth-constructed barrows are registered in the district of Sola, which lies south of Tanager. The landscape is known for its rocky outcrops, high moraine hills, long beaches and bays. In addition to burial mounds, several rock art sites are located close to the shoreline, with the ship as the dominant motif.

The Regehaugen mound lies on a high moraine ridge overlooking Sola beach, and was made of a thick layer of earth, sand and stone. The barrow was not archaeologically investigated but when the landowner removed sand and gravel from the mound in 1881 he discovered two parallel cists. A year later Anders Lorange was able to draw the cist construction (Fig. 11). Both cists were placed under the same central cairn, indicating a contemporary construction. They were made of small, finely cut horizontally laid slabs, with an upright slab in each end. The northern cist held an end slab that was ornamented with three concentric circles, three cup marks, and a groove. The same cist contained the wealthiest burial registered from the Early Bronze Age in Norway. It was a female burial that held a neck collar³⁴, a belt plate³⁵, a tutulus³⁶, two arm rings³⁷, a brooch³⁸, a dagger³⁹ and small bronze tubes⁴⁰ for the skirt. Based on similar finds in southern Scandinavia the artefacts have traditionally been ascribed to Period II. Engedal (2010:75) has dated the burial to Period III based on diagnostic resemblance with a handful of finds from Zealand. These are based on Karl Kersten's (1935) typology, in which he ascribed four out of 28 neck collars that are ribbed with spiral decorated side panels to Period III, and two out of 16 belt plates that are decorated with two spiral zones to Period III. These comparisons seems motivated by a need to connect Southwest Norway to Zealand, rather than diagnostic resemblance, and are also used to place Særheim 1 and Nord-Braut 1 within a Period III context (Engedal 2010:73–76). Regehaugen, as well as Særheim 1 and Nord-Braut 1 are considered Period II burials in accordance with earlier studies (e.g. Møllerop 1963b;

Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004). The southern cist contained burnt bones, a pair of tweezers and a knife blade, dated to Period V. This must be part of a secondary burial as the cist construction indicates the same age as the northern cist (Møllerop 1963b:37–38).

Lorange excavated three other barrows at Rege. They did not contain as rich finds as Regehaugen, however, all cists were made of small, horizontally laid slabs, using a dry stone technique. Based on their construction, the barrows can be placed within an Early Bronze Age context and an ornamented grave slab⁴¹ in one of the barrows further supports this date.

Barrow no. 1 on Tjelta farm is situated on a promontory further south in the district of Sola. The landscape is characterised by its northern ridge, which would have overlooked the now drained Skasvatnet. The farm holds five registered barrows from the Bronze Age. There is little information with reference to the barrows, although one did contain a bronze arm ring⁴² from Period II. It was unearthed in 1881 and revealed a central cist made of small, horizontally laid slabs in an E–W direction (Buch 1881:123).

There are several more earth-constructed barrows along the same ridge as Tjelta farm; however, no bronze objects were recorded in connection to these. Nordenborg Myhre (2004:94) suggest them to be dated to the Bronze Age, based on their size, construction and location.

Sandnes

Southeast of Sola, in the district of Sandnes, lies the most recently excavated burial mound from the Early Bronze Age. With hills, rocky outcrops and lakes, it is an 'inland' landscape on the border with Ryfylke's deep narrow fjords and mountains. In 1978, Trond Løken excavated several smaller cairns in the area; the largest contained two orthogonal flagstones, indicating a small slab-lined cist. Inside was a small concentration of thick charcoal bearing earth, which held fragments of pottery, burnt bones, amber, a flint dagger and a sickle (Løken 1978). Pieces of charcoal were ¹⁴C-dated, and have been recalibrated in OxCal v.4.2 to between 1634 and 1260 BCE⁴³. It is thought to be one of the earliest cremation graves in the region, and based on the sickle it should in all likelihood be dated to the transition from Period I to Period II.

Klepp

The coastal zone along Klepp is short of protective skerries and islands, and is characterised by its long stretches of sandy plains. Orre Lake encompasses a




Figure 12. Sketch of Molkhaug, showing the central cist. Drawing: H. Egenæs Lund (1934).

large area of Klepp, and was most likely dammed up by beach ridges sometime in prehistory. It now holds a rich wildlife, and Bronze Age barrows are located all along its crests.

The Litle Grudhaug mound lies north of Orre Lake. It was excavated by the landowner in 1917, and was constructed as a cairn with a thin outer layer of earth. In its centre a cist constructed in a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs was unearthed. It was 2.10 m long and 40–50 cm wide, and held a sword⁴⁴ from Period II. The skeletal remains from the deceased was uncovered next to the sword (de Lange 1917).

The Molkhaug mound, on Østre Bore is one of the few barrows in Jæren that were excavated by professional archaeologists (Lund 1934). The burial mound was made of a mixture of earth and stone with an outer layer of earth. It was 18 m in diameter and was 1.8 m high, two cists were uncovered inside the barrow. Cist 1 was placed on a WSW–ENE line in the mounds centre (Fig. 12). It measured 1.80 m long and 0.4–0.5 m wide, and was built from a mixture of both large and smaller stone slabs. The eastern side was made of a single standing slab, and the three other sides were constructed of smaller horizontally laid slabs. It was filled with earth and contained pieces of burnt bone at the western cross wall. Cist 2 was discovered 1.5 m north of cist 1. It was made of two to three layers of capstones with one large capstone underneath. The cist measured roughly 2 m in length on the outside and was poorly constructed with boulders and slabs mixed together to construct the cist. The sidewalls were constructed in a dry stone technique, but standing stone slabs were also used. Each end was made of a single slab (Fig. 13). Cist 2 was filled with earth but revealed pieces of skeletal remains, including a cranium. A couple of small teeth have been interpreted as a woman's; this is further supported by a tutulus from Period II, unearthed at the southern cross wall. Between the cranium and the tutulus was a mass of seashells (*Littorina littorea*). A bronze tube and various animal bones were also discovered in the cist. A




Figure 13. Profile and incision of cist 2 in Molkhaug. Drawing: H. Egenæs Lund (1934).

third cist was also unearthed, but did not contain any finds from the Early Bronze Age, and based on its construction it was in all likelihood from the Late Bronze Age. The two main cists present a problem as they deviate from a general pattern of either cists made in a dry stone technique and cists made of standing slabs. The dating of the two cists is equally problematic as cist 1 contained burnt bones, which is rare in Period II. Cist 2 contained a tutulus from Period II and a bronze tube common in both Period II and III. There is a possibility that both graves are from the transition to Period III as the construction of both cists indicates a contemporary building period. The use of horizontally laid slabs is similar to many Period II graves, and the double burial resembles the richer burial mound at Rege.

At Hodne farm, south along the outer ridge of Orre Lake there are three barrows with finds from the Early Bronze Age. The richest barrow held a twisted arm ring of gold⁴⁵ and a bronze sword⁴⁶ from Period III. The barrow measured 17 m in diameter and was 2.3 m high, but earth had been removed prior to the investigation so its original size could have been larger. The cist was constructed of horizontally laid stone slabs and was 2.8 m long and 0.50–0.60 m wide




Figure 14. The construction of the cist at Hodne farm. The cross in the centre of the cist shows where the golden arm ring was discovered. Drawing: E. de Lange, 1919.

(Fig. 14). The sword was discovered in the N–W corner of the cist, 10 cm from the sidewall and 30 cm from the end slab. The twisted arm ring of gold was discovered underneath the floor, which was covered in beach pebbles and small stone slabs. It is unclear why the ring was placed underneath the grave and not together with the deceased. It could be an offering before the deceased was buried, or to protect the artefact from grave robbers (de Lange 1919).

The Jonsokhaugen mound is situated on the same farm as the barrow with the golden arm ring and sword. There is little information concerning the barrow construction, but it did reveal a bronze dagger⁴⁷ from Period III with fragments of the wooden hilt still intact (Gustafson 1890:128).

The Ljoshaug mound is the largest barrow at Orre farm (38 m in diameter and 2–3 m high), and is situated on a promontory on the southwestern side of Orre Lake. There are four other barrows in the same vicinity but no bronze object can be connected to these (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:86). The central cist in Ljoshaug was c. 1.9 m long, and was built in a dry stone technique made of small, horizontally laid slabs. Inside the cist was a tutulus from Period II (Buch 1879:260).

A barrow at Nord Braut was excavated in 1922, and revealed yet another cist with its sidewalls constructed in a dry stone technique and standing stone slabs in

each end. Skeletal remains of a woman were discovered in the grave along with two bronze arm rings⁴⁸ and a belt plate⁴⁹, all dateable to Period II (de Lange & Petersen 1925:7–8). In 1881 a similar barrow at Sør Braut was unearthed. The cist construction was built in the same manner, and held female artefacts; two bronze arm rings⁵⁰, a neck collar⁵¹, and a tutulus⁵² typologically dated to Period II.

Time

The district of Time is supported by two major river systems running across an open, moraine landscape. It differs from the large ridges and hills in northern Jæren, and is perhaps more known for its low-lying hills and flat plains.

The best-documented barrow in Time is at Hognestad. When Arne Bang-Andersen (1936) excavated the remains of a destroyed earthen barrow in 1936 it was 19 m in diameter and 2 m high. The outer layer was constructed of earth and gravel, with a central cairn in the middle made of large boulders. The cist was constructed of standing stone slabs, and seven custom fit slabs were used to create the floor (Fig. 15). One of the capstones was ornamented with two cup marks⁵³. The cist also held the blade and pommel of a bronze dagger,





Figure 15. Profile of the cist discovered in a barrow at Hognestad. Two standing slabs were used at each side with a couple of smaller stones for support. The floor was made of seven nicely fitted stone slabs. The dagger and pommel are drawn in on the second floor slab. Drawing: A. Bang-Andersen, 1936.

Figure 16. The cist at Myklebust farm. The cranium and jawbone are drawn in at their original placement by the eastern end slab. Drawing: A. W. Brøgger 1910.



– diagnostic to Period II – two potsherds, fragments of charcoal, burnt nutshell, and unworked flint⁵⁴.

On the farm Tjøtta further north, a barrow was excavated in 1922. The barrow had a composite structure made of gravel and stone, covered by a thin layer of turf (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:78). The cist was made of standing stone slabs covered by two capstones and held a belt plate, a tutulus and a brooch⁵⁵ together with fragments of unburnt skeletal remains, dated to Period II.

Hå

Hå is a coastal landscape, with sandy beaches and low moraine hills and coastal heathlands to the west. It also marks the southern edge of the traditional Jæren landscape.

There are several burial mounds in the area, with the majority situated close to the shoreline on low-lying hills. The Dyrshaug mound was one of the largest burial mounds in the area and was excavated by Gabriel Gustafson in 1892. The mound measured 22 m in diameter and was 3.5 m high. An outer layer of turf covered the mound with a large central cairn in its centre (11–12 m in diameter and 2.5 m high). Earlier excavations had clearly damaged the barrow, but the central cist was believed to be intact. The cist was made of small, finely fitted horizontally laid slabs in a dry stone technique, and positioned in a NE–SW direction. The cist held a couple of skeletal fragments, including teeth. Other than that, the cist was empty. However, a few years earlier a secondary burial was discovered in the same mound, with finds from the Late Bronze Age.

It is also worth mentioning that a finely crafted hilt⁵⁶ from a bronze sword was discovered in a cairn at the

same farm as Dyrshaug. The cairn was re-excavated by Brøgger but no central cist, or artefacts were discovered. In 1926 part of what is believed to be the blade of the sword was handed in to the museum.

Eigersund

Eigersund lies south of Hå and differs from the traditional landscape of Jæren, and is perhaps more known for its rivers and woodland. The best documented barrow was unearthed at Eigerøya by Brøgger in 1910. The cist was discovered close to the surface, which would indicate that earth had been removed prior to the excavation. The cist was constructed in an E–W direction, and made in a dry-built technique of small, horizontally laid slabs (Brøgger 1910). The cist contained an unidentifiable concentration of organic material in the western corner, described as birch bark-like in texture. The material could conceivably be a birch bark container, which is not uncommon in Danish oak coffins, found for instance in the famous Egtved burial (Thomsen 1929). These are usually placed at the foot end of the grave, and fits well with the distribution at Myklebust (Fig. 16). Birch bark containers also have parallels in Norway, for instance from the Brubakk quarry in Kvikne, and a Late Bronze Age – Pre-Roman Iron Age bog find from Åustråt in Trøndelag (Melheim 2012a:388; Henriksen 2014:158). There is also a possibility that fragments of resin⁵⁷ can be connected to a birch bark container, found in a cremation grave in Larvik, Vestfold, tentatively dated to the Late Bronze Age. Tests in a SEM-microscope of the organic material in the Myklebust grave were not able to provide any definite results, but resembled dry skin. In the

Egtved burial the birch bark bucket was placed on top of cowhide (Thomsen 1929:183). Perhaps this was also the case in the Myklebust grave, though further tests are necessary. Brøgger (1910) also described a white powder in the western corner, thought to be verdigris from bronze, although this seems highly questionable. Fragments of a skeleton, including a jawbone, were discovered in the east end. Sean Denham (1999) has analysed and categorised the bone fragments which originated from a single human skeleton. The chinbone was distinctly masculine, and the individual was aged somewhere over twenty and was *c.* 168 cm tall.

5.4 Lista in Farsund

Øvre Meberg

On the Lista Peninsula (Fig. 17), a kilometer east from Pennefeltet, the largest rock art site in Lista, the farm Øvre Meberg is situated on a promontory with wide views to the ocean and surrounding landscape. In January 1948 the landowner stumbled upon a slab-lined cist with a bronze sword⁵⁸ from Period III when he was removing stones from a mound. A follow-up survey was carried out by Marstrander (1948) who was informed that during the last 50 years stone had been

removed countless times from the barrow. Marstrander estimated its original diameter to be roughly 25–30 m. The burial mound is referred to as a cairn, but the composition of the mound was made of stones mixed with earth, with a thin outer layer of turf. Therefore, it seems more correct to refer to the mound as a composite barrow, similar to burial mounds on Jæren. The central cist was 1.60 m long and 0.40 m at its widest (Fig. 18). The walls were made of standing stone slabs; some were nicely fitted, while others were more randomly placed with their flat side facing inwards. A single capstone, 2.7 m in length and 1.1 m wide, covered the grave. The sword was discovered in the southern part of the western sidewall, with the sword's tip facing north. A piece of unburnt bone, possibly a cranium, is recorded in the original report (Marstrander 1948). Although it is never mentioned in later publications (e.g. Marstrander 1950) it would imply an inhumation burial. A few fragments of coarse pottery were also discovered in the cist.

Østre Hauge

The Sverreshaug mound is an earth-constructed barrow that lies on a high moraine ridge overlooking the sea. In historical times the barrow functioned as a fryctoria (Hauge 2007:47) until it was excavated by Lorange (1878) in 1877. It measured 84 m in diameter and was 6 m high, making it the largest barrow on Lista. It was constructed of layers of earth and sand, with a central cairn in its centre that held a cist made of large boulders and a capstone. The cist measured roughly 2 m in length and was 0.6 to 0.4 m wide. The capstone was covered by birch bark, perhaps in an attempt to preserve the cist and body? Oak-coffins in Denmark are often thought to be deliberate attempts at preserving the body of the deceased, as well as layers and wrappings of the body in skin and clothes, and even seaweed (e.g. Holst *et al.* 2001). The floor inside the cist was covered in dark soil mixed with sand, on top of this a layer of yellowish brown beach pebbles were laid out on the floor. The cist did not contain any artefacts, but due to a secondary burial from the Late Bronze Age and based on the cist construction and mound, it can be tentatively dated to the Early Bronze Age.

Kjørrefjord

There is unfortunately no information concerning the barrow construction in Kjørrefjord. It was destroyed years before a bronze knife⁵⁹ and a bronze arm ring⁶⁰ were discovered in the same vicinity as the barrow. To all appearances the artefacts are from the destroyed barrow, and based on a typological dating of the knife,



Figure 17. Distribution of burial mounds in Lista (see appendix I).




Figure 18. Capstone and cist discovered in the burial mound at Øvre Meberg. Drawing: S. Marstrander 1948.

the barrow can be placed within Period III (Johansen 1986:58). Yet, there has been an ongoing discussion concerning the arm ring's date. Johansen (1986:59–60) dates the arm ring to Period III, with reference to Randsborg's (1969) chronology of similar arm rings in Denmark, and Brøgger's (1913) dating of arm rings at Jæren. Hauge (2007:45) dates the arm ring and barrow to Period II with reference to Møllerop (1963b:16) who dates several arm rings from Jæren to Period II. These arm rings were unearthed in cists that are clearly placed within Period II contexts. Drawing parallels between the arm ring from Kjørrefjord and arm rings found on Jæren is problematic. With reference to the published chronology in both Brøgger's and Randsborg's articles, and with the likely scenario that both the arm ring and the knife are from the same grave, a Period III dating seems more plausible.

Hananger

In the southeastern part of Lista, situated on the western side of the Hananger Lake, fragments of burnt bone⁶¹ and a badly corroded tutulus⁶² were found in an earth-constructed barrow. There is little information about when it was discovered and how it was built, but the tutulus and bones were discovered in a small slab-lined

cist indicating a Late Bronze Age date. However, both Johansen (1986:64–66) and Hauge (2007:46–47) suggest that the tutulus should be typologically dated to Period II, based on similar finds from Jæren. If this is the case, the barrow at Hananger is one of very few cremation graves from Period II.

Allegedly a small shaft-hole hammer⁶³ of cobber was discovered in a barrow at the same farm. There is no information about the barrow construction, and the find itself is rather obscure. There is no direct typological comparison either, with only a tentative dating to the Late Neolithic, based on the material and high content of arsenic (Stylegar 2007:60). The finder is said to have found the hammer together with a now lost urn and a "rusted" sword, which could indicate a grave from the Iron Age. However, several sources have indicated that the find and finder is dubious and not trustworthy (Johansen 1986:55). Melheim (2012a:70) suggests a Bronze Age date for the hammer. This is supported by the landscape around Hananger, which is situated within a classic Late Neolithic–Bronze Age environment, and the use of the hammer for the annealing of bronzework, copper or gold, with references to similar Bronze Age hammers from Denmark (Melheim 2012a:71). A clear dating of the artefact and

the barrow is highly tentative; however, a Bronze Age date seems plausible.

Kviljo

Lorange excavated the Steinhaug mound at Kviljo the same year as Sverreshaug. The cairn was situated close to the shoreline and measured 45 m in diameter and was 2.5 m high. 1 m beneath the surface several layers of stone slabs were discovered. Beneath the slabs was a central cist, made of four oval-shaped stone slabs on each side (0.8 m long, 0.27 m wide, 0.3 m high). Inside the cist a layer of earth and beach pebbles were discovered together with fragments of burnt bone⁶⁴ and seven pieces of flint⁶⁵. The cairn's typological date is challenging. Lorange (1878) dates it to the Neolithic–Bronze Age. There are few cremation graves from the Late Neolithic in Norway, although not unheard of, and some have also been recorded in southern Scandinavia (e.g. Krause 2005; Sarauw 2007). The cist construction in Steinhaug also bears resemblance to the cist in Garahaugen in Etne, and the relatively large size of the cist differs from the smaller Late Bronze Age cists.

Another cairn from Lundevågen in Lista could also very well represent such a grave. In the fill of the cairn in Lundevågen were fragments of burnt bone, pieces of flint and quartz, along with a tin awl⁶⁶. Earlier plundering had damaged the cairn, but a depression in the bedrock (1 x 2 m NE–SW) was interpreted as a grave chamber (Ballin & Jensen 1995:238–239). A recalibrated ¹⁴C-date in OxCal v.4.2 of charcoal from the debris gave a date between 2579–2112 BCE (T-10478: 3870 ± 95 BP). In the original report such an early date was omitted and automatically ascribed to the Bronze Age because of the tin awl (Ballin & Jensen 1995:239). However, the cairn has recently been tentatively dated by Melheim (2012a:64–69) to Late Neolithic I. This is based on a comparative study of similar tin awls from the continent and the radiometric date of the charchoal.

Based on early evidence of cremation practice in Lundevågen and the cist construction, it may be likely that Lorange's original date of Steinhaug to Neolithic–Bronze Age is still relevant, although one could adjust it more tentatively to the Late Neolithic–Early Bronze Age.

Dyngvoll

The Svarthaug mound at Dyngvoll is a composite barrow with a central cairn in its centre (Petersen 1926: 168–169). Lorange excavated the barrow in 1877, and 40 years later it was re-excavated by Helge Gjessing.

The barrow measured 21 m in diameter and was 2.65 m high, with the central cairn measuring 5.5 m in diameter. The cist was 2 m long and oriented SE–NW, and its sides were constructed in a dry stone technique with a single stone slab in each end. The cist was considerably wider in one of the ends, indicating an inhumation grave, however, on the floor, on top of a layer of beach pebbles, Lorange discovered white fragments of burnt bone, together with a few pieces of flint. This would indicate a cremation grave not unlike the burial in Steinhaug at Kviljo. Cremation burials constructed to fit the actual size of a grown human are extremely rare in burial mounds from the Early Bronze Age, yet the construction of the cist and barrow indicate a date to the Early Bronze Age. In southern Scandinavia, cremation graves from Period II are often recorded in cists that are built to fit a grown human, they also appear in Period III, although there is a tendency to build smaller cists in this period (e.g. Aner *et al.* 2001:61, 74, 143; Hansen 2007). The barrow in Dyngvoll may thus be a practice influenced by groups from southern Scandinavia.

Vest-Hassel

There is little information concerning the barrow at Vest-Hassel, but discoveries from a secondary cremation grave from the Late Bronze were made in the barrow sometime in the 19th century. An urn with burnt bones⁶⁷, an arrowhead⁶⁸ made in bronze and a bronze button⁶⁹ were discovered in a small slab-lined cist, all datable to the Late Bronze Age. A year later after the original discovery, a second larger cist was unearthed right next to the cremation grave. There were no discoveries, and the cist was badly damaged, however, a tentative dating to the Early Bronze Age seems plausible.

Klokkhammer

In 1874 a gold spiral ring⁷⁰ was reported to have been discovered in a mound at the farm Klokkhammer (Melheim 2012a:61). Information concerning the construction of the burial mound is unfortunately lost. The ring was bought by Bergen Museum, and it is said that it was discovered along with a bronze ring of a similar shape (Hauge 2007:46; Stylegar 2007:64). It has previously been ascribed to Period III (Hauge 2007:46). However, a Late Neolithic date has recently been proposed, due to a marked resemblance with Late Neolithic *Noppenringe* from Denmark, found for example in the famous LN II Skeldal hoard (Melheim 2012a:61). Metallurgical analysis of the Klokkhammer ring shows a high content of silver (25 % Ag), which is

similar in composition to the rings from the Skeldal hoard (Melheim 2012a:63). *Noppenringe* have also been discovered in burial mounds from the Late Neolithic in Denmark (Vandkilde 1996:203), further

supporting a LN II date for the Klokkehammer ring. Based on the metallurgical analysis and the typological resemblance with *Noppenringe* in Denmark, a Late Neolithic dating seems plausible.

6. Structuring the archaeological data

In the previous chapter a selection of burial mounds from the regions Etne, Karmøy, Jæren and Lista were presented and contextualised. The presentation established a foundation for the analysis of burial practices in the Early Bronze Age, which is rooted in the theoretical framework in Chapter 3. Here, the individuals who were buried are in turn part of a communal group identity, structured either by doxa or through a conscious demarcation of difference. It is argued, theoretically, that we are able to trace these structures through the material remains of the burial mounds, based on the concept that groups manifest their habitual practice in every aspect of their lives, including death. Thus, by compiling and structuring the material remains, this chapter aims to find these subtle traces of habitual practice.

As already mentioned in Chapter 2, there have been tendencies to focus on either the local, as described by Brøgger, or the interregional, as examined by Shetelig. What both of these and several other Bronze Age researchers have in common is a view in which the areas with earth-constructed barrows are seen as a cultural communality, influenced by rich Bronze Age societies in southern Scandinavia. This generalization has neglected or marginalised important elements that express internal differentiation. Another issue pointed out in the same chapter is the methods with which the burial mounds were excavated, that vary to such a degree that many queries are hard to answer. However, as pointed out by Jones (1997:125), an essential part of analysing past identities derives from a multitude of sources and classes of data. Thus, this analysis will continue using the themes presented in section 3.3.2, which are both general and consistent throughout: (1) landscape, (2) construction, (3) cairn, (4) treatment of the deceased, (5) gender categorisation, and (6) artefacts. Essential to every section are diachronic relations.

The analysis will use a compiled set of collected data in a quantitative study of regional differences in the studied areas. By pointing out differences and similarities, it should be possible to identify tendencies that express a structured group identity. The results of this

will be discussed in Chapter 7. There are undoubtedly problems of quantity with such a study, which have also been pointed out by others (e.g. Bakka 1980). For example, Etne and Lista have too few burial mounds to give a representative depiction of the regions' burial practice, and just one new find or excavation could change the empirical data quite dramatically. Moreover, the small number of finds in these districts creates comparable problems with Jæren, which holds the largest number of burial mounds in this study. Jæren's large number of burial mounds compared to Etne, Karmøy, and Lista is partly a result of the area's large size, but other issues, such as an ever-expanding development structure and population growth, could be partial factors to why more finds are registered here than in any of the other areas. Therefore, in order to present a simpler and more easily comparable presentation of the different regions, some of the analysed material will be described in percentages (e.g. Solheim 2012:153). It should be stated that this method presents a different set of problems, in that the total number of burial mounds are disregarded; however, these numbers are available in the appendix, and when the main goal is to illustrate regional differences this method seems more suitable.

6.1 Landscape

The landscape can be a powerful force that to some extent shapes groups and their identity. Several issues will be addressed in this section. The burial mounds' connection to the maritime landscape will remain important (e.g. Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Kvalø 2007), and will help us comprehend the regional settlement pattern better. To do this we need to establish an idea of what the landscape was like in the Early Bronze Age. All of the studied regions are characterised by Quaternary deposits (Fig. 19), and a coastal heathland that covered large parts of the landscape at the end of the Bronze Age (Prøsch-Danielsen & Simonsen 2000b:189; Prøsch-Danielsen *et al.* 2018). The sea level and the shoreline would have been distinctly different compared to today. The sea level along the coast of Jæren is suggested to be roughly 4–5 m above the present level at the transition between Periods II and III




Figure 19. Map of Southwest Norway showing the distribution of Quaternary deposits which are well suited for agrarian activity. The earthen barrows in this study are all located in the area with Quaternary deposits (shaded). Map: Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen, 2000a, 2000b.

(Prøsch-Danielsen 2006). Additionally, rock art sites can give a relative dating to further support these assertions (see Ling 2014; Høgestøl *et al.* 2018). The higher sea level would have changed the landscape quite dramatically, with several more harbours and skerries, and burial mounds would be more closely connected to the maritime landscape. It has previously been suggested that Orre Lake was a lagoon and an important place for travellers to seek shelter during the Early Bronze Age (Kvalø 2007:66–67). Based on the shore displacement curve ArcGIS is implemented to calculate the sea level in this region (Fig. 20). The digital contours are only at 5 m intervals, so minor deviations are possible, but these data offer a good impression of the topography of the Early Bronze Age. For example the Orre Lake does indeed become a lagoon that would have served as a protective harbour for sailing travellers. The burial mounds are still situated along the outer

crest – Orre 4 is now under water and might be of a later date – but the majority of barrows are situated on the highest ridge, further inland, indicative of an area where power and control was concentrated. Different variables were tested in ArcGIS, such as artefact and gender distribution, to see if they had an effect on the placement of barrows; most did not improve the result, although a small majority of Period II graves seem to be concentrated on the highest ridge, with more Period III graves closer to the lagoon and sea. At Sola one can trace a similar pattern, where it is possible to travel by boat from Sola beach and into the Hafrsfjord inlet (Fig. 21). Today, the coast along Sola is considered a difficult sailing route, but if it was a passageway into the protective Hafrsfjord inlet this could be a partial factor that would explain why so many rich burial mounds are situated in this particular area (see 5.3). It is also important to consider that around 1700 BCE the sea level was about 7 m above today's level. This is considerably higher than 4–5 m during periods II and III, and even though certain routes were cut off, historicity and habitual practice could have been an anchor for the continued use of 'blocked' sailing routes.

Beach ridges dammed up the low-lying part of Lista sometime around 5200 BP, creating several lakes where Bronze Age burial mounds are now situated. The beach line would also have been significantly higher than today, and consequently the burial mounds at Lista would have had a much closer connection to the maritime landscape (Prøsch-Danielsen 1995:24; Carrasco 2009:45; Romundset *et al.* 2015; Austvoll 2020 in press). It is also highly likely that Hellevigfjorden and Framvaren were connected and used as an 'inland' sailing route away from the dangerous currents and winds along Listlandet (Kvalø 2007:68–69; Prescott *et al.* 2018). The same pattern can be traced at Karmøy, where every burial mound, save one, is situated close to the shoreline at the eastern side of the island. Bringing ships along the outer shores of Karmøy can be hazardous if winds are strong (Kvalø 2007:65). Hence, the sheltered strait to the east must have been a favourable choice for any traveller. The burial mounds at Karmøy are therefore likely a result of intentional distribution to manifest power, but in some cases the burial mounds are directly connected to earlier settlement and/or ritual practice. This is seen at Kongshaugen on Karmøy (see 5.2), where earlier settlement layers have been unearthed beneath the central cist, and at Lista, where several burial mounds are tentatively connected to the Late Neolithic (see 5.4). Thus, the placement of the burial mounds expresses a sense of belonging that





Figure 20. The burial mounds in Klepp. The sea level is set to 5 m above present level, approximately how it would have been in the Early Bronze Age. Orre Lake has been turned into a lagoon, which could explain why this area is so rich in finds from the Bronze Age. Equally interesting is how the majority of barrows are situated on the highest point in the landscape.

can be explained as structured practice, constructed through some form of social affiliation with the landscape. These patterns can also be traced at Jæren, where for example Sothaug, the largest burial mound from Jæren, together with a currently destroyed barrow at the opposite side of the inlet, must have been an impressive site for travellers by boat.

It must have been important to place the burial mound at an elevated point in the landscape with views to the sea. This becomes apparent when we look at the placement of barrows in figures 20 and 21.

Larsen (1996:41–42) has done a similar study where she mapped 26 barrows located on high moraine hills in Jæren. Out of these, 12 had wide views to the ocean and the surrounding landscape. The remaining 14 were also located on hills but without information regarding their views. Out of 49 burial mounds in total, 29 were located on high hills in the landscape, 19 were without any information regarding their location, and only one was situated in an outfield. This illustrates how important the landscape has been for the people in the Early Bronze Age, and how it would have been a

Figure 21. The burial mounds at Sola and Tananger. The sea level is set to 5 m above present level, approximately how it would have been in the Early Bronze Age. There is now an open passageway or short portage from the North Sea and Solavika into the Hafsfjord basin.



structuring element in a group’s placement strategy (see Prøsch-Danielsen *et al.* 2018).

The burial mounds are also connected to the landscape internally, by the orientation of the cist. Only a quarter of the burial mounds registered with finds have information concerning the cist alignment, and these are highly variable (see appendix I), but there are regional variations worth highlighting. There are five burial mounds with information concerning the alignment of the cist on Karmøy. Every burial mound save mound no. 2 at Storesund are placed on a N–S line,

parallel with the strait, and suggests a strong awareness of the surrounding landscape. Jæren is more variable, but a noticeable detail is that out of 14 cists with information about their orientation, six are placed in a W–E direction, and only two are registered in an N–S direction. This should perhaps be seen in relation to the journey of the sun, which has been interpreted as an important cosmological symbol in the Bronze Age (e.g. Kaul 1998). In Southwest Norway the ornamented grave slabs could be interpreted in the same manner (Fig. 22). Kate I. Syvertsen (2003, 2005) has done

Figure 22. Example of an ornamented grave slab. Here with abstract/geometric motifs from Auglend in Time. Drawing: Tor Helliesen 1901.



a comprehensive study of ornamented grave slabs in Southwest Norway of which 29 can be dated to the Early Bronze Age. The most common figures are cup marks and grooves, and in a few cases ships. However, there is also a third type of grave slabs with abstract/geometric motifs (9 %). These are generally concentrated in mid-Jæren, around Klepp, Time and the southern part of Sola, often within Period II contexts (Syvertsen 2005:507–508; see also Høgestøl *et al.* 2018). The abstract motifs have usually been ascribed to cosmology and the liminal phase between life and death. In Sweden, the ornamented grave slabs in the Sagaholm grave are read by Joakim Goldhahn (1999) as an expression of the sun's journey across the cosmos and as an important element in the transitional stage between life and death. In Denmark, Johannes Brøndsted (1939:45) argued that the general alignment of cists is W–E oriented with the head facing west. This perpetuates the idea of the sun as an important cosmological agent in the Early Bronze Age, and groups in Jæren seem to have adopted this idea at an early stage. Three cists have been identified with both ornamented grave slabs and alignment information. Three graves are of course not sufficient to give an overall representation of the burial practice. It is, however, compelling that each one had a W–E orientation, the same as the journey of the sun. It has only been possible to locate three burials from Lista with known cist alignment: one was positioned N–S, the other W–E and the third NW–SE. Etne is only represented with Garahaugen which was positioned NW–SE.

To conclude, the burial mounds demonstrate a close connection to the maritime landscape, with several additional harbours and passageways in the Early Bronze Age that are not visible in today's landscape (see also Prøsch-Danielsen *et al.* 2018). This reflects

the placement of barrows that follow ridges and natural passageways, with the majority of barrows on high ridges and hills with wide views. It is not unthinkable that this was done to exert an outward expression of power. A connection to the landscape is also exhibited internally, with a north-south orientation on Karmøy, which reflects the orientation of the strait, and a west-east orientation in Jæren, interpreted as part of the cosmological picture and the journey of the sun.

6.2 Burial construction

The construction of the earthen barrows has been analysed both externally and internally. The exterior can be divided into three categories: a thick outer layer of earth, composite barrows where stones, sand, and gravel are mixed together, and a large central cairn and only a thin outer layer of earth. Yet, this information is only available for a small percentage of the overall number of earthen barrows, and it has proven to be of little comparable use. To compensate for this, every earth constructed barrow has been categorised under one grouping, only differentiated by the naked cairn. More important is the internal construction that displays clear regional tendencies. The interior is also more closely connected to the deceased, and consequently the constructed identity. Cists are divided into two building techniques; a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs, and cists made of standing stone slabs. Two cists in Jæren are categorised as 'hybrids' and have walls made of both standing stone slabs and small, horizontally laid slabs in a dry stone technique. Three cists were scantily built with large boulders as walls; still, these have clear compositional similarities with cists made of more finely cut standing stone slabs and have been categorised as such. The distribution of the two typologically categorised cists have clear regional lines of demarcation. Again, Jæren stands out as the region with the clearest majority of dry stone cists (Fig. 23). It is also the region with the largest concentration of burial mounds from Period II. A single burial mound from Etne has been tentatively dated to Period I/II, but a Period III date is also plausible (see 5.1). Lista has one burial mound typologically dated to Period II; however, the burial mound is questionable and could be of a later date (see 5.4). Karmøy is represented solely by Period III graves that have a relatively homogenous construction (Fig. 24). Of particular relevance is the construction of the earthen barrows, which is, save for one, represented solely by standing stone slabs. Karmøy also displays a divide in the placement of earthen barrows contra cairns, which




Figure 23. The relative number of cists constructed in either a dry stone technique or of standing stone slabs.




Figure 24. The relative number of cists, distributed by their construction and period.

are situated in the southern part of the island. Lista is more heterogeneous, but the majority of cists are made of standing stone slabs, with only one portrayal of a dry stone cist in Svarthaug (see 5.4).

To conclude, the construction of the earth-constructed barrows demonstrate clear lines of demarcation and is differentiated by a majority of cists constructed in a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs in Jæren – the majority from Period II – and standing stone slabs in Etne, Karmøy, and Lista – the majority from Period III.

6.3 Cairns

The preliminary discussion and theme in this study have been of earth-constructed barrows. These barrows separate Southwest Norway from other regions, and connect the region to southern Scandinavia. The earthen barrows are also considerably easier to date, largely typologically, based on the find material. This

is much more difficult with cairns, as very few have been excavated, and those that have been excavated have held little information. The book’s classification of Bronze Age cairns is therefore largely grounded in Nordenborg Myhre’s (2004:208) classifications, which are based on the cairns’ location in the landscape, where they are placed primarily on rocky outcrops, headlands, and promontories near the sea (Fig. 25). Bronze Age cairns also differ from Iron Age cairns in that the latter are generally clustered in groups or cemeteries. Iron Age cairns are furthermore connected to farms and agrarian settlements (Myhre 1981:110–111). Bronze Age cairns are taller and more cone-shaped than Iron Age cairns, which are rather low (Nordenborg Myhre 2004). The inner construction is also different in that the majority of cists have been constructed in a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs (see 5.2). The same pattern seems to apply for Early Bronze Age cairns further north as well (Østerdal 1999:63). In two instances cairns have been dated to the Bronze Age through ¹⁴C analyses (see appendix 2: Kongshaugen and Steinhaug). Against the backdrop of this classification, the majority of cairns can be separated by geography situated in the inland fjord districts of Ryfylke and the islands of Boknafjord. Of course overlaps do occur and cannot be explained by natural resources alone. May-Liss Bøe Sollund’s (1996:88) analysis of cairns in Vestfold showed that alternative building material was readily available in most locations, and therefore that choice of material was intentional. This must also be the case for cairns in Southwest Norway and should be interpreted as entangled structures of social practice (e.g. Vandkilde 2004:82).

A close connection to the sea is evident, perhaps even more so than for earth-constructed barrows; of course, these are not new assertions and have been pointed out on numerous occasions (e.g. Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Melheim 2006). Nordenborg Myhre (2004:207) argues that cairns are often situated close to maritime passageways. Based on the distribution from figure 25, one can see that a majority of cairns are situated at narrow inlets and passageways, particularly north of Jæren. The coast of Jæren has a different distributional pattern, most likely as a result of the landscape’s character where the cairns are more scattered and do not have the same clear linear representation as they do further north (Nordenborg Myhre 2004:210). Yet, they do follow a certain pattern of lines along the coast before they become more distinct and visible on ridges and hills along passageways and narrow inlets further north around Byfjorden and




Figure 25. Distribution of cairns and barrows along the coast of southwest Norway (see appendix I).

Boknafjorden. Cairns are distributed in such a way that they follow lines of movement that create a map of alternative sailing routes. This could also explain the liminal placement of cairns contra barrows, which are frequently placed within clustered groups and/or linear arrangements (e.g. Figs. 20 and 21). Surely, these are purely hypothetical assertions, but it is plausible that the cairn served a different or at least a secondary function in their distinct placement along the coast of Southwest Norway. Earlier theories that connect the two different monuments to different economic systems seem outdated, and it is perhaps more fitting to talk about a discrete set of rules rather than cultural





Figure 26. Inhumation graves contra cremation graves in the respective regions.

Figure 27. Gender distribution along the coast of southwest Norway (see appendix I for details).



expression. This would entail that the cairn and the barrow were part of a common cultural practice but with individually distinct meanings.

To conclude, the earlier theories of the cairn as a marker of social differentiation and culture dualism are not as readily evident as one might have previously thought (Fig. 25); the liminal placement should be seen as part of a common cultural practice (see 7.2).

6.4 Treatment of the deceased

The majority of Early Bronze Age burials are generally believed to be inhumation graves, but based on the

85 registered graves with museum numbers, it can be established that only 8.2 % had traces of unburnt skeletal remains, and 9.4 % contained fragments of burnt bone. The longer lifetime of burnt bone contra unburnt bone could be a partial factor to why there are more burnt bone in the grave material than *vice versa* (e.g. Holck 1986). Therefore, a method needs to be established in order to categorise the different burial practises. The cist construction can fortunately help to some extent. The analysis reveals that burnt bone is never connected to cists made in a dry stone technique – one possible exception is Svarthaug in Lista (see 5.4) – nor cists made




Figure 28. The relationship between graves from Period II to Period III (Period II/III are graves that could not be clearly dated). There is a strong regional change from Jæren in Period II to Karmøy in Period III. Period I is omitted due to low numbers.

of standing stone slabs that are built to fit an adult body. The largest cremation graves are Steinhaug in Lista and Garaugaugen in Etne, measuring 0.80 m and 0.75 m in length respectively, which is too small to fit the body of a grown human – alternatively they could represent children's graves, though this seems highly unlikely as there is little evidence to support this claim. Furthermore, it seems that children buried in mounds are extremely rare, even in southern Scandinavia (Randsborg 1974:39; Bergerbrant 2014). If the burials are sorted according to these general requirements, the task becomes considerably easier (Fig. 26). Cremation practice is present throughout every period, but represents a minority compared to the inhumation graves. Nevertheless, the analysis did discover cremation graves that were older than what was anticipated beforehand. In Jæren, a cairn from Stokka from Period I–II is a cremation grave. In Etne we have Garaugaugen from Periods I–II, and at Lista there are three cremation graves, two tentatively dated to the Late Neolithic and one to the Early Bronze Age. Karmøy is only represented with one cremation grave, possibly from the Early Bronze Age.

To sum up, inhumation burials are the dominant burial practice in Periods II and III, although cremation burials are more visible at an early stage, both in the Late Neolithic and Period I, particularly in Etne, Jæren, and Lista.

6.5 Gender categorisation

The material has also been organised according to archaeological gendering. This is a complicated topic where the identification of a specific gender category is in danger of being subjectively interpreted by one's own

cultural perceptions (Díaz-Andreu 2005:14). Seen as only one burial can be tentatively sexed on an osteological basis (Denham 1999), the categorisation of gender is here based on artefact assemblages and correlated with works from comparatively similar regions (Randsborg 1986; Gibbs 1998; Bergerbrant 2007). Liv Gibbs's (1998) interpretation of skeletons in graves from Zealand is particularly useful. There are some pitfalls to using gender categories from a different area; however, the find categories display clear similarities with Jutland, as well as Southwest Norway. Also, Gibbs' foundation in the physical and genetic elements of sex makes the gender/sex dichotomy far more approachable (e.g. Díaz-Andreu 2005). Here, graves have been categorised as male, female, and indeterminable. Artefacts considered to be those of a male grave category are weapons such as swords and spears. Daggers are only considered male if other weapons or male artefacts such as tweezers, razors, fire-stroke stones, and smaller knives are present, as female graves are also recorded with daggers (Randsborg 1986:147). Personal artefacts such as jewellery, which typically include tutuli, neck collars, belt plates, arm rings, and in a few instances daggers, are sorted as female graves. Arm-rings do exist in male graves, though these are rare and then usually made of gold with spiral coiled ends (Kristiansen 2013:758). Still, the majority of the find material is sorted as indeterminable (see appendix I).

Jæren displays the highest number of female graves. No female graves are recorded from Etne and Karmøy. Lista has one female grave tentatively dated to the Early Bronze Age Period II. There is also a fragmented bronze plate, pendant or disc-headed pin⁷¹ discovered in a




Figure 29. The actual number of artefacts of bronze and gold in Early Bronze Age graves.

secondary burial at Sverreshaug (see Engedal 2010:45). However, the dating of this find is uncertain. In Period III, Karmøy has the most polarised male concentration of the find material, with no known female graves. In Denmark the number of female burials are only half as high as men (Randsborg 1974:39, 54–55). Based on the variables given above, Jæren has an almost 50–50 % ratio between male and female graves, much higher than anywhere else in Scandinavia (e.g. Bergerbrant 2007: appendix 6–7, 9). In Period II there is even a higher percentage of female graves, however, the majority of graves are still indeterminable when it comes to archaeological gendering. The distribution of female graves is also interesting, with a clear cluster around the districts of Klepp and Time. Male graves are more scattered, but Period III graves seem to be clustered further north, around Sola and Tananger (Fig. 27).

6.6 Artefacts

It is often believed that the Early Bronze Age society was socially stratified (e.g. Earle 2002). Still, the distribution of wealth is difficult to record, and many lighter and thinner artefacts are often more exposed to chemical changes and deterioration than heavier objects like swords and axes (Randsborg 1974:47–48). This could result in a misrepresentation of the overall number of bronzes; nevertheless, objects of bronze discovered in burial mounds, independent of type, must be considered an exclusive material for the upper strata of society, and allows us to differentiate regional social structures. Gold in graves is recorded in three of the regions and must be included as a signal of considerable wealth.

The sudden rise in burial mounds at Karmøy in Period III occurs at a time when there is a dramatic decline in burial mounds in Jæren (see Figs. 24 and 28). Such observations could indicate a change in power

structure or a conflict between two competing regions. There could also be a connection between the strong warrior ethos found in Period III graves on Karmøy and the sudden decline in bronzes in Jæren (see Chapter 7); if we include a lost sword from Guttormshaugen and a single find from Haugesund, over 50 % of the burials at Karmøy contained weapons of some sort. Graves recorded with gold are few and not sufficient to constitute a representative distribution of the precious metal, but it is worth mentioning that they are evenly distributed between Karmøy and Jæren (Fig. 29). However, if we include the twisted arm ring of gold that was lost in Kjørkhaug (see 5.2), there are actually more graves recorded with gold from Karmøy than Jæren or Lista. The gold *Noppenringe* from Lista have been tentatively dated to the Late Neolithic (see 5.4), but the gold artefacts from Karmøy and Jæren cannot be dated earlier than Period III. This corresponds well with the general picture of Karmøy as a dominant region throughout this period. Access to gold and other prestige objects have been explained as the result of a direct contact with Jutland (Solberg 1994).

To sum up, there are clear regional distribution patterns, with a strong concentration of metal in Jæren during Period II. This changes quite dramatically in Period III, when Karmøy becomes more dominant, and is also reflected in the number of gold artefacts, which becomes more visible in the grave material in Period III.

6.7 Summary and preliminary results

The focus of this chapter has first and foremost been centred on revealing patterns in the available material in order to point out similarities and differences between the different regions. The results must be understood as part of a communal practice, structured by doxa (or orthodoxy–heterodoxy) in each region. As expected, the analysis displays clear interregional similarities, from everything to the burial mounds themselves to the artefacts within, which must connote cross-regional interaction. However, there are also clear lines of demarcation, which is most visible between Jæren and the other regions, particularly Karmøy. There are several contributing elements at play here. Foremost is the chronology where no other region have such a strong concentration of burial mounds in Period II as Jæren – Karmøy has none. This is also reflected in the construction of the cist where Jæren has the highest number of cists constructed in a dry stone technique compared to the other regions where standing stone slabs are dominant if not exclusive. The orientations

of cists are dominantly W–E in Jæren, whereas on Karmøy, cist alignment is generally N–S. Gender is also reflected in the material, where the number of female graves is nearly 50 % of the total number of graves in Jæren. This is unparalleled anywhere else, the closest region is Lista with only one convincing female grave, possibly from Period II.

The placement of burial mounds is more inter-regional, with clusters of earthen barrows usually situated on elevated locations in the landscape. Every region shares a close connection to the maritime landscape, with the exception of Time in Jæren, which has

a more characteristic inland setting. The majority of cairns are situated in the fjord districts and islands further north of Jæren, although a surprising number of cairns are erected along the coast of Jæren, scattered between the more dominant earthen barrows. On Karmøy, cairns and barrows are divided between the southern and northern part of the island, with the earthen barrows situated in the northern part.

The different structures outlined in this chapter need to be interpreted as signs of social differentiation and interregional competition, but also as similarities. This will be further discussed in Chapter 7.

7. Constructing identities

The aim of this book has first and foremost been to examine social structures and how we can trace constructed identities in the archaeological record of burial mounds. The burial mound as a source of data to understand the social lives of prehistoric people is not new in archaeology, and one could easily argue that a large portion of our understanding of prehistory is a result of a disproportionate emphasis on the burial mounds as source material. Still, this focus has also resulted in generalizations that have neglected regional differentiations. The burial mounds of Southwest Norway are unquestionably part of a grander continental phenomenon spanning large areas of Europe during this time, however, the goal of this study has neither been to argue for a grand narrative nor to differentiate Southwest Norway as a separate group altogether. More so it has been an attempt to demonstrate how entangled and multifarious the construction of collective identities really are. The current study has revealed both a homogenous material but also distinctions and clear lines of demarcation. Yet, how should these patterns be interpreted?

Before moving on to this discussion, it is useful to recap what has been discussed so far. The book began by asking the questions: *How can we trace collective identities in regional burial practices, and how have external relations influenced them?* In Chapter 2, an overview of previous research dealing with identity and burial mounds were presented. One of the main concerns in that chapter was a mode of organizing the Bronze Age societies in Southwest Norway from either a perspective where they were influenced by developments in southern Scandinavia or regional/local evolution. These perspectives were furthermore grounded in out-dated theories on culture dualism, leaving questions of identity – which is arguably both fixed and fluid – circumscribed and intellectually unchallenged. Therefore, a theoretical framework that combined recent ideas on identity with the well-established theory of practice was presented in Chapter 3. This theory has been applied to numerous archaeological inquiries (e.g. Glørstad 2006; Bukkemoen 2007) but is practically non-existent in southwest Bronze Age research

(although see Hauge 2007). Of course, the theoretical framework needed to be grounded in concrete contexts; this was presented in Chapter 5, and broken down and structured into smaller parts in Chapter 6, which showed Bronze Age societies that encompassed both similarities and differences in the material remains from burial contexts. This leads us back to the book's first question: how should these structures be interpreted? This question is divided into the two following sections: the first will incorporate the results from Chapter 5 and 6 with the theoretical framework from Chapter 3. The second part will attempt to outline this incorporation (i.e. analysis and theory) in relation to more practical interpretations of the societies in the Early Bronze Age.

Before outlining the theoretical ideas on social identification, it is necessary to sketch a short presentation of the periods preceding the Early Bronze Age in order to provide an idea of diachronic and historical structures that would have had an impact on societies in the Early Bronze Age. The beginning of the Neolithic is a complicated period with contradictory data and complex structures. The first pollen diagrams that document grain cultivation in this period were recorded from Lista, though the material is scant and inconsistent (Prøsch-Danielsen 1997, 2011; Høgestøl & Prøsch-Danielsen 2006). The emergence of the Battle Axe Culture in the Middle Neolithic saw several new changes, such as an increase in agricultural activity, more inland exploration, and an intensified exchange network, that seems to have included, to some extent, western Norway (*cf.* Bergsvik 2012). However, the period is still not very well understood and has been described as a “black box phase” (Prescott & Walderhaug 1995). At the transition to the Late Neolithic, there is a dramatic change in the social structure – a break with the doxic mode of living – with unambiguous signs of agro-pastoral production (*cf.* Prescott 1996). These changes are also concurrent with the Bell Beaker phenomenon in southern Scandinavia, together with the first evidence of direct contact across Skagerrak (e.g. Prescott 1996:85; Østmo 2012). The material culture in the Late Neolithic phase is relatively homogenous

with a strong interregional exchange network and the use of flint daggers as prestigious items (e.g. Apel 2001). A strong concentration of Bell Beaker material is found in the area around Limfjorden and Thy in Jutland (Prieto-Martínez 2008; Sarauw 2008) – an area that from the Late Neolithic and into the Early Bronze Age was closely connected to Southwest Norway (see 7.1–7.2). We see the emergence of individual burials, predominantly cairns, and depositions of prestigious items; still, variations in burial practice are visible, with inhumation as well as cremation graves. The implications of these changes in the Late Neolithic with regard to the social structures in the Early Bronze Age are still an open question that will be commented on in the following sections.

7.1 Theoretical ideas on social identification

Jenkins (2000:7) argues that two independent processes are necessary for the classification and identification of the social episteme: the specification of similarities and of differences. If we apply this to a group, we can say that collective identification is structured by two socially constituted categories – the internal, taken-for-granted doxa and the external categorisation of others, structured either through heterodoxy or orthodoxy. In order for a social group to categorise itself as ‘us’, it needs an external contrast which can be defined as ‘them’ (Barth 1969). Material manifestations will therefore accumulate through ‘our’ need for social differentiation. These structures become apparent when examining the material remains from the Early Bronze Age societies of Southwest Norway. But who did they need to differentiate from? Based on the analysis (Chapter 6) we can clearly see groups in Jæren holding a dominant position throughout Period II. The establishment of earth-constructed barrows in this area were swift and practically simultaneous with groups in southern Scandinavia; this would entail that groups in Jæren already had existing contacts across Skagerrak, and that their existing doxic mode of knowledge was not formed through resistance but acceptance and adaptation. Still, although clear material resemblance may have been recognised as part of a broad ‘Nordic’ identity, local variations are clearly visible in the burial practice in Southwest Norway, such as composite barrows, central cairns, ornamented grave slabs, and perhaps most unique; cists made in a dry stone technique of small, horizontally laid slabs. How did such a practice come to pass? Such consequences are not always intended but can be a result of unintended consequences in history and identification

(Jenkins 2000:22). Bourdieu (1990:53) explains it like this:

The conditionings associated with a particular class of conditions of existence produce *habitus*, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor.

I interpret this as external influences, structured by historical habitual practice. The rise of burial mounds at the beginning of Period II in Jæren can therefore be explained as a result of intended incorporation of a new external practice, but also formed through a historical practice – or simply put, *habitus*. Suffice to say, there are several well-founded arguments that groups in Southwest Norway and southern Scandinavia had already established a contact network from the Late Neolithic and onwards (see beginning of this chapter), and these arguments are supported by several finds attributable to influences from the Bell Beaker culture, particularly in Jæren and Lista (e.g. Skjølsvold 1977; Apel 2001; Prescott 2012b; Østmo 2012; Kilhavn 2013). Chapter 5 identified several graves that, despite being previously ascribed to the Early Bronze Age, actually could be dated to the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Period I – although tentative. The small slab-lined cist discovered in a cairn at Stokka in Sandnes (see 5.3) from Period I/II, contained, among other things, amber, which is extremely rare in this region, and in all likelihood originated from southern Scandinavia; the fact that it contained burnt bone could likewise be seen as external influence (e.g. Krause 2005). A *Noppenring*⁷² of gold found in a bog at Braut, Klepp, most probably from the Late Neolithic, further supports a network across Skagerrak (Melheim 2012b:76–77). The same pattern is visible at Lista where we have a *Noppenring* of gold from Klokkhammer, and both Steinhaugen at Kviljo and a cairn from Lundevågen indicate early cremation burials from the Late Neolithic – Svarthaug at Dyngvoll also seem to be an early cremation burial (see 5.4). Garaug in Etne is yet another early example of a cremation burial, and together these examples challenge the classic idea of cremation burials as a Late Bronze Age phenomenon. Of course we must still consider inhumation burials as the dominant practice throughout this period (e.g. Østmo 2011), but it seems reasonable to argue that the Late Neolithic was a period

where major changes occurred, and consolidation and acceptance of new ideas would have been incorporated with local practice (Prescott 2005:129–130). Thus, one could define the Late Neolithic as a frontier of social practice in which various expressions occurred and as an expansion and a vanguard of societies in the Early Bronze Age (Prescott & Melheim 2009:92).

The processes of transformation at the beginning of the Late Neolithic are arguably a break with experiences and knowledge of the habitus and the doxic mode of living. “It is when the social world loses its character as a natural phenomenon that the question of the natural or conventional character (*phusei* or *nomos*) of social facts can be raised” (Bourdieu 1977:169). The results of this is either heterodox or orthodox forms of knowledge that result in various representations or bricolages of social identity (Jones 1997:95). As argued in Chapter 3, these forms of knowledge will inevitably reproduce over time and be incorporated as part of a structured disposition of habitus. Thus, Period II can be seen as a culmination of this process, particularly in Jæren where it was manifested in the construction of earthen barrows. However, the symbolic power that manifested itself in the material remains in Jæren would not have gone unnoticed by other groups. As Jenkins (2000:21) points out, external categorisation is necessarily significant in the processes of internal identification, and *vice versa*. A collective group exists through its own subjective recognition of itself, but just as important is how others recognise the group, resulting in an internal-external dialectic that will produce boundaries of identification (Barth 1969; Jenkins 2004:117). This categorisation by ‘others’ is, according to Jenkins (2004:83), immanent, and part of the reality of any group. It is reasonable to believe that the material and social power exerted by groups in Jæren throughout Period II would have been recognised and categorised by the peripheries. The fact that there are no known barrows on Karmøy during Period II makes it an external objectified categoriser of groups in Jæren, which would effectively constitute itself as the ‘other’ group, and acknowledge the existence of choice through explicit critique in the form of heterodoxy or orthodoxy. Thus, Karmøy’s categorisation of groups in Jæren would inadvertently result in their own identity construction, and explains why there is such a strong homogeneity in the material remains at Karmøy in Period III. Perhaps most visible are the cists constructed of standing stone slabs, in an N–S alignment parallel with the strait. This does not only demonstrate a highly collective act, but an intentional position of the cist, which reflects a strong local

awareness. There are also no known female graves at Karmøy, and the choice of artefacts is typically represented with weapons and male toiletries such as razors and tweezers. Reading identity through the material is not without its weaknesses though, and as pointed out by Jones (1997:135): “[...] the actual role of particular types of material culture in terms of identity cannot be subordinated to universal laws”. It is therefore necessary to try and establish the relationship between the material remains and other processes of identification in concrete contexts. This has been exemplified through the dialectic relationship between groups in Jæren and Karmøy, but other external factors could have played an active role in the process of categorisation that eventually resulted in the heterodox or orthodox construction of groups on Karmøy at the beginning of Period III. Of particular relevance are groups in Etne and the surrounding inland fjord districts. In addition to Garahaugen, which can be dated to Periods I–II, there are several single-context finds that support a strong inland region prior to Period III. In Skeie in Vindafjord a bronze sword from Period II was recovered from a barrow in a cist built in dry stone technique of small horizontally laid slabs (see appendix I), and in Ølen several single context finds from the Late Neolithic and Period II have been discovered, including the famous deposit at Lunde, where three magnificent shaft-hole axes in bronze were recovered in 1950, all dated to Period II (Indreid 1991:56). Furthermore, at Bømlø, an island north of Karmøy, stone quarries have been established from the Stone Age and onwards, and a bronze sword⁷³ dated to Period II, has also been recovered from a bog in the same area (Melheim 2009:29). All of the above examples could have functioned as external factors that were categorised and identified by people on Karmøy that ultimately resulted in their social differentiation and construction of a group identity.

It is important to acknowledge that the construction of identity in each region is the *sine qua non* to each other. No group can exist entirely unaffected by the other, and it is therefore not surprising to see groups in Jæren change some of their structures as a result of the strong group mentality on Karmøy. In Period II, Jæren had a strong assembly of graves with jewellery, nearly 50 % of graves with weapons. This changes dramatically in Period III where, in addition to graves becoming larger, graves with weapons become more dominant and there is a marked difference in barrow placement. Whereas Period II graves with jewellery were concentrated in southern Sola, Klepp and Time, they now shift further

north to Tananger and the Hafrsfjord inlet, dominated by weapon graves (see 6.5). Cist construction also becomes more heterogeneous, and cists constructed in a dry stone technique become fewer in this period (see 6.2). In addition to these changes there is an emergence of gold in graves during Period III – both in Jæren and Karmøy. The visible changes in Jæren at the transition to Period III, are effects that are affected by the emergence of power on Karmøy, which by then had already been effected in Jæren in Period II. Both regions are therefore part of an on-going process of objectified knowledge and habitual subjective knowledge that transpires over a length of time – and periods.

Including Lista in this process has been more of a challenge. The region does not share Karmøy's striking homogenous cultural expression, nor does it share Jæren's rich concentration of bronzes and barrows. It is perhaps more appropriate to describe Lista as a bricolage of different social practices, in all likelihood as a consequence of earlier activities, one of them being the Bell Beaker package that served as a bridgehead for the introduction of Late Neolithic/Bronze Age structures (Prescott 2012b:116). The social structures in Lista must be seen in a *longue durée* of habitual practice but also incorporation of impulses from South Scandinavia. Comparatively, Lista shares its closest parallel with Jæren. Chapter 6 outlines how this is seen in the landscape, the mounds themselves and the artefacts – e.g. Ottenjann's type B hafts from Øvre Melberg and Jåsund. Most significant however is the shared history that can be traced back to the Late Neolithic, where the Bell Beaker material, such as triangular, bifacial pressure-flaked arrowheads, early metal, and amber, are predominantly clustered in these two areas. Thus, intended incorporation along with habitual practice could have formed societies in Lista very much in the same manner as Jæren, and should be related to Lista's well established contact network with Jutland from the Late Neolithic (e.g. Petersen 1926; Prescott & Walderhaug 1995; Østmo 2005). However, societies in Lista were not only shaped by processes from the south, but have through the preceding phases been subjected to a *longue durée* of external pressure from south, east, and west, consequently shaping Lista into an area with a large degree of heterogeneity, or to borrow a term from Barth (1983:165), a kaleidoscope of persons.

This section has demonstrated a theoretical framework of how the tracing of different patterns through the material remains are outlines of groups and boundaries. These patterns are untidy, and entangled, based on different social layers and contexts. Moreover, they

are based on historically constituted structures and active processes of categorisation. Nonetheless, a theoretical outline of social processes is not particularly relevant if it cannot be connected to concrete practicalities. These will be addressed in the section below.

7.2 A practical outline on social identification

In the previous section a theoretical framework that identified regional differences along the southwest coast of Norway was established. Still, how could this framework be adapted to provide insight into concrete practicalities? All the regions have shown an underlying normative ideal of the barrow. Yet, other elements vary considerably, and it is almost a paradox that the most comprehensive excavations of burial mounds also are the ones with the most complex and heterogeneous contexts (e.g. Kongshaug, Molkhaug, Øvre Meberg). This illustrates a strong sense of awareness, where the local and the interregional are effectively used to constitute a constructed identity. To understand these social processes, it is necessary to look beyond regional processes and towards developments further south, of which the closest parallel to Southwest Norway has traditionally been ascribed to the region of Thy in Northwest Jutland (e.g. Brøgger 1913; Lund 1938:39). Societies here developed a strong pastoral economy at the beginning of Period II, usually attributed to the production of cattle (Kristiansen 2011:178). It appears that this economy was controlled by smaller groups or chieftains and would involve a surplus of food used to support labour and the acquirement of prestigious items. The constant need for prestigious goods and display of power linked the region to larger parts of Europe (Earle 1997:197), including Southwest Norway. It is not unimaginable to suggest that a large portion of the bronzes found in graves in Norway were acquired and used to develop relationships of power. Still, an additional component used in the establishment of networks might be found in female burials.

7.2.1 The female traveller – Period II

Female graves show a clear marginal role in the grave material in large part of Scandinavia during the Early Bronze Age, particularly during Period II (Randsborg 1974:54–55; Bergerbrant 2007). During the same period in Jæren the female-male ratio is nearly 50 %, a significantly larger number that is in need of further elaboration. In southern Scandinavia, high concentrations of female graves have been connected to population density (Randsborg 1974); this may also be applicable to Jæren, where female graves are concentrated to an

area around southern Sola, Klepp, and Time (Fig. 27). The unusually high number of female graves is difficult to explain, especially since the numbers are not paralleled anywhere else, but raises the notion of exogamy as a plausible scenario. The idea that women married out to maintain power has been discussed on numerous occasions and documented throughout history, often regarded as the supreme gift (Lévi-Strauss 1969 [1949]:65; Mauss 2016 [1925]). More recently, geochemical analysis of well-preserved individuals in oak log coffins from South Scandinavia have shown that female individuals did indeed travel hundreds of kilometres during their lifetime (Frei *et al.* 2015, 2017). Also, Sophie Bergerbrant's dissertation (2007) discusses the possibility of women as travellers. She does not include the material from Southwest Norway but argues that women travelled from the Lüneburg culture of northern Germany to southern Scandinavia during Period II, grounding it in typical Lüneburg artefacts and costumes (Bergerbrant 2007:119–120). No evidence show females moving in the other direction; however, a cairn in Offerlunden, Uppland, in Sweden indicates that southern Scandinavian women could have moved further north during the same period (Bergerbrant 2007:121). This is based on typical southern Scandinavian artefacts but also Continental pendants. Given the indications of exogamy in other parts of northern Europe, including Scandinavia, and considering the close material connection with Northwest Jutland and Southwest Norway it is highly conceivable that communities in southern Scandinavia exercised this practice with groups in Southwest Norway. This would explain why there is such a large concentration of female graves in the area around Klepp and Time as 'foreign' women would most likely have held a higher social and political status in society than 'local' women. There is also evidence that would suggest that high-ranking foreign women would have had an even greater influence on the community they moved to than foreign men:

There seems to have been more contact between the two regions [Lüneburg and South Scandinavia] on the female side than on the male side [...] the foreign woman buried in Fallingbostel influenced the community in which she was buried. This can clearly be seen in that so many parts of her costume continued to be used by the following generations. No foreign male burial seems to have had the same visual impact on the new area (Bergerbrant 2007:128).

As previously mentioned, high concentrations of female graves in southern Scandinavia are usually located in populated areas; for obvious reasons it is reasonable to assume that the same applies to Klepp/Time, thereby establishing the area as an important


nodal place in Period II. In Jutland, nodal places in networks are also accumulated in those places with the largest concentration of gold and full-hilted swords (Earle & Kristiansen 2010:227). This resembles the situation in Klepp/Time, with six registered swords and three gold artefacts from burials in the Early Bronze Age (see appendix I). The female artefacts display a striking resemblance with artefacts from southern Scandinavia, albeit others could be more local, like the two arm rings from Anda 1 (Hornstrup 2011:73) (see appendix I). The artefacts from the female burial in Regehaugen (see 5.3) display typological resemblance with artefacts found primarily in northern and western Zealand (Hornstrup 2011:71), and suggests networks far beyond the region of Thy in Jutland.

Whether the high concentration of female graves expressed exogamy and marriage alliances remains merely theoretical unless supported by scientific methods such as strontium isotope analysis of tooth enamels (see Price *et al.* 2007). Still, historically speaking most traditional societies perceived marriage as a relationship between groups, not between individuals (Eriksen 2010:117), and one of the more common institutions in traditional societies is bride wealth. This practice entails that the groom's kin must give resources to the bride's kin. This type of payment creates a moral bond between two groups and effectively creates trading partners between lineages. A reason for marrying exogamously in the Bronze Age was above all to gain alliances, which would mean access to and control of metal flows. Subsequently, marriages between two groups are also associated with stability, and anthropological studies have demonstrated how groups with shared affinal ties would mobilise and unite in situations of stress. The situation in Southwest Norway in Period II demonstrates a strong centralised region around Klepp/Time with little evidence of external pressure in the material record. Still, one of the most common causes for feuds between societies built on bride wealth occurs when someone fails to make their payment (Eriksen 2010:117, 122). Such a situation could have resulted in changes in network alliances and shifts towards a stronger warrior ethos, which is visible in the material record at the turn to Period III in Southwest Norway (see Fig. 30).

7.2.2 The male traveller – Period III

The male traveller is a common idea in Early Bronze Age research. Kristiansen (2011) has long argued for the travelling male individual and how journeys and foreign knowledge were important for gaining status.

Figure 30. A visualisation of the dynamic relationship between female graves and the social structures in southwest Norway during period II and III. Period II displays a strong female concentration, together with trade and centralisation. Period III displays a strong male concentration, together with increased competition and decentralisation.



These ideas are presented as an ‘international’ warrior chief, who was able to travel, trade, and maintain political alliances *vis-à-vis* the ritual chief who stayed at home. A warrior chief is recognised through the flange-hilted sword, an international type that can be traced from Scandinavia down to south-central Europe (Earle & Kristiansen 2010:237). Only two known examples are registered in Southwest Norway, one from a grave on Karmøy (see 5.2) and a second discovered at the bottom of a lake in Hå⁷⁴, both dated to Period III. Only two other flange-hilted swords have been discovered in Norway, one from a cairn in Nord Trøndelag⁷⁵, and the second from a bog in Vinje in Nordland⁷⁶, also these can be typologically dated to Period III (*cf.* Broholm 1944:Planche 25). There is therefore no available data to support this type of social structure in Southwest Norway – or Norway in general – in Period II. The period is recognised by its strong centralization in Jæren, principally around Klepp, Time, and the southern parts of Sola, and the need to express power may instead have been focused internally. Later, with the emergence of a density of gravemounds on Karmøy at the beginning of Period III, a more strained and competitive region developed towards a more warrior-focused ideal (see 6.6). In southern Scandinavia, the flanged-hilted sword becomes especially numerous in Period III and has been connected to warfare, ecological disasters, and collapse of foreign relations (Earle & Kristiansen 2010). These structures have also been related to the Urnfield expansion at the beginning

of Period III and the collapse of states in the Aegean (Vandkilde 2007a:139–140).

Towards the end of Period II in Thy, ecological resources seem to have diminished, as documented by smaller and poor-quality timber in house constructions, bog turf used instead of wood for heating, and an increased pressure on pastures (Bech *et al.* 2018). This argument is supported by local pollen diagrams that show massive forest clearance that already began in the Late Neolithic (Kristiansen 1998a:282, 1998b:107). The worsening conditions in Thy may have been an incentive for the changing power structures in Southwest Norway at the beginning of Period III. Network alliances could have become increasingly strained or challenged by other groups. Existing alliance-networks between Jæren and Thy may have collapsed and new ones formed. In Southwest Norway we see an intensified building of barrows outside of Klepp/Time, towards the northern part of Sola, Tananger, and Randaberg. A majority of these are male graves that would suggest a new emphasis on power display, exemplified by Sothaug, the largest barrow in Jæren (see 5.3). At the turn to Period III we also see a dramatic decrease in female graves and in the grave material on Karmøy we see the emergence of a strong polarised male concentration, represented by typical male artefacts such as swords, spears, daggers, and toiletries. The emergence of a strong group identity on Karmøy is visible at an early stage. Fyrstegraven, dated to the beginning of Period III (see 5.2), is not just the earliest grave from

Karmøy, it is also the richest and suggests a rapid accumulation of a chiefly society. This is also reflected in burial size, which can be observed both on Karmøy and Jæren. Previously, how the large size of Sothaug could have been used to exert an outward expression of power has been illustrated. Among the barrows at Reheia on Karmøy, Fyrstegraven, Guttormshaugen, and Mound no. 30 are all of a parallel size to Sothaug according to calculations done by Nordenborg Myhre (1998:Figure 81), this would entail a strong emphasis on size and how it played a role as an important element to express power, particularly in Period III.

The intensification of male graves in Jæren, together with the rise of a strong male concentration on Karmøy, and the appearance of two flange-hilted swords are all compelling signs of a changing social structure at the beginning of Period III. The change may have been unleashed by, or brought on by, changes in network-alliances outside of Southwest Norway i.e. in Thy, but internal developments and categorisations that began already in Period II (see 7.1) played an equal part in the increase of male graves on both sides of the Boknafjord.

The scenario outlined above could have been an incentive for the obvious parallels in cist construction between the two competing regions (see 6.2), one where a collective group on Karmøy wanted to be recognised through its new external alliances, effectively differentiating itself from Jæren through the construction of standing stone slabs (heterodoxy – orthodoxy). The same pattern is visible in Lista where the majority of cists are made of standing stone slabs. Unfortunately, the greater part of these cannot be placed within a specific period (see appendix I), and if we look at historical developments, then Lista shares more similarities with Jæren (see 6.1). Lista and Jæren are also connected in Period III through two full-hilted bronze swords from Meberg and Sothaug. The two swords have been ascribed by Engedal (2010:63) to Ottenjann's type B hafts, which are usually clustered around Northwest Jutland. The swords are so typologically similar that it is likely that the two regions continued to share some form of alliance.

7.2.3 The multispatial cairn

The cairn is present in all of the studied areas and needs to be addressed as an item of social identification. The homogenous construction of the cairn differs from the more regionally varied barrow. The majority of cairns in the investigated areas cannot be placed within a specific period; however, based on their form and placement within the landscape, they demonstrate

a wide interregional scope with connection to the Bronze Age (see 6.3). Their closeness to the shoreline and placement on elevated locations indicates that they served as specific markers in the landscape, and based on the analysis in Chapter 6, their placement often addresses courses of movement along pathways/seaways (Fig. 25). The same pattern can be traced in other parts of Scandinavia. Peter Skoglund's (2005) PhD thesis on the southern cairns in Sweden, deals with cairns as multispatial. The cairn did not just have one spatial meaning, but several, depending on which aspect of the monument we study. For example, the material used for building the cairn and artefacts placed within it can be gathered from the local surroundings. The cairn could otherwise have served on a purely practical level as a side effect of clearing areas of stone and making them into arable fields (Thrane 1998:271). However, the form of the cairn has a more general construction, found over larger parts of Scandinavia. The same goes for the placement of the cairn, which is distinctly local, but also interregional in that its placement can evoke associations with cairns elsewhere (Skoglund 2005:250–251). This ascribes a certain function to the cairn beyond a local burial mound, one where it serves as a landmark and as lines of movement for unfamiliar travellers.

The Bronze Age barrows have for a long time been ascribed a secondary use, at least in parts of Jutland. In Sophus Müller's (1904) classic study he notes that lines of barrows coincides with old roads. The dating and mapping of primitive roads is difficult, but the theory was later supported by several researchers (e.g. Thrane 1998; Holst *et al.* 2001; Johansen *et al.* 2004; Prøsch-Danielsen *et al.* 2018). The earthen barrows in Southwest Norway are too few and scattered to establish any plausible road system, however, seeing that the sea was, in all likelihood, an important travel route, the cairns prescribe a use as markers in the landscape. If we were to follow the cairn in figure 23, we see that cairns in the south are situated further inland. This could indicate that rivers and inland pathways were used for bypassing the dangerous and inhospitable North Sea. This is also exhibited at Lista where inland sailing routes and passageways were used to avoid the dangerous winds and currents around Listalandet (see Prescott *et al.* 2018). From Orre and further north, cairns become more frequent and follow a line through Hafrsfjord, past the islands north of Randaberg, across Boknafjorden, crossing the strait between Austre and Vestre Bokn, before arriving on Karmøy. Beyond the outdated culture dualism debate,

this framework describes cairns and earthen barrows as part of an intertwined structure of local and inter-regional identification.

7.3 Re-considering social structures in the Early Bronze Age

The initial aim of this study was to establish a more detailed and dynamic picture of the social structures along the coast of Southwest Norway, but an adjacent aim has been to create a more dialectic discourse between the regional and interregional dichotomy. Identity as a concept does in many ways serve as a tool to answer both of these questions. As argued throughout this study, identity is constructed through a bricolage of internal and external elements. It is an interactional product of external identification by others, but also internal self-identification (Jenkins 2004:176). More concretely, as an analytical tool *identity* demonstrates how local practice is effectively influenced by foreign external structures in a way that makes it a mediator between local perspectives and grand narrative perspectives. There are particularly three elements that establish *identity* as an analytical tool to help us approach a more dialectic discourse:


- Identity is structured by a historically constituted habitus. Historical context must therefore be taken into account.
- Identity is structured by peripheral local development, demonstrated for instance in the case of Etne and Karmøy in this study. Peripheral local developments can therefore not be ignored.

- Identity is always affected by interregional developments. A large-scale, grand narrative perspective is therefore an important structuring element for local peripheral groups in the Early Bronze Age.

If we adopt and follow these three subsections in Bronze Age studies it is possible to approach a more dialectic discourse that can give a more dynamic picture of the history in the Bronze Age. Yet, as argued by Prescott (2012a:215), developing a history of the earliest Bronze Age will be a long-term undertaking, and is beyond the scope of this study. However, this study has arguably established a framework that can be built upon in future research. In Chapter 2 it was argued that previous research on burial mounds and the Early Bronze Age in general has been written from a perspective that sees societies in Southwest Norway as belonging to a cultural communality with societies in southern Scandinavia. Although these assertions cannot be disregarded, the complicated relationships between internal groups have been marginalised, disregarding social processes. Therefore, throughout this study emphasis has been placed on how it is possible to gain a more dynamic picture of the Early Bronze Age by following the sociological framework outlined in Chapter 3.

Based on the data presented in the previous chapters a more dynamic outline of groups and boundaries in the Early Bronze Age follows here (Fig. 31). After an initial break with doxa at the beginning of the Late Neolithic, groups in Southwest Norway seem to have been in direct contact across Skagerrak. This is for

Figure 31. Interaction model between external and internal influences and how they have been adopted internally in southwest Norway. The small vertical arrows demonstrate how local groups have been influenced by, and through, processes of categorisation and interaction with other groups.



example indicated by several finds attributed to the Bell Beaker phenomenon with a shift toward a more homogenous cultural expression. Developments in the Late Neolithic are unfortunately beyond the scope of this study but are nevertheless relevant as structuring elements for groups in the Early Bronze Age. In Etne, Jæren, and Lista structures from the Late Neolithic appears to have had an impact on the burial practice, reflected in early cremation graves. These changes were later bound up with a strong centralisation in mid-Jæren in Period II, partly as a result of a natural harbour at Orre. The presence of high status foreign women contributed to a strong network across Skagerrak and linked groups directly together. Foreign influence may also have affected groups on a cosmological level, and is arguably why the area around Klepp, Time, and southern Sola has the highest concentration of abstract/geometric figures on grave slabs (Syvertsen 2005:507–508). Based on material remains, Period II can be described as a stable period with little emphasis on warrior ethos.

Meanwhile, these structures of identification were categorised and identified by groups on Karmøy that effectively used them to express and construct their own identity. Here, people identified themselves as a group and consequently excluded themselves from others (Etne, Jæren, Lista) who in turn identified them, demonstrating identity's complex dialectic. The establishment of a group on Karmøy was also structured by the landscape, or more precisely the strait, which was a natural place for travellers to seek rest or shelter from the North Sea. Through a well-organized group, the narrow strait would have been a vital resource for control of prestigious items and metal flows further north. Still, developments further south, i.e. the environmental disaster in Thy, the onset of the Urnfield expansion, and the collapse of city-states in the Aegean, may all have affected and altered groups and alliances-networks further north, including groups in Southwest Norway. The Urnfield expansion has also been interpreted as a rise of a new type of warrior elite over larger parts of Europe (Vandkilde 2007a:139–140). This resonates in the material of Southwest Norway, particularly on Karmøy and is reflected in the grave material, which is mainly represented by weapons and male toiletries. A flange-hilted sword discovered in one of the burial mounds, often interpreted as a symbol of an international warrior chief (e.g. Kristiansen & Larsson 2005), further supports this. The remarkable homogenous construction of the barrow is yet another example that demonstrates how groups on Karmøy did

not randomly choose their material representation. These were conscious, well founded choices, in order to express a local identity. Of course, this does not mean that they did not consider themselves part of a larger Nordic Bronze Age, on the contrary; however, excluding themselves from a power structure that had dominated and ruled across their region throughout Period II would have had a differentiating effect on groups on Karmøy. This is why there is such a strong homogeneity in the material remains (see chapters 5 and 6), amplified through a warrior ethos expressed in the artefact assembly from burial mounds.

A power structure on Karmøy would not have gone unnoticed by groups in Jæren, and a similar focus can be traced here. This is suggested by a dramatic decline in female graves and a stronger focus on male weapon graves, together with a location shift further north around Sola and Tananger. Accompanying the male graves are also larger burial mounds, reflected on both sides of Boknafjorden. It is reasonable to connect developments in Jæren during Period III as answers to a new and threatening group on Karmøy, which experienced a remarkable upsurge of wealth through new alliance-networks. Lista echoes many of the same developments found in Jæren. There is arguably a more heterogeneous representation in the grave material in Lista than in any of the other regions, which was most likely formed through a *longue durée* of external influence.

The constructed identity in Southwest Norway displays dynamic relationships where foreign structures are incorporated and adopted into already existing practices. The region also demonstrates an internal differentiation that would suggest a high level of consciousness, maintaining Barth's (1969) classic idea that pressured groups become aware of their collective identity. This internal differentiation illustrates that identities were highly variable and complex, with the ability to maintain larger interregional identities along with the unique and local.

7.4 Concluding remarks

Like identity itself, this book has been a bricolage of different analytical and theoretical discourses that build upon the notion that identity is both structured and structuring.

The focus has been on the burial mounds in Southwest Norway, and how variations in construction, placement, and artefacts have played an active role in the construction of a group's collective identity. The burial mounds are seen as reflections of choices made by the bereaved in situations of stress; however,

these choices are complicated actions formed through historical structures and external relations.

The initial intent was to provide a more dynamic and renewed look at a longstanding debate on the Early Bronze Age in Southwest Norway. This does not mean that this book successfully discovered a definitive answer to these questions. On the contrary, the study of identity in the Bronze Age is complicated and fascinating and in need of future studies in order to construct a more detailed and varied picture of the past. A comprehensive artefact study, including deposits and stray finds, is a necessary next step for tracing the construction of identity in the Early Bronze Age, as is a more extensive study on foreign developments that would have impacted local societies directly or indirectly. There is also a need for new scientific methods. The preservation of buried human remains varies considerably, which consequently influences the level of detail by which we can study the identity of the dead (Holst 2013:106). New scientific methods will therefore be decisive for future studies on the burial practice along the southwest coast of Norway. Methods such as metallurgical analysis (e.g. Ling *et al.* 2013; Ling *et al.* 2014; Melheim *et al.* 2018), have already been used in order to trace the origin of the bronze but other scientific techniques such as micromorphic analysis, isotopic analysis of human remains (e.g. Frei *et al.* 2015; Frei *et al.* 2017) and aDNA (e.g. Allentoft 2015) may become important tools for underlining prior, more social interpretations of the past.

References

- Aakvik, J. (2000). *Med blikket vendt mot sør! En materialstudie av eldre bronsealder på Vestlandet*. University of Bergen: Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis.
- Allentoft, M. E., Sikora, M., Sjogren, K.-G., Rasmussen, S., Rasmussen, M., Stenderup, J., Damgaard, P. B., Schroeder, H., Ahlstrom, T., Vinner, L., Malaspinas, A.-S., Margaryan, A., Higham, T., Chivall, D., Lynnerup, N., Harvig, L., Baron, J., Casa, P. D., Dabrowski, P., Duffy, P. R., Ebel, A. V., Epimakhov, A., Frei, K., Furmanek, M., Gralak, T., Gromov, A., Gronkiewicz, S., Grupe, G., Hajdu, T., Jarysz, R., Khartanovich, V., Khokhlov, A., Kiss, V., Kolar, J., Kriiska, A., Lasak, I., Longhi, C., McGlynn, G., Merkevicius, A., Merkyte, I., Metspalu, M., Mkrtychyan, R., Moiseyev, V., Paja, L., Palfi, G., Pokutta, D., Pospieszny, L., Price, T. D., Saag, L., Sablin, M., Shishlina, N., Smrcka, V., Soenov, V. I., Szeverenyi, V., Toth, G., Trifanova, S. V., Varul, L., Vicze, M., Yepiskoposyan, L., Zhitenev, V., Orlando, L., Sichert-Ponten, T., Brunak, S., Nielsen, R., Kristiansen, K. & Willerslev, E. (2015). Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia. *Nature*, 522(7555), 167–172.
- Aner, E., Kersten, K. & Willroth, K.-H. (2001). *Die Funde der älteren Bronzezeit des nordischen Kreises in Dänemark, Schleswig-Holstein und Niedersachsen. Thisted Amt*. Vol. XI. Neumünster: Wachholtz Verlag.
- Apel, J. (2001). *Daggers, Knowledge and Power. The Social Aspects of Flint-Dagger Technology in Scandinavia, 2350–1500 cal BC*. Uppsala: Coast to Coast Books 3.
- Armstrong Oma, K. (2012). Large-scale “grand narratives” and small-scale local studies. In N. Arnfinset & M. Wrigglesworth (eds), *Local societies in Bronze Age Northern Europe* (pp. 71–88). Sheffield: Equinox.
- Artelius, T. (1996). *Långfärd och återkomst – skeppet i bronsålderns gravar*. Skrifter 17. Gothenburg: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Austvoll, K. I. (in press). *Seaways to Complexity. A Study of Sociopolitical Organisation Along the Coast of Northwestern Scandinavia in the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Bakka, E. (1963). Forntida i Odda, Ullensvang og Kinsarvik. In K. Kolltveit (ed.), *Odda, Ullensvang og Kinsarvik i gamal og ny tid* (pp. 47–205). Odda: Odda, Ullensvang and Kinsarvik Bygdeboknemnd.
- Bakka, E. (1973). Omkring problemet om kulturdualisme i Sør-Noreg. In P. Simonsen & G. Stamsø Munch (eds), *Bonde-veidemann, bofast-ikke bofast i nordisk forhistorie. Foredrag og diskusjoner fra 13. nordiske arkeologmøte i Tromsø 1970* (pp. 109–127). Tromsø: Tromsø museums skrifter 14.
- Bakka, E. (1980). Representativitetsproblem i vestnorsk bronsealder. In H. Thrane (ed.), *Bronsealderbebyggelse i Norden: beretning fra det andet nordiske symposium for bronsealderforskning Odense 9.–11. april 1980* (pp. 37–58). Odense: Odense University.
- Bakka, E. (1993). Kulturtilhøve og regionale skilnader i vestnorsk bronsealder. In B. Solberg (ed.), *Minneskrift til Egil Bakka* (pp. 90–117). Arkeologiske Skrifter 7. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Ballin, T. B. & Jensen, O. L. (1995). *Farsundprosjektet. Steinalderboplads på Lista*. Varia 29. Oslo: Universitetets Oldsaksamling.
- Bang-Andersen, A. (1936). *Excavation Report*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection. Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Banks, M. (1996). *Ethnicity: anthropological constructions*. London: Routledge.
- Barrett, J. C. (1994). *Fragments from antiquity: an archaeology of social life in Britain, 2900–1200 BC*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barth, F. (1969). Introduction. In F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (pp. 9–38). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Barth, F. (1983). *Sohar: culture and society in an Omani town*. Baltimore, MD.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bech, J.-H., Eriksen, B. V. & Kristiansen, K. (eds). (2018). *Bronze Age Settlement and Land-Use in Thy, Northwest Denmark* (Vol. 1). Moesgård: Jutland Archaeological Society.
- Bendixen, B. E. R. (1877). *Indberetning om arkæologiske undersøgelser i 1876*. Kristiania.
- Bergerbrant, S. (2007). *Bronze Age Identities: Costume,*

- Conflict and Contact in Northern Europe 1600–1300 BC*. Stockholm Studies in Archaeology no. 43. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Bergerbrant, S. (2014). Children in the Bronze Age: Three case studies. In H. Alexandersson, A. Andreeff, & A. Bünz (eds), *Med hjärta och hjärna: En vänbok till professor Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh* (pp. 523–536). Gotarc Series A Vol. 5. Gothenburg: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Bergerbrant, S., Kristiansen, K., Allentoft, M. E., Frei, K. M., Price, T. D., Sjögren, K.-G. & Tornberg, A. (2017). Identifying commoners in the Early Bronze Age: burials outside barrows. In S. Bergerbrant & A. Wessman (eds), *New Perspectives on the Bronze Age* (pp. 37–64). Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bergsvik, K. A. (2012). The Last Hunter-Fishers of Western Norway. In C. Prescott & H. Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European* (pp. 100–114). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Binford, L. R. (1971). *Mortuary practices: their study and their potential*. Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.
- Bjørn, A. (1926). *Tidlig metalkultur i Øst-Norge*. Oslo: A. S. Brøgers Boktrykkeri.
- Bottero, W. (2010). Intersubjectivity and Bourdieusian Approaches to 'Identity'. *Cultural Sociology*, 4(1), 3–22. doi:10.1177/1749975509356750
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Symbolisk makt: artikler i utvalg* (A. Prieur, Trans.). Oslo: Pax.
- Broholm, H. C. (1933). *Studier over den yngre Bronzealder i Danmark, med særligt Henblik paa Gravfundene: en arkæologisk Undersøgelse*. Copenhagen: Thiele.
- Broholm, H. C. (1943). *Samlede fund fra den ældre bronzealder* (Vol. 1). Copenhagen: Nyt nordisk forlag.
- Broholm, H. C. (1944). *Kultur og folk i den ældre bronzealder* (Vol. 2). Copenhagen: Nyt nordisk forlag.
- Bronk Ramsey, C. (2009). Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates. *Radiocarbon*, 51(1), 337–360.
- Brubaker, R. (2004). *Ethnicity without groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brück, J. (2004). Material metaphors: The relational construction of identity in Early Bronze Age burials in Ireland and Britain. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 4(3), 307–333. doi:10.1177/1469605304046417
- Brøgger, A. W. (1910). *Letter to Stavanger Museum*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection, Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Brøgger, A. W. (1913). Nogen armringer fra ældre bronsalder fra Jæderen, Norge. In *Opuscula archaeologica Oscari Montelio dicata*. Stockholm.
- Brøgger, A. W. (1925a). *Det norske folk i oldtiden*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Serie A: Forelesninger VIa. Oslo: H. Aschehoug Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Brøgger, A. W. (1925b). *Det norske folk i oldtiden*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Brøgger, A. W. (1925c). Vår bondekulturs opprinnelse. *Vitenskaps-Akademiets Årbok 1925*. Oslo: Dybwad.
- Brøndsted, J. (1939). *Danmarks oldtid 2. Bronzealderen*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Buch, S. A. (1879). Fortegnelse over oldsager, ældre end reformationenen, erhvervede af Stavanger Museum. In *Aarsberetning for Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring* (pp. 249–263). Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Buch, S. A. (1881). Fortegnelse over oldsager, indkomne i 1881 til Stavanger Museum. In *Aarsberetning for Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring* (pp. 122–129). Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Bukkemoen, G. B. (2007). Alt har sin plass: stedsidentitet og sosial diskurs på Jæren i eldre jernalder. In L. Hedeager (ed.), *Sjøreiser og stedsidentitet: Jæren/Lista i bronsealder og eldre jernalder*. Oslo Arkeologiske Serie 8 (pp. 135–302). Oslo: Unipub.
- Carrasco, L. (2009). *Maritim praksis i senneolitikum og eldre bronsealder: en analyse av båtristningene på Lista fra et maritimt perspektiv*. University of Oslo, <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-23620>: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Childe, V. G. (1925). *The Dawn of European Civilization* (6th ed.). London: Kegan Paul.
- Childe, V. G. (1956). *Piecing together the past: the interpretation of archaeological data*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Christie, J. K. (1842a). Antikvarisk-historisk Skitse af Augvaldsnæs. *Urda, et antiqvarisk-historisk Tidsskrift, Andet Bind*, 322–347.
- Christie, J. K. (1842b). Oldtidsminder paa Karmøen. *Urda, et antiqvarisk-historisk Tidsskrift, Andet Bind*, 213–240.
- Comaroff, J. L. & Comaroff, J. (1992). *Ethnography and the historical imagination*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- de Lange, E. (1912). Ornerte heller i norske bronsaldergraver. In *Bergens Museums Aarboke 1912* (Vol. 4), pp. 1–36. Bergen: A/S John Griegs Boktrykkeri.
- de Lange, E. (1914). Kenotafer fra ældre bronsalder paa Vestlandet. In *Oldtiden (Særhefte)* (pp. 61–74). Kristiania.
- de Lange, E. (1917). Fortegnelse over de til Stavanger Museum i 1916 indkomne saker ældre end reformationenen. *Stavanger Museums Årshefte*. Stavanger.
- de Lange, E. (1919). En gullring fra eldre bronsalder. *Stavanger Museums Årshefte, 1918–1919*, 15–21. Stavanger.
- de Lange, E. & Petersen, J. (1925). Fortegnelse over de til Stavanger Museum i 1922 indkomne saker ældre end reformationenen. *Stavanger Museums Årshefte 1921–24*. Stavanger.
- Denham, S. 1999. *S.3412a – Analyse av bein*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection, Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (1996). Constructing Identities Through Culture. In P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones, & C. Gamble (eds), *Cultural identity and archaeology: the construction of European communities* (pp. 48–61). London: Routledge.

- Díaz-Andreu, M. (2005). Gender Identity. In M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babić, & D. N. Edwards (eds), *The Archaeology of Identity. Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion* (pp. 13–42). London: Routledge.
- Earle, T. (1997). *How Chiefs Come to Power. The Political Economy in Prehistory*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Earle, T. (2002). *Bronze Age Economics. The Beginnings of Political Economies*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Earle, T. & Kristiansen, K. (2010). Organising Bronze Age Societies: Concluding Thoughts. In T. Earle & K. Kristiansen (eds), *Organizing Bronze Age Societies. The Mediterranean, Central Europe, and Scandinavia Compared* (pp. 218–256). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Egenæs Lund, H. (1934). Graver og gravskikk i en bronsealders haug på Jæren. *Stavanger Museums Årshefte 43, 1932–33*, 57–69. Stavanger.
- Egenæs Lund, H. (1938). Sjøhandelsveier og handelsvarer til og fra Rogaland i bronsealderen. *Stavanger Museum Årshefte 1936–37*, 35–55. Stavanger.
- Engedal, Ø. (2002). *The Nordic scimitar. External relations and the creation of elite ideology*. BAR International Series 1050. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Engedal, Ø. (2010). *The Bronze Age of Northwestern Scandinavia*. University of Bergen: Dr. Philos. Thesis.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Small Places, Large Issues. An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology* (3rd ed.). London: Pluto Press.
- Fett, E. N. & Fett, P. (1941). *Sydvestnorske helleristninger. Rogaland og Lista*. Stavanger: Stavanger Museum.
- Fett, E. N. & Fett, P. (1979). Relations West Norway – Western Europe documented in petroglyphs. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 12(2), 65–92. doi:10.1080/00293652.1979.9965315
- Fett, P. (1963). *Etne prestegjeld*. Førhistoriske minne i Sunnhordland. Bergen: Historisk museum.
- Frei, K. M., Mannering, U., Kristiansen, K., Allentoft, M. E., Wilson, A. S., Skals, I., Tridico, S., Louise Nosch, M., Willerslev, E., Clarke, L. & Frei, R. (2015). Tracing the dynamic life story of a Bronze Age Female. *Scientific Reports*, (10431). doi:10.1038/srep10431, accessed August 14, 2016
- Frei, K. M., Villa, C., Jørkov, M. L., Allentoft, M. E., Kaul, F., Ethelberg, P., Reiter, S. S., Wilson, A. S., Taube, M., Olsen, J., Lynnerup, N., Willerslev, E., Kristiansen, K. & Frei, R. (2017). A matter of months: High precision migration chronology of a Bronze Age female. *PLOS ONE*, 12(6), e0178834. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0178834, accessed September 12, 2017
- Fyllingen, H. (2012). *Arkeologisk utgravning på Tjora, gnr. 10 bnr. 5,17, og 19. Sola kommune, Rogaland. Sesong 2008 – id.14854 og id.158316*. Oppdragsrapport 2012/23A, Excavation report, Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2010 [1960]). *Sannhet og metode: grunntrekk i en filosofisk hermeneutikk* (L. Holm-Hansen, Trans.). Oslo: Pax.
- Gardner, A. (2011). Paradox and Praxis in the Archaeology of Identity. In L. Amundsen-Meyer, N. Engel, & S. Pickering (eds), *Identity Crisis: Archaeological Perspectives on Social Identity. Proceedings of the 42nd (2010) Annual Chacmool Archaeology Conference, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta* (pp. 11–26). Calgary: Chacmool Archaeological Association University of Calgary.
- Gibbs, L. (1998). Identifying Gender Representation in the Archaeological Record: A Contextual Study. In K. A. Hays-Gilpin, D. S. Whitley & L. H. Dommasnes (eds), *Reader in Gender Archaeology*, (pp. 231–254). London: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gjessing, G. (1943). *Træn-funnene*. Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter. Oslo: H. Aschehoug og Co (W. Nygaard).
- Gjessing, G. (1944). Steinalder – Bronsealder – Steinbronsealder? *Viking*, VIII, 15–27.
- Gjessing, H. (1914). Fortegnelse over de til Stavanger Museum i 1914 indkomne saker ældre end reformationenen. *Stavanger Museum Aarshefte 1–37*. Stavanger.
- Glørstad, H. (2006). *Neolitisk renessanse. Hyperarkeologiske tekster om neolitikum i Sør-Norge*. Oslo Arkeologiske Serie 4. Oslo: Unipub.
- Goldhahn, J. (1999). *Sagaholm. Hällristningar och gravritual*. Studia Archaeologica Universitatis Umensis 11. Jönköping: Jönköping Läns Museums Arkeologiska Rapportserie 41.
- Goldhahn, J. (2006). Från landskapets monument till monumentens landskap – om döda och efterlevande med exempel från äldre bronsålder, 1700–1100 BC. In T. Østigård (ed.), *UBAS Nordisk, Universitetet i Bergen Arkeologiske Skrifter: Lik og ulik. Tilnærminger til variasjon i gravskikk*. UBAS. Nordisk 2 (pp. 171–202). Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Gustafson, G. (1890). Fortegnelse over de i 1890 til Bergen Museum indkomne oldsager ældre end reformationenen. In *Aarsberetning for Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring* (pp. 105–137). Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Gustafson, G. (1893). Letter to Johan Koren Christie. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection. Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Hansen, M. R. (2007). *Identitetsskabelse og interaktion i ældre bronzealder. En lokal analyse af gravritualer i Thy*. University of Copenhagen: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Hansen, M. R. (2012). Expressing identity through ritual in the Early Bronze Age. In N. Arnfinset & M. Wigglesworth (eds), *Local societies in Bronze Age Northern Europe* (pp. 56–70). Sheffield: Equinox.
- Hastrup, K. (1999). *Viljen til viden. En humanistisk grundbog*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Hauge, S. (2007). *Symbolsk alkymisme. Maktrelasjoner i bronsealderen i Farsund og Lyngdal*. University of Oslo:

- Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis.
- Helliesen, T. (1885). Fortegnelse over oldsager indkomne til Stavanger Museum 1885. In *Aarsberetning for Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring* (pp. 140–141). Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Helliesen, T. (1900). Oldtidslevninger i Stavanger amt. Randaberg sogn, Hetland pgd. *Stavanger Museums Aarshefte*, 51–71. Stavanger.
- Helliesen, T. (1901). Oldtidslevninger i Stavanger amt. *Stavanger Museums Aarshefte*, 56–57. Stavanger.
- Henriksen, M. M. (2014). *Stille vann har dyp bunn: Offerteoriens rolle i forståelsen av depotfunnbelyst gjennom våtmarksdepoter fra Midt-Norge ca. 2350–500 f.Kr.* NTNU Trondheim: PhD Thesis.
- Hodder, I. & Hutson, S. (2003). *Reading the past: current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holck, P. (1986). *Cremated bones: a medical-anthropological study of an archaeological material on cremation burials*. Oslo: Department of Anatomy, Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, University of Oslo.
- Holst, M. K. (2013). Burials. In A. F. Harding & H. Fokkens (eds), *The Oxford handbook of the European Bronze Age* (pp. 102–120). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holst, M. K., Breuning-Madsen, H. & Rasmussen, M. (2001). The South Scandinavian barrows with well-preserved oak-log coffins. *Antiquity*, 75(287), 126–136.
- Holst, M. K. & Rasmussen, M. (eds). (2013). *Skelhøj and the Bronze Age barrows of southern Scandinavia* (Vol. 1) The Bronze Age barrow tradition and the excavation of Skelhøj. Moesgård: Jysk Arkæologisk Selskab.
- Holst, M. K., Rasmussen, M., Kristiansen, K. & Bech, J.-H. (2013). Bronze Age 'Herostrats': Ritual, Political, and Domestic Economies in Early Bronze Age Denmark. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 79, 265–296. doi:10.1017/ppr.2013.14
- Hornstrup, K. M. (1998). Overgangen fra ældre til yngre Bronzealder. Et eksempel fra Nordvestjylland, Danmark. In T. Løken (ed.), *Bronzealder i Norden – Regioner og interaksjon. Foredrag ved det 7. nordiske bronzealdersymposium i Rogaland 31. august–3. september 1995*. AmS-Varia 33 (pp. 23–34). Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Hornstrup, K. M. (2011). Rogaland – Thy i ældre bronzealder. *Historisk årbog for Thy og Vester Hanherred*, 64–76.
- Hume, D. (2000 [1739]). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Høgestøl, M. & Prøsch-Danielsen, L. (2006). Impulses of agro-pastoralism in the 4th and 3rd millennia BC on the south-western coastal rim of Norway. *Environmental Archaeology*, 11(1), 19–34. doi:10.1179/174963106x97034
- Høgestøl, M., Prøsch-Danielsen, L. & Walderhaug, O. (2018). *Bergkunst på Midt- og Sør-Jæren samt i Dalaneregionen, Rogaland. Motiver, historikk, naturmiljø og tilstand*. AmS-Varia 59. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Indrelied, S. (1991). *Fornminne og fornminnevern i Olen kommune*. Bergen: University Museum of Bergen.
- Jenkins, R. (2000). Categorization: Identity, Social Process and Epistemology. *Current Sociology*, 48(3), 7–25.
- Jenkins, R. (2004). *Social Identity* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Jensen, J. (1987). Bronze Age Research in Denmark 1970–1985. *Journal of Danish Archaeology*, 6(1), 155–174. doi: 10.1080/0108464X.1987.10589984
- Jensen, J. (2002). *Bronzealder 2000–500 f.Kr* (Vol. 2). Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Johannesen, J. M. (2004). Operational Ethnicity. Serial practice and materiality. In F. Fahlander & T. Østigård (eds), *Material culture and other things: post-disciplinary studies in the 21st century* (pp. 161–184). Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Johansen, K. L., Laursen, S. T. & Holst, M. K. (2004). Spatial patterns of social organization in the Early Bronze Age of South Scandinavia. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 23(1), 33–55.
- Johansen, Ø. K. (1986). *Tidlig metallkultur i Agder*. Universitetets Oldsaksamlings skrifter. Ny rekke 8. Oslo: Oldsaksamlingen.
- Johansen, Ø. K. (2000). *Bronse og Makt: Bronsealderen i Norge*. Oslo: Andresen & Butenschøn.
- Jones, S. (1997). *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, S. (2007). Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past. In T. Insoll (ed.), *The archaeology of identities: a reader* (pp. 44–58). London: Routledge.
- Jones, S. & Graves-Brown, P. (1996). Introduction. In P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones, & C. Gamble (eds), *Cultural identity and archaeology: the construction of European communities* (pp. 1–24). London: Routledge.
- Kaul, F. (1998). *Ships on bronzes: a study in Bronze Age religion and iconography*. Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark.
- Kersten, K. (1935). *Zur älteren nordischen Bronzezeit*. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag.
- Kilhavn, H. (2013). *Neolitikum i Agder – Interne strukturer og eksterne relasjoner i samfunn fra tidlige neolitikum til seinneolitikum*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oslo. <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-33799>
- Kohl, P. L. (1981). Materialist Approaches in Prehistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10, 89–118. doi:10.2307/2155711
- Komber, J. (1987). Det arkeologiske grunnsynet til Anton Wilhelm Brøgger og Håkon Shetelig: Karakteristikk med utgangspunkt i bøkene «Det norske folk i oldtiden» (1925) og «Norges forhistorie» (1925). *Viking*, L, 23–35.
- Krause, C. (2005). En senneolitisk brandgrav ved Østerhoved, Sydvestsjælland, fundet under en høj med begravelser fra bronzealderen. In *Aarbøger for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie 2005* (pp. 55–82). Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskriftselskab.
- Kristiansen, K. (1978). The consumption of wealth in Bronze Age Denmark. A study in the dynamics of economic processes in tribal societies. In K. Kristiansen

- & C. Paludan-Müller (eds), *New Directions in Scandinavian Archaeology* (pp. 158–190). Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark.
- Kristiansen, K. (1981). A Social History of Danish Archaeology. In G. Daniel (ed.), *Towards a history of archaeology: being the papers read at the first Conference on the History of Archaeology in Aarhus, 29. August–2. September 1978* (pp. 192). London: Thames and Hudson.
- Kristiansen, K. (1987). From stone to bronze – the evolution of social complexity in Northern Europe, 2300–1200 BC. In E. M. Brumfiel & T. Earle (eds), *Specialization, exchange, and complex societies* (pp. 30–51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. (1998a). The construction of a Bronze Age landscape. Cosmology, economy and social organisation in Thy, Northwest Jutland. In B. Hänsel (ed.), *Mensch und Umwelt in der Bronzezeit Europas: [Beiträge und Ergebnisse]* (pp. 281–293). Kiel: Oetker-Voges Verlag.
- Kristiansen, K. (1998b). *Europe Before History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. (2004). Genes versus agents. A discussion of the widening theoretical gap in archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 11(2), 77–99. doi:doi:10.1017/S1380203805211509
- Kristiansen, K. (2010). Decentralized Complexity: The Case of Bronze Age Northern Europe. In T. D. Price & G. M. Feinman (eds), *Pathways to power: new perspectives on the emergence of social inequality* (pp. 169–192). New York, NY: Springer.
- Kristiansen, K. (2011). Constructing Social and Cultural Identities in the Bronze Age. In B. W. Roberts & M. Vander Linden (eds), *Investigating Archaeological Cultures: Material Culture, Variability, and Transmission* (pp. 201–210). New York: Springer.
- Kristiansen, K. (2013). Female Clothing and Jewellery in the Nordic Bronze Age. In S. Bergerbrant & S. Sabatini (eds), *Counterpoint: Essays in Archaeology and Heritage Studies in Honour of Professor Kristian Kristiansen* (pp. 755–769). Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kristiansen, K. & Larsson, T. B. (2005). *The Rise of Bronze Age Society. Travels, Transmissions and Transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. & Prescott, C. (2000). Landscape and cosmology in the Bronze Age. In K. Kallhovd & J. Magnusson (eds), *Rock Carvings in the Borderlands: Bohuslän/Dalsland and Østfold. An INTERREGIA IIA project. Final report*. (pp. 108–122). Gothenburg: Länsstyrelsen.
- Kvalø, F. (2007). Oversjøiske reiser fra Sørvest-Norge til Nordvest-Jylland i eldre bronsealder – en drøfting av maritim realisering og rituell mobilisering. In L. Hedeager (ed.), *Sjøreiser og stedsidentitet. Jæren/Lista i bronsealder og eldre jernalder*. Oslo Arkeologiske Serie 8 (pp. 15–134). Oslo: Unipub.
- Larsen, I. C. (1996). *Haugene fra eldre bronsealder på Jæren – en religionsarkeologisk analyse*. University of Bergen: Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis.
- Larsen, I. C. (1997). Haugene fra eldre bronsealder på Jæren – en stabiliserende faktor i tilværelsen? In I. Fuglestad & B. Myhre (eds), *Konflikter i forhistorien*. AmS-Varia 30 (pp. 15–26). Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1969 [1949]). *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (R. Needham, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Levy, J. E. (1995). Heterarchy in Bronze Age Denmark: Settlement Pattern, Gender, and Ritual. *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association*, 6(1), 41–53. doi:10.1525/ap3a.1995.6.1.41
- Lillehammer, A. (1976). Det var en bronsealder på Årmland! *Frå haug ok heiðni*, (3), 75–78.
- Ling, J. (2014). *Elevated rock art. Towards a maritime understanding of Bronze Age rock art in northern Bohuslän, Sweden*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Ling, J., Hjärthner-Holdar, E., Grandin, L., Billström, K. & Persson, P.-O. (2013). Moving metals or indigenous mining? Provenancing Scandinavian Bronze Age artefacts by lead isotopes and trace elements. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 40(1), 291–304. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2012.05.040
- Ling, J., Stos-Gale, Z., Grandin, L., Billström, K., Hjärthner-Holdar, E. & Persson, P.-O. (2014). Moving metals II: provenancing Scandinavian Bronze Age artefacts by lead isotope and elemental analyses. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 41, 106–132. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.07.018
- Linge, T. E. (2007). *Mjeltehaugen – fragment frå gravritual*. UBAS. Master thesis 3. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Locke, J. (2008 [1690]). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. Phemister ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lorange, A. (1878). Indberetning om en Reise paa Lister 1877. In *Foreningen til norske Fortidsmindesmerkers bevaring. Aarsberetning for 1877*. Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Lundberg, A. (1998). *Karmøys flora: biologisk mangfold i eit kystlandskap*. Bergen-Sandviken: Fagbokforlag.
- Løken, T. (1978). Glimt fra den arkeologiske feltsesongen 1978. *Frå haug ok heiðni* (3), 75–78.
- Marstrander, S. (1948). *Innberetning om undersøkelse av en gravrøys på Øvre Meberg (gnr. 88, bnr. 2), Vanse s. og pgd. Vest-Agder*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection. Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo.
- Marstrander, S. (1950). Jylland – Lista. *Viking*, XIV, 63–85.
- Marstrander, S. (1963). *Østfolds jordbruksristninger: Skjeberg*. Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mauss, M. (2016 [1925]). *The Gift* (J. I. Guyer, Trans.). Chicago: Hau Books.
- Melheim, A. L. (2006). Fra årsvøys til hellekiste – fra hellekiste til årsvøys? Om å putte ting i boks. In H. Glørstad, B. Skar & D. Skre (eds), *Historien i forhistorien: festskrift til Einar Østmo på 60-årsdagen*. KHM Skrifter nr. 4 (pp. 143–159). Oslo: Museum of Cultural History.
- Melheim, A. L. (2009). Kobberimport eller kobberproduksjon? In G. Grønnesby & M. M. Henriksen (eds), *Det 10. nordiske bronsealdersymposium: Trondheim 5.–8. okt. 2006* (pp. 20–35). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Melheim, A. L. (2012a). *Recycling ideas. Bronze Age metal*

- production in southern Norway. Oslo: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo.
- Melheim, A. L. (2012b). Towards a new understanding of Late Neolithic Norway – the role of metal and metalworking. In C. Prescott & H. Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European. The Transformation of Third Millennium Northern and Western Europe* (pp. 70–81). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Melheim, A. L., Grandin, L., Persson, P. O., Billström, K., Stos-Gale, Z., Ling, J., Williams, A., Angelini, I., Canovaro, C., Hjärthner-Holdar, E. & Kristiansen, K. (2018). Moving metals III: Possible origins for copper in Bronze Age Denmark based on lead isotopes and geochemistry. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 96, 85–105. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2018.04.003
- Meskel, L. (2002). The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 279–301.
- Montelius, O. (1885). *Om tidsbestämning inom bronsåldern med särskildt afseende på Skandinavien*. Stockholm: Distribution by Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Myhre, B. (1972). Bronsealderens jordhauger i Etne i Sunnhordland. *ARKEO*, 1, 12–17. Bergen.
- Myhre, B. (1981). *Sola og Madla i førhistorisk tid*. AmS-Småtrykk 10. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Myhre, B. & Myhre, B. (1970). *Excavation Report, Garahaugen*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archive Collection. University Museum of Bergen, University of Bergen.
- Müller, S. (1904). Vei og bygd i sten- og bronsealderen. In *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* (Vol. 1904, pp. 1–64). Copenhagen: Selskapet.
- Møllerop, O. (1963a). Bronsealderens røysen på Ringen, Avaldsnes. *Frå haug ok heiøni* (3), 239–242.
- Møllerop, O. (1963b). Fra Rogalands eldre bronsealder. *Stavanger museums årbok 1962*, 5–58. Stavanger.
- Naum, M. (2008). *Homelands lost and gained: Slavic migration and settlement on Bornholm in the early Middle Ages*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Neumann, J. (1839). Oldtidsminder paa Karmøen. *Urda, et antiqvarisk-historisk Tidsskrift*, 213–240.
- Nicolaysen, N. (1876). Oversikt over norske fund fra bronsealderen. In *Aarsberetning for Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring. Aarsberetning for 1875* (pp. 180–192). Kristiania: Carl C. Werner & Komp's Bogtrykkeri.
- Nordenborg Myhre, L. (1998). *Historier fra en annen virkelighet. Fortellinger om bronsealderen ved Karmsundet*. AmS-Småtrykk 46. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Nordenborg Myhre, L. (2004). *Trialectic archaeology. Monuments and space in Southwest Norway 1700–500 BC*. AmS-Skrifter 18. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- O'Shea, J. M. (1996). *Villagers of the Maros. A Portrait of an Early Bronze Age Society*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Olsen, B. (1997). *Fra ting til tekst: teoretiske perspektiv i arkeologisk forskning*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Olsen, B. (2003). Material Culture after Text: Re-Membering Things. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 36(2), 87–104. doi:10.1080/00293650310000650
- Olsen, B. (2010). *In defense of things*. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.
- Petersen, J. (1926). *Lista i førhistorisk tid*. Oslo.
- Postone, M., LiPuma, E. & Calhoun, C. (1993). Introduction: Bourdieu and Social Theory. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma & M. Postone (eds), *Bourdieu: critical perspectives* (pp. 1–13). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Prescott, C. (1988). Skrivarhelleren i Årdal i Sogn. In S. Indrelid, S. H. H. Kaland & B. Solberg (eds), *Festskrift til Anders Hagen*. Arkeologiske Skrifter fra Historisk Museum 4 (pp. 68–78). Bergen: University Museum of Bergen, University of Bergen.
- Prescott, C. (1991). *Kulturhistoriske undersøkelser i Skrivarhelleren*. Arkeologiske Rapporter 14. Bergen: University Museum of Bergen.
- Prescott, C. (1994). Paradigm gained – paradigm lost? 150 years of Norwegian Bronze Age research. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 27(2), 87–109. doi:10.1080/00293652.1994.9965578
- Prescott, C. (1995). *From Stone Age to Iron Age. A Study from Sogn, Western Norway*. BAR International Series 603. Oxford: Tempus Reparatum.
- Prescott, C. (1996). Was there really a Neolithic in Norway? *Antiquity*, 70(267), 77–87.
- Prescott, C. (2005). Settlement and Economy in the Late Neolithic and Bronze Age of Southern Norway: Some Points and Premises. In M. Høgestøl, L. Selsing, T. Løken, A. J. Nærøy, & L. Prøsch-Danielsen (eds.), *Konstruksjonsspor og byggeskikk. Maskinell flateavdekking – metodikk, tolkning og forvaltning*. AmS-Varia 43 (pp. 127–136). Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Prescott, C. (2012a). The origin of a Bronze Age in Norway: structure, regional process and localized history. In N. Arnfinset & M. Wrigglesworth (eds), *Local Societies in Bronze Age Northern Europe* (pp. 215–231). Sheffield: Equinox.
- Prescott, C. (2012b). Third millennium transformations in Norway: modeling an interpretative platform. In C. Prescott & H. Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European. The Transformation of Third Millennium Northern and Western Europe* (pp. 115–127). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Prescott, C. & Glørstad, H. (2012). Introduction: becoming European. In C. Prescott & H. Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European. The transformation of third millennium Northern and Western Europe* (pp. 1–11). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Prescott, C. & Melheim, A. L. (2009). The First Bronze Age Communities in Scandinavia. Comments on M. Pilar Prieto Martínez: 'Bell Beaker Communities in Thy: The First Bronze Age Society in Denmark'. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 42(1), 89–93.
- Prescott, C., Sand-Eriksen, A. & Austvoll, K. I. (2018). The Sea and Bronze Age Transformations. In E. Holt (ed.), *Water and Power in Past Societies* (pp. 177–197). Albany, New York: SUNY Press.
- Prescott, C. & Walderhaug, E. (1995). The last frontier?

- Processes of Indo Europeanization in Northern Europe. The Norwegian Case. *Journal of Indo-European studies*, 23, 257–280.
- Price, D. T., Ambrose, S. H., Bennike, P., Heinemeier, J., Noe-Nygaard, N., Petersen, E. B., Petersen, P. V. & Richards, M. P. (2007). New information on the Stone Age graves at Dragsholm, Denmark. *Acta Archaeologica*, 78(2), 193–219.
- Prieto-Martínez, M. P. (2008). Bell Beaker Communities in Thy: The First Bronze Age Society in Denmark. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 41(2), 115–158. doi:10.1080/00293650802517027
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. (1995). *Lista i støpeskjeen: landskapsendringer gjennom 15000 år*. Kristiansand: Fylkeskonservatoren i Vest-Agder.
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. (1997). New light on the Holocene shore displacement curve on Lista, the southernmost part of Norway. Based primarily on Professor Ulf Hafstens' material from 1955–1957 and 1966. *Norsk geografisk tidsskrift*, 51, 83–101.
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. (2006). *Sea-level studies along the coast of southwestern Norway. With emphasise on three short-lived Holocene marine events*. AmS-Skrifter 20. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. (2011). Spor av neolittisk økonomi i Syd- og Sydvest-Norge. Regionale variasjoner i pollensignal og arkeologiske artefakter. In F. Kaul & L. Sørensen (eds), *Agrarsamfundenes ekspansjon i nord. Symposium på Tanums Hällristningsmuseum, Underslös, Bohuslän, d. 25.–29. maj 2011* (pp. 116–118). Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet.
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. & Simonsen, A. (2000a). *The deforestation patterns and the establishment of the coastal heathland of southwestern Norway*. AmS-Skrifter 15. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L. & Simonsen, A. (2000b). Palaeoecological investigations towards the reconstruction of the history of forest clearances and coastal heathlands in south-western Norway. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany*, 9(4), 189–204. doi:10.1007/BF01294634
- Prøsch-Danielsen, L., Prescott, C. & Holst, M. K. (2018). Economic and social zones during the Late Neolithic/ Early Bronze Age in Jæren, Southwest Norway. Reconstructing large-scale land-use patterns. *Praehistorische Zeitschrift*, 93(1), 48–88.
- Randsborg, K. (1968). *Bronze age grave finds in East Denmark (period III)*. Bonn: Habelt.
- Randsborg, K. (1969). Von periode II zu III. Chronologische Studien über die ältere Bronzezeit Südsandinavien und Norddeutschlands. *Acta Archaeologica*, XXXIX.
- Randsborg, K. (1974). Social Stratification in Early Bronze Age Denmark: a Study in the Regulation of Cultural Systems. *Praehistorische Zeitschrift*, 49(1), 38–61.
- Randsborg, K. (1986). Women in Prehistory: The Danish Example. *Acta Archaeologica*, 55, 143–154.
- Rasmussen, M., & Holst, M. K. (2004). Grave pakket i vand – et eksempel på rituel praksis i forbindelse med bygningen af bronzealderens gravhøje. *Arkæologisk Forum*, 11, 19–2.
- Reimer, P. J., Bard, E., Bayliss, A., Beck, J. W., Blackwell, P. G., Bronk Ramsey, C., Buck, C. E., Cheng, H., Edwards, R. L., Friedrich, M., Grootes, P. M., Guilderson, T. P., Haflidason, H., Hajdas, I., Hatté, C., Heaton, T. J., Hoffmann, D. L., Hogg, A. G., Hughen, K. A., Kaiser, K. F., Kromer, B., Manning, S. W., Niu, M., Reimer, R. W., Richards, D. A., Scott, E. M., Southon, J. R., Staff, R. A., Turney, C. S. M. & van der Plicht, J. (2013). IntCal13 and Marine13 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves 0–50,000 Years cal BP. *Radiocarbon*, 55(4), 1869–1887.
- Ringstad, B. (1986). *Vestlandets største gravminner: et forsøk på lokalisering av forhistoriske maktsentra*. University of Bergen: Unpublished Mag. Art Thesis.
- Romundset, A., Fredin, O. & Høgaas, F. (2015). A Holocene sea-level curve and revised isobase map, S Norway. *Boreas*, 44(2), 383–400. doi:10.1111/bor.12105
- Rowlands, M. (2007). Politics of identity in archaeology. In T. Insoll (ed.), *The Archaeology of identities: a reader* (pp. 59–71). London: Routledge.
- Sahlins, M. (1958). *Social stratification in Polynesia*. Monographs of the American Ethnological Society 29. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Sand-Eriksen, A. S. (2017). Mjeltehaugen: Europe's northernmost Bell Beaker expression? In S. Bergerbrant & A. Wessman (eds), *New Perspectives on the Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 13th Nordic Bronze Age Symposium held in Gothenburg 9th to 13th June 2015* (pp. 7–18). Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Sarauw, T. (2007). Male Symbols or Warrior Identities? The 'Archery Burials' of the Danish Bell Beaker Culture. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 26(1), 65–87.
- Sarauw, T. (2008). Danish Bell Beaker pottery and flint daggers – The display of social identities? *European Journal of Archaeology*, 11(1), 23–47.
- Saxe, A. A. (1970). *Social dimensions of mortuary practices*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.
- Sellevold, B. J. (2001). *Rapport om antropologisk undersøkelse av skjelettresten fra "Kongshaugen", Ringen gnr. 97, Karmøy k., Rogaland*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archicive Collection. Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Semb, G. (1962). *Jorda på Jæren: beskrivelse til jordbunnskart over en del av Jæren*. Jordbunnsbeskrivelser 42. Ås: NLH.
- Shetelig, H. (1907). *Excavation report, Knaughaug*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archicive Collection. Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Shetelig, H. (1922). *Primitive tider i Norge: en oversigt over stenalderen*. Bergen: John Griegs Forlag.
- Shetelig, H. (1925). *Norges Forhistorie. Problemer og Resultater i Norsk Arkæologi*. Serie A: Forelesninger Vol. 5a. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Shetelig, H. & Brøgger, A. W. (1905). *Excavation report, Kubbhaug and Kjørkhaug*. Retrieved from the Topographical Archicive Collection. Museum of Archaeology, University of Stavanger.
- Sjurseike, R. (2001). "Kongshaugen" på Ringjen, Karmøy – Etterundersøkelser og restaurering. *Frå haug ok heidni* (4), 35–40.

- Skjølsvold, A. (1977). *Slettåbopllassen: et bidrag til diskusjonen om forholdet mellom fangst- og bondesamfunnet i yngre steinalder og bronsealder*. AmS-Skrifter 2. Stavanger: Museum of Archaeology.
- Skoglund, P. (2005). *Vardagens landskap: lokala perspektiv på bronsålderns materiella kultur*. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia Series in 8° No. 49. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Skogstrand, L. (2006). I krig og evighet? Kjønnsideologiske forestillinger i yngre bronsealder og eldre førromersk jernalder belyst gjennom graver og helleristninger i Østfold. In C. Prescott (ed.), *Kjønnsideologi og kosmografi i den østnorske bronsealder*. Oslo Arkeologiske Serie 6 (pp. 13–168). Oslo: Unipub.
- Solberg, B. (1994). Exchange and the role of import to Western Norway in the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze age. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 27(2), 111–126. doi:10.1080/00293652.1994.9965579
- Solheim, S. (2012). *Lokal praksis og fremmed opphav: arbeidsdeling, sosiale relasjoner og differensiering i østnorsk tidligneolitikum*. University of Oslo: PhD Thesis.
- Sollund, M.-L. B. (1996). *Åsrøysen: gravminner fra bronsealderen? En analyse av åsrøysene i Vestfold*. Varia 34. Oslo: Oldsaksamlingen.
- Stutz, L. N. (2006). Escaping the allure of meaning: Toward new paradigms in the study of ritual in prehistory. In A. Andrén, K. Jennbert & C. Raudvere (eds), *Old Norse religion in long-term perspectives: origins, changes and interactions: an international conference in Lund, Sweden, June 3.–7., 2004* (pp. 95–98). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Stylegar, F.-A. (2007). *Farmers, mariners and lords of long-ago: archaeology and prehistory in the Agder region*. Kristiansand: Vest-Agder fylkeskommune, Regionalavdelingen.
- Syvertsen, K. I. J. (2003). *Ristninger i graver – graver med ristninger: om ristningers mening i gravminner og gravritualer: en analyse av materiale fra Rogaland*. University of Bergen: Unpublished M.Phil thesis.
- Syvertsen, K. I. J. (2005). Rogalands ristninger i graver som transformerende og stabiliserende faktorer i tilværelsen. In J. Goldhahn (ed.), *Mellan sten och järn: rapport från det 9:e nordiska bronsålderssymposiet, Göteborg 09.–12.10.2003* (pp. 503–520). Gothenburg: Intellecta Docusys.
- Säfvestad, U. (1993). Högen och bygden – territoriell organisation i skånsk bronsålder. In L. Larsson (ed.), *Bronsålderens Gravhögar. Rapport från ett symposium i Lund 15.XI–16.XI 1991* (pp. 161–169). Lund: Arkeologiska Institutionen och Historiska Museet.
- Thedéen, S. (2004). *Gränser i livet – gränser i landskapet. Generationerelationer och rituelle praktiker i södermanländska bronsålderslandskap*. Stockholm Studies in Archaeology 33. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Thomsen, T. (1929). *Egekistefundet fra Egtved, fra den ældre bronzealder*. Copenhagen.
- Thrane, H. (1998). The effects of the Bronze Age on the Environment and Culture in Scandinavia. In B. Hänsel (ed.), *Mensch und Umwelt in der Bronzezeit Europas. Man and Environment in Bronze Age Europe* (pp. 271–280). Kiel: Oetker-Voges Verlag.
- Thrane, H. (2009). Refleksjoner over grave og gravmonumenter i Nordens bronsealder. In G. Grønnesby & M. M. Henriksen (eds), *Det 10. nordiske bronsåldersymposium: Trondheim 5.–8. okt. 2006* (pp. 8–19). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Tilley, C. (1994). *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- Trigger, B. G. (2006). *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vandkilde, H. (1996). *From Stone to Bronze. The Metalwork of the Late Neolithic and Earliest Bronze Age in Denmark*. Jysk Arkæologisk Selskabs Skrifter 32. Aarhus: Jutland Archaeological Society.
- Vandkilde, H. (1999). Social Distinction and Ethnic Reconstruction in the Earliest Danish Bronze Age. In C. Clausing & M. Egg (eds), *Eliten in der Bronzezeit. Ergebnisse zweier Kolloquien in Mainz und Athen. Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 43* (pp. 245–276). Mainz.
- Vandkilde, H. (2004). Bronze Age Cairns. In P. Bogucki & P. J. Crabtree (eds), *Ancient Europe 8000 B.C.–A.D. 1000: Encyclopedia of the Barbarian World* (Vol. 2, pp. 82–85). New York: Thomson & Gale/Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Vandkilde, H. (2007a). *Culture and Change in Central European Prehistory. 6th to 1st Millennium BC*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Vandkilde, H. (2007b). A Review of the Early Late Neolithic Period in Denmark: Practice, Identity and Connectivity. *Offa*, 61/62, 2004/05(2007), 75–109.
- Vandkilde, H. (2008). Leoni's House. Materialising Identity and Change in Contemporary Papua New Guinea. In K. Chilidis, J. Lund & C. Prescott (eds), *Facets of Archeology. Essays in Honour of Lotte Hedeager on her 60th Birthday*. Oslo Arkeologiske Serie 10. Oslo: Unipub.
- Wetherell, M. (2009). Introduction. In M. Wetherell (ed.), *Theorizing identities and social action* (pp. 1–16). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Widholm, D. (1998). *Rösen, ristningar och riter*. Acta archaeologica Lundensia Series in 4° nr. 23. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Worsaae, J. J. A. (1881). *Nordens Forhistorie: efter samtidige Mindesmærker*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal Boghandels Forlag.
- Wrigglesworth, M. (2011). *Finding your place. Rock art and local identity in West Norway*. University of Bergen: PhD Thesis.
- Yelvington, K. A. (1991). Ethnicity as Practice? A Comment on Bentley. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 33(1), 158–168. doi:10.2307/179013
- Østerberg, D. (2003). *Sosiologiens nøkkelbegreper og deres opprinnelse*. Oslo: Cappelen akademisk forlag.
- Østerdal, A. (1999). *Tid, rom og sted: bronsealderroysene i Hordaland*. University of Bergen: Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis.
- Østigård, T., & Goldhahn, J. (2006). From the Dead to the Living: Death as Transactions and

- Renegotiations. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 39(1), 27–48. doi:10.1080/00293650600703928
- Østmo, E. (2005). Over Skagerak i steinalderen. *Viking LXVIII*, 55–82.
- Østmo, E. (2008). Some Notes on the Development of Shipbuilding and Overseas Connections in Scandinavian Prehistory. In C. Prescott, J. Lund & K. Chilidis (eds), *Facets of archeology: essays in honour of Lotte Hedeager on her 60th birthday*. Oslo: Arkeologiske Serie 10 (pp. 265–274). Oslo: Unipub.
- Østmo, E. (2011). *Kriggergraver: en dokumentarisk studie av senneolittiske hellekister i Norge*. Oslo: Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo.
- Østmo, E. (2012). Late Neolithic Expansion to Norway. The beginning of a 4000 year old shipbuilding tradition. In C. Prescott & H. Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European: the transformation of third millennium Northern and Western Europe* (pp. 63–69). Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Endnotes

- ¹ C27790a – Footnotes are primarily used for referencing the national museum number for the various artefacts; these can be looked up at www.unimus.no.
- ² S2849
- ³ B7656c
- ⁴ B7656b
- ⁵ B1893
- ⁶ B1616
- ⁷ B548
- ⁸ C566
- ⁹ C567
- ¹⁰ B999
- ¹¹ S4975
- ¹² B3152a
- ¹³ B5310
- ¹⁴ B5952a
- ¹⁵ B5952c
- ¹⁶ B5952d
- ¹⁷ B5952b
- ¹⁸ B5952e
- ¹⁹ B5765b
- ²⁰ B5765a
- ²¹ B5765c
- ²² B2772
- ²³ S9355a
- ²⁴ S3737b
- ²⁵ S3737a
- ²⁶ S2083
- ²⁷ S7425a
- ²⁸ S7425b
- ²⁹ C1045c
- ³⁰ B1011
- ³¹ S1261
- ³² S2882
- ³³ S1569
- ³⁴ S1263
- ³⁵ S1264
- ³⁶ S1265
- ³⁷ S1266
- ³⁸ S1267
- ³⁹ S1268
- ⁴⁰ S1269a
- ⁴¹ S6502
- ⁴² S1262
- ⁴³ Topographical archive in Stavanger: uncalibrated 3180 ± 80 BP.
- ⁴⁴ S3967a
- ⁴⁵ S4091
- ⁴⁶ S1022
- ⁴⁷ B4716
- ⁴⁸ S4227b-c
- ⁴⁹ S4227a
- ⁵⁰ S1273
- ⁵¹ S1272
- ⁵² S1274
- ⁵³ S9784
- ⁵⁴ S6400a-e
- ⁵⁵ S4265a-c
- ⁵⁶ S3410
- ⁵⁷ C35237d
- ⁵⁸ C27790a
- ⁵⁹ C20991b
- ⁶⁰ C20991a
- ⁶¹ C25633b
- ⁶² C25633a
- ⁶³ C22273
- ⁶⁴ B3201a
- ⁶⁵ B3201b
- ⁶⁶ C38005g
- ⁶⁷ B3875a
- ⁶⁸ B3875c
- ⁶⁹ B3875d
- ⁷⁰ B4513
- ⁷¹ B3209
- ⁷² S3585
- ⁷³ B4954
- ⁷⁴ S2969
- ⁷⁵ T7501
- ⁷⁶ Ts4318

Appendix 1: Catalogue of graves in Southwest Norway

Burial mounds with no known local name have been given the name of its farmstead with a number starting from 1 and upward. Several burial mounds do not have a known location, these have been given coordinates based on the farmstead, and marked as *unclear location* in the catalogue. Burial mounds that have either been destroyed or

removed due to excavations have been identified as *removed* in the comments field.

I have chosen to include several burial mounds that are either unexcavated or with no known finds. These are tentatively dated by Nordenborg Myhre's (2004) to the Early Bronze Age, based on construction, size and distribution alone. I have included these, as there are no updated catalogues of burial mounds from the Early Bronze Age in Southwest

Norway, and they might become of value for future studies. They have also been included as a comply to a request by Thrane (2009:17) who encouraged northern Scandinavian researchers to see the value of comparative studies that are based on ground-work and published catalogues (e.g. Aner *et al.* 2001). This catalogue is a small contribution to this request.

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Kyrkjehaugen	Grindheim 75	Etne	Hordaland	BA	B7757, B7656a-c	Flint, ceramics, razor, burnt bone (LBA)	Barrow			Indeterminable	Possibly LBA?	Fett 1963; Myhre 1972
Olahaugen	Støle 35/10	Etne	Hordaland	BA	B6592 la-d, II	Urn from LBA	Barrow			Indeterminable	Possibly LBA?	Fett 1963; Myhre 1972
Lyndehaugen	Sørheim 36	Etne	Hordaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Fett 1963
Garahaugen	Sørheim 36	Etne	Hordaland	EBA I/II	S2849?	Bronze dagger?	Barrow		NW-SE	Indeterminable		Fett 1963; Myhre & Myhre 1970; Myhre 1972
Skeie I	Skeie	Vindafjord	Rogaland	EBA II	B1011	Sword	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Male	Unclear location	Engedal 2010
Storasund I	Storasund 33	Haugesund	Rogaland	BA	B5875a-c	Knife (per. IV), burnt bone, snail house (<i>Buccinum undatum</i>)	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Seashells on bedding, removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mound no. 21	"Reheia"	Karmøy	Rogaland	BA			Stone setting			Indeterminable	Bendixen's map no. 21	Bendixen 1877; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mound no. 30	"Reheia"	Karmøy	Rogaland	BA	Lost	Burnt bones	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	N-S	Indeterminable	Bendixen's map no. 30	Bendixen 1877; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mound no. 31	"Reheia"	Karmøy	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Bendixen's map no. 31	Bendixen 1877; Nordenborg Myhre 1998, 2004
Knaghaug	Bø 146	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B5046	Sword	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Male		Gustafson 1893; Shetelig 1907; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Kjørkhaug	Gunnarshaug 143/21	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B5310	Dagger blade	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable		Shetelig & Brøgger 1905; Nordenborg Myhre
Kubshaug	Gunnarshaug 143/2	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B5952a-e	Dagger blade, razor, brooch, double stud, pair of tweezers	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Male		Shetelig & Brøgger 1905; Nordenborg Myhre 2004

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Fyrstegraven	Nedre Hauge 127/2	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B999, C566, C567, C568, C569, C570a-b	Spearhead, sword, scabbard, chape, double stud, brooch, unburnt bones	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Male		Christie 1842; Møllerop 1963b; Nordenborg Myhre 1998, 2004
Kongshaugen	Ringen 97/1, 9	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	S9355a-i	Burnt bone and teeth, bone, pottery, bone, pottery, pottery, bone, pearl, bone	Cairn	Dry stone technique	NW-SE	Indeterminable		Møllerop 1963a; Sjørseike 2001; Nordenborg Myhre 1998b, 2004
Håvardshaugen	Skjølningstad 136/4	Karmøy	Rogaland	BA	B6129	Ornamented stone slab	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Storesund 1	Storesund 142	Karmøy	Rogaland	BA	B2772	Pair of tweezers	Barrow			Male	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Storesund 2	Storesund 142	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B5765a-c	Brooch, knife, sword	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	NNW-SSE	Male	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Storesund 3	Storesund 142	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA	S6247	Bone	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	E-W	Indeterminable	Unclear location, removed	Kristen Lindøe 1934; Nordenborg Myhre 1998a, 2004
Guttormshaugen	Uvik 85	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B546, B548? B547?	Double stud, leaf gold, burnt bone	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mound no. II	Uvik 85	Karmøy	Rogaland	EBA III	B1616, B1893	Leaf gold, twisted arm ring of gold	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	N-S	Male	Bendixens map no. II	Bendixen 1877; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nedrebø 1	Nedrebø 4	Bokn	Rogaland	BA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nedrebø 2	Nedrebø 4	Bokn	Rogaland	BA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Sedberg 1	Sedberg 37/2	Strand	Rogaland	EBA	S6524	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable	Possibly from a destroyed barrow (Fett & Fett 1941)	Fett & Fett 1941; Syvertsen 2003; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tau 1	Tau 16	Strand	Rogaland	LN/EBA	S3253	Flint dagger	Cairn	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Unclear location	Helliesen & Brøgger 1910; Gressing 1920; Østmo 2011
Askje 1	Askje 46	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable	Mosterøy	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 1	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 2	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 3	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 4	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 5	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 6	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Bru 7	Bru 44	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
"Øygarden"	Haugvallstad 52	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA II	S4975a-e	Spearhead, burnt bone, flint, flint, charcoal	Barrow			Male		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Hodnafjell	Hodnafjell 50	Rennesøy	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable	Mosterøy	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Megershaug	Randaberg 51	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Harestad 1	Harestad 49	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Harestad 2	Harestad 49	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Odderøysa	Harestad 49	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Rauhaug	Indre Bø 54	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Scorerøysa	Indre Bø 54	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Sande 1	Sande 53	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Krosshaug	Viste 59/29	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA	S3737a-c	Ceramics, bone, shell	Barrow	"Hybrid"	ENE-WSW	Indeterminable	Removed	Helliesen 1900; Gjessing 1914; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Børudla	Ytre Bø 55	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Lynshaug	Ytre Bø 55	Randaberg	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Husabø 1	Husabø 6	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Madla 1	Madla 38	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA II	B4152	Blade of a bronze sword	Barrow			Male	Removed	Møllerup 1963; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Madla 2	Madla 38	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA	S2357	Arm ring in bronze	Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Engedal 2010
Madla 3	Madla 38	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mjøghaug	Nordre Sunde 41	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nordre Sunde 1	Nordre Sunde 41	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA II	S400	Dagger	Barrow	Dry stone technique	W-E	Indeterminable	Removed	Møllerup 1963; Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Engedal 2010
Nordre Sunde 2	Nordre Sunde 41	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Århaug	Nordre Sunde 41	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Heistsandsrudlo	Søre Sunde 40	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Lille Østensvarden	Søre Sunde 40	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Mimmarudlo	Søre Sunde 40	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Østensvarden	Søre Sunde 40	Stavanger	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Untitled		Sola	Rogaland	EBA	B3619	Flint	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Kjellehaug	Byberg 25/23	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Svarthaug	Byberg 25/23	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Lynghaug	Dysjåland 27/5	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Vålhaug	Dysjåland 27/14	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Harvaland	Harvaland 26	Sola	Rogaland	BA	S6472	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Hedland 1	Hedland 24/3	Sola	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Hedland 2	Hedland 24/3	Sola	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tormodsvarden	Hedland 24/5	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Hellestø 1	Hellestø 23	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Trollrudia	Hellestø 23	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Håland 1	Håland 21/1.2	Sola	Rogaland	EBA	B449, B908, B909	Brooch, razor, button	Barrow			Male		Engedal 2010
Sothaug	Jåsund 1	Sola	Rogaland	EBA III	C 1045a/ S7425a, C 1045b/ S7425b, C 1045c	Sword, piece of bronze button, pieces of cloth	Barrow	Dry stone technique	NNW-SSE	Male		Nicolaysen 1875; Myhre 1980; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Myklebust 1	Myklebust 3	Sola	Rogaland	EBA	S269, S270, S271	Ornamented grave slab, stone with cup marks, Stone with cup marks	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Removed	Buch 1878; Helliesen 1901; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Rege 1	Rege 17/57	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow	Dry stone technique		Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Rege 2	Rege 17/57	Sola	Rogaland	EBA	B4054, S6502	Ceramics, ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Sødhaug	Rege 17/57	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow	Dry stone technique		Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Einarshaug	Rege 17	Sola	Rogaland	EBA	S8726a-d	Ceramics, ceramics, burnt bone, flint	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Regehaugen	Rege 17/2	Sola	Rogaland	EBA II	S1263, S1264, S1265, S1266, S1267, S1268, S1269a-c	Neck collar, belt plate, tutulus, arm ring, brooch, dagger blade, spiral tube, bronze tube, bone	Barrow	Dry stone technique	Two cists: E-W	Cist 1: Female		Lorange 1882; Møllerop 1963b; Myhre 1980; Larsen 1996
Score Melhaug	Sola 14	Sola	Rogaland	EBA III	S2950	Razor	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Male	LBA finds B3333a-c	Lorange 1879; Nordenborg Myhre 2004

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Lille Melhaug	Sola 14/25	Sola	Rogaland	EBA	B 1009, S2882	Sword, razor	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Male	Removed	Nicolaysen 1875; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 1	Tjelta 28/14	Sola	Rogaland	EBA II	S1262	Arm ring in bronze	Barrow	Dry stone technique	E-W	Indeterminable	Removed	Buch 1881; Møllerop 1963; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 2	Tjelta 28/16	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 3	Tjelta 28/16	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 4	Tjelta 28/18	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 5	Tjelta 28/18	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjelta 6	Tjelta 28/68	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Kongshaug	Tjora 10	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Orshaug	Tjora 10	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Svarthaug	Tjora 10	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Vedesarvden	Tjora 10	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Elhaug	Tjora 10/10	Sola	Rogaland	EBA II / LBA	S1569	Razor	Barrow			Male		Helliesen 1885; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Gårdshaug	Vigdel 22	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Vigdelveden	Vigdel 22/6	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Haugarhaug	Ølberg 20	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Østre Stangeland 1	Østre Stangeland 31	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Østre Stangeland 2	Østre Stangeland 31	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Østre Stangeland 3	Østre Stangeland 31	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Østre Stangeland 4	Østre Stangeland 31	Sola	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Lunde 1	Lunde 47	Sandnes	Rogaland	EBA II	S6870	Brooch	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Engedal 2010
Stokka 1	Stokka 67	Sandnes	Rogaland	EBA I	S10184a-c	Flint dagger; flint sickle, amber	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Mixed cairn, unclear location, removed	Løken 1978; Melheim 2006; Østrmo 2011
Anda 1	Anda 14	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	S3672a-b	Arm ring, arm ring	Barrow	"Hybrid"	E-W	Female	Burnt bone in the central cist	Brøgger 1913

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Anda 2	Anda 14	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II /III	C4927, C4928, C4929, C4930, C4931, C49	Dagger, brooch, knife, brooch, brooch, unknown bronze	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Male	Removed	Møllerop 1963, Larsen 1996
Toftehaugen	Anda 14	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S1457	Sword	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Male	Birch bark reported	Engedal 2010
Molkhaug	Bore 45	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II/III	S6020a-i, S6020k-n	Bone, tutulus, bronze tube, bone, bone, shell (<i>Littorina littorea</i>), ceramics, bone, firestroke stone, belt buckle, stone, ornamented grave slab, ceramics	Barrow	"Hybrid"	Cist 1: WSW-ENE, Cist 2: N-S	Cist 1: Female	Poorly built, large moraine stones, removed	Lund 1934
Stavhaug	Borsheim 43	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA	B5611, S4036	Part of ornamented grave slab, ornamented grave slab	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Copper verdigris and beach pebbles on the floor	
Erga 1	Erga 30	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	S406	Tutulus	Barrow			Female		
Friestad 1	Friestad 24	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	B1010	Sword	Barrow			Male		
Friestad 2	Friestad 24	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Friestad 3	Friestad 24	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Friestad 4	Friestad 24	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Store Grudhaug	Grude 3	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Litle Grudhaug	Grude 3/12	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S3967a-b	Sword, unburnt bone	Cairn			Male		de Lange 1917
Jonsokhaugen	Hodne 42	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	B4716	Dagger	Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Gustafson 1890
Håhaugen	Hodne 42	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA	S3506	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	
Hodne 1	Hodne 42	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	S1022, S4091, S4158	Sword, twisted arm ring of gold, ornamented grave slab	Barrow	Dry stone technique	NNW-SSE	Male	Removed	Buch 1880; de Lange 1919
Kleppe 1	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	B2844	Belt, plate/ shield	Barrow	Dry stone technique	NW-SE	Female	Removed	
Kleppe 2	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Kleppe 3	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Kleppe 4	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Kleppe 5	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Kleppe 6	Kleppe 1	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	SI 638	Bronze knife	Barrow			Male		
Nese 1	Nese 25	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	B3578, B3874a-c	Tutulus, tutulus, plate, flint	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Female	Unclear location	
Nese 2	Nese 25	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location, removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nese 3	Nese 25	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA	S9785	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	
Nord-Braut 1	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S4227a-d	Belt plate, arm ring, arm ring, bone	Barrow	Dry stone technique	E-W	Female		de Lange & Petersen 1925; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 2	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 3	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 4	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 5	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	BA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 6	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 7	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Nord-Braut 8?	Nord-Braut 21	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Orre 1	Orre 40	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Orre 2	Orre 40	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Orre 3	Orre 40	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Orre 4	Orre 40	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Ljoshaug	Orre 40	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S859	Tutulus	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Female		Buch 1879; Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Pollestad 1	Pollestad 31	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S3361b	Tutulus				Indeterminable	Unclear location, possibly from a burial mound	Engedal 2010
Sele 1	Sele 51	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	B2598	Two spiral formed finger rings in gold	Cairn			Female	Pottery sherds and burnt bones were also discovered	

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Steinhaug	Særheim 16	Klepp	Rogaland	LN/EBA	S9633a-aq		Cairn			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Særheim 1	Særheim 16	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	B3322a-c	Beltplate, arming, brooch	Barrow			Female		
Sør-Braut 1	Sør-Braut 20/9	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S1272, S1273, S1274	Neckcollar, arming, tutulus	Barrow	Dry stone technique	N-S	Female		Buch 1881; Møllerop 1963; Larsen 2004; Engedal 2010
Sør-Braut 2	Sør-Braut 20	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Tjøtta 1	Tjøtta 18/5	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S4265a-c	Belt-plate, tutulus, brooch	Barrow			Female	Unclear location, removed	Møllerop 1963; Larsen 1996; Engedal 2010
Tjøtta 2	Tjøtta 18	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA	B4894	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow	Dry stone technique		Indeterminable		
Tu 1	Tu 17	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA III	B2558	Sword shaft	Barrow			Male	Unclear location, removed	
Vasshus 1	Vasshus 48	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	B4098	Tutulus	Barrow			Female	Unclear location	
Lynghaug	Vik 39	Klepp	Rogaland	EBA II	S7020, S7620	Sword	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Male		Møllerop 1963; Larsen 1996; Engedal 2010
Augland 1	Augland 10	Time	Rogaland	EBA	S2405		Barrow			Indeterminable		Helliesen 1901; de Lange 1912
Herikstad 1	Herikstad 11	Time	Rogaland	BA	S4745	Ornamented grave slab	Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Hognestad 1	Hognestad 9	Time	Rogaland	EBA II	S6400a-e, S9784	Dagger, ceramics, charcoal, earth sample, flint, ornamented grave slab	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Removed	Bang-Andersen 1936
Holen 1	Holen 21	Time	Rogaland	EBA II	B5000a-c	Brooch, dagger, piece of ceramics	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Removed	Møllerop 1963; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Engedal 2010
Holen 2	Holen 21	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Holen 3	Holen 21	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Line 1	Line 5	Time	Rogaland	EBA I?	B4911		Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Re 1	Re 3	Time	Rogaland	EBA III	B5002	Dagger blade	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Removed	Gustafson 1893; Larsen 1996; Nordenborg Myhre 2004; Engedal 2010
Re 2	Re 3	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable	Removed	Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Re 3	Re 3	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Re 4	Re 3	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004
Re 5	Re 3	Time	Rogaland	EBA			Barrow			Indeterminable		Nordenborg Myhre 2004


Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Dyrshaug	Bø 26	Hå	Rogaland	EBA	B5003a-e	Blade/razor, bronze plate, ceramics, burnt ceramics	Barrow	Dry stone technique	NE-SW	Male		Gustafson 1892; Myhre 2013
Bø 1	Bø 26	Hå	Rogaland	EBA II	S3410	Sword/dagger	Cairn			Male		Engedal 2010; Myhre 2013
Kvia 1	Kvia 19	Hå	Rogaland	BA	S9347	Ceramics, burnt bone	Barrow			Indeterminable	Described as a cairn	
Nærland 1	Nærland 7	Hå	Rogaland	EBA II	S2059	Buton and pommel of a dagger	Barrow			Indeterminable	Only finds from LBA, unclear location	
Søyland 1	Søyland 3	Hå	Rogaland	BA	S4452	Ornamented capstone	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	NW-SE	Indeterminable	Most likely from a barrow (Unimus)	
Vigrestad 1	Vigrestad 77	Hå	Rogaland	EBA	B4320a-c, C13457	Neckcollar, beltplate, bow of brooch, pin of brooch	Barrow			Female	Charcoal and fragments of pottery were also discovered	Aakvik 2000; Engedal 2010
Årsland	Årsland 69/2, 11	Hå	Rogaland	EBA	S10043n	Charcoal, ceramics, flint	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Lillehammer 1976
Eigersund 1		Eigersund	Rogaland	EBA III	B4466	Knife	Barrow			Male		
Storhaugen	Myklebust 5/45	Eigersund	Rogaland	EBA	S3412a-c	Bone, organic material, flint	Barrow	Dry stone technique	W-E	Indeterminable	Unclear location	Brøgger 1910
Svarthaug	Dyngvoll 39	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA		Ceramic, flint, burnt bone	Barrow	Dry stone technique	SE-NW	Indeterminable		Lorange 1878; Petersen 1926
Fjellestad 1	Fjellestad 5	Farsund	Vest-Agder	LN/EBA	C38005a-g	Charcoal, flint, quartz, burnt bone, tin awl	Cairn			Indeterminable		Ballin & Jensen 1995; Melheim 2012a-b; Kilhavn 2013
Hananger 1	Hananger 16	Farsund	Vest-Agder	LN/EBA	C22273	Copper hammer	Barrow			Indeterminable		Johansen 1986; Stylegard 2007; Melheim 2012
Hananger 2	Hananger 66	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA II	C25633a-b	Tutulus, organic material	Barrow	Standing stone slabs		Female	Unclear location	Johansen 1986; Hauge 2007
Kjørreifjord 1	Kjørreifjord 13	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA III	C20991a-d	Arming of bronze, knife, bronze fragments, flint	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Johansen 1986; Hauge 2007; Melheim 2012
Klokkhammer 1	Klokkhammer 103	Farsund	Vest-Agder	LN II	B4513	Gold nopperring	Barrow			Male	Unclear location	Johansen 1986; Hauge 2007; Stylegard 2007; Melheim 2012
Kviljo 1	Kviljo 23	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA	B3201a-b	Flint	Cairn	Standing stone slabs		Indeterminable	Unclear location	Lorange 1878; Petersen 1926; Hauge 2007; Melheim 2012

Burial mound	Farmstead	Municipality	County	Period	Museum number	Material	Exterior construction	Interior construction	Cist alignment	Gender	Comments	Literature
Vest-Hassel I	Vest-Hassel 28	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA	B3875a-e	Pottery with burnt bones, ceramics, arrowhead, doublestud, four-sided bronze stiff	Barrow			Indeterminable	Unclear location	Melheim 2006; Hauge 2007
Sverreshaug	Østre Hauge 40	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA	B3209	Bronze plate (LBA I)	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	W-E	Indeterminable	Unclear location	Lorange 1878; Petersen 1926; Hauge 2007
Øvre Meberg I	Øvre Meberg 88	Farsund	Vest-Agder	EBA III	C27790a-c	Sword, ceramic, charcoal	Barrow	Standing stone slabs	N-S	Male	Burnt bone from secondary burial	Mårstønder 1948; Hauge 2007


Appendix II: Recalibrated ¹⁴C-dates


There are very few ¹⁴C-analysis from Bronze Age burial mounds in Southwest Norway. I have therefore chosen to present these in recalibrated dates, as there have been some marked changes of the recalibration curve since many of the original reports. All recalibrated dates have been done in the latest version of OxCal version 4.2 (Bronk Ramsey 2009) and the most up-to-date calibration curve IntCal 13 (Reimer *et al.* 2013).

Period	Burial mound	Sample	Un-calibrated	Re-calibrated	Context
EBA I – II	Garahaugen	See Myhre & Myhre 1970	3330 ± 80 BP	1777 – 1436 BCE	Charcoal from inside the cist
EBA II – III	Garahaugen	T-860	3080 ± 80 BP	1516 – 1111 BCE	Charcoal from below the cist
LN I – II	Fyrstegraven	TUa-168	3145 ± 60 BP	1532 – 1260 BCE	Wood from scabbard
EBA II – III	Kongshaugen	Beta-159023	2870 ± 40 BP	1131 – 923 BCE	Skeletal in central cist
EBA II – III	Kongshaugen	Beta-159027	3180 ± 40 BP	1532 – 1386 BCE	Charcoal at bottom of cist
LN II – EBA I	Kongshaugen	See Nordenborg Myhre 2004: 160	3582 ± 40 BP	2036 – 1870 BCE	Charcoal from cracks below the cairn
LBA VI – PRIA	Steinhang	T-991	2340 ± 70 BP	593 – 346 BCE (66,3%)	Charcoal from pit 1
LBA V – VI	Steinhang	T-992	2460 ± 70 BP	774 – 407 BCE	Charcoal from pit 2
LBA V – VI	Steinhang	T-1201	2470 ± 80 BP	785 – 409 BCE	Charcoal from pit 3
LBA IV – VI	Steinhang	T-1314	2610 ± 80 BP	935 – 485 BCE	Charcoal from pit 4
LBA V – PRIA	Steinhang	T-1315	2380 ± 110 BP	792 – 347 BCE	Charcoal from pit 5
EBA I – II	Stokka	Topographical archive, Stavanger	3180 ± 80 BP	1634 – 1260 BCE	Charcoal inside cist
MNB – LN II	Lundevåg	T-10478	3870 ± 95 BP	2579 – 2112 BCE	Charcoal from debris
EBA II – LBA IV	Årsland	T-2149	2990 ± 100 BP	1442 – 970 BCE	Charcoal from pit 1
EBA I – II	Årsland	T-2150	3270 ± 70 BP	1694 – 1415 BCE	Charcoal from pit 2




Appendix III: Distribution maps





Distribution of graves divided into gender and periods.



Distribution of cist construction divided into periods.