

SOFIE SCHEEN JAHNSEN
MASTER'S THESIS IN ARCHAEOLOGY
SPRING 2015

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORWEGIAN VIKING

An analysis of the national identity discourse in Norwegian Viking Age research



UiO : **Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History**
University of Oslo

Front-page illustration and layout by Martine Scheen Jahnsen

PREFACE

Many people deserve thanks for making this thesis possible to complete. First and foremost, I wish to thank my supervisor Dr Julie Lund for constructive comments and suggestions, for continuous encouragement, and for guiding me in the right directions when I wanted to include a bit too much in my thesis.

Dr Marie Louise Stig Sørensen deserves a big thank you for advice and guidance during my semester of exchange at the University of Cambridge. Valuable comments on earlier drafts of the thesis have been much appreciated. Also, thank you to Dr Dacia Viejo Rose for comments and highly inspiring lectures at Cambridge, and to Leanne Philpot for introducing me to the concept of coding. Thank you to Dr Unn Pedersen at the University of Oslo for encouraging comments and literature suggestions, and to Marte Spangen for suggestions on literature concerning Sami archaeology.

Fellow students at Blindernveien 11 have made the writing of this thesis a highly enjoyable time. I especially want to thank Kaja Hannedatter Sontum for commenting on several drafts of the thesis, as well as acting as proofreader, travel partner, hobby psychologist and great friend these last few years. Thank you to Frida Espolin Norstein for proofreading, and to Anette Sand-Eriksen, Eirik Haug Røe, Isak Roalkvam and Maria Svendsen for constructive comments, discussions and encouragement throughout the year.

Thank you to my family; my sister Martine Scheen Jahnsen for designing the front page, my dad Frode Jahnsen for comments and proofreading, my mom Hanne-May Scheen for valuable discussions, and my sister Johanne Scheen Jahnsen for always providing comic relief. Last, but not least, thank you to Jonathan Siqveland for helpful discussions, encouragement and continuous support.

Oslo, May 2015

Sofie Scheen Jahnsen

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	II
LIST OF TABLES	VII
ABBREVIATIONS.....	VIII

PART 1: BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Aims and research questions	1
Delimitations, methodology and theoretical framework.....	2
Structure of thesis.....	3
2. RESEARCH HISTORY	5
2.1 CULTURAL IDENTITY, ETHNICITY AND NATIONALISM	5
2.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIKING AGE ARCHAEOLOGY IN NORWAY	7
2.3 SUMMARY.....	10
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	11
3.1 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM	11
3.2 THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL IDENTITIES.....	13
4. METHOD	14
4.1 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	14
Power and knowledge.....	15
4.2 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH.....	16
Nodal points and moments	16
Banal nationalism.....	17
Coding	18
Lost in translation.....	18

PART 2: MATERIAL AND ANALYSIS

5. TEXTUAL MATERIAL	21
5.1 CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF TEXTS	21
5.2 PRESENTATION OF SELECTED TEXTS.....	22
A. W. Brøgger (1916) – <i>Borrefundet og Vestfoldkongernes graver</i>	22
A. W. Brøgger, Haakon Shetelig and HJ. Falk (1917) – <i>Osebergfundet</i>	23
Haakon Shetelig (1925) – Vikingetiden, in <i>Norges forhistorie. Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi</i>	24
Sigurd Grieg (1928) – <i>Vikingetiden i Norge</i>	25
Haakon Shetelig (1930) – Det norske folks liv og historie gjennom tidene. Fra oldtiden til omkring 1000 e.Kr.	26
A. W. Brøgger (1937) – Gullalder, in <i>Viking</i>	27
Charlotte Blindheim (1953) – <i>Kaupang: Markedsplatsen i Skiringssal</i>	29
Irmelin Martens (1960) – Vikingetogene i arkeologisk belysning, in <i>Viking</i>	29
Ellen Karine Hougen (1965) – Handel og samferdsel i nordens vikingtid, in <i>Viking</i>	30
Charlotte Blindheim and Roar L. Tollnes (1972) – <i>Kaupang. Vikingenes handelsplass</i>	31
Liv Helga Dommasnes (1979) – Et gravmateriale fra yngre jernalder brukt til å belyse kvinners stilling, in <i>Viking</i>	32
Anne Stine Ingstad (1982) – Osebergdronningen – hvem var hun? In <i>Viking</i>	32

Gerda Stamsø Munch, Olav Sverre Johansen and Ingegerd Larssen (1987) – Borg in Lofoten. A chieftan’s farm in arctic Norway, in <i>Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress</i>	33
Arne Emil Christensen, Anne Stine Ingstad and Bjørn Myhre (1992) – <i>Osebergdronningens grav. Vår arkeologiske nasjonalskatt i nytt lys</i>	34
Bjørn Myhre (1992) – The royal cemetery at Borre, Vestfold: A Norwegian centre in a European periphery, in <i>The Age of Sutton Hoo</i>	35
Heid Gjøstein Resi (2000) – Kaupang, før nye utgravninger, in <i>Collegium Medievale</i>	35
Bergljot Solberg (2003) – Vikingtiden ca. 800-1030 e.Kr, in <i>Jernalderen i Norge: ca. 500 f.Kr. – 1030 e.Kr.</i>	36
Dagfinn Skre (2007) – Towns and markets, kings and central places in South-western Scandinavia c. AD 800-950, in <i>Kaupang in Skiringssal</i>	37
Frans-Arne Stylegar (2009) – Kaupangs omland og urbaniseringstendenser i norsk vikingtid, in <i>Den urbane underskog</i>	38
Helge Sørheim (2011) – Three prominent Norwegian ladies with British connections, in <i>Acta Archaeologica</i>	38
5.3 SUMMARY.....	39
6. NATIONAL IDENTITY DISCOURSE.....	40
6.1 DEICTIC MARKERS.....	40
6.2 NODAL POINTS, MOMENTS AND CHAINS OF EQUIVALENCE	43
6.3 MODE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY DISCOURSE	47
6.4 DEVELOPMENT OVER TIME	49
Intended audience	50
6.5 SUMMARY.....	51
7. VIKINGS AND SAMI IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL TEXTS.....	52
7.1 CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF TEXTS.....	52
7.2 PRESENTATION OF TEXTS	52
Gutorm Gjessing (1928) – Finsk-Ugriske vikingetidssmykker i Norge, in <i>Universitetets Oldsaksamlings årbok</i>	52
Povl Simonsen (1967) – Relations between the Lapps and the Scandinavians in early times – an archaeological survey, in <i>Lapps and Norsemen in olden times</i>	53
Lars F. Stenvik (1980) – Samer og nordmenn. Sett i lys av et uvanlig gravfunn fra Saltenområdet, in <i>Viking</i>	54
Arne Skjølsvold (1980) – Refleksjoner omkring jernaldergravene i sydnorske fjellstrøk, in <i>Viking</i>	54
Audhild Schanche (1989) – Jernalderens bosettingsmønster i et fleretnisk perspektiv, in <i>Framskritt for fortida i nord: I Povl Simonsens fotefar</i>	55
Inger Storli (1991) – De østlige smykkene fra vikingtid og tidlig middelalder, in <i>Viking</i>	56
Jostein Bergstøl and Gaute Reitan (2008) – Samer på Dovrefjell i vikingtiden, in <i>Historisk tidsskrift</i>	57
Hege Skalleberg Gjerde (2010) – Tilfeldig? Neppe. Finsk-ugriske smykker i Sør-Norge, in <i>Viking</i>	57
7.3 ETHNIC IDENTITIES IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL TEXTS	58
Deictic markers	60
Mode of national identification	60
7.4 SUMMARY.....	62

PART 3: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

8. THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORWEGIAN VIKING 65
 Master narratives67
 Sami and Norwegians.....69
 The Norwegian Viking Age.....71
 Constructed identities.....73

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY 77

APPENDIX..... 88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger (1916).....	23
Table 2: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger, Shetelig and Falk (1917)	24
Table 3: Chains of equivalence in Shetelig (1925).....	25
Table 4: Chains of equivalence in Grieg (1928)	26
Table 5: Chains of equivalence in Shetelig (1930).....	27
Table 6: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger (1937).....	28
Table 7: Chains of equivalence in Blindheim (1953).....	29
Table 8: Chains of equivalence in Martens (1960)	30
Table 9: Chains of equivalence in Hougen (1965)	31
Table 10: Chains of equivalence in Blindheim and Tollnes (1972).....	31
Table 11: Chains of equivalence in Dommasnes (1979).....	32
Table 12: Chains of equivalence in Ingstad (1982)	33
Table 13: Chains of equivalence in Munch, Johansen and Larssen (1987).....	33
Table 14: Chains of equivalence in Christensen, Myhre and Ingstad (1992).....	34
Table 15: Chains of equivalence in Myhre (1992)	35
Table 16: Chains of equivalence in Resi (2000).....	36
Table 17: Chains of equivalence in Solberg (2003).....	37
Table 18: Chains of equivalence in Skre (2007)	38
Table 19: Chains of equivalence in Stylegar (2009)	38
Table 20: Chains of equivalence in Sørheim (2011)	39
Table 21: Texts distributed after genre.....	40
Table 22: Texts distributed after deictic markers	43
Table 23: Texts distributed after chains of equivalence	46
Table 24: Texts distributed after mode of national identity discourse	49
Table 25: Texts distributed after ethnic identity	59
Table 26: Texts distributed after mode of national identification.....	62

ABBREVIATIONS

AD	-	Anno Domini
CDA	-	Critical discourse analysis
No.	-	Norwegian
Eng.	-	English
UiO	-	University of Oslo
UiB	-	University of Bergen

PART 1: BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to analyse if a connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity can be traced in Norwegian archaeological literature. The relationship between archaeology and national identities has been widely elaborated on in recent years, but often with an emphasis on extremist cases, such as the Nazi's misuse of archaeological research during the Second World War (Härke 2000; Myhre 1994), or the contribution of archaeology to the rise of ethnic nationalism at times of social and political change (Champion and Díaz-Andreu 1996; Dennell 1996; Graves-Brown, et al. 1996; Härke 1998; Kohl and Fawcett 1996). In contrast to earlier research, the purpose of this thesis is not to examine extremist cases and grand narratives, but the everyday and almost invisible markers of the *national*. By that, I mean statements and formulations which function as constant reminders of a nation, and a national identity. I intend to use this term in favour of the term *nationalism*. Nationalism is often regarded as a more loaded term, which alludes to a more intentional manifestation of a national identity and a nation's territorial rights (Pettersson 2005:8). My intention is to examine the ordinary words and statements that seem so natural to us that we hardly notice them. These everyday formulations can, however, be effective components in the creation and maintenance of national identities. On this background, the aim is to analyse if Norwegian archaeological texts assign the Vikings and elements from the Viking Age a Norwegian identity.

Aims and research questions

In Norway, the development of archaeology as a specialised research field coincided with the dissolution of the union with Sweden in 1905. This, together with the findings of the large Viking ships such as Gokstad and Oseberg at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, entailed that archaeology, and Viking Age archaeology in particular, became an important aspect in the strengthening of national awareness and national identity. For archaeologists, it became important to emphasise that the Norwegian culture and history were unique, and often markedly distinctive from Danish and Swedish (Opedal 1999:9; Schanche and Olsen 1985:87). During the pre-war years, statements that proclaimed archaeology as an important means in the strengthening of national culture were not uncommon (i.e. Brøgger 1916:66; Shetelig 1910:473). According to Audhild Schanche and Bjørnar Olsen (1985:88), the nationalistic environment that Norwegian archaeology developed within, gave the field an ideological framework that has never really changed; that Norwegian archaeological research

contributed and still contributes to the creation of a Norwegian national identity. The purpose is here to examine whether such an ideological framework can be found in the archaeological literature examining the Viking Age. The main research question of this thesis is thus:

*Can a national identity discourse be found within Norwegian
archaeological research on the Viking Age?*

Two sub-questions will also be examined:

- *What characterises the discourse?*
- *How has the discourse changed over time?*

The aim of this thesis is to shed light on how embedded certain terms and statements have become in the archaeological discourse, and in what way the prehistory, as a consequence, is perceived and conveyed. In this way, this thesis can contribute in creating a greater awareness for how the Viking Age is conveyed, as well as a more critical stance towards the terminology used in the discourse.

Delimitations, methodology and theoretical framework

The research questions presented above will be discussed through an analysis of texts written by Norwegian archaeologists between the beginning of the 20th century and the present day. This timeframe has been chosen as it follows the development of the Norwegian archaeological field from a new to an established research field; from a time when the national value of archaeological research was highly encouraged, to a time when the explicit national aspects seem to be of less importance. Thus, a selection of texts from 1916 to 2011 has been chosen, and will be analysed through the method of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a large field comprising a number of methodological approaches. I have limited my approach to those methods and tools that will help identify the trivial and everyday markers of the national. These tools are; *moments, nodal points, banal nationalism* and *coding*, all of which will be presented in chapter 4 (*Method*). These are all textual tools developed independent of each other, but are in this thesis combined in order to achieve a more detailed analysis of how specific words and formulations contribute in the creation and reproduction of a national identity discourse.

During the process of getting an overview over the Viking Age material it became evident to me that some formulations and statements disappear from the discourse after a

period of time, while others continue to be reproduced. This created an interest in how knowledge is conveyed through language. Parts of the analysis will therefore use Michel Foucault (1972, 1982) and Norman Fairclough's (1989, 1992, 1995) concepts of *power* and *knowledge* as a basis for further discussions. Hence, one aim of this thesis will be to illustrate how some statements get accepted as meaningful and true in a given historical period. An important premise for the analysis and discussion is the recognition that our perceptions of reality is socially constructed, and that the reality only receives meaning through discourse (Kjørup 2001). Thus, *social constructivism* will be applied as a theoretical framework. On this basis I will argue that our identities, as well as our perception of the nation, are socially constructed. I am not debating the fact that there existed people during the period we call the Viking Age, or that some of these people lived in what today constitutes the Kingdom of Norway. However, how we choose to interpret the material remains of the past, and what identity we choose to label prehistoric people with, is dependent on the archaeologist, and can therefore be viewed as social constructions. Both the concepts of power/knowledge, and the theoretical framework of social constructivism will be recurring themes throughout the thesis, as they provide certain guidelines for the methodological approach, as well as the subsequent analysis and discussions.

In order to create a nuanced picture of the discourse, a slightly less extensive analysis will be made of texts concerned with Sami archaeology. This will be done in order to examine whether similar or different statements occur in these texts than in the texts presented above. In this way, an extra element will be added to the final discussion. The material presented in this section consist of texts written between 1928 and 2010, and will in this way largely correspond to the timeframe of the above-mentioned texts.

Structure of thesis

The thesis will consist of three main parts. This is done mainly as a structural tool, and should not be seen as a clear divide between the different chapters. Part 1 presents the background and framework, and encapsulates this introduction as well as research history (chapter 2), where central components within the national identity discourse are presented, as well as an overview of the development of Viking Age archaeology in Norway. The theoretical framework (chapter 3) and method (chapter 4) will also be presented in part 1. Their relation to the overall theme of the thesis will be elaborated, and the chapters will provide the framework for the analysis and following discussions. In part 2 the textual material is presented, including the criteria for the selection of texts (chapter 5). Following the

presentation of texts, a detailed analysis is given where a possible connection between the texts and a national identity discourse is discussed (chapter 6). The last chapter in part 2 consists of a presentation of the texts that deal with Sami archaeology, as well as an analysis of these (chapter 7). The criteria for the selection of these texts will also be accounted for here. Part 3 consists of a discussion where the results from the analysis are considered (chapter 8). The research questions presented earlier in the introduction are attempted answered here. The results from the analysis are discussed in relation to the texts concerning the Sami material, as well as in wider theoretical and social contexts. Final thoughts and the way forward are summarised in chapter 9; concluding remarks.

2. RESEARCH HISTORY

This chapter consists of two parts. The first will examine central components of the national identity discourse, more specifically the concepts of cultural identity and ethnicity, and how these have developed as integrated terms in the archaeological national discourse. Even though I have previously stated that the term *national* will be used in favour of the term *nationalism*, the development of the relationship between nationalism and archaeology is included in this chapter as it serves as an important component in the development of archaeology as a field in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Europe. The second part will elaborate on the development of Viking Age archaeology in Norway, and serve as a historical backdrop for the subsequent analysis and discussion.

2.1 CULTURAL IDENTITY, ETHNICITY AND NATIONALISM

The term *culture* first occurred in archaeological literature during the end of the 19th century together with an increasing emphasis on ethnicity (Díaz-Andreu 1996:54). Culture-historical archaeology provided the dominant framework for archaeological analysis in Europe at the time, and one of the main assumptions underlying the culture-historical approach was that bounded uniform cultural entities correlated with particular peoples, ethnic groups, tribes and/or races. Gordon Childe was the first to explicitly define the concept of culture in the archaeological literature (Díaz-Andreu 1996:48). He defined a culture as a complex where certain type of traits, such as ornaments, burial rites and houses, would constantly recur together (Childe 1929:v-vi).

Gustav Kossina, another pioneer in culture-historical archaeology, based his definition partly on the work of Childe when he asserted that “in all periods, sharply delineated archaeological culture areas coincide with clearly recognisable peoples or tribes” (Jones 1996:63). Inspired by a fanatical patriotism, Kossina declared archaeology to be the most national of sciences and the ancient Germans to be the noblest subject for archaeological research (Kossina 1911, 1926; Trigger 2006:236). However, since the Nazi party drew heavily on Kossina’s research during the Second World War to legitimize their claim for territory, archaeologists after the war tended to stay away from his theories. Childe’s definition of culture, rather than Kossina’s, became the definition known and referred to within archaeological research.

The culture-historical approach, with its emphasis on the prehistory of specific peoples, provided a model for national archaeology, and was used to bolster the pride of

nations and ethnic groups (Jones 1996:64-65; Trigger 2006:249). Archaeology provide histories and origin stories rooted in the *material* remains of the past, and have in conjunction with history and anthropology played a vital role in providing specific symbols and evidences used to create exclusive and homogeneous conceptions of identity rooted in traditions, conceptions of race, ethnicity, and language (Díaz-Andreu 1996:54; Shanks 2001:290).

In Europe, the cruder and more obvious relationship between archaeological interpretation and nationalism gradually diminished after the Second World War, and emphasis was put on the fluid, dynamic and contested nature of ethnic and national identities (Jones 1996:66-67; Trigger 2006:256). Especially the role that archaeology played in the justification of Nazi atrocities and the experience of the Second World War in general had a profound effect on the archaeological discipline, often leading to a reaction against theory in general and nationalistic archaeology in particular (Jones and Graves-Brown 1996:18). Ethnicity as an explanatory model was therefore regarded as politically incorrect. Also, during the heyday of processualist archaeology in the 1960s and 70s, questions of ethnicity were regarded as uninteresting and irrelevant, as detracting from the “real” questions such as social structures, economic systems, and environmental conditions (Hamerow 1994:166; Härke 1998:24). The research on ethnicity in the 1970s and 80s were dominated by an instrumentalist approach, where economic and political factors are seen as important variables significantly related to ethnicity. This approach illustrated the dynamic nature of ethnicity, not only historically, but also in different social contexts according to the interests and positions of the actors (Barth 1969; Cohen 1974; Jones 1996:67). By the early 1980s, the understanding of culture had changed, together with the realisation that the notions of ethnicity, culture and nations are social constructions (e.g. Anderson 1983; Barth 1969; Graves-Brown, et al. 1996; Jones 1996, 1997; Shennan 1989).

Ethnicity re-emerged in archaeological research together with symbolism (e.g. Hodder 1982), but was not fully back on the intellectual agenda until the 1990s, mainly due to the political climate in the wake of the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia (Härke 1998:24). Also, with the introduction of post-processual archaeology, with its emphasis on how the symbolic character of material culture can express ethnic identity, it was again accepted to reflect upon topics such as identity and ethnicity (Olsen 1997:65).

In recent years, questions of identity in relation to a more multicultural and globalized world have been discussed. Recent work focus on the role of the nations, the national heritage and the national museums in societies which are becoming more and more heterogeneous, and whose members have a variety of identities. Increased awareness has

been placed on the consequences of a national heritage that no longer unites, but increasingly distinguishes different population groups within one and the same state (Ashworth, et al. 2007; Biehl and Prescott 2013; Holtorf 2009; Prescott 2013).

These changing perceptions of ethnicity, identity and the nation have to a varying degree affected Norwegian archaeological practice. To what extent these notions have become integrated in Norwegian Viking Age studies will be a recurring theme throughout this thesis, and can partly be exemplified through an overview of Viking Age archaeology in Norway.

2.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIKING AGE ARCHAEOLOGY IN NORWAY

The establishment of Viking Age archaeology in Norway is closely connected to social movements in advance of, and during, the emergence of Norway as an independent nation-state at the end of the 19th century. While Norway was still in an enforced union with Sweden, a growing number of urban, educated Norwegians, inspired by movements elsewhere in Europe, felt a growing national self-awareness and a wish for national sovereignty. Norwegian rural life, with popular traditions that were viewed as particularly Norwegian, was presented as an expression of the Norwegian people and its 'spirit'. Thus a national symbolism, unique in contrast to the Swedish and Danish, gradually developed. A national historiography was founded during the same period, emphasising the Norwegian nation's continuity back to the Viking Age, while a national literature, national art, national music and a new national language based on rural dialects, thereby markedly distinctive from Danish, were created. The intention was to give the impression that Norway was a nation with a unique history and culture, that deserved political independence (Eriksen 2001:276).

Consequently, the archaeological research at the end of the 19th century was strongly characterised by a motivation to serve the nation. Together with history, archaeology was to participate in the creation of a Norwegian identity, an awareness of a shared, collective past (Olsen 1997:219). The findings of several Viking ship graves at the end of the 1880s became highly welcoming contributions to the manifestation of a cultural identity in Norway following the dissolution of the union with Sweden in 1905. Especially the excavation of the Oseberg ship in 1904 became, in the public opinion, a symbol for the national liberation (Baudou 2004:222; Schanche and Olsen 1985:87). For archaeologists such as A.W. Brøgger and Haakon Shetelig, the task was to restore the national heritage, but at the same time show that Norway was part of a common European culture. In *Norges Forhistorie* (1925a:3), Shetelig compares the Bronze Age in Denmark and the farmsteads in Norway to

the palace at Mycenae and imperial Rome. The aim was to present Norway as a cultural nation on an equal footing with other European nations (Schanche and Olsen 1985:88).

During the interwar years, examinations of grave mounds were a prioritized research field within the district of the University's collection of Norwegian antiquities (No. *Oldsaksamlingen*). Especially the great mounds that could be linked to historically known royal families were given a lot of attention. Brøgger's (1916) extensive studies on the grave field at Borre is an example of this, and his interpretation of the grave field's connection to the Yngling dynasty is still frequently referred to. His studies were also directly responsible for turning the grave field into a national park in 1932 (Myhre 1994:89-91). In his speech at the opening of the park, Brøgger asserted that:

“The thought of making the graves of the kings of Borre to a national sanctuary builds therefore on old roots from Norwegian folklore, independent of heathendom and Christendom [...] Through the monuments and that which they hide, we listen to the voice of the entire working people, the farming community that during thousands of years development created the conditions for the Norwegian kingdom” (reprinted in Myhre 1994:91, my translation).

This quote also illustrates the emphasis put on the farmer and the farming culture by Norwegian archaeologists at the time. The farming community was regarded as representing the national culture, a cultural archetype. The Viking and the farmer were seen as complimentary aspects of the Norwegian character. Where the Viking symbolised freedom and adventure, the farmer symbolised stability, continuity and tradition (Opedal 1999:10, 17). Brøgger focused on cultural traits that demonstrated a continuity of the farming culture in Norway from prehistory up until modern times. Certain features of the Norwegian farm could, according to Brøgger, be traced all the way back to the Neolithic period. However, the Viking Age and High Middle Ages were perceived as the heydays where the farming culture received its Norwegian distinctiveness. The farmer was also highlighted as an important contributor to the eventual creation of the Norwegian nation state (Brøgger 1925, 1933; Opedal 1999:39, 45).

During the 1930s the national identity discourse became more extreme, partly due to political and social currents in Europe. The 1920s and 30s were characterized by crisis in Western economy, and by a political polarisation between a right wing bourgeoisie and a revolutionary labour movement. In such a situation, archaeology may function as a suitable means to encourage inner unity and a gathering around national values (Schanche and Olsen 1985:89). Especially the Viking Age, with its expansions abroad, was portrayed as Norway's

'Golden Age'. However, both Brøgger and Shetelig noted the problematic relationship between nationalism and archaeology during these years. In the preface of the first publication of the journal *Viking* (1937), Brøgger explains how prehistory “often speaks dramatically to people’s feelings and passions”, and can contribute to the awakening of a national identity. This, he asserts, creates a need for caution. He points out how archaeological material and results are a part of a people’s and a nation’s spiritual capital, but that “it should not be misused in nationalistic propaganda” (Brøgger 1937b:6, my translations). Shetelig (1935) also urged for caution a couple of years earlier. Even though he is not as explicit as Brøgger, he makes a clear statement arguing against Kossina’s theories by claiming that “contemporary Germanic language areas does not respond to a term that could be called a Germanic race” (1935:202, my translation). He describes Kossina’s theories as being arbitrary and uncritical, and concludes by emphasizing that one should not talk about a unique Germanic race, “but rather a Germanic language whose origin could be totally independent of the physical lineage of the Germanic peoples” (Shetelig 1935:205, 211, my translation).

Before and during the Second World War, the archaeological material, and especially material from the Viking Age, was used actively by the Norwegian nationalist party *Nasjonal Samling* (Eng. *National Gathering*). The party exhibited an extensive fondness for national symbols, and a romanticising of Norwegian history and prehistory. The Viking Age and the High Middle Ages were viewed as Norway’s golden age, and symbols and places related to historical events from these periods were actively used. Especially Brøgger’s extensive studies on the grave field at Borre was easily transferred into a political context, and applied in different forms of Nazi propaganda (Myhre 1994:97, 111).

During the first decade after the war academic research in Norway shifted its focus from Central Europe and Germany to England and the United States. This reorientation affected archaeological research, as the new focus brought in impulses from Anglo-American dominated social sciences, and changed the vocabulary and research questions in Norwegian archaeology. Nation, culture history, roots and identity were definitely not principal terms in the new archaeological discourse that slowly came to dominate Scandinavian archaeology (Solli 1996a:85). Bjørn Myhre (1991:163) views this period as an optimistic and creative period for archaeology in Scandinavia, where the new impulses led to increased attention to settlement patterns and ecological and natural factors. Large-scale excavations involving archaeologists from all the Nordic countries led to the development of new excavation techniques and incorporation of methods such as pollen analysis, osteology and carbon

dating. Despite this, however, many publications on the Viking Age from the 1940s and 50s focus on the archaeological artefacts, and studies of styles and typological context were given priority. Even though the excavations were mentioned, it was largely the artefacts that were in focus (Kleppe 1983:1; Myhre 1994:143). Examples are Brøgger and Shetelig's *Vikingeskipene. Deres forgjengere og etterfølgere* (1950) and Charlotte Blindheim's *Kaupang: Markedsplassen i Skiringssal* (1953). Nevertheless, Blindheim's excavations at Kaupang (Blindheim 1953, 1969; Blindheim, et al. 1981; Blindheim and Tollnes 1972) attracted much attention after the war. Research at Skiringssal and Kaupang had in fact begun more than 200 years earlier, starting with Gerhard Schøning in 1771, but it was not until Blindheim's excavations between 1950 and 1974 that the research had a real breakthrough (Skre 2007a:13). The research by Blindheim contributed to an extended interest in settlement patterns (Skre 2007a:42), and from the 1970s onwards, studies of early urbanisation in Scandinavia underwent a surge (e.g. Andersson 1979; Christophersen 1991; Cinthio 1975; Helle 1980; Helle and Nedkvitne 1977). Viking Age studies in general were a prioritised field during this period. According to Bruce Trigger (2006:257), in the 1970s, 20 to 25 per cent of all archaeological publications in Scandinavia were devoted to this era.

During the 1990s and early 2000s general scholarship concerning the Viking Age flourished. Excavations and research results from urban centres all over Scandinavia, such as Kaupang, Birka, Ribe and Hedeby, were being published, as well as research on rural central places and social structures during the Viking Age (Skre 2007a:15). The Viking Age is still today a prioritized research field within Norwegian archaeology. This can be exemplified through priority areas and projects at the Museum of Cultural History in Oslo such as the specialised research group devoted to research on the Viking Age (ViS), as well as large archaeological projects, such as *Gokstad Revitalised* and *Saving Oseberg*.

2.3 SUMMARY

This chapter has presented an overview of certain components embedded in the national identity discourse, i.e. cultural identity, ethnicity and nationalism, and how these have been central in the development of archaeology as a field. Further, the development of Viking Age archaeology in Norway has been presented, partly in relation to the above-mentioned themes. How archaeologists perceive concepts such as identity, culture and ethnicity, is in this thesis viewed in terms of the theoretical framework of social constructivism. It is the purpose of the following chapter to introduce this framework, and thus present an important parameter for the subsequent analysis and discussions.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As stated in the introduction, an important premise for the analysis and discussion in this thesis is the recognition that our perceptions of reality is socially constructed, and that the reality only receives meaning through discourse. This chapter will elaborate on the theoretical framework of *social constructivism* and the impact this framework has on the perception of national identities.

3.1 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM

Social constructivism is a generic term used for a number of recent theories regarding culture and society. Ian Hacking (1999:6-7) explains social constructivism as being critical of the status quo. A situation, or practice, need not to have existed, or need not be at all as it is. A situation is not inevitable; it was brought into existence or shaped by social events, forces, history, all of which could well have been different. Often, but not always, social constructivists go further and claim that a situation, or practice, is quite bad as it is, and that we would be better off without it, or at least if it was radically transformed. Social constructivism is in some contexts referred to as *social constructionism*, and there seems to be some confusion regarding the difference between the two terms. One of the main representatives of social constructionism is Vivian Burr (1995:2-5) who presents four premises which all social constructionist approaches have in common:

- 1) *A critical stance toward “taken-for-granted” knowledge.*
- 2) *Historical and cultural specificity.* All ways of understanding are historically and culturally relative. They are specific to particular cultures and periods of history, and are products of that culture and history.
- 3) *Knowledge is sustained by social processes.* Our current accepted ways of understanding the world is a product not of objective observation of the world, but of the social processes and interactions in which people are constantly engaged with each other.
- 4) *Knowledge and social action go together.* Descriptions or constructions of the world sustain some patterns of social action and exclude others.

This means that the reality is only available to us through our categories – and our knowledge and worldviews are not mirrored images of the reality “out there”, but a product of our ways of categorising the world. This does not mean that the reality does not exist, but that the ways in which we understand and represent the world are historically and culturally specific and

contingent: our worldviews and identities could be different, and they can change over time (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:13-14).

Burr argues that our knowledge and worldviews are shaped through language, and that language is structured into a number of *discourses*. The meaning of any word depends upon the context of the discourse in which it is used. A discourse refers to a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events. Our identities are not fixed and pre-given, but formed through the representations available to us in discourse (Burr 1995:46-48, 62).

Søren Kjørup (2001) is one of the critics of a universal constructionism and has criticized Burr who he argues belongs to the most radical version of social constructionism. He is sceptical to Burr's claim that there is no such thing as objective truth. According to Burr, there exist only numerous versions of events, and because there can be no truth, all these events must theoretically be accorded equal status and value (Burr 1995:81). Kjørup (2001:20-21) argues that even if there exist several ways of constructing the world and numerous versions of events, we are not committed to award them all equal value. We cannot avoid the obligation to differ between true and false constructions, and to try to give as correct descriptions as possible of the world. Kjørup (2008:164) presents two forms of social constructionism; one *epistemological*, where it is our *perception* of reality which is regarded as constructed, and one *ontological*, where it is, more or less, *reality itself* which is regarded as constructed. Kjørup (2001:7) criticize Burr for belonging to an ontological form of social constructionism where *everything* is constructed. Instead he proposes an epistemological social *constructivism*, which can be understood as a way of thinking where the experienced and acknowledged reality in varying degrees is seen as being shaped by the way we think and talk about it, through our ways of describing, imagining and explaining it, thus through our language, concepts and other sign systems, and through social conventions. I largely agree with Kjørup's social constructivism, and will therefore apply this term throughout the thesis.

Using social constructivism as my theoretical framework has implications for my methodological approach. However, before the methods used in the analysis are presented, the relationship between social constructivism and national identities will be elaborated. This relationship is of central importance for the analysis and discussions, and therefore deserves some further presentation.

3.2 THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL IDENTITIES

Viewing national identities as a social construction is well established both within and outside archaeological theory (e.g. Billig 1995; Díaz-Andreu 1996; Eriksen 1993; Jones 1996; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996; Neumann 2001; Shanks 2001; Svanberg 2003). Identities are, in these texts, often presented as historically and culturally dependent. They can, and have, changed over time.

In the same manner, the concept of the nation as a social construction is much elaborated on, both in archaeological literature and elsewhere (Anderson 1983; Díaz-Andreu 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Hobsbawm 1992). According to these, the idea of the 'nation' with a common people that shares the same identity and culture was created during the 18th and 19th centuries, as a consequence following the French Revolution and German Romanticism. Modern nations are, in this sense, created or invented and have no real historical continuity (Díaz-Andreu 1996:53; Svanberg 2003:30). They can, according to Benedict Anderson (1983), be defined as *imagined communities*.

The question of whether national identities were created through the formation of nation-states, or whether it is possible to trace the genealogy of national identities back to times before the rise of the nation-state has been subject to some debate (Billig 1995:25). Those who take the former view, amongst them Ernest Gellner (1983, 1997), claim that national identities were invented as a consequence through the formation of nation-states. During the heyday of nation making in the 18th and 19th centuries many new traditions and artefacts were created and presented as if age-old. Through these traditions, national identities were being created as if they were 'natural' features of human existence (Billig 1995:25-26). On the other hand, some argue that not all identities have been entirely invented in the eighteenth century; some identities must have existed previously. Anthony D. Smith (1989) argues that the origins of the nation can be traced back to pre-modern ethnic communities. According to Smith, these 'ethnies', with their myths of common descent, culture and associations with a homeland, are found in most ages.

I contend that the identities assigned to the Vikings, whatever identity that might be, is a social construction. Representations of prehistory are always dependent on the exclusion of other possible representations. In this way, they are dependent on the significance given to them through discourse. The following chapter will elaborate on how meaning is established through language, and present the methodological approaches applied in the analysis.

4. METHOD

Both analysis and subsequent discussions in this thesis are largely dependent on the notion that meaning is established through discourse. This chapter will present discourse analysis as it is applied in the thesis, together with different elements, tools and concepts used in the analysis. A combination of different analytical concepts and tools has been applied in order to create a more detailed analysis. These consist of *nodal points*, *moments*, *banal nationalism*, and *coding*, all of which will be presented in the following.

4.1 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

A discourse is a certain way of talking about and understanding the world (or a section of it). Our way of talking does not reflect our surroundings, our identities and social relations neutrally, but plays an active role in creating and changing them (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:9). A discourse analyst examines how and why things appear as they do, and is concerned with the study of how meaning is created through language (Neumann 2001:14, 18). The focus on language draws on structuralist and post-structuralist philosophy, which claims that our access to reality is through language. This does not mean that the reality does not exist, but that it only receives meaning through discourse (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:17). Post-structuralism developed as a reaction to structuralism's conception of language as an ordered and closed system. Post-structuralism denies the possibility that a single sign can be present in and of itself, referring only to itself. It highlights the notion of a text as a product woven of quotation and traces from other texts. It also emphasises 'the death of the author' (Barthes 1977), which means that a reader of a text will, often in different historical and cultural settings, bring different meanings to the text, meanings often not intended by the author (Olsen 2006:86-88). Not all discourse analytical approaches are very explicit in their use of post-structuralism, but most make use of the main points; language is not a reflection of an already existing reality, language is structured in patterns or discourses – there is not only one system of meaning, and meaning will change from discourse to discourse (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:21). A discourse analyst study what has already been said or written, and the patterns that can be traced in different statements. The aim is to study how a given statement activates a series of social practices, and how the statement in turn confirms or denies these practices. A discourse analyst is interested in how some statements 'naturally' get accepted as true, while others do not (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:31-32; Neumann 2001:83).

Power and knowledge

Several aspects of the analysis and discussion will be based on the relationship between *power* and *knowledge*. This is here represented by Michel Foucault's theory of *power/knowledge* (1972, 1982), and Norman Fairclough's *critical discourse analysis* (1989). In his book *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault's (1972:16) aim is to formulate the tools that different studies have used or forged for themselves in the course of their work. He seeks to describe the organisation of the field of statements where they appear and circulate, how statements are dependent on each other, and which groups of statements that may be combined (1972:56-57). His analysis is based on what he calls the archive; the existence of a set of practices which enables the creation and maintenance of a set of statements (Neumann 2001:13). The archive is "the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events" (Foucault 1972:129). Foucault follows the general social constructivist premise that knowledge is not just a reflection of reality. The truth is a discursive construction, and different regimes of knowledge decide what is viewed as true and what is viewed as false. What he wishes to reveal 'archaeologically' are the rules for what type of statements that get accepted as meaningful and true in a given historical period. He aims to identify how different truths have been created, as well as how they continuously are repeated, continued, shifted, and renewed (Foucault 1999:34; Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:21). By choosing texts that span from a period of nearly a hundred years, one aim of this thesis is to trace some of these 'truths', and examine how they have changed over time.

Foucault distinguishes between two categories of formulations: those that are regarded as unique and may serve as model for others, and those everyday formulations that are not responsible for themselves, and which derive, sometimes word for word, from what has already been said (Foucault 1972:141). This is connected to Foucault's concept of *power*, which encapsulates the question of who that has the power to utter certain statements. Who is speaking, and who is qualified to do so (1972:50)? Foucault (1982:791) asserts that "a society without power relations can only be an abstraction". Because of this it is important to analyse the power relations in a given society, their historical formation, the source of their strength or fragility, and the conditions which are necessary to transform some or to abolish others (1982:791).

Also in Norman Fairclough's *critical discourse analysis* (CDA) (Fairclough 1989), the relationship between power relations and social contexts is of central importance. CDA poses theories and methods to theoretically problematize and empirically study the relations between discursive practice and social and cultural development in different social contexts

(Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:72). Central to Fairclough's approach is the notion that discourse has effects upon social structures, as it reproduces and change knowledge, identities and social relations, including power relations. Discourse is at the same time determined by social structures, and so contributes to social continuity and social change (Fairclough 1989:17). What Fairclough wishes to detect is who has access to which discourses, and who has the power to impose and enforce constraints on access (Fairclough 1989:62). I will mainly draw on Fairclough's concept of *intertextuality* (Fairclough 1992, 1995) – how an individual text draws upon *orders of discourse*, that is, elements and discourses in other texts. The concept of intertextuality is based on Fairclough's focus on how discourses has the ability to change social structures, as discourses always draws on earlier discursive structures and established meanings. Through an analysis of intertextuality, it is possible to investigate how discourses get reproduced when no new elements are introduced, and how the discourses change through new combinations. (Fairclough 1992:117; 1995:188; Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:15). Thus, by applying an analysis of intertextuality on the material of this thesis, it should be possible to detect how drawing on discourses and elements in earlier texts reproduces discourses in the Viking Age literature.

4.2 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Nodal points and moments

Nodal points and *moments* are introduced by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in their *discourse theory* (2001). Here, discourse is formulated as an establishing of meaning within a certain domain. The concept of nodal points is understood as privileged discourse points that attempt to dominate, but at the same time only receive meaning through, the discourses they are presented in (Laclau and Mouffe 2001:112). In the Norwegian Viking Age literature, *Viking* and *Viking Age* represent nodal points. They dominate the discourse, but they only receive meaning through articulations presented in relation to them.

Moments are presented by Laclau and Mouffe as all the signs in a discourse (2001:105). Their meaning is decided by their relation to each other (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:36, 63). By locating these moments in a concrete material, such as a text, it is possible to examine how discourses, identities and social spaces are organized discursively. This is done by studying how these moments are linked to other signs. 'Liberal democracy' becomes liberal democracy by being linked to other moments such as 'free elections' and 'freedom of speech'. In this way it is possible to characterize the discourse by detecting the chains of

meaning, or the *chains of equivalence*. Individual and collective identities, and maps of social spaces can, in the same way, be detected by following how the chains of equivalence link different meanings. A social space such as 'the West', is typically linked to 'civilisation', 'white people', 'the Christian church' etc. It is also possible to detect how concepts always are established relationally; they are defined by comparison to what they are not (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:63). The nodal point Viking might create different chains of equivalence when compared to other identities than to when it is presented by itself. My intention is to pick out certain nodal points and moments in the texts and trace whether the chains of equivalence created in relation to these contribute to a national identity discourse. In the following, this is further elaborated.

Banal nationalism

I expect that many of the texts in my analysis will be very implicit in their relation to a national identity. However, in order to capture the everyday and almost invisible reproduction of the national identity discourse, I intend to look for what Michael Billig (1995) terms 'banal nationalism'. This method operates with prosaic, routine words rather than grand, memorable phrases. Common words “offer constant, but barely conscious, reminders of the homeland, making 'our' national identity unforgettable” (Billig 1995:93). In his analysis Billig suggests a linguistic tool; that a closer look should be taken at a text's *deictic markers*. Deictic markers are the markers in a statement that refer to a person, time or space, such as 'I', 'here' and 'now'. The meaning of the markers depends on how and when the statement was stated. This means that it is necessary to become linguistically microscopic. The crucial words of banal nationalism are often the smallest (Billig 1995:94; Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:186). An example is how the media constantly reproduce this banal nationalism. In an ordinary TV news report it is possible to find an amount of markers that underpins the national discourse. If nothing else is explicitly specified, the stories relate to the national unit without explanation. After news from abroad, the news presenter will typically say “...and now back home again...”. Home is of course not the news presenter's home, but home to 'us', the presenter's and viewers' common home, i.e. Norway (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:186). The concept of *coding* will be applied to locate these deictic markers. This concept will be presented in the following.

Coding

Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell (1987) introduce ten stages in the analysis of discourse. Some of these are not relevant for the analysis being conducted here, such as interviews and transcription. The stage I will focus on is stage six: coding. The goal of coding is to “squeeze an unwieldy body of discourse into manageable chunks” (Potter and Wetherell 1987:167). The process involves choosing categories to look for in the texts, and then systematically select all occasions in the texts where this category is being used. Coding has a pragmatic rather than analytical goal of collecting together instances for examination, and should therefore be done as *inclusively* as possible. Thus all borderline cases, and instances that seem initially only vaguely related, should be included. This method is quite different from standard techniques of content analysis where coding data into categories and looking at the frequency of occurrence is simply equivalent to the analysis. The goal of coding is not to find results but to prepare for a much more intensive study of the material (Potter and Wetherell 1987:167). A slightly revised version of the method will be applied for my analysis. It will be used in connection with Laclau and Mouffe’s nodal points and moments, and in this way make it easier to trace the chains of equivalence that are created in relation to certain nodal points and moments, such as 'the Vikings', or 'the Viking Age'. All the occasions in the texts where certain deictic markers are used, such as '*our* forefathers' etc. will also be selected. It is important here to emphasise that my method makes for a reading of the texts that has probably not been intended by the authors. My examination of how single words and statements are included in the construction of meaning, must not be seen as an attempt to deprive the texts of their seriousness (jf. Olsen 1997:296).

Lost in translation

The original texts used in the analysis are mostly written in Norwegian. Thus, all quotes originally in Norwegian have been translated. Best efforts have been made to make the translations as accurate as possible. However, in order to keep the original meaning of quotes, sentence structure has sometimes had to be slightly changed. This is mostly the case for the texts written during the pre-war period, as they are written in a style that makes verbatim translation challenging (for original versions of all quotes in Norwegian, see appendix). A number of these quotes are included in the following presentation of the selected texts.

PART 2: MATERIAL AND ANALYSIS

5. TEXTUAL MATERIAL

In this chapter the selected texts used in the analysis are presented. An account for the criteria for the selection of texts will be made, before a short overview of each text is given. The material consists of 20 texts written between 1916 and 2011. All texts are written by Norwegian archaeologists, and address different aspects of the Viking Age. As stated in the presentation of the methodological approach (chapter 4.2), my method consists of tracing different chains of equivalence, and selecting certain deictic markers in the texts. This is done through the method of coding. The selected chains of equivalence and deictic markers are presented at the end of each text (tables 1 – 20). Quotes will be used to highlight statements in the texts and in this way illustrate the methodological approach, and the use of italics will be applied in order to emphasise certain words. All texts are presented in chronological order.

5.1 CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF TEXTS

Choosing what texts to include in a discourse analysis can seem like a daunting task at first. I have chosen to follow Neumann (2001:51-52), who asserts that the best way to start is by reading secondary literature. This way it is easy to notice that some texts are canonical, in the sense that they are often referred to and quoted from. They have a broad reception, which means that they play a prominent role in the discourse. By locating which texts these again are based on, it should be relatively easy to identify the texts that appear as monuments in the discourse. A discourse analysis should ideally be based on all available material that focuses on the subject being analysed. However, based on the limited scope of this thesis, it has not been possible to include everything that has ever been said about the Viking Age in Norwegian archaeological literature. Even though I have had to limit the scope of my material, I have tried to include both those texts that represent what Neumann terms ‘canonical’, as well as those texts that base much of their research on these. An important reason for this is to try to trace which statements that are continuously reproduced, and which statements that disappear from the discourse (see chapter 4.1 *Power and knowledge*).

The material consists of both archaeological books and articles. In instances where books constitute an overview of several periods in addition to the Viking Age, only the chapters regarding the Viking Age have been chosen. Also, where a publication consists of several volumes, a limited number of chapters have been chosen as part of the analysis. Both academic texts and popular science texts aimed at a more general public have been included. I view the texts aimed at a more general public as important components of the discourse as

they usually have a clearer ideological expression, and can highlight dominating trends within the field (Hesjedal 2000:20). In addition, how archaeological research is conveyed to the general public, is in my opinion an important aspect of the discourse. Thus, the intention is to shed light on tendencies within the Viking Age research, and analyse whether these tendencies form a part of a national identity discourse.

5.2 PRESENTATION OF SELECTED TEXTS

A. W. Brøgger (1916) – *Borrefundet og Vestfoldkongernes graver*

A. W. Brøgger's paper on the grave find from Borre starts with a description of the finding of the ship and the subsequent archaeological registrations (1916:1-18). Brøgger describes the burial site where the ship grave was found as a burial site with no comparisons in Norway or the entire Nordic region (1916:25). According to Brøgger, the burial site at Borre is most certainly the burial site of the Yngling dynasty. In his argumentation he draws heavily on the skaldic poem *Ynglingatal*, which lists all the kings of the Ynglings. Brøgger refers to the kings buried at Borre as the "Norwegian kings" to differentiate them from the kings that resided in what today constitutes Sweden. Brøgger carries out a detailed analysis of selected stanzas from the poem, and through interpretations of the Old Norse words, tries to give evidence for the Borre burial ground as the resting place of the Yngling kings. Brøgger ends the paper by proclaiming the national importance of the burial ground at Borre:

"If it thus is, in the end, clear to us that the Borre mounds holds *proud memories* from the *Norwegian royal lineage* from which the country's gathering emanated, there is only one thing to do. We have to end the unworthy, wrecked and abandoned condition in which the mounds now lie, we must make the Borre field into a *national memorial*, a *national sanctuary*, where we truly can find harmony between the place's *historical dignity* and meaning and its outer shape" (Brøgger 1916:65, my translation).

He continues by asserting that other grave mounds from the period must undergo proper archaeological investigations. These are national symbols and archaeology has "the duty to take the initiative to create the protection that an increased knowledge of the *oldest history of the country* demands" (1916:65, my translation). According to Brøgger, this was the role of Norwegian archaeology at that time. "If we do not have the chance to move milestones, then we have the chance [...] to contribute to *the strengthening of the national culture*" (1916:66, my translation).

Table 1: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger (1916)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Viking age	Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Brøgger uses the deictic marker *our*, such as: “*our* Viking Age”, “*our* history”.

A. W. Brøgger, Haakon Shetelig and HJ. Falk (1917) – Osebergfundet

The first publications of the Oseberg find were published as a four volume series, comprising the excavation and restoration of the ship, the find circumstances, as well as descriptions and interpretations of the different objects in the grave. The first three volumes were published between 1917 and 1928, while the fourth volume was not published until 2006. The focus here will be on two chapters in the first volume; “the mound” by A. W. Brøgger and “the grave” by Haakon Shetelig (Brøgger, et al. 1917:123-164, 209-278).

Brøgger begins by describing the surrounding area and the farm where the Oseberg mound was built. He discusses the placement of the grave in the area, and compares it to other known ship graves found in Norway. However, according to Brøgger, the Oseberg find separates itself from the others as the mound that “contained *Norway’s most splendid antiquity*” (1917:132, my translation). Brøgger describes the construction of the mound and the material used in the construction. Again he compares it to other ship mounds, amongst others the mound containing the Tune ship, which he describes as “the largest known *Norwegian* Viking ship” (1917:140, my translation). Brøgger views Oseberg, Tune and the other great mounds as representing “the royal grave mounds from *Norway’s Viking Age*” (1917:140, my translation).

Also Shetelig, in his analysis of the grave itself, describes the Oseberg ship as “a treasure without comparison amongst *Norwegian* antiquities” (1917:216, my translation). However, in terms of the grave custom and character, the Oseberg find has, according to Shetelig, “several parallels amongst *Norwegian* finds from the Viking Age” (1917:217, my translation). Shetelig also compares the custom of burying ships to the many mounds containing smaller boats found in Norway. He describes these as “*Norwegian* boat graves” and belonging to “*our* Viking Age” (1917:233, 234). Shetelig sums up by asserting that the ship mounds represent “a unique Nordic-heathen mortuary belief and grave custom that

receives its richest and most typical form through the Vestfold graves and first and foremost through the Oseberg find” (1917:251, my translation).

Table 2: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger, Shetelig and Falk (1917)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Viking ships	Norwegian
Grave mounds, grave finds	Norwegian, royal, Norwegian style
Viking Age	Norwegian

Deictic markers

Brøgger and Shetelig use the deictic marker *our* such as: “*our* Viking Age”, and “*our* Norwegian finds”.

Haakon Shetelig (1925) – Vikingetiden, in *Norges forhistorie. Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi*

'Vikingetiden' is the eighth chapter in Haakon Shetelig's book comprising “Norway's prehistory” from the Stone Age to the Viking Age. Shetelig asserts that the Viking Age was a time of progress, and demonstrates this by presenting material produced in Norway, such as iron, soapstone, weapons, tools for handicrafts, and jewellery (1925b:186-187). The preservation of all of these objects is, according to Shetelig, due to the characteristic grave customs from the Viking Age (1925b:187). The rest of the chapter is devoted to descriptions of the Viking Age burial customs, which Shetelig describes as distinctly Norwegian. He describes the burial customs in Norway, Denmark and Sweden as quite distinct, and that these can be used to describe certain aspects of the Viking Age's national conditions. Norwegian graves can for example be easily recognised from Danish graves. The fact that the Norwegian graves are not touched by Christian influences, is seen by Shetelig as “a deliberate reaction against foreign influences, as a manifestation of a *national sense of self* faced with foreign countries” (1925b:190, my translation). Shetelig ends the chapter by referring to the big ship mounds as the strangest monuments from the heathen time:

“They are burial forms that quite specifically are related to the ancestry of the kings of Vestfold, to the royal line which founded a collected Norwegian kingdom. Therefore, the graves at Gokstad, Oseberg, Borre and Karmøy also have, above all others, the characteristics of *national monuments*, the proud and visible memories from the time that marks the beginning of *our history*” (Shetelig 1925b:193, my translation).

Table 3: Chains of equivalence in Shetelig (1925)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Viking Age	Norway,
Viking raids	“a larger Norway”, a Norse world
Viking towns	Norse areas, Norse and foreign culture
Burials	Norwegian forms, distinctive Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Shetelig uses the deictic marker *our* throughout the text, such as: “the oldest traditions in *our own* homely history”, “*our* connections with Ireland”, “*our* burial forms”, “*our* history”.

He also uses the deictic markers *us* and *we*, such as: “during the seventh – eighth century, *we* also meet (...)” (1925b:179), and “the relationship with Ireland leads *us* in on a totally new side of *our* culture history that meets *us* for the first time (...)” (1925b:183).

Sigurd Grieg (1928) – *Vikingetiden i Norge*

This little book by Sigurd Grieg is a short overview of the Viking Age, and deals with topics such as labour, settlement, grave customs, royal farmsteads etc. Grieg asserts that his goal is to examine the “Norwegian culture history and seek to find the *particularly Norwegian* in lifestyles and in the history of settlement” (1928:10, emphasis in original, my translation). Grieg presents different aspects of the Viking Age mainly by analysing archaeological material, and in a detailed way describing their appearance, material and theories regarding their usage. Old Norse literary sources are used as argumentation for his theories, and to elaborate on certain objects. He notes on the quality of different material, such as; “the *Norwegians* were during the Viking Age excellent carpenters and wood carvers” (Grieg 1928:30). His descriptions of the Viking Age are vibrant and full of pride:

“Like the Greeks established colonies in Asia Minor and in Italy, we have in *Norwegian history* the Viking Age, where the *Norse tribe* unfolds its *youthful vigour*. *Our forefather’s mighty conquests* and long term settlement in Ireland and on the Orkney Islands, Shetland, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland express this *youthful urge* to win new land, and colonise it in their own way; not just to plunder and burn, but to cultivate the land and conduct trade” (Grieg 1928:80, my translation).

“With the martyr death of King Olav a whole new era begins in *our land* – the heathendom disappears, customs and practices change. The new that arrives should not hinder us in seeing the *greatness* in what happened in the ninth and tenth century. Large areas of inner Norway was cleared, and new Norse kingdoms were founded out there in the west” (Grieg 1928:151-152, my translation)

Table 4: Chains of equivalence in Grieg (1928)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Viking Age	Forefathers, Norwegian, Norse
Viking Age settlement	Typical Norwegian, Norwegian emigrants
Burial customs	Norwegian, Nordic
Viking raids	Norwegians, Nordic merchants

Deictic markers:

Grieg uses the deictic marker *our* throughout the text, such as: “*our* grave finds”, “*our* oldest history”, “*our* culture history”, “*our* forefathers”, “*our* Vikings”.

Haakon Shetelig (1930) – *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennom tidene. Fra oldtiden til omkring 1000 e.Kr.*

Haakon Shetelig is the author of the first volume of a series titled “The Norwegian people’s life and history through time”. This first volume comprises chapters that span the time from the Stone Age to the end of the Viking Age. Shetelig begins his chapters on the Viking Age by introducing the Viking raids. He explains how “virtually all coasts and countries of the continent were haunted by pirates and conquerors who emanated from the *Nordic people*” (1930:176, my translation). Shetelig discusses the nationality of the Vikings, whether they were Norwegian, Danish or Swedish. Shetelig explains that the question has sparked a lot of fiery discussions, as it is mixed with modern national movements. He asserts that he finds it strange that some should find it satisfying to dedicate the Viking raids to modern people, when the contemporaneous West-European sources about the Vikings to a large degree are the opposite of flattering (1930:179). He also notes on the difficulty of dedicating elements from the Viking Age to modern nation states: “It is pretty difficult to allocate the honour of the Viking raids fairly between Denmark and Norway. The two countries were during the ninth century not in any way clearly entrenched as national concepts [...]” (1930:180).

Shetelig examines the Viking settlement on Iceland, which he names “the oldest geographical discoveries in the North Sea which is known in *Norwegian history*” (1930:205, my translation). He looks to different written sources about the settlement on Iceland, and concludes that; “by one generation at the turn of the century around 900 AD a new land had been built, and a land that was completely *Norwegian*” (1930:211, my translation). He admits that not only Norwegians lived in these new colonies, as the settlers would bring slaves with them from Scotland and Ireland. Shetelig acknowledges that the Celtic elements can have had

an impact on the Icelanders, but emphasises that “the society and legal system was throughout managed on *Norwegian terms*, just as *Norwegian language* became supreme” (1930:211, my translation).

Shetelig describes the characteristics of royal graves found in Denmark, before turning to what he names the “typical custom” for “Norwegian chieftains”, that is, burial in a vessel. Shetelig describes this custom as unparalleled in prehistoric Europe. He looks to the stone settings formed as ships also found in Norway as the closest parallel, and asserts that they must present the same symbolic idea as the ship graves. He also points to rock carvings depicting ships and boats, and, on the basis of this, states that it is reasonable to assume that the ship and boat graves we meet in the Viking Age are based on very old Norwegian traditions, a tradition he argues is a continuity of religious conceptions dating back to the Bronze Age (1930:276).

Table 5: Chains of equivalence in Shetelig (1930)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Vikings	Norwegian
Viking Age towns	Norwegian
Viking Age handicraft	Norwegian taste

Deictic markers:

Shetelig uses the deictic markers *our* and *we* in his text: “*our* history”, “*our* axes”, “*our* artists”, “*our* history of style”, “in both countries *we* shall share the honour”.

A. W. Brøgger (1937) – Gullalder, in *Viking*

A. W. Brøgger’s article titled 'Golden Age' was published in the first edition of the journal *Viking*. It focuses on the era of Harald Hårfagre and the unification of Norway. Brøgger asserts that; “with the *grave of the Oseberg queen* the history of Norway begins” (1937a:137, emphasis in original, my translation).

Brøgger emphasises the fact that it is hard for us today to grasp the real contents of “the old kingdom”, as our perceptions of nation, state and kingdom was created during the 18th and 19th centuries, and has very little to do with the old Kingdom of Norway and its predecessors. Statements about the “nation building acts” of Harald Hårfagre and Olav Haraldsson are perceptions created during the political struggles at the time of the union in the 19th century, and later during political parties demands for historical justification. As

Brøgger states; “neither the word nation or state, nor the terms they represent, are known in the old literature” (1937a:138, my translation).

Brøgger presents the different battles and events that lead up to the Battle of Stiklestad, which he terms the last battle fought for “the lineage of *Harald’s kingdom in Norway* and thereby for *Norway’s “independence”*” (1937a:143, my translation). Brøgger emphasises the importance of the Battle of Stiklestad, as the unification of the different parts of the country into one kingdom ruled by one king, and as the origin of a “*national identity*”, something “*Norwegian*” in opposition to something “*foreign*” (1937a:143, my translations). One part of the article is devoted to a description of the different grave mounds, both from the Viking Age, and from earlier times. In his description of the grave mounds at Borre, Brøgger’s pride and attachment to these mounds becomes evident. He describes the park as “the most beautiful and most impressive monument site that can be imagined” (1937a:156):

“Today the Borre mounds have become a national park under the management of Vestfold county, an enclosed and protected area, where we try in a most careful way to give the large graves the most beautiful surroundings as the natural conditions can provide, and where during the summer large gatherings can be arranged, face to face with these *glorious ancient monuments* that are the introduction to *Norway’s history*” (Brøgger 1937a:156, my translation).

Later, Brøgger describes the era 800-960 AD as more of an “*ending*” than a beginning;

“From no period of time in *Norway’s history* do we have a richer archaeological material to the restoration of the history itself [...]. We can say that the era opens with the queenly grave at Oseberg [...]. It ends with the grave of Håkon the Good at Seim, the last royal mound that was built in Norway. It is a *golden age* in the old symbolic meaning of the word” (1937a:174, my translation).

Table 6: Chains of equivalence in Brøgger (1937)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
The Viking Age	Golden age, Norway’s history
Grave mounds	Norwegian, history of Norway

Deictic markers:

Brøgger uses the deictic markers *our* and *we*, such as: “*our* old history”, “more quaint and interesting is Håvamål, one of the strangest works of art *we* own from the entire older Norwegian culture” (1937a:184), and “a set of feelings *we* no longer have” (1937a:189).

Charlotte Blindheim (1953) – *Kaupang: Markedsplassen i Skiringssal*

Charlotte Blindheim starts this little book about Kaupang by referring to the literary source where Ottar describes his travels along the Norwegian coast. Blindheim explains how Ottar’s account is “the only written source we have about this *our oldest Norwegian marketplace*” (1953:2, my translation). Most of the archaeological material discussed in the text are objects found during excavation of some of the graves on the site. Blindheim presents the different objects and discusses their origin of production and importance in relevance to other finds from the Continent, the British Isles, and Scandinavia. Especially Birka is used as a parallel for several finds. Blindheim places a lot of emphasis on questions relating to trade at Kaupang and different trading routes. She asserts that; “while the findings from Birka largely testifies to *Swedish* trading interests being to the south and east, *our finds* reflect just as unambiguous a trade policy oriented towards the west” (Blindheim 1953:20, my translation).

Table 7: Chains of equivalence in Blindheim (1953)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Kaupang	Norwegian market place
Viking Age material	Norwegian
Viking Age graves	Norwegian, Norwegian ground

Deictic markers:

Blindheim uses the deictic markers *our* and *here*: “*our* old literature”, “*our* Kaupang bronzes”, “*our* grave sites”, “the dead woman might have been dressed in a fashion especially favoured in Finland – Baltics, but little used *here* in *our* country” (1953:14).

Irmelin Martens (1960) – *Vikingetogene i arkeologisk belysning, in Viking*

Irmelin Martens examines archaeological finds that testifies to the Viking voyages abroad. She divides the archaeological material into two main groups; foreign artefacts found on Nordic ground, and Scandinavian artefacts found abroad. She discusses the different finds as *Swedish*, *Danish* or *Norwegian* find categories (1960:94, 96, 97). According to Martens, these categorisations fits well with the historical sources and the different “spheres of interest” that has become known through these. She asserts that the archaeological material confirms that “the *Swedes* main interest lay to the East, while the *Norwegian voyages* to a large extent went West to the British Isles” (1960:98, my translation). However, as the Nordic material are of a uniform character, Martens asserts that place names are a much safer

source when tracing the origin of the material. She explains how place names can be used to differentiate between *Danish* and *Norwegian* settlements, especially in England (1960:100).

The areas best examined archaeologically are the Shetland Islands and the Orkney Islands. Martens explains how both the archaeological finds from the islands, as well as place names, leave no doubt that there has been a *Norwegian* settlement on the islands. She admits that “there probably existed a Celtic population [on the Shetland Island] when the *Norwegians* arrived, but the finds from the island group as a whole give the impression that [the population] must have been rather few in numbers, and that it can hardly have rendered much resistance against the *Norwegian settlement*” (1960:101, my translation). The first Viking voyages along the British coast are also described as being done by *Norwegians* (1960:111).

Table 8: Chains of equivalence in Martens (1960)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Viking voyages	Norwegian, Danish, Swedish
Viking Age settlements	Norwegian, Norwegians, Danish, Swedish

Ellen Karine Hougen (1965) – Handel og samferdsel i nordens vikingtid, in *Viking*

Ellen Karine Hougen asserts that the Nordic people have never lived in isolation, especially not during the Viking Age. During this period the Vikings created contacts with a wider geographical area than ever before, from the Northern Atlantic area to the Mediterranean, over all of Eastern Europe, including Russia, Ukraine, to the Black Sea and the Near East. She also explains how “the *three Nordic countries* also was in close contact, through wars and pillages, but also peaceful contact through marriage between powerful families and even though it is not much mentioned, through trading expeditions” (Hougen 1965:167, my translation). Hougen describes the different trading articles that were important during the Viking Age. Especially iron was important, “something the iron richness in the *Norwegian graves* can testify to [...]” (1965:183, my translation). Also, analysis of “*Norwegian produced swords* have shown that the Vikings were capable of producing iron of excellent quality” (1965:183, my translation).

Table 9: Chains of equivalence in Hougen (1965)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
The Vikings	Swedes, Norwegian, Danish, Nordic
Viking Age sagas	Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Hougen uses the deictic marker *here*: “it was primarily fittings, partly turned into jewellery *here* at home in the North [...]” (1965:172-173).

Charlotte Blindheim and Roar L. Tollnes (1972) – *Kaupang. Vikingenes handelsplass*

Charlotte Blindheim and Roar L. Tollnes’ purpose with this book is to convey some of their experiences during their 17 yearlong excavation of the Kaupang site (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:5). They explain how the excavations of the site have in fact been on-going from 1867 to the date of their publication (1972). These excavations have resulted in findings that testify to a small community that used trade as their main livelihood, and this in a period “that traditionally is seen as a time of robbery and unrest, when *our forefathers* ravaged and threatened to burn (No. *brannskatte*) most of Europe” (1972:8, my translation). This view of the Viking Age is based largely on written sources, which Blindheim and Tollnes view as often unreliable. Instead, they base their interpretations on the archaeological material, and discuss the information about the history of trade at the site that can be given by the material (1972:9). Blindheim and Tollnes devote the larger part of the book to a detailed summary of their excavations of the Kaupang site between 1956 and 1970. Methodological and practical highlights and challenges are presented, as well as the different archaeological finds. In the concluding chapter they try to shed light on what the findings from Kaupang mean “for *Norway’s* early history of trade” (1972:89, my translation).

Table 10: Chains of equivalence in Blindheim and Tollnes (1972)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Kaupang	Norwegian marketplace
Viking Age finds	Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Blindheim and Tollnes use the deictic marker *our*: “*our* forefathers”, “there are grounds for putting *our* graves in the same class as the rich merchant graves at Birka” (1972:53).

Liv Helga Dommasnes (1979) – Et gravmateriale fra yngre jernalder brukt til å belyse kvinners stilling, in *Viking*

Liv Helga Dommasnes’ aim in this article is to shed light on differences in social status and division of labour between men and women during the Merovingian and Viking Periods through an analysis of archaeological material (1979). Dommasnes states that her wish is to answer some questions about “one of *our* prehistoric periods” (1979:96, my translation). The material in her analysis consists of grave finds from the district of Sogn. In her classification of male and female graves, Dommasnes asserts that weapons are assumed to be the safest basis for distinguishing male graves. According to Dommasnes, historical sources confirms this: “*English* chronicles tell of *Nordic men* who came to the country as Vikings, *our own* royal sagas tell of armed men in the King’s company [...]” (1979:99, my translation). The remainder of the article consists of a description of archaeological finds from graves, which Dommasnes uses to differentiate between male and female graves in relation to, amongst others, social status and division of labour.

Table 11: Chains of equivalence in Dommasnes (1979)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Iron age material	Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Dommasnes uses the deictic marker *our*: “one of *our* prehistoric periods”, “*our* iron age”, “*our* own royal sagas”.

Anne Stine Ingstad (1982) – Osebergdronningen – hvem var hun? In *Viking*

Anne Stine Ingstad uses this article to explore the possible identity of the presupposed queen of the Oseberg grave. Ingstad uses, amongst others, the textiles from the Oseberg find to argue for one of the women’s status as queen. She asserts that the fragments of clothing found in the ship were all fabrics of a red colour, and that the colour red was a very valuable colour during pre-historic times. She explains how the colour red was not found on any of the textiles from the *Norwegian* Viking Age marketplace Kaupang. The red textiles from the Oseberg find are “therefore distinct from other contemporary *Norwegian* finds” (1982:50-51, my translation). When trying to identify the woman in the grave Ingstad turns to written sources, especially sources concerning the Yngling dynasti, which she describes as a *Norwegian* royal lineage (1982:56, 58). She also lists several similarities between the

Oseberg grave and the Gokstad grave. She emphasises how these grave mounds “express a self esteem and a need for assertiveness that *during ancient times is unique in Norway*” (1982:60, my translation).

Table 12: Chains of equivalence in Ingstad (1982)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Kaupang	Norwegian marketplace
Viking Age graves	Norwegian

Gerd Stamsø Munch, Olav Sverre Johansen and Ingegerd Larssen (1987) – Borg in Lofoten. A chieftain’s farm in arctic Norway, in *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress*

This article by Gerd Stamsø Munch, Olav Sverre Johansen and Ingegerd Larssen (1987) describes the first archaeological excavations at Borg in Lofoten. The authors introduce the chieftain’s farm found on the site as “the first *Norwegian* and one of the first *Scandinavian* chieftain’s farms [...] discovered north of the Arctic Circle” (1987:149). They describe settlement patterns along the North Norwegian coast during the Iron Age and assert that “finds and monuments indicate that there has been a continuous *Norwegian* Iron Age settlement as far north as the Tromsø area” (1987:149). Most of the article is devoted to the excavations done at Borg in 1983 and 1984, and descriptions of different finds. At the end of the article the authors attempt to place Borg in a historical context by mentioning Viking Age chieftains from the north who are known from written sources. These are presented as being “*North Norwegian* chieftains” (1987:168). According to the authors, Borg should be viewed in light of the “earliest reliable written source dealing with *Viking Norway* – the chieftain Ottar’s account to King Alfred the Great about AD 890” (1987:168). The authors end the article by asserting that the discovery of Borg is important in relation to the *history of Lofoten* and the *history of Northern Norway* (1987:168).

Table 13: Chains of equivalence in Munch, Johansen and Larssen (1987)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Borg	Norwegian, history of Northern Norway
Iron Age	Norwegian
Viking Age	Norway

Arne Emil Christensen, Anne Stine Ingstad and Bjørn Myhre (1992) – *Osebergdronningens grav. Vår arkeologiske nasjonalskatt i nytt lys.*

In this book by Arne Emil Christensen, Anne Stine Ingstad and Bjørn Myhre, the Oseberg grave is presented as “*Our archaeological national treasure in new light*”. In the preface the three authors declare the national importance of the find by claiming that “the Oseberg find is the great adventure in *Norwegian* archaeology” and that “the Viking Age is an exciting period in the *history of Norway*. For the first time *our nation* becomes a part of Europe, for good and for bad” (1992:7, my translation). The book is written by archaeologists, but aimed at a more general public. The authors hope that the book “can give an insight into both a rich material of finds and tell something about *our nation’s roots*” (Christensen, et al. 1992:9, my translation).

The first three chapters are written by Bjørn Myhre and describe the connection between the Oseberg find and the dynasty of the Ynglings. Myhre draws heavily on written sources, but uses also archaeological material in his discussion of the county of Vestfold as the seat of power of the Ynglings, and Oseberg and other rich archaeological sites’ connection to this. He asserts that “the rich grave find from the Oseberg mound has more than any other archaeological find participated in the enhancement of Vestfold as the *Norwegian centre* during the Viking Age” (Christensen, et al. 1992:32, my translation).

Anne Stine Ingstad describes the textile material found in the grave. She analyses the different fabrics and methods used in the making of the different textiles, and suggests trading routes for where the different fabrics might have come from. One of her suggestions is that some of the fabrics must have come from the Orient, where closely related fabrics were produced long before they started appearing in northern Europe. She explains that textiles found in Syria and Egypt are “far nicer than those found in *our* graves, but they all have the same characteristic that also *our* textiles have” (Christensen, et al. 1992:203, my translation).

Table 14: Chains of equivalence in Christensen, Myhre and Ingstad (1992)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
The Viking Age	History of Norway, the nations roots, Norwegian

Deictic markers:

Christensen, Ingstad and Myhre use the deictic marker *our*, such as: “*our nation’s roots*”, “*our* textiles”, “*our* graves”.

Bjørn Myhre (1992) – The royal cemetery at Borre, Vestfold: A Norwegian centre in a European periphery, in *The Age of Sutton Hoo*

Bjørn Myhre presents the grave field at Borre as having a “special name in *Norway’s early history*” (1992:301). He refers to the Sagas, especially *Ynglingatal*, which names Borre as the burial place of one or two kings of the royal dynasty of the *Ynglingas*. Myhre describes how the poem was written as a tribute to king Ragnvald Heidumhár, “a cousin of king Harald Fairhair, who united the *Norwegian petty kingdoms* during the last part of the ninth century” (1992:301). Myhre describes Borre as a centre in Eastern Norway, and traces its significance back to the Merovingian Period:

“The *Sagas* and the *Ynglingatal* describe the competition between east *Norwegian kingdoms* during the centuries before the Viking Period, as well as their unification under the leadership of the Vestfold kings of the *Ynglinga* dynasty in the ninth century. The mounds at Borre probably are the archaeological manifestation of the early phases of this economic and politic process towards a Norwegian State” (1992:311).

Table 15: Chains of equivalence in Myhre (1992)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Borre	Norwegian centre, early history of Norway
Kingdoms	Norwegian

Heid Gjøstein Resi (2000) – Kaupang, før nye utgravninger, in *Collegium Medievale*

Heid Gjøstein Resi’s purpose with this article is to present the archaeological finds that illustrates the activities taking place at Kaupang during the Viking Age (2000:141). Resi asserts that “the amount and variety of finds that tell of the practice of metal crafts at Kaupang are outstanding for *Norwegian* conditions and testify to practitioners with advanced knowledge” (2000:145, my translation). Resi describes archaeological material that can provide information about the building techniques and material used in the house constructions, the production of boats, the work of the silver smith etc. at Kaupang. According to Resi, the remains after the smiths indicate that, in terms of technique, the smiths “did not stand back for their colleagues in comparable *foreign settlements*” (2000:160, my translation). Resi ends the article by concluding that the archaeological finds from Kaupang give an impression of a varied production of necessity articles for daily use and a wide consumption of imported products (2000:161).

Table 16: Chains of equivalence in Resi (2000)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
Finds from Kaupang	Norwegian conditions
Kaupang	Local vs. foreign

Deictic markers:

Resi uses the deictic marker *our*: “*our area*”, “*our country*”.

Bergljot Solberg (2003) – Vikingtiden ca. 800-1030 e.Kr, in *Jernalderen i Norge: ca. 500 f.Kr. – 1030 e.Kr.*

In this book, Bergljot Solberg examines the entire Iron Age in Norway from about 500 BC to 1030 AD. I will here only focus on the chapter devoted to the Viking Age (Solberg 2003:212-320). Solberg discusses different sources that provide information about the Viking Age. She asserts that the contemporary sources from “*our own country*” primarily consist of archaeological, zoological and botanical material. There also exist contemporary sources from abroad that contain some information about “*Norway and Norwegian conditions*”, such as Ottar’s account to King Alfred, and the texts by Adam of Bremen (Solberg 2003:215, my translation). Solberg explains how the sources from the Viking Age are both versatile and extensive. “The material makes it possible to get a better insight into both *homely* social conditions and activities in other areas during this period” (Solberg 2003:218, my translation).

When describing the Viking ships, Solberg portrays the Gokstad ship as “one of the ultimate examples of *Norwegian* shipbuilding art during the Viking Age” (2003:243, my translation). She depicts the Viking raids on the British Isles, Ireland and France, where she asserts that the first Vikings to attack the British Isles were probably *Norwegian*. According to Solberg, it is primarily foreign artefacts in *Norwegian* graves that testify to the early Viking raids (2003:246). During a description of the Viking raids and settlements in Ireland, Solberg describes the colonies as *Norwegian* – one of them conquered by a *Norwegian* chieftain, Olav Hvite – and that, based on archaeological finds, “the Viking voyages to Ireland must have been an almost purely *Norwegian* undertaking” (2003:248, my translation).

Table 17: Chains of equivalence in Solberg (2003)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Vikings	Norwegian, Scandinavian, Norse, Danish
The Viking Age	Norwegian
Grave finds	Norwegian graves, “Nordic taste and expression”, North Norwegian finds

Deictic markers:

Solberg uses the deictic markers *we*, *here* and *our*, such as: “categories that *we* have”, “*here* in this country”, and “*our* society”.

Dagfinn Skre (2007) – Towns and markets, kings and central places in South-western Scandinavia c. AD 800-950, in *Kaupang in Skiringssal*

This is the final chapter in the first volume of a three volume series about the archaeological excavations at Kaupang at the beginning of the 2000s. This chapter, written by Dagfinn Skre, discusses the foundation of Kaupang as a town, and the subsequent history of Kaupang and the central place Skiringssal (Skre 2007b:445). Kaupang is throughout the chapter set into a larger context by comparing finds from the town with sources from and about other contemporaneous Viking Age towns such as Birka, Ribe and Hedeby.

Skre discusses the introduction of a new concept of lordship, one that was territorially defined and had borders. According to Skre, this is first observed in Scandinavia with the foundation of the border towns by the Danish king. In Norway “it was not before the final decades of the 9th century that there were signs that a king with comparable ambitions, Harald Fairhair, was setting about establishing himself in those lands that would *eventually become the kingdom of Norway*” (2007b:461-462).

Skre refers, amongst others, to *Ynglingatal* when arguing that Kaupang and Skiringssal were under the rule of a Danish king. Skre discusses the final six Yngling generation’s relation to different known sites. In this context he mentions that the five generations preceding Rögnvald are described as “Norwegian”, and that the skald who wrote the poem “made all the Ynglings after Halfdan Whiteleg “Norwegian” by associating the whole kin-branch with Norway” (2007b:466, 467, quotation marks in original). However, Skre emphasises that the term *Nóreg* in *Ynglingatal* should be understood as “a geographical rather than a political term” (Skre 2007b:468).

Table 18: Chains of equivalence in Skre (2007)

Moment	Chains of equivalence
The Yngling dynasty	“Norwegian”

Frans-Arne Stylegar (2009) – Kaupangs omland og urbaniseringstendenser i norsk vikingtid, in *Den urbane underskog*

Frans-Arne Stylegar’s intention with this chapter is to analyse the archaeological finds from Kaupang and examine whether there exists other areas with similar types of finds. Already in the title, Stylegar terms the period under scrutiny, i.e. the Viking Age, as being *Norwegian*. He also states that he will focus on “the *Norwegian* archaeological Viking Age material” in his analysis (2009:67, my translation). However, when presenting Kaupang, it is described as a one-of-a-kind type of site “in *present day Norway*” (2009:67). Stylegar describes several urban centres located along the coasts of the Northern and Baltic Sea during the Viking and Middle Ages. When returning to Kaupang, he again describes it as located in “*present day Norway*” (2009:72). Stylegar presents the different archaeological finds from Kaupang and compares them to other finds from localities elsewhere in Vestfold. He highlights three smith graves from Tjølling, which “occupies a unique position in the *Norwegian* Viking Age material” (2009:77, my translation). He concludes the chapter by describing Kaupang as a “disputed border zone between *Danish* overlords and *Norwegian* state formation kings (No. *rikssamlingskonger*)” (2009:92, my translation).

Table 19: Chains of equivalence in Stylegar (2009)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Viking Age	Norwegian
Viking Age material	Norwegian
Kaupang	“present day Norway”

Helge Sørheim (2011) – Three prominent Norwegian ladies with British connections, in *Acta Archaeologica*

In this article, Helge Sørheim presents three rich female graves dating from the Viking Age in Norway. Already in the title, Sørheim presents these graves as containing the remains of “three prominent *Norwegian* ladies” (Sørheim 2011:17, my translation). Sørheim describes each grave separately, with a detailed analysis of the grave goods in each grave. Throughout

the article he refers to both the graves and the grave finds as *Norwegian* (2011:20, 21, 25, 26 etc.). As the three graves all contain objects of British origin, Sørheim discusses the Viking's expansions abroad, both for raiding and for trade. He presents some of the earliest known dates of Viking raids and describes how they increased both in frequency and size during the 9th century. Sørheim asserts that "it was mostly the coast around the Irish Sea that was affected by the *Norwegians*", and that "we know that the *Norwegians* settled on the islands north and west of Scotland from about 800" (2011:46). He also uses written sources and asserts that voyages to Ireland must have been "well known at that time for *most Norwegians*" (2011:49).

Table 20: Chains of equivalence in Sørheim (2011)

Moments	Chains of equivalence
Vikings	Norwegian
Viking Age graves	Norwegian graves, Norwegian finds/objects

5.3 SUMMARY

In this chapter, the selected texts that are to be studied further in the analysis have been presented. Chains of equivalence and certain deictic markers have been selected through the method of coding. By applying this method, it has been possible to locate words and formulations that contribute to the creation of a national identity discourse. Through the presentation of quotes and the use of italics in order to emphasise certain words, the aim has been to highlight how certain statements appear in the texts.

The next chapter will consist of a detailed analysis and discussion of some of the words and formulations presented here, as well as several others located in the selected texts. In what way the deictic markers and chains of equivalence contribute to the creation and maintenance of a national identity discourse will be discussed, as well as how the discourse has changed over time.

6. NATIONAL IDENTITY DISCOURSE

This chapter will take a closer look at the presented texts through a detailed analysis where tendencies in the Viking Age literature that contribute to a national identity discourse will be discussed. As mentioned earlier, the material used in the analysis consists of a total of 20 texts published between 1916 and 2011, and comprise articles, books and chapters in books (see table 21). Italics are applied throughout the analysis in order to emphasise certain words. In this chapter and the next, the term 'Viking' will be applied, in favour of terms such as 'Norse' or 'Germanic', to describe the population groups presented in the texts. This is done as an analytical tool, and is meant only as a reference to the period discussed in the research.

Table 21: Texts distributed after genre

Genre	Texts	Number of texts
Article	Brøgger (1937), Martens (1960), Hougen (1965), Dommasnes (1979), Ingstad (1982), Munch et al. (1987), Resi (2000), Sørheim (2011)	8
Book	Brøgger (1916), Brøgger et al. (1917), Grieg (1928), Blindheim (1953),	4
Chapter in book	Shetelig (1925), Shetelig (1930), Myhre (1992), Solberg (2003), Skre (2007), Stylegar (2009)	6
Popular science	Blindheim and Tollnes (1972), Christensen et al. (1992)	2

6.1 DEICTIC MARKERS

As stated earlier (chapter 3), one methodological approach has been to pick out instances in the texts where the authors apply certain *deictic markers*, and in this way trace examples of 'banal nationalism' (Billig 1995, see chapter 4.2). In an ordinary conversation, deictic markers such as 'I', 'you', 'we', 'now' and 'here' are usually unproblematic. In most cases it is obvious who is talking and being addressed, as well as when and where the talking is occurring. The deictic markers point to something concrete. In the case of the material analysed here, the deictic markers are more complex. Thus, the markers selected here are limited to those that contribute to the creation of a national identity discourse, in other words the deictic markers that explicitly or implicitly link the identity of the Vikings to a Norwegian identity.

Our

The deictic marker used most frequently by most authors is '*our*'. It occurs in twelve of the selected texts, and always occurs more than once in each text (see table 22). Using '*our*' alludes to that something is belonging to someone. Exactly who this someone is however, remains unmarked as none of the authors define whom they are referring to. Nonetheless, all the texts using the deictic marker '*our*' are written in Norwegian and have most likely had Norwegians as their target audience. Thus, by using the deictic marker '*our*' in connection with an element from the Viking Age, an illusion that these elements belong to '*us*', i.e. present day Norwegians, is created.

'*Our*' is used to describe different aspects of the Viking Age. It is '*our*' Viking Age, '*our*' history, '*our*' forefathers. In other words; Norway's Viking Age, Norway's history, Norway's forefathers. Some of the texts are more explicit in their use than others. For Grieg there seems to be no question of a link between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity:

“When *we* go to our archaeological museums and view the large quantities of weapons, jewellery and tools that the Vikings received as grave goods, *we* wonder about how steadfast *our forefathers* were in their belief in a life after this one” (Grieg 1928:110, my translation).

Others are more implicit, such as Solberg:

“*We* have no sources that clearly describe how *our society* was during the Viking Age. But archaeological finds and information from written sources seen in relation to the country itself give *us* certain notions” (Solberg 2003:255, my translation).

Even though she does not remark on it, it is clear whose society Solberg is referring to: The society of the Norwegians. Some uses of the deictic marker '*our*' are not as explicit as the examples above. An example is Charlotte Blindheim's reference to “*our* little collection from Kaupang” and “some of *our* Kaupang bronzes” (1953:18, my translations). In these instances Blindheim may in fact be referring to the excavation and excavation site at Kaupang, and not, as such, to a Norwegian identity. This might also be the case for Blindheim and Tollnes' book about the later excavation at Kaupang, where they assert that “there are grounds for putting *our* graves in the same class as the rich merchant graves at Birka” (1972:53, my translation). In Scandinavian Viking Age archaeology there is a tradition for referring to finds from excavations as '*our*' finds. Thus, they refer to the research team who undertook the excavation, and not to all Norwegians as such. This is probably the case for Resi (2000:150, 160) as well, where “*our* area” most likely refers to the excavated site at Kaupang. This must be kept in mind when reading texts using this marker. However, both the texts by Blindheim,

and Blindheim and Tollnes include uses of the deictic marker that are clearer in their connection to a national identity. Blindheim terms for example Kaupang as “*our* oldest *Norwegian* marketplace” (1953:2, my translation), and Blindheim and Tollnes describe the Vikings as “*our* forefathers” (1972:8, my translation).

We

Four of the texts use the deictic marker ‘*we*’ in a manner that contribute to a national identity discourse (see table 22). Shetelig is an example of this in his discussion of whether the French and English words for the Vikings relates to a Norwegian or a Danish identity:

“It must be a coincidence that has led to the word *normanner* becoming a common term for all Vikings in French, and in England *daner*. In both countries *we* shall share the honours” (Shetelig 1930:181, my translation).

Brøgger uses the deictic marker ‘*we*’ in his description of the poem *Voluspå*: “*we* shall not here try to explain the difficult poem, whose inner dedication requires a set of feelings *we* no longer have” (Brøgger 1937a:189, my translation). It can here, however, be argued that Brøgger acknowledges the fact that we cannot identify with the same feelings as the Vikings, because our reference points today are so different, and that this separates us from that time. However, based on the word choice elsewhere in the article – for example his terming of the Viking Age as Norway’s golden age – I will argue that the sentence “a set of feeling *we no longer have*”, allude to a perceived connection between the Vikings and present-day Norwegians.

Us

Shetelig is the only author who uses the deictic marker ‘*us*’ in a way that contributes to a national identity discourse. He is quite explicit when discussing the Vikings’ relationship to Ireland:

“The relationship to Ireland leads *us* into a whole new side of *our* culture history, which meets *us* here for the first time – and at the same time the last – namely the relationship with colonies founded on foreign land through the Viking raids. A “larger Norway” was created [...]” (Shetelig 1925b:183, my translation).

Here

The least explicit of the deictic markers that contributes to a national identity discourse used in the texts is ‘*here*’. The use of this marker has only distinguished itself in three of the texts

(see table 22). Even though the use of this deictic marker is not as obvious as the ones presented above, I will argue that it does contribute to the creation and maintenance of a national identity discourse. The use of the deictic marker *'here'* can be exemplified through Blindheim, Hougen and Solberg's texts:

“Together with these textiles there are remains of weathered bronze thread and small bronze spirals. They look seemingly rather insignificant, but indicate that the dead woman might have been dressed in a fashion especially favoured in Finland – Baltics, but little used *here* in *our country*” (Blindheim 1953:14, my translation).

“The goods that came to the Nordic countries from the West European area consisted of a variety of different kinds. From the British Isles there exists mainly ornate bronze objects, of Irish or Anglo-Saxon origin. It was primarily fittings, partly turned into jewellery *here* at *home* in the North” (Hougen 1965:173, my translation).

“The objects made of jet are small figures, beautifully carved and flawlessly polished. It is probably the raw material itself that has been imported. The figures are namely shaped in full compliance with Nordic taste and expression, something that suggests that they have been produced *here* in *this country*” (Solberg 2003:227-228, my translation).

“This country” and “our country” are never defined in the three texts. The embedded reference to Norway is thus presented as if natural. Seven of the texts include no deictic markers that attract attention (see table 22). However, most of them still contain other textual elements that relate them to the creation of a national identity discourse.

Table 22: Texts distributed after deictic markers

Deictic marker	Texts	Number of texts
Our	Brøgger (1916), Brøgger et al. (1917), Shetelig (1925), Grieg (1928), Shetelig (1930), Brøgger (1937), Blindheim (1953), Blindheim and Tollnes (1972), Dommasnes (1979), Munch et al. (1987), Christensen et al. (1992), Solberg (2003)	12
We	Shetelig (1925), Shetelig (1930), Brøgger (1937), Solberg (2003)	4
Us	Shetelig (1925)	1
Here	Blindheim (1953), Hougen (1965), Solberg (2003)	3
–	Martens (1960), Ingstad (1982), Munch et al. (1987), Myhre (1992), Skre (2007), Stylegar (2009), Sørheim (2011)	7

6.2 NODAL POINTS, MOMENTS AND CHAINS OF EQUIVALENCE

Another methodological approach has been to trace the chains of equivalence related to certain moments and nodal points. As with the deictic markers, only the chains of

equivalence that contribute to a national identity discourse were selected. As can be seen in the presentation of the selected texts (chapter 5.2), the texts analysed created several chains of equivalence that connect different aspects of the Viking Age to a Norwegian identity. I have in this section gathered the moments and chains of equivalence that occurred most often. All the moments chosen are variants of the nodal point 'Viking', namely 'the Viking Age', 'the Vikings', and different Viking Age elements, such as 'Viking graves', 'Viking towns', 'Viking raids' etc. Nine of the texts link 'Norwegian' or 'history of Norway' to the moment 'the Viking Age' (see table 23). As with the deictic markers, some of the texts are more explicit than others, such as Grieg:

“Like the Greeks established colonies in Asia Minor and in Italy, we have in *Norwegian history the Viking Age*, where the Norse tribe unfolds its youthful vigour” (Grieg 1928:80, my translation).

Christensen et al. (1992) create similar chains of equivalence:

“*The Viking Age* is an exciting period in *the history of Norway*. For the first time *our nation* becomes a part of Europe, for good and for bad” (Christensen, et al. 1992:7, my translation).

Six of the texts link, in the same manner, 'Norwegian' or 'our forefathers' to the moment 'the Vikings' (see table 23). One of these is Blindheim and Tollnes' book on Kaupang:

“*We* are here back in the *Viking Age* – a period that is traditionally seen as a time of robbery and unrest, when *our forefathers* ravaged and threatened to burn most of Europe” (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:8, my translation).

It is in this quote a bit unclear whether Blindheim and Tollnes themselves view the Vikings as 'our forefathers', or whether this also is a part of the traditional view of the Vikings. As no references to any other texts are made, it is easily perceived as their view.

Sørheim refers to the Vikings as 'Norwegian' several times in his article, for example in his title: “Three prominent *Norwegian* ladies with British connections” (Sørheim 2011). Similar chains of equivalence are apparent later in the article:

“During the 9th century, such raids increased in frequency and size and became “a veritable mass movement”. It was mostly the coast around the Irish Sea that was afflicted by *the Norwegians* and from there directly to Loire and Garonne, a route that was well known from earlier raids and also much trafficked during the Merovingian Period. We know that *the Norwegians* settled on the islands north and west of Scotland from about 800” (Sørheim 2011:46, my translation).

Shetelig's *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennom tidene* also use 'Norwegian' to term the Vikings:

“For *the Norwegians* during the age of the sagas and the Middle Ages, the islands north of Scotland were not perceived as foreign country, but as an area they reckoned as *their own*, though in a changing relationship to the kingdom and king, but entirely populated by *Norwegians*, with *Norwegian language and history*” (Shetelig 1930:182, my translation).

As many as 17 texts create chains of equivalence between different Viking Age elements and the term 'Norwegian' (see table 23). Eight texts create chains of equivalence between moments related to Viking Age graves, such as grave mounds, ship graves and grave finds, and the term 'Norwegian' (Blindheim 1953; Brøgger 1937a; Brøgger, et al. 1917; Grieg 1928; Ingstad 1982; Shetelig 1925b; Solberg 2003; Sørheim 2011). This can be exemplified through Shetelig and Blindheim:

“Thanks to the quaint grave customs of the Viking Age we receive a strangely rich picture of the daily working life of that time. These *Norwegian forms of burial* show at the same time a high degree of independence in the face of foreign influence” (Shetelig 1925b:187-188, my translation).

“[...] just underneath a steep outcrop a double grave containing a man and a woman was found, with an unusually fine equipment, amongst others two pieces of jewellery that are unique in *Norwegian Viking Age material* [...]” (Blindheim 1953:8, my translation).

Nine of the texts term Viking Age towns and settlements 'Norwegian'. Blindheim (1953:2), Blindheim and Tollnes (1972:9) and Ingstad (1982:51) all refer to Kaupang as a '*Norwegian*' market place, while Shetelig (1925b:183; 1930:211), Grieg (1928:80) and Martens (1960:100) refer to Viking settlements abroad as '*Norwegian*'. Myhre (1992:301) presents the Borre grave field as an important centre in “the early *history of Norway*”, while Munch et al. (1987:149) describe the chieftain's farm at Borg as “the *first Norwegian*” chieftain's farm found north of the Arctic Circle.

Only three of the texts create chains of equivalence where they seem to be critically aware of the possible contribution to a national identity discourse (see table 23). Solberg, for example, in her presentation of Ottar's descriptions of his travels along the Norwegian coast, discusses whether his use of the word *Nordweg* is purely a geographical description, or whether it is a description of the inhabitants, and that a “Norwegian” identity has arisen (2003:277). In this instance she includes quotation marks around the word *Norwegian*. The quotation marks denote that it might not be certain that the Vikings viewed themselves as Norwegian, that this precise term might not yet be of use, or at least not inhabiting the same meaning as today. However, Solberg is not consistent in her terminology. She alternates between the terms Norwegian, Scandinavian, Northern and Norse when describing different aspects of the Viking Age. For example, in her description of the Viking settlements abroad

she mentions Norwegian Vikings, Norse settlement expansions and Scandinavian groups and influences in the same paragraph:

“The activity of *Norwegian* and *Danish* Vikings focused primarily on the west. However, the *Danish* and the *Norwegians* had different areas of interest even though they sometimes overlapped. [...] It has for a long time been a prevailing view that the *Norse* settlement expansion on the islands north of Scotland (No. *Vesterhavssøyene*) first began around 800 [...] There seems to be a period where the Pictish and the *Scandinavian* groups overlap” (Solberg 2003:251, my translation).

Stylegar is also a bit inconsistent in his descriptions. When referring to Kaupang he continuously describes it as being located in “present-day Norway” (2009:67, 72, 79). However, at the same time, he describes the Viking Age and Viking Age material in his article as '*Norwegian*' (2009:67, 77). The only text with no deictic markers, and no chains of equivalence that can be said to contribute to a national identity discourse is Skre (2007b). He is consistent in his use of quotation marks when referring to anything as Norwegian, and is generally very precise in his wording.

Table 23: Texts distributed after chains of equivalence

Moment	Chains of equivalence	Texts	Number of texts
The Viking Age	Norwegian, history of Norway	Brøgger (1916), Brøgger et al. (1917), Shetelig (1925), Grieg (1928), Brøgger (1937), Munch et al. (1987), Christensen et al. (1992), Solberg (2003), Stylegar (2009)	9
The Vikings	Forefathers, Norwegian	Grieg (1928), Shetelig (1930), Hougen (1965), Blindheim and Tollnes (1972), Solberg (2003), Sørheim (2011)	6
Viking Age elements (graves, towns, raids etc.)	Norwegian	Brøgger et al. (1917), Shetelig (1925), Grieg (1928), Shetelig (1930), Brøgger (1937), Blindheim (1953), Martens (1960), Hougen (1965), Blindheim and Tollnes (1972), Dommasnes (1979), Ingstad (1982), Much et al. (1987), Myhre (1992), Resi (2000), Solberg (2003), Stylegar (2009), Sørheim (2011)	17
The Viking Age	“Norwegian” present-day Norway	Solberg (2003), Skre (2007), Stylegar (2009)	3

6.3 MODE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY DISCOURSE

Based on the above analysis, the texts have been placed within different modes according to how explicitly they contribute to a national identity discourse. I have grouped the texts into four different modes; *explicit*, *implicit*, *probably unaware* and *non-existing* (see table 24).

Explicit

Five of the texts fall within this category: Brøgger (1916, 1937a), Shetelig (1925b, 1930) and Grieg (1928) (see table 24). These are all texts that create a very explicit connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity. The Viking Age is in these texts presented as a proud era in the history of Norway, a period that deserves research and attention as it can contribute to a strengthening of the national culture. The Vikings are seen as the forefathers of the Norwegians (Grieg 1928:80), and the Viking Age is presented as Norway's golden age (Brøgger 1937a:174). However, an interesting element here, is that two of the texts critically discuss the usage of modern terms on Viking Age material (Brøgger 1937a; Shetelig 1930). Shetelig asserts how the identity of the Vikings sometimes is confused with modern national terms, and seems surprised that some contemporary Norwegians would want to associate themselves with the Viking raids. The Vikings were gruesome, Shetelig argues. They killed women and children, and burned nuns alive. He seems puzzled that some would want to associate themselves with this (1930:179-180). However, two pages later, Shetelig (1930:182) elaborates on how the islands north of Scotland basically could be termed Norwegian during the Viking Age, as they were populated by Norwegians, the Norwegian language was spoken, most place names were Norwegian etc. Thus, it seems unproblematic to connect a Norwegian identity to a certain type of settlement expansion, while expansions conducted through raids is not to be associated with.

In the article "Golden Age" Brøgger (1937a:138) discusses how our modern perceptions of terms such as state, nation and kingdom have very little to do with the old Kingdom of Norway and its predecessors. These terms are not known in the old literature, they are modern creations. In the preface of the same journal, Brøgger (1937b:5) also warns against using archaeology in nationalistic propaganda. He is evidently aware that archaeology can contribute to a national identity discourse. Yet, terming the Viking Age Norway's golden age, is nevertheless presented as if unproblematic (Brøgger 1937a:174, 190).

Implicit

The largest category containing nine texts is placed within an implicit mode (see table 24). These texts present a pretty strong connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity, but their wording is not as explicit as the texts in the previous category. The texts in this category still present different elements from the Viking Age as clearly Norwegian, but the authors do not go as far as to call the period Norway's golden age, and the wording in general is slightly less patriotic. However, the Viking Age is still presented as the history of Norway, and as containing information about Norway's roots (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:89; Christensen, et al. 1992:7-9). Settlements both at home and abroad are described as being Norwegian, and sources that can distinguish between Norwegian, Swedish and Danish settlements and voyages are emphasized (Blindheim 1953; Hougen 1965; Martens 1960; Munch, et al. 1987; Solberg 2003; Sørheim 2011).

Probably unaware

Five of the texts can be said to be probably unaware of their contribution to a national identity discourse (see table 24). This does not mean that they do not contribute to the creation and maintenance of the discourse, but that, based on their wording, they might not be conscious of it. It will be argued in the final discussion that some formulations and wordings have become so embedded in the discourse that researchers are not necessarily aware of the implications that come with them. In these texts, different elements related to the Viking Age are still presented as Norwegian, but the patriotic undertones are no longer as easily traceable. Especially grave finds are described as being Norwegian, and for example Myhre presents the grave field at Borre as having a "special name in Norway's early history" (1992:301). However, based on the general wording of the texts, I will argue that a connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity is not made intentionally by any of the texts. For example Stylegar terms both the Viking Age itself and material from the period as Norwegian, but at the same time describes the location of Kaupang as being in "present day Norway" (2009:67).

Non-existing

Only one of the texts can be described as not contributing to a national identity discourse. This is the text by Skre (2007b), which is also the only text without deictic markers or chains of equivalence that create a connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity. I

contend that the lack of deictic markers and chains of equivalence in this text are partly due to the genre and intended audience. This will be elaborated in the following.

Table 24: Texts distributed after mode of national identity discourse

Mode of national identity discourse	Text	Number of texts
Explicit	Brøgger (1916), Shetelig (1925), Grieg (1928), Shetelig (1930), Brøgger (1937)	5
Implicit	Brøgger et al. (1917), Blindheim (1953), Martens (1960), Hougen (1965), Blindheim and Tollnes (1972), Munch et al. (1987), Christensen et al. (1992), Solberg (2003), Sørheim (2011)	9
Probably unaware	Dommasnes (1979), Ingstad (1982), Myhre (1992), Resi (2000) Stylegar (2009)	5
Non-existing	Skre (2007)	1

6.4 DEVELOPMENT OVER TIME

As stated in the introduction, one aim has been to trace how the discourse has changed over time. Embedded in this is also the question of how statements get regarded as true and meaningful and as a consequence are reproduced in the discourse (see chapter 3 *Method*).

Based on the categories presented above, it is possible to trace a gradual development throughout the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries from an explicit to a non-existing mode (see table 24). The majority of the texts fit into the following categories and time frame:

- 1916 – 1940: *explicit mode*
- 1950 – 1990: *implicit mode*
- 1990 – 2005: *probably unaware*
- 2005 – 2010: *non-existing*

This is of course a very rough categorisation, and the transitions between the different categories are quite fluid. Especially the categories *implicit mode* and *probably unaware* are not easily separated from each other, and some of the texts in these categories could arguably fit into both. Statements concerning archaeology's role in the strengthening of a national culture are quite common in the texts from the pre-war period. The texts also depict the Viking Age as a proud golden age in the history of Norway. These types of formulations tend to disappear after the war. Nevertheless, even if the patriotic sentiments are slightly toned

down, formulations portraying the Viking settlements in Norway and abroad as Norwegian, continue after the war as well. After the 1990s, the texts, in general, lose their patriotic undertones and explicit connection between the Viking Age and a national identity. However, formulations where elements from the Viking Age, such as grave finds, are termed Norwegian continue. After the year 2000, at least one text has lost all clear connections between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity. Thus, I contend that it has been possible to trace changes within the material that correspond quite well to the classifications presented above. Still, there are a few exceptions. In the group termed implicit, there are mostly texts written between 1950 and 1990. However, three texts are of a later date than the majority (Christensen, et al. 1992; Solberg 2003; Sørheim 2011). I argue that these exceptions are partly due to the genre of the texts, as well as their intended audience.

Intended audience

The intended audience of a text will influence how a text is written. I would therefore expect that texts aimed at academics and other archaeologists, and texts aimed at a general public, would convey different statements and representations of the past. I hold that this is the case for the texts written by Christensen, et al. (1992) and Solberg (2003). I have placed both of these texts in the category termed implicit mode, but they differ from the other texts in terms of when they were written. The book by Christensen, et al. (1992) was written as popular science and published as part of a series of books included in the culture program of the Olympic Winter Games at Lillehammer in 1994. Therefore, it is not aimed at an academic audience, but a broader general public with an interest in the Viking Age. Also, the Olympic Games often generate feelings of national pride within the host country (Malfas, et al. 2004). Seen in light of this, it is perhaps less surprising that the Viking Age is presented as being “an exciting period in the history of Norway” and “our nations roots” (Christensen, et al. 1992:7, 9). Moreover, this book was not exclusive in its presentation of the Viking Age as being an important part of Norway’s history during the Olympic Games at Lillehammer. Elements from the Viking Age were used actively throughout the games, such as two “Viking children”, Kristin and Håkon, which were used as mascots and depicted on everything from pins to coffee cups.

The book by Solberg (2003) has probably also been influenced by the intended audience. This book was written as an introductory textbook for archaeology students. Hence, it is written more in line with popular science, where the argumentation typically is simplified and competing theories within the field are downplayed (Hesjedal 2000:20). As this book is

intended for students, I would suspect that emphasis has been put on making the book as interesting as possible. This will also have influenced the wording. However, precisely because this book is a textbook for students, the strong connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity that is conveyed can be viewed as problematic.

One more text stands out from the group with an implicit mode. This is the text by Sørheim (2011). This article was published in an archaeological journal with, most probably, academics and other archaeologists as the intended audience. Therefore, I find it difficult to explain the strong connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity presented in this article. Instead, the reasons for why the article was accepted by the editorial board of the journal should perhaps be questioned. As already mentioned, the text by Skre (2007b) is almost certainly affected by the intended audience. The article presented here is part of a three-volume publication aimed at a large, international audience. Several of the articles are written by archaeologists from a variety of countries, and all volumes are published in English. Skre is, in addition, the editor of the entire series, which will most likely have made him very precise in his wording.

6.5 SUMMARY

The analysis and discussions presented here has shown that a national identity discourse can be found within Norwegian archaeological research on the Viking Age. Deictic markers and chains of equivalence that contribute to the creation and maintenance of this discourse has been presented and discussed; the Vikings and Viking Age are presented as '*Norwegian*' and belonging to '*our*' national history. The analysis illustrates how the discourse has changed over time, and that a gradual development from an explicit to a non-existing discourse can be traced. It has been suggested that the genre and intended audience of the texts contribute to how explicitly the texts express a national identity discourse. It has also been demonstrated how statements, which create associations between the Viking Age and present-day Norwegians, are reproduced in the discourse. All of these results will be elaborated further in the final discussion (chapter 8). Problematic aspects of the national identity discourse will be discussed, and the texts will be placed within larger social, cultural and theoretical contexts. However, prior to this, a less extensive analysis will be made of texts presenting both Viking and Sami archaeological material, and in this way add another aspect to the final discussion.

7. VIKINGS AND SAMI IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL TEXTS

Archaeological texts concerned with differentiating between material remains after the Vikings and the Sami will be presented here in order to create a nuanced picture of the discourse. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the terms 'Vikings' and 'Sami' will be applied, in favour of other possible terms such as Norse and proto-Sami. Here, the primary intention is to analyse how the Vikings and elements related to the Viking Age are presented and termed when examined in opposition to something else, in this case the Sami. As somewhat different elements have been of interest in these texts, it has been necessary to slightly revise the method when analysing the material. More emphasis has been placed on how the Vikings and Viking Age material are presented in relation to the Sami. The intent is to trace whether similar chains of equivalence appear in these texts as in the texts in the previous chapter, or whether material related to the Vikings are described in a different manner. More specifically, the aim is to examine whether the Vikings are termed *Norwegian* in this material as well, or if other terms are used. The terms located in the texts have been presented as *ethnic identities* at the end of each presented text. Certain deictic markers have also been selected.

7.1 CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF TEXTS

As this analysis will be less extensive than the previous, fewer texts have been included. Hence, the material cannot be seen as fully representative. However, I will argue that it should still be possible to trace tendencies within this material, and in this way contribute to the final discussion. Eight texts written between 1928 and 2010 have been chosen. In this way the timeframe will largely correspond to the timeframe of the Viking Age material. The only criteria to the contents of the texts have been that they refer to both Sami and Viking archaeological material found in present-day Norway.

7.2 PRESENTATION OF TEXTS

Gutorm Gjessing (1928) – Finsk-Ugriske vikingetidssmykker i Norge, in *Universitetets Oldsaksamlings årbok*

In this article, Gutorm Gjessing discusses jewellery of a Finno-Ugric origin found in graves dated to the Viking Age in Norway. He divides the finds into two groups, a North Norwegian group and a South Norwegian/Trønderlag group (1928:23). He starts with the North Norwegian group where he asserts that it is difficult to talk of a Viking Age, as the culture is

strongly dominated by Lapps, and the few finds of a Scandinavian type should be seen as foreign elements (1928:23). However, Gjessing emphasises that the finds might suggest that there has been “resident Norwegians” in this area, not just random visitors (1928:24). Gjessing gives a detailed description of all the finds of a Finno-Ugric origin, and places them either in a Lappish or a Norwegian context. When discussing how the objects found their way into the country, Gjessing concludes that it cannot have been “Norwegians who brought them here”, but that they “came to the country with Lappish people” (1928:32, my translation). When discussing how the South Norwegian group of jewellery came to the country, Gjessing postulates two alternatives; that it arrived in the same manner as the northern finds, with the Lapps, or directly from the east, through trade or raids by Norwegian Vikings (1928:38-39).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Lapps, Vikings: Norwegian, Norse, Scandinavian

Deictic markers: Gjessing uses the deictic marker *our*, such as: “*our* finds”.

Povl Simonsen (1967) – Relations between the Lapps and the Scandinavians in early times – an archaeological survey, in *Lapps and Norsemen in olden times*

Povl Simonsen’s aim with this article is to “study the frontier and bridge between two great cultural complexes” in Northern Norway (1967:65). In order to examine cultural impulses between Scandinavian and Lappish communities, Simonsen asserts that archaeological material from the entire 'Lappish Iron Age' (A.D. 300 – 1600) must be analysed (1967:66). The Lappish Iron Age is divided into three distinct periods; the Kjelmöy period, the period of the Varanger graves, and the late pagan period. The finds from the Varanger graves are dated to A.D. 800 – 1100, and consist primarily of ornaments with a Finno-Ugric origin. According to Simonsen, the same eastern imports also turn up in “the Norwegian hoards from the Viking period”, and that “these hoards show, in their content as well as their distribution – often in areas not inhabited by Norwegians – that we here have marks of trade relations and the collecting of the 'Lapp tax' (paid by the Lapps to the Norwegian chieftains)” (1967:71). Simonsen also emphasises another Viking Age grave find from “the northernmost Norwegian graves in North Troms” (1967:71). According to Simonsen, a “settling of Norwegians” must have taken place here, where, in order to survive, “the Norwegians had to learn Lappish occupations, hunting of furred animals, catching of seals and small whales, and perhaps reindeer-breeding” (1967:72). Simonsen asserts that from the Viking Age there are several finds that testify to Lappish culture and “Lappish influence in Norwegian-populated districts” (1967:72).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Lapps, Vikings: Norwegian

Lars F. Stenvik (1980) – Samer og nordmenn. Sett i lys av et uvanlig gravfunn fra Saltenområdet, in *Viking*

In this article, titled *Sami and Norwegians*, Lars F. Stenvik describes two Iron Age grave mounds containing burials in boats excavated in Gildeskål, Bodø (Stenvik 1980). One of the mounds contained the skeletal remains of a “long skulled woman with a presumed age of over 70 years. The woman may have measured approximately 156 cm and has belonged to the “Nordic race”” (1980:127, my translation). The other mound contained the remains of an “extremely short skulled” man of about 50-60 years of age. This is an “obvious Sami” as the measurements of the skull “are one of the characteristics that clearly separates the Sami population from the Norwegian” (1980:129, my translation). The only problem is, according to Stenvik, that the grave does not fit in with what is known about Sami grave customs. There are no known examples of other Sami burials in boats, and the grave is situated outside the Sami dominated settlement area. Thus, Stenvik concludes that the Sami must be buried in a “Norwegian hamlet” (1980:132, my translation). Stenvik seeks to explain how the Sami can have been buried in such a grave and in such an area. He concludes that “based on what is previously mentioned about commercial contact between Sami and Norwegians, it is tempting to view the buried Sami as a trade chieftain who died on one of his voyages in an area where he was known and revered among the local population” (1980:137, my translation). Yet, he concludes by stating that the grave find makes it difficult to determine ethnicity, as it is hard to define cultural affiliation based on grave goods (1980:137).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Sami, short skulled, Vikings: Norwegian, Nordic race, Norse, long skulled

Arne Skjølsvold (1980) – Refleksjoner omkring jernaldergravene i sydnorske fjellstrøk, in *Viking*

In this article, Arne Skjølsvold seeks to categorise Iron Age mountain graves found in South Norwegian mountain regions. Skjølsvold asserts that the grave finds point to hunting as a fundamental activity for the people buried in the mountains. However, dominating theories has characterised the mountain graves as indicating a nearby shieling or farm (1980:141). These theories are due to a South Scandinavian way of thought where the farming community has been in focus when it comes to “most settlement studies from the Neolithic

and later through our entire history” (1980:141, my translation). Skjølsvold wishes to place more emphasis on “the fundamental importance of hunting (No. *veiding*) in our country in prehistoric times [...]” (1980:141, my translation). Skjølsvold uses most of the article to discuss whether the mountain graves belong to a shieling culture, a farming culture or a hunting culture. He concludes that hunting seems to be the only logical explanation for the graves, and that this indicates the existence of population groups who used hunting as their main or only acquisition during the Iron Age. When discussing who these population groups might have been, Skjølsvold refers to a theory concerning the Sami’s advance towards the south of Norway, and that this might have happened already during prehistoric times. Many place names in South Norwegian mountain regions also contain the word *finnar*. However, Skjølsvold asserts that he will not take a stance on the question about the Sami culture’s earliest settlement in the South (1980:156). Nevertheless, he concludes the article by stating that, based on the previous discussion, it is tempting to suggest that several of the mountain graves “can be the remains of a hunting settlement” (1980:157, my translation).

Ethnic identity: Sami: hunting culture, Sami, Vikings (Iron Age): farming culture, shieling culture

Deictic markers: Skjølsvold uses the deictic marker *our*: “our country”, “our prehistory”, “our mountain regions”, “our finds”.

Audhild Schanche (1989) – Jernalderens bosettingsmønster i et fleretnisk perspektiv, in *Framskritt for fortida i nord: I Povel Simonsens fotefar*

Audhild Schanche asserts in this article that since Tromsø Museum received its archaeological department in 1874, the majority of the research has focused on “the Norwegian settlement in the region” (1989:171, my translation). However, according to Schanche, this has changed during the 15-20 years before this article was written, as more articles concerned with questions about Sami settlements in historic and prehistoric times has been published (1989:171). Schanche asserts that the archaeological material that can be directly connected to a Sami settlement south of Northern Troms is very meagre. She wonders whether there exists “characteristics among the rich material from the Norwegian Iron Age that can be used to trace a contemporaneous Sami settlement” (1989:172, my translation). Schanche chooses in her analysis not to differ between early and late Iron Age, but asserts that the situation she is describing is closest to the situation found towards the end of the Iron Age (1989:172). The entire article is devoted to a discussion where Schanche

seeks to determine the delineation of what she terms “Norwegian” and “Sami” settlement patterns. She concludes by stating that even though Sami archaeological material is lacking, it is not impossible to develop theories about Sami settlement patterns. For example, “the Norwegian settlement patterns during the Iron Age are hard to explain without a reference to the relation Norwegian/Sami” (1989:181, my translation).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Sami, Vikings (Iron Age): Norwegian, Norse

Inger Storli (1991) – De østlige smykkene fra vikingtid og tidlig middelalder, in *Viking*

In this article, Inger Storli discusses jewellery of an eastern origin found in graves dated to the Viking Age and Early Middle Ages. This is the same jewellery discussed by Gjessing (1928). Her purpose is to discuss the distribution and context of the jewellery, and use “jewellery of an eastern origin found in Norse graves as a basis for discussing the relationship between Sami and Norwegians in this period, and the Sami’s status in the Viking Age society” (1991:92, my translation). In her argumentation, Storli places a lot of emphasis on trying to differentiate between what she terms “Norwegian” and “Sami” graves (1991:92, 95, 96). Storli is not always consistent in her terminology though, graves and settlement sites that are not characterised as Sami, are sometimes referred to as Norse, and sometimes Norse and Norwegian are used in the same paragraph: “How shall we then perceive the eastern jewellery found in *Norse* graves? The material comprises in all 14 graves, partly richly furnished, and which therefore are perceived as Norwegian” (1991:96, my translation, emphasis in original). One grave is also described as “a “*mixed*” grave, i.e. with characteristics that point to both the Norwegian and the Sami population” (1991:96, my translation, emphasis in original). Storli also argues that some of the graves might represent Sami women married to Norwegian men. She asserts that “there have been found female graves with Scandinavian jewellery in Sami areas, and female graves with Sami jewellery in Norwegian areas” (1991:99, my translation). She interprets this as an expression of the “exchange of spouses between Sami and Norwegians” (1991:100, my translation). Storli concludes the article by stating that she sees the jewellery as “an expression of a cultural orientation towards the east which has roots all the way back to the Stone Age” (1991:101).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Sami, Vikings: Norwegian, Norse

Jostein Bergstøl and Gaute Reitan (2008) – Samer på Dovrefjell i vikingtiden, in *Historisk tidsskrift*

Jostein Bergstøl and Gaute Reitan focus in this article on archaeological finds made at Aursjøen at Dovrefjell. The finds consist of four paved fireplaces placed on a line. As these type of fireplaces are known only from Sami culture, the authors argue that these finds confirm the existence of a Sami settlement at Dovrefjell during the Viking Age (2008:9). Most of the article is devoted to a description of the excavated site, the fireplaces and other archaeological finds found on the site. The authors continuously argue for a Sami settlement on the site, as the finds are “common finds in earlier examined Sami contexts” (2008:23, my translation). Bergstøl and Reitan argue that in order to ascribe archaeological material to a specific ethnic group, a conscious relationship to the material is demanded. An example is when trying to differentiate between Sami and Norse settlement forms. The way the settlement is organised includes many cultural codes, and “in the meeting between sedentary Norse farmers and mobile Sami hunters, this difference has been accentuated” (2008:24, my translation). Bergstøl and Reitan emphasise that the material presented must be understood as material remains of a Sami community that has used the site several times during the Viking Age. The material also “indicates that the contact between Sami and Norse societies was more extensive than previously assumed”, and material from Sweden “suggests that the contact between Sami and Norse societies not only has occurred far south, but also on a high political level” (2008:26, my translations).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Sami, Vikings: Norse

Hege Skalleberg Gjerde (2010) – Tilfeldig? Neppe. Finsk-ugriske smykker i Sør-Norge, in *Viking*

In this article, Hege Skalleberg Gjerde also discusses the jewellery of a Finno-Ugric origin described by Gjessing (1928). Gjerde focuses specifically on three pendants found in Southern Norway (2010:49-50). She asserts that a large number of Eastern pendants found in Scandinavia are found at Sami sacrificial sites or metal deposits in Northern Sweden and are usually connected to Sami cultic practice (2010:53). The ornamentation on the pendants can often be related to prehistoric Sami religious practice. However, according to Gjerde, “similarities to Sami, shamanistic religious practice do not exclude Norse religious practice. Several have pointed to the similarities between Norse and Sami religion and mythology, and many agree that the Norse seidr is a form of shamanism” (2010:54, my translation). Gjerde

emphasises that “the parallels between Norse and Sami mythology and religious practice are striking, and whether the influence has gone from the Norse to the Sami society or reversely, has been debated for a long time” (2010:55). Gjerde asserts that these pendants are among the finds that indicate a Sami presence in the south of Norway, however “fellowship, networks and interaction with the other Norse population must have been essential” (2010:57, my translation). She also discusses whether the pendants should be seen as an expression of “Saminess” in opposition to the Norse society, or if they might have been an integrated part of it. She concludes by asserting that settlement patterns and material culture that express a relation to Sami culture in Southern Norway open up for a series of questions regarding our perception of ethnic relations (2010:57).

Ethnic identity: Sami: Sami, Vikings: Norse

7.3 ETHNIC IDENTITIES IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL TEXTS

As illustrated through the presented texts, different ethnic identities have been ascribed to both the Vikings and the Sami. In the following, this is discussed through a closer analysis. Quotes and italics are used in order to emphasise specific words and formulations.

Five of the texts term the Vikings and elements from the Viking Age as '*Norwegian*' (see table 25). Gjessing is an example of this, in his description of a grave find dated to the first half of the 10th century:

“The find is of great importance, firstly because it contributes in showing that there has been resident *Norwegians* in Finnmark, and secondly because it, in a splendid way, illustrates the foreign influences which are made apparent on *Lappish* area” (Gjessing 1928:24, my translation).

Also Storli presents the Vikings as 'Norwegian'. She is not always consistent in her terminology though, as the term 'Norse' is used as well: “Finally I want to place finds of jewellery of an eastern origin in *Norse graves* as a basis for discussing the relationship between *Sami* and *Norwegians* during this period, and the Sami’s status in the Viking Age society” (Storli 1991:92, my translation).

Five of the texts use the term 'Norse' when describing the Vikings (see table 25). However, only two of the texts are consistent in their use of this term; Bergstøl and Reitan (2008) and Gjerde (2010). The three other texts (Gjessing 1928; Stenvik 1980; Storli 1991) alternates between 'Norwegian' and 'Norse'. Five of the texts refer to the Sami as 'Sami', while two texts refer to them as 'Lapps' (see table 25). The two texts using 'Lapps' as a term are also

the two oldest texts, written in 1928 and 1967. I contend that the difference in terminology is simply due to when the texts were written, and consequently which terms dominated at that time.

One text does not specifically refer either to the Vikings or the Sami; Skjølsvold (1980). Instead, he applies the terms 'farming culture', 'shieling culture' and 'hunting culture' when seeking to differentiate between the different groups in his article. Only once does he imply a connection between the hunting culture and the Sami, but also here the argumentation is very implicit. He does not make any statements himself, but refers to another researcher's theory about the Sami's advance towards the south (1980:155-156). He eludes any ethnic classification and is unwilling to "take any stance whatsoever on the question about the Sami culture's oldest advance toward the south" (1980:156):

“But if we include the mountain graves in the consideration there is little reason to choose such a “dramatic” interpretation as that they can have been remains after “*indigenous people*” or a *pre-Germanic* hunting people. The graves are as known “*South Scandinavian*” both in construction and grave finds, and there is little basis for drawing in *ethnic differences*. However, this does not prohibit the fact that we might be facing groups of people that have had a *different acquisition basis* than the *farming culture*” (Skjølsvold 1980:156, my emphases, my translation).

Hence, it is partly my interpretation of these terms that has led me to place 'farming culture' and 'shieling culture' in connection to the moment Viking/Iron Age and 'hunting culture' in connection to the moment Sami.

Table 25: Texts distributed after ethnic identity

Moment	Ethnic identity	Texts	Number of texts
Viking	Norwegian	Gjessing (1928), Simonsen (1967), Stenvik (1980), Schanche (1989), Storli (1991)	5
Viking	Norse	Gjessing (1928), Stenvik (1980), Storli (1991), Bergstøl and Reitan (2008), Gjerde (2010)	5
Viking/Iron Age	Farming culture/shieling culture	Skjølsvold (1980)	1
Sami	Sami	Stenvik (1980), Schanche (1989), Storli (1991), Bergstøl and Reitan (2008), Gjerde (2010)	5
Sami	Lapps	Gjessing (1928), Simonsen (1967)	2
Sami	Hunting culture	Skjølsvold (1980)	1

Deictic markers

Only two of the texts use deictic markers in a way that attract attention (Gjessing 1928; Skjølsvold 1980). Both Gjessing and Skjølsvold use the deictic marker '*our*'. With Gjessing's text it has been difficult to decide whether the deictic marker alludes to a connection between the Viking Age and the modern day, or if it is simply used as a pedagogical tool, as a means of guiding the reader through the text. Gjessing uses the deictic marker '*we*' as a way of addressing the reader: "For various reasons I find it most correct to start with the North Norwegian [group], and *we* will then quite shortly summarise the cultural conditions in Finnmark" (1928:23, my translation). In my opinion, the use of the deictic marker '*our*' can be seen to represent the same textual tool, as when Gjessing is describing different grave finds: "In one of the graves from Kremon lies a scabbard together with a medieval sword [...] Nevertheless, I think *we* can safely date *our* scabbard to the Viking Age" (1928:32, my translation). Skjølsvold's use of the deictic marker is more clearly connected to a national identity discourse:

"[...] the farming culture has been in focus when it comes to most settlement studies all the way from the Neolithic and later through *our entire history*. [...] The fundamental importance of hunting to the livelihood in *our country* in prehistoric times has albeit been accentuated, but the farmer and hunter has, fairly one-sided, been regarded as one and the same person [...]" (Skjølsvold 1980:141, my translation).

Skjølsvold never defines who "*our*" is referring to, and since he never uses terms like Norwegian, Norse, Sami etc. it is more challenging to understand who the deictic marker is signalling. However, since this article is written in Norwegian and published in a Norwegian journal, the implicit meaning seems to be other Norwegians. The lack of deictic markers in the remaining texts can partly be due to the fact that discussing Sami archaeological material was for a long time regarded as more problematic and controversial than discussing "Norwegian" material (Olsen 1997:265-266; Skandfer 2001:119-120). Thus, referring to anything as '*our*' may not have been perceived as a natural part of the discourse. This is discussed further in the next chapter.

Mode of national identification

Based on the above analysis, the texts have been placed within the same type of categories as the texts in the previous chapter (see chapter 6.3 *Mode of national identity discourse*). The groups presented here have been termed the same as in the previous chapter however; the

criteria for classification are slightly different. The texts are here grouped only after how explicitly they use the term '*Norwegian*' in relation to descriptions about the Vikings.

Explicit

Four of the texts have been placed in an explicit mode of national identification; Gjessing (1928), Simonsen (1967), Stenvik (1980) and Storli (1991) (see table 26). These texts are very clear in their use of the term '*Norwegian*' when describing the Vikings in opposition to the Sami. The texts focus on differentiating between Sami and Norwegian artefacts and culture traits, and emphasis is placed on describing culture contact between defined Sami and Norwegian settlement areas.

Implicit

Two of the texts have been placed in the implicit category (see table 26). Skjølvold (1980) have been placed in this category as he never mentions either the terms '*Norwegian*' or '*Sami*'. However, he places a lot of emphasis on differentiating between a farming and a hunting culture. Based on his use of the deictic marker '*our*' and his implied connection between the hunting culture and the Sami, I contend that there exists an implicit connection between the farming culture and a Norwegian identity. Schanche (1989) could arguably have been placed in an explicit mode of ethnic identification. Her text is devoted to a description of '*Sami*' and '*Norwegian*' settlement patterns, and she asserts that most of her material is from the end of the Iron Age, i.e. the Viking Age. Nevertheless, as she never explicitly uses the term Viking Age to describe her material, I have categorised her text as implicit.

Non-existing

None of the texts have been placed within the probably unaware mode. The last two texts have been placed within the category termed non-existing; Bergstøl and Reitan (2008), and Gjerde (2010) (see table 26). These texts consequently use the term '*Norse*' when describing elements from the Viking Age. Therefore, no connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity is created.

Thus, as can be seen in table 26, it is possible to trace a very rough development over time, from an explicit to a non-existing mode of national identification. The two earliest written texts (Gjessing 1928; Simonsen 1967) have been placed within the explicit mode of national identification, while the two newest texts (Bergstøl and Reitan 2008; Gjerde 2010) have been placed in the non-existing mode. The unexpected element that came out of this

analysis was the four remaining texts, all written between 1980 and 1991, and all placed in either an explicit or implicit mode of national identification. Their use of the term *'Norwegian'* in opposition to *'Sami'* was surprisingly obvious. No texts were placed in the probably unaware category. However, there exists a gap of 17 years between the text written by Storli in 1991 and the text written by Bergstøl and Reitan in 2008. If texts from this period had been included, I expect that some of these would have fit into this category.

Table 26: Texts distributed after mode of national identification

Mode of national identification	Text	Number of texts
Explicit	Gjessing (1928), Simonsen (1967), Stenvik (1980), Storli (1991)	4
Implicit	Skjølvold (1980), Schanche (1989)	2
Probably unaware	-	-
Non-existing	Bergstøl and Reitan (2008), Gjerde (2010)	2

7.4 SUMMARY

This chapter has consisted of a presentation of a selection of texts that seek to differentiate between archaeological material assigned to the Vikings and the Sami, and an analysis of these. The intention has been to examine which terms that are assigned to the Vikings in these texts, and whether similar or different chains of equivalence and deictic markers would appear here as in the texts in the previous chapter. As illustrated in the analysis the majority of the texts presented here create explicit or implicit connections between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity. The Vikings are presented as *'Norwegian'* in all but two texts, and the term is used in a more expressed manner when compared to contemporaneous texts in the previous chapter. The analysis has also demonstrated a development over time, where the explicit connection between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity no longer is traceable in the texts produced after the year 2000. The results from the analysis, such as the strong contribution to a national identity discourse found in the texts from the 1980s and 90s, will be discussed further in the next chapter. The texts will also be placed within larger social and theoretical contexts, and discussed in relation to issues regarding the use of contemporary ethnic identities on prehistoric groups.

PART 3: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

8. THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORWEGIAN VIKING

The presented texts and subsequent analysis illustrate that a national identity discourse can be found within Norwegian archaeological research on the Viking Age. 19 out of 20 texts suggest a connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian identity (see table 24). Although not always explicit, elements that contribute to the creation and maintenance of a national identity discourse can be found in all but one text. Deictic markers are present in 13 texts, while chains of equivalence connecting aspects associated with the Viking Age era to a Norwegian identity are found in 19 (see tables 22 and 23). The Viking Age is often presented as a distinct period in a common, unifying history related to the present Norwegian nation. This is evident by phrasings that refer to '*Norwegian*' Vikings and '*our forefathers*', or comparisons with '*Swedish*' or '*Danish*' Vikings. Comparably, the use of the term '*Norse*' is less frequent.

The authors' choice of particular words and statements in the texts written prior to the Second World War have been argued earlier in the thesis to have significant impact on the national identity discourse. In this regard, it is beneficial to consider the texts related to their social and cultural context. The Norwegian society was characterised by a strong national sentiment during the years following the dissolution of the union with Sweden, and archaeology was used to bolster national pride. Norwegian archaeological research was at this time characterised by a culture-historical approach. This approach, which dominated archaeological research in general, viewed ethnic groups as clearly defined, homogeneous entities, where national historic narratives were conveyed as unbroken, linear, historical accounts, with a unitary origin, and frequently a 'Golden Age' (Jones 1996:64-65; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996:3). Therefore, the texts by Brøgger (1916, 1937), Shetelig (1925, 1930) and Grieg (1928), and the explicit national discourse conveyed in these, must be viewed in light of the social, cultural and theoretical milieu in which they were integrated. However, despite this, Brøgger and Shetelig are both very explicit in their condemnation of the use of archaeology for nationalistic purposes (Brøgger 1937b; Shetelig 1930, 1935). They express an awareness of the potentially dangerous relationship between archaeology and nationalism. In spite of that, they were not very critical to their own research, which illustrates how closely connected archaeology and national interests was at this time.

The problematic aspects of a nationally oriented archaeology in Norway have been discussed during the last few decades (e.g. Eikrem 2005; Prescott 2013; Skre 2001; Solli 1996a, 1997a, b, 2002; Svanberg 2003; Østigård 2001). This thesis adds to the discussion by

highlighting the banal markers of the national identity discourse, i.e. the words that have become such a natural part of the discourse that they are hardly noticed. In chapter 6.3 (*Mode of national identity discourse*) 14 out of 20 texts were placed in either an implicit or probably unaware mode of a national identity discourse. The majority of these were written between 1950 and 2005. In the discussion of how the discourse has development over time (chapter 6.4) these two modes were separated at about 1990. This is a very fluid line, and several of the texts could arguably have been placed in both. This is best exemplified through an overview of the social and theoretical standpoints that dominated archaeological research around 1990, both within and outside Norway.

Archaeology in general was during the late 1980s and 90s characterised by the introduction of post-processual archaeology. Post-processualism developed partly as a critique of the positivistic doctrine of an objective and neutral research separated from social and political interests which characterised archaeological theory during the 1960s and 70s (Olsen 1997:67). An important aspect of the new theoretical standpoint was thus a critical awareness of archaeology's role in today's society (e.g. Hodder 1984; Kristiansen 1993; Shanks and Tilley 1987a, b; Trigger 1984; Ucko 1989). Post-processualism also included an increased emphasis on the archaeology of indigenous and minority groups. In Norwegian archaeological research, this became particularly evident through debates concerning the Sami's status as an indigenous population during the 1980s (Olsen 1986; Schanche and Olsen 1985). The debate raised questions concerning the role of Norwegian archaeology in contributing to the perception of Norway as an ethnic homogeneous nation state. Partly due to this debate, post-processual archaeology became quite influential in Norwegian archaeology (Olsen 1997:70-71). As such, it might be expected that Viking Age research in Norway would have been affected by the new theoretical standpoints as well. However, as exemplified in my analysis, post-processualism became less influential here. The texts analysed in this thesis under-communicates theoretical standpoints, both in terms of processual and post-processual theories. The extended use of words such as 'our', 'we', 'Norwegian' and 'forefathers', during the entire time span the presented texts are written within, illustrates that the increased critical emphasis on archaeology's role in presenting Norway as an ethnic homogeneous nation state, did not have profound influence on the Viking Age research.

According to Lise Nordenborg Myhre, post-war archaeology in Norway was dominated by a silent protest against the political abuse inflicted on prehistory by the Nazis during the war. This entailed that archaeology and politics became a non-issue until the end

of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s. Instead, the Norwegian archaeological field was dominated by a material based or ecologically oriented research (Kleppe 1983:1; Myhre 1994:141-142). Elements of this can be traced in the Norwegian Viking Age research as manifested in the analysed texts. Analyses of the archaeological artefacts are in focus, especially in the texts written between 1950 and 1980 (as seen in Blindheim 1953; Blindheim and Tollnes 1972; Dommasnes 1979; Hougen 1965; Ingstad 1982; Martens 1960). Towards the end of the 1980s however, the focus within the Viking Age research seems to change. Emphasis is shifted from a material based focus to research on urban centres and central places, and the role of these and other archaeological finds in a larger, European context (as seen in Christensen, et al. 1992; Munch, et al. 1987; Myhre 1992). The research on urban centres was more theoretically oriented than previous research. However, debates regarding archaeology's role in today's society, or theories concerning perceptions of ethnic identities, are still absent. Thus, statements creating a connection between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity are still present in the texts.

The critical approach that characterised post-processualism led to several important works concerning identity, ethnicity and the social construction of the nation (Anderson 1983; Atkinson, et al. 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Jones 1997; Kohl and Fawcett 1996; Ringrose and Lerner 1993). These works focus on how our perceptions of ethnicity, cultural identity and the nation are quite recent in origin and often constructed. Several argue that this is partly due to the close tie between archaeology and nationalism. The Norwegian Viking Age research, as exemplified in the analysed texts, appears largely unaffected by these works. The themes discussed follow the same patterns as before the war, and no specific attention is paid to the on-going debates concerning the constructed nature of identities and nations. It can be argued that this absence of theoretical debates within Norwegian Viking Age research contribute to the reproduction of certain words and statements that maintain a national identity discourse. It is thus possible to find descriptions of the Vikings as '*Norwegian*', without a problematisation of this term, also after the introduction of new critical works (as seen in Christensen, et al. 1992; Munch, et al. 1987; Myhre 1992; Solberg 2003; Stylegar 2009; Sørheim 2011).

Master narratives

In addition to, and possibly as a consequence of, a lack of theoretical discussion within Norwegian Viking Age research, I argue that the creation and maintenance of a national identity discourse is due to the fact that some terms and formulations have become so

embedded in the discourse that their usage and possible implications are not always noted on. In accordance with Foucault (1999); they have become regarded as meaningful and true. This can be exemplified through the texts use of markers such as 'our' 'we' and 'Norwegian'. Who 'we' are, and who the 'Norwegians' are, are never clearly defined in any of the texts. This way, Norwegian identity is projected back in time and an illusion of continuity is created; from the Viking Age on we are Norwegian (jf. Hesjedal 2000:288).

Julia A. King (2012:175) states that even though archaeologists have the potential to produce new or alternative stories of the past, it can be difficult to escape old and familiar master narratives which have been told for so long and so often that they have assumed the status of “incontrovertible historical facts”. Archaeology’s claim to produce a “more democratic” interpretation of the past is complicated by the power of these master narratives as the intertextuality and ideology that these are built on makes them difficult to rewrite (Fairclough 1992:117; 1995:188; King 2012:176-177). As such, I contend that many of the texts in the implicit and probably unaware categories presented above use certain words and formulations partly because of these master narratives. Terms and statements that were developed during the pre-war years under the influence of a national ideology turned into routine terms and statements that have been repeated again and again until they have become regarded as truths. New empirical data have easily been interpreted within this ideological framework (Opedal 1999:71; Skre 1991:323). Shetelig (1930), for example, exemplifies the influence of 'Norwegian' Vikings on the British Isles by referring to 'Norwegian' place names and lone words. In the same manner, Martens (1960:100) use place names to differentiate between 'Danish' and 'Norwegian' settlements on the British Isles, Solberg (2003:246) asserts that the first Vikings raids on the British Isles probably was done by 'Norwegian' Vikings, and Sørheim (2011:46) states that the coast around the Irish Sea was affected by the 'Norwegians'.

In light of this, I do not intend to imply that all the texts in the implicit mode express a particular desire to contribute to the creation of a national identity discourse. They do however convey a connection between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity that is more notable than in the texts in the probably unaware mode. For example, Martens (1960) and Hougen (1965) emphasise the difference between Norwegian, Swedish and Danish finds, and the connection between the Viking Age and the term 'Norwegian' is generally more explicit, especially in Munch, et al. (1987), Christensen, et al. (1992), Solberg (2003) and Sørheim (2011).

Sami and Norwegians

Archaeological texts that seek to differentiate between archaeological material assigned to the Vikings and the Sami were included in the analysis in order to examine how the Vikings are termed when presented in opposition to something else. In this material, five out of eight texts present the Vikings as 'Norwegian' (see table 25). Five texts also apply the term 'Norse', but only two of the texts are consistent in their use (Bergstøl and Reitan 2008; Gjerde 2010).

The prominent national context that Norwegian archaeology as a field developed within had unfortunate consequences for research in Northern Norway, and Sami prehistory in particular. Sami prehistory was made invisible and neglected, a tradition that continued up towards the 1980s (Schanche and Olsen 1985). As such, the texts by Gjessing (1928) and Simonsen (1967) can be seen as untypical for their time, as they both are very aware of the existence of both 'Norwegian' and 'Sami' populations in Northern Norway during the Iron Age. However, a strong connection between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity is still present in the texts. Gjessing's text was written at a time when fear of the contiguous effects of the Russian Revolution was very strong, and due to the close proximity to Russia, this fear was especially prominent in the north. Consequently, it was seen as very important to strengthen the Norwegian identity in this part of the country, which partly resulted in a Norwegianization of the Sami. In contrast to Gjessing, most archaeologists ignored a Sami presence during prehistory in Northern Norway (Schanche and Olsen 1985:89). Simonsen wrote his text at a time when the effects of the Second World War still could be traced in the research. As mentioned earlier, this consisted of a silent protest against the misuse of archaeology, and a material based focus that largely continued in the same track as before the war. Thus, the strong connection between the Vikings and a Norwegian identity found in the texts by Gjessing and Simonsen can partly be explained by the contemporary social and academic milieu they were written within.

The 1980s was a time of profound changes within the archaeological field in general, and new theoretical standpoints including increased ethnic awareness brought with them several important studies within Sami archaeology (e.g. Odner 1983; Olsen 1984; Schanche 1986; Zachrisson 1984). However, there was still being published articles such as Stenvik (1980) where skeletal remains are identified as Sami on the basis of measurements of a skull. This was a common method used to separate between the origins of Sami and "Norwegian" populations at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. It is thus rather surprising to find the use of this method as late as the 1980s. Also Skjølsvol's (1980) text can be viewed as problematic due to its terminology. He consequently uses the terms 'hunting

culture', 'shieling culture' and 'farming culture' to describe the graves in his article. Until the middle of the 1980s it was common practice to use neutral keywords such as 'hunting groups' and 'hunting culture', and in this way avoid terming the neighbouring group of the Norse population 'Sami'. According to Hesjedal (2004:16), these are neutral categories that masks and understates both a prehistoric and contemporary ethnic diversity. Researchers seem to have been unwilling to argue for the possibility of different ethnic groups during prehistory in present day Norway. By using these neutral terms, archaeologists were able to avoid taking a stance on questions regarding Sami prehistory (e.g. Skjølsvold 1980:156). Hesjedal (2004:16) asserts that traditions like these were one of the factors that led to Sami archaeology not being taken seriously by researchers until the middle of the 1980s.

All four texts written during the 1980s and 90s in my analysis present the Vikings as 'Norwegian' either explicitly or implicitly. I contend that this is due to the same master narratives as presented previously. Following the pre-war tradition, applying ethnic markers such as 'Norwegian' was perceived as neutral science. This is particularly prominent in the research that is concerned with both Viking and Sami material. The 1980s and 90s was a time when Sami archaeology was establishing itself as a prominent research field. This happened in accordance with the Sami political developments in Norway. With the passing of the Sami Law in 1987 it was viewed as a public responsibility to protect Sami culture and ethnicity, and the Sami were to speak their own cause in the Norwegian society (Furre 2000:296). The protection of Sami cultural heritage older than 100 years was included in the Cultural Heritage Act in 1978, and the Sami Parliament of Norway was established in 1989 (Holme 2005:142). Therefore, researchers working with Sami archaeology might have felt it important to emphasise Sami archaeology in opposition to the traditional "Norwegian". The terminology is accentuated in the texts from this period: Both the term 'Sami' and the term 'Norwegian' are emphasised.

A clear divide separates the texts written during the 1980s and 90s, and the texts written after 2000. Bergstøl and Reitan (2008) and Gjerde (2010) are the only texts that are consistent in their use of the term 'Norse' in favour of 'Norwegian'. Both texts are also concerned with Sami material in Southern Norway. Discussions regarding the Sami expansion to the south of Scandinavia, where different interpretations of the past have been presented, have been subject to intense debate (e.g. Bergstøl 1997; 2004; Jünge 1996; Narmo and Hansen 2000; Price 2000, 2002; Zachrisson and Nockert 1997). Archaeological research has even been used as evidence in legal disputes concerning the rights to land between Sami villages and Swedish or Norwegian landowners (Bergstøl 2009; Zachrisson 1994). Thus,

many archaeologists have become aware of how archaeological research can be used in present-day politics, and, not at least, the power embedded in the research. This might be one reason for the precise terminology used in the articles by Bergstøl and Reitan, and Gjerde.

The Norwegian Viking Age

Jørgen Haavardsholm (2004) argues that the Viking Age as a clearly defined period with a specific content was created during the 19th century. As discussed in the presentation of Viking Age archaeology in Norway (chapter 2.2), the formulation of a distinct Norwegian culture and history was developed at the same time. As such, I argue that our interpretations and perceptions of history and prehistory to a large degree are social constructions. Interpretations are always dependent on who is doing the interpreting. When archaeologists refer to the Vikings, or elements from the Viking Age as 'Norwegian', a connection that projects Norwegian identity back to the Viking Age is constructed. This is bound up with how archaeologists choose to convey information about the Viking Age. In this regard, Solberg's (2003) book can be considered as problematic. Solberg's *Jernalderen i Norge*, is used as a textbook on bachelor level at all four universities that teach archaeology in Norway (Adubofour Millicent pers.comm. 2015; Marek E. Jasinski pers.comm. 2015; UiB 2015; UiO 2014). Thus, it is read by all new archaeology students, and serves the purpose of introducing students to the Iron Age in present day Norway. Several studies show that novice students judge textbooks to be more trustworthy than other sources, and that textbooks are looked to for "answers" to historical questions (Bråten, et al. 2011; Paxton 1999; Wineburg 1991). Solberg's book can thus, as an example of the status a textbook can achieve amongst students, illustrate the potentially problematic aspects when one of the first encounters with the Viking Age in archaeological literature is with the *Norwegian* Viking Age.

I have stated earlier (chapter 5 *Material*) that I view popular science books aimed at a general public as an important part of the discourse. How archaeologists choose to define the Viking Age is not only important in relation to other archaeologists, but, maybe more importantly, in relation to how information is conveyed to the general public. The book by Christensen, Myhre and Ingstad (1992) present the Viking Age as an important period "in the history of Norway" (1992:7). The intention of the book is to "tell something about our nation's roots" and in this way appeal to "the entire nation" (1992:9). Popular science books typically omit theoretical disputes (Hesjedal 2000:20), so an elaboration on the constructed nature of "our nation's roots" is perhaps not expected. However, formulations such as "our nation" and "our roots" are never defined or explained by the authors. In this way, the

connection between the Viking Age and present-day Norwegians is presented as natural. People use history to situate themselves in and make sense of the world in which they live. Archaeology has the power to encode the material world with meaning, in the past as well as the present (Hesjedal 2000; King 2012; Olsen 1997; Solli 1996b). Archaeology can, in this way, be used as a powerful tool in the formation of contemporary identities (King 2012:6, 198). Thus, presenting a prehistoric era as “our roots” contributes to the creation of a contemporary, national identity.

According to Paul Ricoeur (1984) the past can be constructed as *Same*, as *Other*, or as *Analogue*. That is to say, the traces of the past can be presented as familiar and comforting, as alien and disconcerting, or as a combination of the two where traces “stands for” the past, but which are only ultimately an interpretation (Thomas 1995:354). Brøgger, Shetelig and Grieg, as illustrated in the analysis, construct the past as *Same*, with the strengthening of the national culture and the national pride as an ideological base.

The 20th century saw a growth of social movements supporting the recognition of the rights of socially marginalized groups, demanding economic and socio-political changes for underrepresented ethnic and social groups, such as indigenous people, minorities and women. While these movements made their way into the academy through the development of feminism, Marxism, postcolonialism and multiculturalism during the 1960s and 70s, they became prevalent in archaeology only during and after the 1980s (Fawcett, et al. 2008:3). This led to several works arguing that instead of focusing on ethnic homogeneity and similarities between past and present, emphasis should be placed on the diversity of identities and the dissimilarities of the past (Ang 2011; Ashworth, et al. 2007; Gosden 1999, 2012; Habu, et al. 2008; Hill 1993; Hodder 1986, 1999; Jones 1997; Lowenthal 1985; Svanberg 2003). These works discuss the possibilities of exploring difference in the past, both in terms of viewing the past as “a foreign country” (Lowenthal 1985), but also in terms of presenting multiple narratives of the past that includes minority and indigenous groups. In Norway, Brit Solli (1996a, 1997b), Dagfinn Skre (1994, 2001) and Terje Gansum (1999) have argued for a sense of attachment to place instead of forefathers as a cultural reference. Instead of creating identity ties with the Vikings, emphasis should be placed on obvious dissimilarities between modern Norwegians and the Vikings. This can also encapsulate values in terms of affiliation and identity, but not identity in relation to “our forefathers”, but to the people and landscapes of the past (Skre 2001:139-140; Solli 1996a:88). A sense of place identity and belonging can still be created when asserting that “the past is another place” (Gansum 1999). This entails that the past is constructed as *Analogue*, where material remains represent the Viking Age,

but the *representation* is accentuated. They are both familiar and alien, but ultimately they are interpretations of the past. The Viking Age research in Norway, as exemplified through my analysis, construct, to a large degree, the Viking Age as *Same*. Even though the texts after the war no longer were produced under the same national ideology as the texts by Brøgger and Shetelig, the same statements are reproduced as if natural. By presenting the Viking Age as 'our' and consisting of 'Norwegians', the past is still constructed as *Same*.

Constructed identities

Bergstøl (2009:79) argues that if it is not possible to define a 'Norwegian' history, then it is not possible to define a 'Sami' history either. This could have profound consequences for Sami archaeology. People's need to identify with history is great, and ethnic identities in the past are important aspects in the construction of contemporary identities (Jones 1997:1). Bergstøl's argument refers to a complicated issue regarding the use of ethnic terms on minority and indigenous groups. For groups like the Sami this is especially complex. Statements such as "the first Norwegians", which has been used in archaeological research to describe population groups all the way back to the Stone Age, create clear associations to present-day Norwegians, and in this way a sense of continuity. Comparably, it has often been argued that it is problematic to talk of "the Sami" before AD, not because of a lack of material culture, but because it is seen as problematic to trace modern ethnic groups back to prehistoric societies (Skandfer 2001:119-120). Norwegian archaeological research has been subject to a dichotomy where Norwegian ethnicity and Norwegian presence in what today constitutes Norway is regarded as natural and unproblematic, while Sami ethnicity is regarded as problematic and controversial (Olsen 1997:265-266). Recent decades has, however, seen an emphasis on research devoted to the Sami in prehistory. After a long period of neglect, a revival of Sami history is stressed. If, following Bergstøl's argument that it is not possible to define a 'Sami' history or prehistory, this revival will stagnate. Thus, statements which argue for the social construction of identities and the discontinuity of history, has the potential to undermine the basis of indigenous ethnic claims for land and cultural self-determination. For instance, the success of Sami land claims in the south of Norway and Sweden was, and still is, dependent upon establishing continuity in the use of a particular area of land (Bergstøl 2009:79; Jones 1997:142; Olsen 2001:84). Yet, the claim for continuity can, for indigenous groups, easily turn into a double-edged sword, as continuity often includes an implicit premise of cultural immutability. This alludes to the time when Sami culture was perceived as being part of ethnography, not history. Ethnographic peoples

are expected to display a traditional, unchanged culture. Change is perceived as loss of culture and identity, and of accompanying rights (Olsen 2001:85; Williamson and MacDonald 2015:103). 'Sami' and 'Norwegian' history are thus not viewed on similar terms in regard to perceptions of continuity and change.

If we turn the argument around: If it is possible to define a 'Sami' history, then it should also be possible to define a 'Norwegian' history. This is, in my view, not a preferable approach. This is a complicated issue, as relating cultural heritage to modern national identities is viewed as problematic, while the use of cultural heritage to enhance an indigenous group's identity is viewed as positive. The argument encapsulates the question of when it is appropriate and when it is problematic to identify ethnic groups with a common past. My intention is not to provide answers to these questions, and a full discussion of these issues is outside the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, I want to emphasise the power invested in certain representations of the past, and how the choice of presenting some representations over others are embedded in power relations both within and between groups (Jones 1997:144).

My intention is not to suggest that archaeologists should move away from studying ethnic identities in the past. To deny different population groups a past, whether these are Norwegian or Sami, is not considered a fruitful approach. I do nevertheless argue that to use the term 'Norwegian' to describe a period such as the Viking Age, without any definition, is problematic and often unnecessary. A discourse is always established as a totality, where every moment receives meaning through its relation to other moments. This is done through an exclusion of other possible relations. A discourse is in this way a reduction of possibilities (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:37). Hence, when terming the Viking Age 'Norwegian' instead of for example 'Norse', a certain past is created in favour of another. The Viking Age could be presented in a variety of ways, but, whether it is intentional or not, defining it as 'Norwegian' is what characterises the discourse. If 'Norwegian' must be used, a definition should be included. Whatever identity the Vikings assigned to themselves, it was probably not Norwegian, and definitely not Norwegian in the way Norwegian identity is defined today (Østigård 2001:25). By emphasising other possible pasts, increased diversity is introduced, both in the past as well as the present (Eikrem 2005:23). Even though it has been mentioned several times before, archaeological research needs to start producing more texts that present a Viking Age that is not *our* Viking Age.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this thesis has been to examine if a national identity discourse can be found within Norwegian archaeological research on the Viking Age. Through a close analysis of certain statements and words that appear in a selection of texts, it has been illustrated that the Norwegian Viking Age research is characterised by a reproduction of knowledge, which contributes to the creation and maintenance of a national identity discourse.

As exemplified in my analysis, the national identity discourse has undergone a gradual development from the beginning of the 20th century until recent years. The patriotic sentiments that dominated the research before the war have steadily become less prevalent throughout the selected texts. However, the analysis also demonstrates that certain types of formulations have continuously been reproduced in the texts, and treated as neutral components of the discourse. The formulations usually consist of banal and everyday words and statements. Still, they function as effective components in the creation of contemporary national identities. Markers such as '*Norwegian*', '*forefathers*' and '*our*' create associations and a sense of continuity between the Viking Age and present-day Norwegians.

My intention with this thesis has been to analyse how some formulations in the Viking Age research continuously get reproduced and in this way are perceived as meaningful and true. I have been interested in how, as a consequence, a certain past is created in favour of another. As my analysis has been limited to twenty texts concerning Viking Age material, and eight texts concerning both Viking and Sami material, my aim has not been to produce a full discourse analysis. An inclusion of a wider selection of texts could be the subject for future research. In this way, a more detailed study of the Viking Age research could be conducted, including more texts not creating clear connections between the Viking Age and a Norwegian national identity. Also, the academic background of the authors, such as the universities they were educated and worked at, could be taken into consideration. If different research traditions at different universities have had any influence on the discourse, could add an interesting element to the discussion. Nevertheless, this thesis has shed light on tendencies within the Norwegian Viking Age research. It is important to emphasise that embedded in archaeological research lies the power to produce certain representations of the past, which in turn can be used as tools in the creation of contemporary identities. As exemplified in my analysis, it has been illustrated that Norwegian archaeological research on the Viking Age has contributed, and still contributes, to the creation of a Norwegian national

identity. My aim has not been to condemn all Norwegian Viking Age research on the basis of this, but to highlight how banal markers of the *national* function as important components in the creation and maintenance of a Norwegian identity discourse. Archaeologists have to be critically aware of the power invested in their research, and this thesis has aimed at contributing to such awareness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, B.
1983 *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso, London.
- Andersson, H.
1979 *Urbaniseringsprocessen i det medeltida Sverige: en forskningsöversikt 7*. Riksantikvarieämbetet, Stockholm.
- Ang, I.
2011 Unsettling the national: Heritage and diaspora In *Heritage, Memory and Identity*, edited by H. K. Anheier, Y. R. Isar and D. Viejo-Rose. The Cultures and Globalisation Series vol. 4. SAGE Publications, London.
- Ashworth, G. J., B. Graham and J. E. Tunbridge
2007 *Pluralising pasts: heritage, identity and place in multicultural societies*. Pluto Press, London.
- Atkinson, J. A., I. Banks and J. O'Sullivan
1996 *Nationalism and archaeology: Scottish Archaeological Forum*. Cruithne Press, Glasgow.
- Barth, F.
1969 *Ethnic groups and boundaries : the social organization of culture difference*. Little Brown, Boston.
- Barthes, R.
1977 *Image, music, text*. Essays selected and translated by S. Heath. Fontana Press, London.
- Baudou, E.
2004 *Den nordiska arkeologin: historia och tolkningar*. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, Stockholm.
- Bergstøl, J.
1997 *Fangstfolk og bønder i Østerdalen: rapport fra Rødsmoprosjektets delprosjekt "marginal bosetning" 42*. Oldsaksamlingen, Oslo.
- 2004 Creoles in Iron Age Norway. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 19(2):7-24.
- 2009 Samisk og norsk arkeologi. Historieproduksjon, identitetsbygging eller politikk? *Primitive tider* 11:75-81.
- Bergstøl, J. and G. Reitan
2008 Samer på Dovrefjell i vikingtiden: et bidrag til debatten omkring samenes sørgrense i forhistorisk tid. *Historisk tidsskrift* 87(1): 9-27.
- Biehl, P. F. and C. Prescott
2013 Introduction: Issues concerning heritage in the context of globalization. In *Heritage in the context of globalization: Europe and the Americas*, edited by P. F. Biehl and C. Prescott, pp. 3-8. Springer, New York.

- Billig, M.
1995 *Banal nationalism*. Sage, London.
- Blindheim, C.
1953 *Kaupang: Markedsplassen i skiringssal*. Norsk arkeologisk selskap, Oslo.
- 1969 Kaupangundersøkelsen avsluttet. Kort tilbakeblikk på en lang utgravning. *Viking* 33:5-39.
- Blindheim, C., B. Heyerdahl-Larsen and R. L. Tollnes
1981 *Kaupang-funnene. Bind 1*. Norske Oldfunn, vol.XVI. Universitetets oldsaksamling, Oslo.
- Blindheim, C. and R. L. Tollnes
1972 *Kaupang. Vikingenes handelsplass*. Ernst G. Mortensens Forlag, Oslo.
- Brøgger, A. W.
1916 *Borrefundet og vestfoldkongernes graver*. I kommission hos J. Dybwad, Kristiania.
- 1925 *Det norske folk i oldtiden*. Novus Press, Oslo.
- 1933 Sigd, ljà og snidill: av det norske jordbruks ophav. In *Bidrag til bondesamfunnets historie 1*, pp. 1-65. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Oslo.
- 1937a Gullalder. *Viking* 1:137-195.
- 1937b Viking. *Viking* 1:5.
- Brøgger, A. W. and H. Shetelig
1950 *Vikingeskipene, deres forgjengere og etterfølgere*. Dreyer, Oslo.
- Brøgger, A. W., H. Shetelig and H. Falk
1917 *Osebergfundet. Utgitt av den norske stat*. Bind 1. Universitetets Oldsaksamling, Oslo.
- Bråten, I., H. I. Strømsø and L. Salmerón
2011 Trust and mistrust when students read multiple information sources about climate change. *Learning and Instruction* 21:180-192.
- Burr, V.
1995 *An introduction to social constructionism*. Routledge, London.
- Champion, T. and M. Díaz-Andreu
1996 *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*. UCL Press, London.
- Childe, V. G.
1929 *The Danube in prehistory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Christensen, A. E., B. Myhre and A. S. Ingstad
1992 *Osebergdronningens grav: Vår arkeologiske nasjonalskatt i nytt lys*. Schibsted, Oslo.
- Christophersen, A.
1991 Ports and trade in Norway during the transition to historical time. In *Aspects of maritime Scandinavia AD 200-1200: proceedings of the Nordic Seminar on Maritime Aspects of Archaeology, Roskilde, 13th-15th March, 1989*, edited by O. Crumlin-Pedersen, pp. 159-170. The Viking Ship Museum, Roskilde.

- Cinthio, E.
1975 Köping och stad i det tidigmedeltida Skåne. *Ale*:1-10.
- Cohen, A.
1974 *Urban ethnicity*. Tavistock, London.
- Dennell, R.
1996 Nationalism and identity in Britain and Europe. In *Nationalism and archaeology: Scottish Archaeological Forum*, edited by J. A. Atkinson, I. Banks and J. O'Sullivan, pp. 22-34. Cruithne Press, Glasgow.
- Díaz-Andreu, M.
1996 Constructing identities through culture: The past in the forging of Europe. In *Cultural identity and archaeology: the construction of European communities*, edited by S. Jones, C. Gamble, P. Graves-Brown and B. Solli, pp. 48-61. Routledge, London.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. and T. Champion
1996 Nationalism and archaeology in Europe: An introduction. In *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*, edited by T. Champion and M. Díaz-Andreu, pp. 1-23. UCL Press, London.
- Dommasnes, L. H.
1979 Et gravmateriale fra yngre jernalder brukt til å belyse kvinners stilling. *Viking* 42:95-114.
- Eikrem, K.
2005 1905-2005: Har arkeologien framleis ein nasjonal agenda? *Primitive tider* 8:21-32.
- Eriksen, T. H.
1993 *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives*. Pluto Press, London.
2001 *Small places, large issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology*. 2nd edition. Pluto Press, London
- Fairclough, N.
1989 *Language and power*. Longman, London.
1992 *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
1995 *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman, Harlow.
- Fawcett, C., J. Habu and J. M. Matsunaga
2008 Introduction: Evaluating multiple narratives: Beyond nationalist, colonialist, imperialist archaeologies. In *Evaluating multiple narratives: Beyond nationalist, colonialist, imperialist archaeologies*. Springer, New York.
- Foucault, M.
1972 *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock Publications, London.
1982 The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* 8(4):777-795.
1999 *Diskursens orden: tiltredelsesforelesning holdt ved Collège de France 2. desember 1970*. Translated by E. Schaanning. Spartacus, Oslo.

- Furre, B.
2000 *Norsk historie 1914-2000: Industrisamfunnet - frå voksterville til framtidstvil*. Det Norske Samlaget, Oslo.
- Gansum, T.
1999 Gjenstanden og dens meningsinnhold - arkeologisk perspektiv på saker og ting. In *Samtiden* vol. 5/6.
- Gellner, E.
1983 *Nations and nationalism*. Cornell university press, Ithaca.
1997 *Nationalism*. New York University Press, New York.
- Gjerde, H. S.
2010 Tilfeldig? Neppe. Finsk-ugriske smykker i Sør-Norge. *Viking* 73:49-60.
- Gjessing, G.
1928 Finsk-ugriske vikingetidssmykker i Norge. In *Universitetets Oldsaksamlings årbok 1927*, pp. 23-41, Oslo.
- Gosden, C.
1999 *Anthropology and archaeology: a changing relationship*. Routledge, London.
2012 Post-colonial archaeology. In *Archaeological theory today. Second edition*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 251-266. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Graves-Brown, P., S. Jones and C. Gamble
1996 *Cultural identity and archaeology: The construction of European communities*. Routledge, London.
- Grieg, S.
1928 *Vikingetiden i Norge*. J.W. Cappelen, Oslo.
- Haavardsholm, J.
2004 *Vikingtiden som 1800-tallskonstruksjon*. Acta Humaniora nr 193. Det humanistiske fakultet, Universitetet i Oslo, Oslo.
- Habu, J., C. Fawcett and J. M. Matsunaga
2008 *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. Springer, New York.
- Hacking, I.
1999 *The social construction of what?* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hamerow, H.
1994 Migration theory and the migration period. In *Building on the past: papers celebrating 150 years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*, edited by B. Vyner, pp. 164-177. Royal Archaeological Institute, London.
- Helle, K.
1980 *Handelsplass - by. Handelsplats - stad - omland. Symposium om det medeltida stadsväsendet i Mellansverige*. Medeltidsstaden 18, Stockholm.

- Helle, K. and A. Nedkvitne
 1977 Sentrumsdannelser og byutvikling i norsk middelalder. In *Middelaldersteder*, edited by G. A. Blom, pp. 189-286. Urbaniseringsprosesser i Norden vol. 1. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Hesjedal, A.
 2000 *Samisk forhistorie i norsk arkeologi 1900-2000*. PhD-thesis, Institute of Archaeology, University of Tromsø, Tromsø.
- 2004 Vinterlandet Norge. Om hvordan samisk forhistorie har blitt usynliggjort i norsk arkeologi. In *Samisk forhistorie. Rapport fra konferanse i Lakselv 5.-6. september 2002*, edited by M. Krogh and K. Schanche, pp. 7-19. Varanger Samiske Museums Skrifter.
- Hill, J. D.
 1993 Can we recognise a different European past? A contrastive archaeology of later prehistoric settlements in Southern England. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1:57-75.
- Hobsbawm, E. J.
 1992 *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. and T. Ranger
 1983 *The Invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I.
 1982 *Symbols in action: Ethnoarchaeological studies of material culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1984 Archaeology in 1984. *Antiquity* 58:25-32.
- 1986 *Reading the past: Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1999 *The archaeological process: An introduction*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Holme, J.
 2005 *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse*. Bind 1. Økokrim, Oslo.
- Holtorf, C.
 2009 A European perspective on indigenous and immigrant archaeologies. *World Archaeology* 41(4):672-681.
- Hougen, E. K.
 1965 Handel og samferdsel i nordens vikingtid. *Viking* 29:167-190.
- Härke, H.
 1998 Archaeologists and migrations: A problem of attitude? *Current anthropology* 39(1):19-46.
- 2000 *Archaeology, ideology, and society: The German experience*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Ingstad, A. S.
 1982 Osebergdronningen - hvem var hun? *Viking* 45:49-65.

- Jones, S.
 1996 Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past. In *Cultural identity and archaeology: The construction of European communities*, edited by S. Jones, C. Gamble, P. Graves-Brown and B. Solli, pp. 62-80. Routledge, London.
 1997 *The archaeology of ethnicity: Constructing identities in the past and present*. Routledge, London.
- Jones, S. and P. Graves-Brown
 1996 Introduction: Archaeology and cultural identity in Europe. In *Cultural identity and archaeology: The construction of European communities*, edited by S. Jones, C. Gamble, P. Graves-Brown and B. Solli, pp. 1-24. Routledge, London.
- Jünge, Å.
 1996 *Spor etter samar i Midt- og Sør-Skandinavia: To historieoppfatninger i debatt 1970-1996*. Dokumentarforl., Åsen.
- Jørgensen, M. W. and L. Phillips
 1999 *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Roskilde Universitetsforlag, Frederiksberg.
- King, J. A.
 2012 *Archaeology, narrative, and the politics of the past : The view from Southern Maryland*. 1st ed. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- Kjørup, S.
 2001 Den ubegrundede skepsis. En kritisk diskussion af socialkonstruktionismens filosofiske grundlag. *Sosiologi i dag* 31(2):5-22.
 2008 *Menneskevidenskaberne 2. Humanistiske forskningstraditioner*. 2. udg. Roskilde Universitetsforlag, Frederiksberg.
- Kleppe, E. J.
 1983 The use of the concept of culture in archaeology. In *Kontaktstencil 22.23. Organ för nordiska arkeologistuderande.*, edited by T. Hultgren, pp. 1-18, Tromsø.
- Kohl, P. L. and C. Fawcett
 1996 *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kossina, G.
 1911 *Die Herkunft der Germanen. Zur Methode der Siedlungsarchäologie*. Mannus-Verlag, Bonn.
 1926 *Ursprung und Verbreitung der Germanen in vorund frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*. Kabitzsch, Leipzig.
- Kristiansen, K.
 1993 The past and its great might: An essay on the use of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1:3-32.
- Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe
 2001 *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso, London.
- Lowenthal, D.
 1985 *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Malfas, M., E. Theodoraki and B. Houlihan
 2004 Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. *Municipal Engineer* 157 (ME3):209-220.
- Martens, I.
 1960 Vikingetogene i arkeologisk belysning. *Viking* 24(1):93-113.
- Munch, G. S., O. S. Johansen and I. Larssen
 1987 Borg in Lofoten. A chieftain's farm in arctic Norway. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress, Larkollen, Norway 1985*, edited by C. Blindheim and J. E. Knirk, pp. 149-170. vol. 9. Oldsaksamlingen, Oslo.
- Myhre, B.
 1991 Theory in Scandinavian archaeology since 1960: A view from Norway. In *Archaeological theory in Europe: The last three decades*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 161-186. Routledge, London.
 1992 The Royal Cemetery at Borre, Vestfold: A Norwegian centre in a European periphery. In *The Age of Sutton Hoo: The seventh century in north-western Europe*, edited by M. O. H. Carver, pp. 301-313. Boydell Press, Woodbridge, Suffolk.
- Myhre, L. N.
 1994 *Arkeologi og politikk: En arkeo-politisk analyse av faghistoria i tida 1900-1960*. Varia 26. Universitetets Oldsaksamling, Oslo.
- Narmo, L. E. and M. Hansen
 2000 *Oldtid ved Åmøtet: Østerdalens tidlige historie belyst av arkeologiske utgravinger på Rødsmoen i Åmot*. Åmot historielag, Rena.
- Neumann, I. B.
 2001 *Mening, materialitet, makt: En innføring i diskursanalyse*. Fagbokforl., Bergen.
- Odner, K.
 1983 *Finner og terfinner: Etniske prosesser i det nordlige Fenno-Skandinavia*. Oslo occasional papers in social anthropology 9, University of Oslo.
- Olsen, B.
 1984 *Stabilitet og endring: Produksjon og samfunn i Varanger, 800 f.Kr.-1700 e.Kr.* Master's thesis in archaeology, University of Tromsø.
 1986 Norwegian archaeology and the people without (pre)history: Or how to create a myth of a uniform past. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 5(1):25-42.
 1997 *Fra ting til tekst: Teoretiske perspektiv i arkeologisk forskning*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
 2001 "At ikke Fremmede skulle raade over en Jordbund, som gjemmer vore Fædres Been og hvortil vore helligste og ærværdigste Minder ere knyttede." Problemer knyttet til bruken av fortid og kulturminner i diskurser om opphav, rettigheter og identiteter. In *Fortidsforståelser*, edited by T. Thuen, pp. 71-92. Høyskoleforlaget, Kristiansand.
 2006 Scenes from a troubled engagement. Post-structuralism and material culture studies. In *Handbook of material culture*, edited by C. Tilley, pp. 85-103. Sage, London.

- Opedal, A.
1999 *Arkeologiens gårdsforskning og utformingen av en norsk identitet*. AmS-Varia 35. Arkeologisk museum, Stavanger.
- Paxton, R. J.
1999 A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research* 69(3):315-339.
- Pettersson, H.
2005 Nationalstaten och arkeologin: Vetenskapsideologi och nationalism. *Primitive tider* 8:7-19.
- Potter, J. and M. Wetherell
1987 *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage, London.
- Prescott, C.
2013 Heritage and the new immigrant minorities: A catalyst of relevance for contemporary archaeology? In *Heritage in the context of globalization: Europe and the Americas*, edited by P. F. Biehl and C. Prescott, pp. 59-65. Springer, New York.
- Price, N. S.
2000 Drum-time and Viking Age: Sámi-Norse identities in Early Medieval Scandinavia. In *Identities and cultural contacts in the Arctic: Proceedings from a conference at the Danish National Museum, Copenhagen. November 30th to December 2nd 1999*, edited by M. Appelt, J. Berglund and H. C. Gulløv, pp. 12-27. The Danish National Museum & Danish Polar Center, Copenhagen.
- 2002 *The Viking way: Religion and war in late Iron Age Scandinavia*. Aun 31. Uppsala University, Uppsala.
- Resi, H. G.
2000 Kaupang, før nye utgravninger. *Collegium Medievale* 13:141-164.
- Ricoeur, P.
1984 *The reality of the historical past*. Marquette University Press, Milwaukee.
- Ringrose, M. and A. J. Lerner
1993 *Reimagining the nation*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Schanche, A.
1986 *Nordnorsk jernalderarkeologi: Et sosialgeografisk perspektiv*. Master's thesis in archaeology, University of Tromsø.
- 1989 Jernalderens bosettingsmønster i et fleretnisk perspektiv. In *Framskritt for fortida i nord: I Povl Simonsens fotefar*, edited by R. Bertelsen, P. K. Reymert and A. Utne, pp. 171-183. vol. 22. Tromsø museum, Tromsø.
- Schanche, A. and B. Olsen
1985 Var de alle nordmenn? En etnopolitisk kritikk av norsk arkeologi. In *Arkeologi og etnisitet*. AmS-Varia 15, edited by J.-R. Næss, pp. 87-99. Arkeologisk museum, Stavanger.
- Shanks, M.
2001 Culture/Archaeology. The dispersion of a discipline and its objects. In *Archaeological theory today*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 284-305. Polity, Cambridge.

Shanks, M. and C. Tilley

1987a *Re-constructing archaeology: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1987b *Social theory and archaeology*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Shennan, S.

1989 Introduction: Archaeological approaches to cultural identity. In *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*, edited by S. Shennan, pp. 1-32. *One world archaeology* vol. 10. Unwin Hyman, London.

Shetelig, H.

1910 Av det moderne aandsarbeide. Arkæologien i nutiden. *Samtiden* 21:470-476.

1925a *Norges forhistorie: Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie A, forelesninger. vol. 5a. H. Aschehoug & Co., Oslo

1925b Vikingetiden. In *Norges forhistorie: Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi*, pp. 178-193. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie A, forelesninger. vol. 5a. H. Aschehoug & Co., Oslo

1930 *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennom tidene. Fra oldtiden til omkring 1000 e.Kr.* H. Aschehoug, Oslo.

1935 *Germanernes avstamning under arkeologisk synspunkt*, Oslo.

Simonsen, P.

1967 Relations between the Lapps and the Scandinavians in early times - an archaeological survey. In *Lapps and Norsemen in olden times*, edited by I. Hoff, pp. 65-77. Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning. vol. 26. Aschehoug, Oslo.

Skandfer, M.

2001 Etik i forvaltning - forvaltning av etikk. Samisk kulturminnevern mellom "døde" strukturer og levende tradisjon. *Viking* 64:113-131.

Skjølvold, A.

1980 Refleksjoner omkring jernaldergravene i sydnorske fjellstrøk. *Viking* 43:140-160.

Skre, D.

1991 Einar Østmo: Gård og boplass i østnorsk oldtid og middelalder. Bokanmeldelse. *Forening til norske fortdisminnesmerkens bevaring. Årbok 1991*:322-324.

1994 Samtidig fortid, fortidig samtid. Den institusjonaliserte fortid. In *M for museum: Rapport fra jubileumsseminar Oslo 3.-6. juni 1993*, edited by I. Øie, S. Helliesen and B. Tønseth, pp. 88-100. Norske kunst- og kulturhistoriske museer, Oslo.

2001 Arkeologien, nasjonalismen og politikken. En kommentar til Terje Østigårs bok "Norge uten nordmenn. En antinasjonalistisk arkeologi". *Primitive tider* 4:135-142.

2007a *Kaupang in Skiringssal*. Kaupang Excavation Project Publication Series, Volume 1. Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.

- 2007b Towns and markets, kings and central places in South-western Scandinavia c. AD 800-950. In *Kaupang in Skiringssal* edited by D. Skre, pp. 445-469. Kaupang Excavation Project Publication Series, Volume 1. Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.
- Smith, A. D.
1989 The origins of nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 12(3):340-367.
- Solberg, B.
2003 Vikingtiden. ca. 800-1030 e.Kr. In *Jernalderen i Norge: ca. 500 f.Kr.-1030 e.Kr.*, pp. 212-320. 2. utg. ed. Cappelen akademisk forlag, Oslo.
- Solli, B.
1996a Fortiden er et annet sted. *Norsk Antropologisk Tidsskrift* (2):79-90.
1996b Narratives of Veøy: On the poetics and scientifics of archaeology. In *Cultural identity and archaeology: The construction of European communities*, edited by P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones and C. Gamble, pp. 209-227. Theoretical Archaeology Group. Routledge, London.
1997a Forankring fryder? *Ottar* (3):15-20.
1997b Ting og tid, fortellinger og identitet. In *Kollektive identiteter, ting og betydninger: seminarrappport*, edited by B. Brenna and K. M. Fjeldstad, pp. 163-179. vol. 24. Senter for teknologi og menneskelige verdier Oslo.
2002 Kommentar til Gro Kyviks artikkel "Hjemmeverden, fremmedverden og arkeologisk refleksivitet": Den annens menneskelighet - Om fortidens annerledeshet og våre muligheter til å vite noe om den. *Primitive tider* 5:145-152.
- Stenvik, L. F.
1980 Samer og nordmenn. Sett i lys av et uvanlig gravfunn fra Saltenområdet. *Viking* 43:127-139.
- Storli, I.
1991 De østlige smykkene fra vikingtid og tidlig middelalder. *Viking* 54:89-104.
- Stylegar, F.-A.
2009 Kaupangs omland og urbaniseringstendenser i norsk vikingtid. In *Den urbane underskog: Strandsteder, utvekslingssteder og småbyer i vikingtid, middelalder og tidlig nytid*, edited by T. Gansum, F.-E. Eliassen and J. Brendalmo, pp. 67-92 Novus forlag, Oslo.
- Svanberg, F.
2003 *Decolonizing the Viking age*. Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm.
- Sørheim, H.
2011 Three prominent Norwegian ladies with British connections. *Acta Archaeologica* 82:17-54.
- Thomas, J.
1995 Where are we now? Archaeological theories in the 1990s. In *Theory in archaeology: A world perspective*, edited by P. J. Ucko, pp. 343-362. Routledge, London.

- Trigger, B. G.
1984 Alternative archaeologies: Nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19(3):355-370.
- 2006 A history of archaeological thought. Second edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ucko, P. J.
1989 Foreword. In *The Politics of the past*, edited by P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, pp. ix-xxi. Hyman, London.
- University of Bergen
2015 Electronic document:
Pensumliste ARK104 Våren 2015, https://miside.uib.no/fs-cron/download/129010990/Pensumliste_ARK104.doc2015.pdf.
- University of Oslo
2014 Electronic document:
Pensum/læringskrav ARK1000 - Høst 2014, <http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/iakh/ARK1000/h14/pensumliste/index.html>.
- Williamson, R. F. and R. I. MacDonald
2015 Echoes of the Iroquois Wars: Contested heritage and identity in the ancestral homeland of the Huron-Wendat In *Identity and Heritage: Contemporary Challenges in a Globalized World*, edited by P. F. Biehl, D. C. Comer, C. Prescott and H. A. Soderland, pp. 97-106. Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Wineburg, S. S.
1991 Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 83(1):73-87.
- Zachrisson, I.
1984 *De samiska metalldepåerna år 1000-1350: I ljuset av fyndet från Mörträsket, Lappland*. Archaeology and environment 3, University of Umeå.
- 1994 Archaeology and politics: Saami prehistory and history in Central Scandinavia. *Journal of European archaeology* 1994(2):361-368.
- Zachrisson, I. and M. Nockert
1997 *Möten i gränsland: Samer och germaner i Mellanskandinavien* 4. Statens historiska museum, Stockholm.
- Østigård, T.
2001 *Norge uten nordmenn: En antinasjonalistisk arkeologi*. Spartacus, Oslo.

APPENDIX

COMMENTS TO APPENDIX

All translated quotes included in chapters 5, 6 and 7 are here presented in their original form. The texts are listed in the same order as they appear in the thesis. The quotes within the texts are listed after page number, and therefore not in the order as they appear in the thesis.

QUOTES IN ORIGINAL

A. W. Brøgger (1916) – *Borrefundet og Vestfold-kongernes graver*

“Er det saaledes til slutning blit klart for os at Borrehaugene rummer de stolte minder fra den norske kongeslegt fra hvilken landets samling utgik, saa har vi én ting at gjøre. Vi maa gjøre ende paa den uværdige, havarerte og forlatte tilstand hvori disse hauger nu ligger, vi maa gjøre Borrefeltet til et nationalt mindested, en national helligdom, hvor vi virkelig kan finde harmoni mellem stedets historiske værdighet og betydning og dets ytre form” (Brøgger 1916:65).

”I dette program ligger ganske visst ikke løsningen av store videnskapelige opgaver, men det gjelder nationale symboler, hvor arkeologien har til pligt at ta initiativ og til at skape det vern som en øket kundskap om landets ældste historiske paalægger” (Brøgger 1916:65).

”Om vi ikke har chanser for at flytte milepæle saa har vi den chance, som i denne stund mer end nogensinde er git os, - at være med at styrke den nationale kultur” (Brøgger 1916:66).

A. W. Brøgger, Haakon Shetelig and HJ. Falk (1917) – *Osebergfundet*

“Dette er alt som før haugen blev gravet ut, findes i norsk litteratur om den gravhaug som rummet Norges pragtfuldeste oldfund” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:132).

”Ikke synderlig bedre er det med den haug som rummet det største norske vikingeskib som er kjendt, den paa *Haugen* paa Rolvsøy (”Tuneskibet”)” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:140).

”Oseberghaugen gaar da ogsaa i denne hendseende ind som et værdid i rækken av de kongelige gravanlæg fra Norges vikingetid” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:140).

”Det er ogsaa et sammentræf av enestaaende heldige omstendigheter, som har gjort at saa mange forjængelige og skrøpelige saker kunde bevares i Oseberghaugen, og som derved har gjort dette fundet til en skat uten sidestykke blant norske oldfund” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:216).

”Efter gravskikk og karakter har Osebergfundet flere nærliggende sidestykker blant norske fund fra vikingetiden, og til oplysning om gravskikken maa vi her trække ind en redegjørelse for de andre skibsgravene, særlig dem som kommer Osebergfundet nærmest” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:216-217).

“Det er altsaa en særegen nordisk-hedensk dødstro og gravskikk som faar sit fyldigste og mest typiske uttrykk i Vestfoldgravene og først og fremst i Osebergfundet” (Brøgger, et al. 1917:251).

Haakon Shetelig (1925) – *Vikingetiden, in Norges forhistorie. Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi*

”Men i løpet av det 7. – 8. aarh. møter vi ogsaa forhold som ikke bare kan knyttes sammen med Europas historie mere i almindelighet, men ogsaa kjendes fra de ældste traditioner i vor egen hjemlige historie” (Shetelig 1925b:179).

”Forholdet til Irland fører os ind paa en helt ny side i vor kulturhistorie, som her første gang møter os – og for siste gang samtidig – nemlig forholdet til koloniriker grundlagt i fremmed land ved vikingetogene. Det blev skapt et ”større Norge” [...]” (Shetelig 1925b:183).

”Takket være vikingetidens eiendommelige gravskikk faar vi nu et saa merkelig fyldig billede av tidens daglige arbeidsliv. Disse norske former for begravelsen viser samtidig i høi grad selvstændighet overfor fremmed paavirkning” (Shetelig 1925b:187-188).

”Som ogsaa andre træk ved tidens aandsliv, virker gravformene rent som en bevisst reaktion mot fremmed paavirkning, som et utslag av national selvfølelse overfor fremmed land som vikingene var vant til at hemsøke” (Shetelig 1925b:190).

”Det er gravformer som ganske særlig er knyttet til Vestfoldkongenes æt, til den kongerækken som grundlagde et samlet Norges rike. Gravene paa Gokstad, Oseberg, Borre og Karmøen har dermed ogsaa fremfor alle andre karakterer av nationale monumenter, de stolte og synlige minder fra den tid som danner inledningen til vor historie” (Shetelig 1925b:193).

Sigurd Grieg (1928) – *Vikingetiden i Norge*

”Vårt mål må være å gjøre vår oldforskning til levende norsk kulturhistorie og søke å finne det *særlig norske* i levesett og i bosetningens historie” (Grieg 1928:10).

”Nordmennene var i vikingetiden fremragende *snekkere* og *treskjærere*” (Grieg 1928:30).

”Likesom grekerne grunnla kolonier i Lilleasia og i Italia, slik har vi ogsaa i norsk historie vikingetiden, hvor den norrøne folkestamme utfolder sin ungdomskraft. Våre forfedres veldige erobringer og langvarige *bosetning* i Irland og på Orkenøyene, Hjalmland, Færøyene, Island og Grønland gir uttrykk for denne ungdommelige trang til å vinne nytt land, og kolonisere det på sin egen måte; ikke bare plyndre og brenne, men ogsaa dyrke jorden, og drive handel” (Grieg 1928:80).

”Når vi går i våre arkeologiske museer og ser den store mengde av våpen, smykker og redskaper som vikingene fikk med sig i graven, så undrer vi oss over hvor håndfaste våre forfædre var i sin tro om livet efter dette” (Grieg 1928:110).

”Men dypere sett slutter vikingetiden ved slaget på Stiklestad 29 juli 1030. Med kong Olavs martyrdød begynner en helt ny tid i vårt land – hedenskapet forsvinner, sed og skikk skifter. Det nye som kommer bør ikke hindre oss i å se *storheten* i det som skjedde i 9 og 10 århundre. Store deler av det indre av Norge blev ryddet, og nye norrøne riker blev grunnlagt derute i vest” (Grieg 1928:151-152).

Haakon Shetelig (1930) – *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennom tidene. Fra oldtiden til omkring 1000 e.Kr.*

”I tiden henimot 800 år efter Kristus står vi på terskelen til dette merkverdige avsnitt i Europas historie, da nærsagt alle kyster og land i hele verdensdelen blev hemsøkt av pirater og erobrere som utgikk fra Nordens folk” (Shetelig 1930:176).

”Det er ganske vanskelig å fordele æren for vikingetogene rettfærdig mellom Danmark og Norge. De to land var i 9. årh. ikke på noen måte klart festnet som nasjonale begreper, og enn mindre hadde de kristne i Vesteuropa noen spesiell interesse av vikingenes hjemland, av folkeslag og kongeriker i Norden” (Shetelig 1930:180).

”Det må være tilfeldigheter som har gjort at på fransk blev normanner en felles betegnelse for alle vikinger, i England *daner*. I begge land skal vi dele æren” (Shetelig 1930:181).

”For nordmenn i sagatid og middelalder var øene nord for Skottland ikke oppfattet som fremmed land, men som et område de regnet for sitt eget, vel i noe vekslende forhold til riket og kongen, men helt norsk befolket, med norsk sprog og historie” (Shetelig 1930:182).

”Til Island knytter sig de eldste geografiske opdagelser i Nordhavet som kjennes i norsk historie” (Shetelig 1930:205).

”På en menneskealder ved århundreskiftet omkring 900 var altså bygget et nytt land, og et land som var helt norsk” (Shetelig 1930:211).

”Men samfund og rett blev helt igjennem ordnet på norsk vis, likesom norsk sprog blev enerådende” (Shetelig 1930:211).

”De fornemste av gravene fra vikingetiden hører også til de merkeligste historiske minner vi eier i det hele; de bør ha sin særlige plass i denne fremstilling” (Shetelig 1930:271).

A. W. Brøgger (1937) – Gullalder, in *Viking*

”Med *Osebergdronningens grav* begynner Norgeshistorien, ikke bare på grunn av dens enestående vidnesbyrd om rikdom og kvalitet i Norge i 9. årh., men fordi kongegraven i virkeligheten er et symbol av den høieste betydning i den gamle historien i Norge” (Brøgger 1937a:137).

”Hverken ordet nasjon eller stat, og heller ikke de begrepet de representerer kjennes i den gamle litteratur” (Brøgger 1937a:138).

”Stiklestad er det siste som kjempes om Haraldsættens kongedømme i Norge og derigjennem om Norges ”selvstendighet”” (Brøgger 1937a:143).

”Idag er Borrehaugene blitt Nasjonalpark under Vestfold fylkes styre, et innhegnet og fredet område, hvor vi søker på varsomste måte å gi de store gravminner de skjønneste omgivelser som de naturlige kår kan yde, og hvor sommeren igjennem stor folkestevner kan holdes, ansikt til ansikt med disse herlige oldtidsminner som er innledningen til Norges historie” (Brøgger 1937a:156).

”Fra intet tidsrum i Norges historie har vi et rikere arkeologisk materiale til restaurering av selve historien [...] Vi kan si at tidsalderen åpner med dronninggraven på Oseberg. I selve rikdommen ligger makt i tidens stil. Det er dronning Åsa som stammor for erobringen, for arven. Den slutter med Håkon den godes grav på Seim, den siste kongshaugen som blev bygget i Norge. Det er gullalder i den gamle symbolske betydning av ordet” (Brøgger 1937a:174).

”Vi skal ikke her forsøke å gjøre rede for det vanskelige dikt, hvis indre tilegnelse krever et følelsesliv vi ikke lengre har” (Brøgger 1937a:189).

”Ingen norsk konge opplevde siden å bli så gammel. Han slutter den store gullalder i Norges historie” (Brøgger 1937a:190).

Charlotte Blindheim (1953) – *Kaupang: Markedsplassen i Skiringssal*

”Mens både Hedeby og den svenske vikingtidsbyen Birka i Mälaren er godt belagt så vel litterært som arkeologisk, er Ottars opplysninger faktisk den eneste skriftlige kilde vi har om denne vår eldste norske handelsplass” (Blindheim 1953:2).

”Straks opp for Kaupangkilen strekker en temmelig bred, grov glove seg innover øya og like innunder en bratt knaus her støtte en på en dobbeltgrav for mann og kvinne med et uvanlig pent utstyr bl.a. to smykkesaker som er enestående i norsk vikingtidsmateriale, men har nærstående paralleller i Birkafunnene” (Blindheim 1953:7-8).

”Sammen med disse tekstilene ligger det rester av irret bronsetråd og små bronsespiraler. De ser tilsynelatende nokså uvesentlige ut, men antyder at den døde kvinnen kan ha vært kledd etter en mote som var særlig yndet i Finnland – Balticum, men lite brukt her i vårt land” (Blindheim 1953:14).

”Vår lille kolleksjon fra Kaupang er derimot en sluttet gruppe fra godt daterte funn, og de er derfor et meget vesentlig bidrag til løsningen av dette viktige spørsmål. [...] – og det interessante trekk er da et enkelte av våre Kaupang-bronser viser seg å være meget nær beslektet med skårne arbeider fra Oseberg og Gokstad” (Blindheim 1953:18).

”Men mens Birka-funnene i stor utstrekning vitner om at svenske handelsinteresser gikk sør- og østover, avspeiler våre funn like utvetydig en handelspolitisk orientering mot vest” (Blindheim 1953:20).

Irmelin Martens (1960) – Vikingetogene i arkeologisk belysning, in *Viking*

”Vi får bekreftet at svenskenes hovedinteresser har ligget i øst, mens de norske ferdene i stor utstrekning har gått vestover til De britiske øyer” (Martens 1960:98).

”Det fantes nok en keltisk befolkning der da nordmennene kom, men funnene fra øygruppene som helhet gir inntrykk av at den har vært nokså fåtallig og at den neppe har ytet særlig motstand mot det norske landnåmet” (Martens 1960:101).

Ellen Karine Hougen (1965) – Handel og samferdsel i nordens vikingtid, in *Viking*

”De tre nordiske land stod i nær kontakt, ved kriger og plyndringstokter, men også i fredelig samkvem ved giftemål mellom stormannsættene og, selv om det ikke berettes meget om det, ved handelsferder” (Hougen 1965:167).

”De varere som kom til Norden fra det vesteuropeiske området var av høyst forskjellig slag. Fra de britiske øyer finnes fortrinnsvis ornerte bronsesaker, av irsk eller angelsaksisk opprinnelse. Det var i første rekke beslag, delvis omgjort til smykker her hjemme i Norden [...]” (Hougen 1965:172-173).

”Det var utvilsomt et stort behov for jern i vikingtiden, noe særlig de norske gravenes jernrikdom vitner om, samtidig som de viser at det ikke har vært noen mangelvare [...] Analyser av norskproduserte sverd har vist at de maktet å fremstille jern av utmerket kvalitet” (Hougen 1965:183).

Charlotte Blindheim and Roar L. Tollnes (1972) – *Kaupang. Vikingenes handelsplass*

”Vi er jo her tilbake i vikingtiden – en periode som tradisjonelt anses for å være en røverienes og ufredens tid, da våre forfedre herjet og brannskattet det meste av Europa” (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:8).

”Det er grunnlag for å sette våre graver i klasse med de rike kjøpmennenes graver på Birka” (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:53).

”Skal vi gjøre opp status og se hva funnene fra Kaupang betyr for Norges tidlige handelshistorie – slik vår målsetning var – må vi imidlertid veie begge funngruppene mot hverandre” (Blindheim and Tollnes 1972:89).

Liv Helga Dommasnes (1979) – Et gravmateriale fra yngre jernalder brukt til å belyse kvinners stilling, in *Viking*

”Spørsmålet er således grunnleggende, og det var fristende å forsøke iallfall å komme svaret noe nærmere for en av våre forhistoriske perioder ved å formulere konkrete spørsmål til et arkeologisk materiale” (Dommasnes 1979:96).

”Det som finnes av historiske kilder om vår jernalder, som lovttekster og islendingesagaer, beskriver jo nettopp samfunnet som et sterkt lagdelt bondesamfunn. Binfordeks modell kan altså med en viss rett anvendes på et norsk yngre jernaldersmateriale” (Dommasnes 1979:98).

”Historiske kilder bekrefter dette: engelske krøniker beretter om nordiske menn som kom til landet som vikinger, våre egne kongesagaer forteller om væpnede menn i kongens følge, som også de islandske ættesagaene reserverer våpnene for menn” (Dommasnes 1979:99).

Anne Stine Ingstad (1982) – Osebergdronningen – hvem var hun? In *Viking*

”De røde tekstilene i Osebergfunnet skiller seg derfor ut fra andre samtidige norske funn og bestyrker etter min oppfatning at den ene av kvinnene i skibet har vært dronning” (Ingstad 1982:51).

”Disse gravminnene gir uttrykk for en selvfølelse og en selvhevdelsestrang som i gammel tid er enestående i Norge” (Ingstad 1982:60).

Arne Emil Christensen, Anne Stine Ingstad and Bjørn Myhre (1992) – Osebergdronningens grav. *Vår arkeologiske nasjonalskatt i et nytt lys.*

”Osebergfunnet er det store eventyret i norsk arkeologi [...] Vikingtiden er en spennende periode i norgeshistorien. For første gang blir vår nasjon en del av Europa, på godt og vondt” (Christensen, et al. 1992:7).

”Vi håper at presentasjonen kan gi et innblikk i både et rikt funnstoff og fortelle noe om nasjonens røtter” (Christensen, et al. 1992:9).

”Det rike gravfunnet fra Oseberg-haugen har mer enn noen andre arkeologiske funn vært med på å fremheve Vestfold som vikingtidens norske sentrum” (Christensen, et al. 1992:32).

”Disse er langt finere enn de som er funnet i våre graver, men de har alle de karakteristika som også våre tekstiler har” (Christensen, et al. 1992:203).

Heid Gjøstein Resi (2000) – Kaupang, før nye utgravninger, in *Collegium Medievale*

”Mengden og bredden av funn som taler om utøvelse av metallhåndverk på Kaupang er for norske forhold enestående og vitner om avanserte kunnskaper hos utøverne” (Resi 2000:145).

”Sammen med ulike råmaterialer, redskaper, støpeformer, halvprodukter etc., tyder funnene på at smedene teknisk ikke sto tilbake for sine kolleger i sammenliknbare utenlandske tettsteder” (Resi 2000:160).

Bergljot Solberg (2003) – Vikingtiden ca. 800 – 1030 e.Kr, in *Jernalderen i Norge: ca. 500 f.Kr. – 1030 e.Kr.*

”Også utenlandske samtidskilder inneholder enkelte opplysninger som berører Norge og norske forhold” (Solberg 2003:215).

”Materialet gjør det mulig å få et bedre innblikk både i hjemlige samfunnsforhold og i aktiviteter i andre områder i denne perioden, enn tilfellet er for noen tidligere periode” (Solberg 2003:218).

”Gjenstandene av jet er små figurer, nydelig utskåret og feilfritt blankpolert. Trolig er det selve råmaterialet som har vært importert. Figurene er nemlig formet fullt ut i overensstemmelse med nordisk smak og uttrykk, noe som tyder på at de er fremstilt her i landet” (Solberg 2003:227-228).

”Gokstadskipet er et av de ypperste eksempler på norsk skipsbyggingskunst i vikingtiden” (Solberg 2003:243).

”Sammenlignet med Danmark og Sverige, der det til sammen er kjent om lag ti tilsvarende funn, tyder dette på at vikingferdene til Irland var et nærmest rent norsk foretak” (Solberg 2003:248).

”Aktiviteten til norske og danske vikinger rettet seg hovedsakelig mot vest. Danene og nordmennene hadde imidlertid ulike interesseområder selv om de i enkelte tilfeller overlappet hverandre. [...] Det har lenge vært en rådende oppfatning at den norrøne bosetningsekspansjonen på Vesterhavsoyene først startet ca. 800 [...] Det synes å være en periode der den piktiske og den skandinaviske gruppen overlapper hverandre” (Solberg 2003:251).

”Vi har ingen kilder som med rene ord forteller hvordan vårt samfunn var i vikingtiden. Men arkeologiske funn og opplysninger i skriftlige kilder sett i relasjon til landet selv gir oss visse forestillinger” (Solberg 2003:255).

Frans-Arne Stylegar (2009) – Kaupangs omland og urbaniseringstendenser i norsk vikingtid, in *Den urbane underskog*

”Med utgangspunkt i det særegne funnbildet rundt Kaupang i Vestfold, skal jeg i denne artikkelen se nærmere på enkelte trekk ved det norske arkeologiske vikingtidsmaterialet [...]” (Stylegar 2009:67).

”Grønneberg med tre smedgraver inntar en særstilling i det norske vikingtidsmaterialet” (Stylegar 2009:77).

”Knut Helle knytter det særpregede urbaniseringsmønsteret i Viken på overgangen mellom vikingtid og middelalder – med relativt bred bydannelse med nokså uklare lokale forutsetninger – blant annet til regionens rolle som et omstridt grenseområde mellom danske overherrer og norske rikssamlingskonger” (Stylegar 2009:92).

Gutorm Gjessing (1928) – Finsk-Ugriske vikingetidssmykker i Norge, in *Universitetets Oldsaksamlings årbok*

”Av forskjellige grunner finner jeg det riktigst å begynne med den nordnorske, og vi vil da ganske kort resumere kulturforholdene i Finnmark” (Gjessing 1928:23).

”Sin stor betydning har funnet, for det første fordi det bidrar til å vise at det i Finnmark har vært fastboende nordmenn, og for det annet fordi det på en utmerket måte illustrerer de fremmede innflytelsene som gjør sig gjeldende på lappisk område” (Gjessing 1928:24).

”I en av gravene fra *Kremon* ligger en ganske nærstående slir sammen med et middelalders sverd, dopsko til sverdslir med romanske rankeornamenter etc. Likevel kan vi, tror jeg, trygt datere vår slir til vikingetid” (Gjessing 1928:32).

”At det ikke er nordmenn som har bragt dem hit, fremgår av gravskikken. [...] Arkeologisk taler med andre ord alt for at de er kommet til landet med lappiske folk” (Gjessing 1928:32).

Lars F. Stenvik (1980) – Samer og nordmenn. Sett i lys av et uvanlig gravfunn fra Saltenområdet, in *Viking*

”Ut fra dette var det mulig å fastslå at den døde var en langskallet kvinne med antatt alder over 70 år. Kvinnen har vært ca. 156 cm høy og har tilhørt den ”nordiske rase”” (Stenvik 1980:127).

”Dette er en ekstrem kortskalle, ”åpenbart same” slik prof. Torgersen uttrykker det. Breddelengdeindeksen er ett av de trekk som klart skiller den samiske befolkningen fra den norske” (Stenvik 1980:129).

”Det synes derfor som samene er gravlagt i en norsk grend” (Stenvik 1980:132).

”Ut fra det som tidligere er nevnt om kommersiell kontakt mellom samer og nordmenn, er det fristende å se på den gravlagte samene som en handelshøvding som døde på en av sine ferder i et område der han var kjent og aktet blant den lokale befolkningen” (Stenvik 1980:137).

Arne Skjølsvold (1980) – Refleksjoner omkring jernaldersgravene i sydnorske fjellstrøk, in *Viking*

”Dette er kanskje ikke mer enn naturlig når man tenker på hvor sterk norsk arkeologi har vært preget av sydiskandinaviske tankegang hvor, av forståelige grunner, bondekulturen har stått i fokus når det gjelder de fleste bosetningsstudier helt fra neolitikum av og senere gjennom all vår forhistorie. [...] Veidingens grunnleggende betydning for næringsgrunnlaget i vårt land i forhistorisk tid har riktignok vært sterkt aksentuert, men bonde og veidemann hat nokså ensidig vært oppfattet som en og samme person hvor gården med husdyr, slåtteland og åker har dannet den stabile kjernen i bosetningsmønsteret” (Skjølsvold 1980:141-142).

”Men dersom vi tar fjellgravene med i betraktningen er det liten grunn til å velge en så ”dramatisk” tolkning som at det kan være tale om rester etter en ”urbefolkning” eller et førgermansk veidefolk. Gravene er som kjent ”sydiskandinaviske” både i anlegg og oldsaksinnhold, og det er lite grunnlag for å trekke inn etniske forskjeller. Men dette forhindrer ikke at vi kan stå overfor grupper av folk som har hatt et annet ervervsgrunnlag enn bondekulturen” (Skjølsvold 1980:156).

”På bakgrunn av de refleksjoner som her er fremkommet, er det fristende å antyde at en rekke av våre fjellgraver, såvel som andre graver i utkanten av bondekulturens bosetningsområder, langs kysten, i skogsområdene og langs sjøer og vann i innlandet, kan være minner etter en fangsboetning” (Skjølsvold 1980:157).

Audhild Schanche (1989) – Jernalderens bosetningsmønster i et fleretnisk perspektiv, in *Framskritt for fortida i nord: I Povl Simonsens fotefar*

”Siden Tromsø Museum fikk sin arkeologiske avdeling i 1874 har hovedtyngden av nord-norsk arkeologisk forskning vært rettet inn mot den norske bosetningen i landsdelen” (Schanche 1989:171).

”Finnes det så trekk ved det rikholdige materialet fra norsk jernalder som kan brukes til å etterspore en samtidig samisk befolkning?” (Schanche 1989:172).

”Mangelen på samisk, arkeologisk materiale – for en stor del et resultat av en etnosentrisk forskningstradisjon – umuliggjør ikke en utvikling av teorier omkring samisk bosetning, all den tid det norske bosetningsmønster i jernalderen vanskelig lar seg forklare uten ved henvisning til relasjonen norsk/samisk” (Schanche 1989:181).

Inger Storli (1991) – De østlige smykkene fra vikingtid og tidlig middelalder, in *Viking*

”Endelig vil jeg legge funn av østlige smykker i norrøne graver til grunn for en diskusjon om forholdet mellom samer og nordmenn i denne perioden, og om samenes status i vikingtidssamfunnet” (Storli 1991:92).

”Hvordan skal vi så oppfatte de østlige smykkene som er funnet i *norrøne* graver? Materialet omfatter til sammen 14 graver, til dels rikt utstyrte, og som altså oppfattes som norske. [...] Dette er altså ei ”*blanda*” grav, dvs. med trekk som peker både mot den norske og den samiske befolkninga” (Storli 1991:96).

”Vi finner m.a.o. kvinnegraver med skandinaviske smykkeformer i samiske områder og kvinnegraver med samiske smykkeformer i norske områder” (Storli 1991:99).

”Jeg tolker m.a.o. materialet som uttrykk for at det kan ha funnet sted utveksling av ektefeller mellom samer og nordmenn” (Storli 1991:100).

”I stedet er jeg tilbøyelig til å se smykkene som uttrykk for ei kulturell orientering østover som har røtter helt tilbake til steinalderen” (Storli 1991:101).

Jostein Bergstøl and Gaute Reitan (2008) – Samer på Dovrefjell i vikingtiden, in *Historisk tidsskrift*

“Alle de nevnte gjenstandstypene er som før nevnt vanlige funn i tidligere undersøkte samiske kontekster” (Bergstøl and Reitan 2008:23).

”Måten selve boplassen organiseres på inneholder mange kulturelle koder, og i møtet mellom bofaste norrøne bønder og mobile samiske fangstfolk har denne forskjellen blitt aksentuert” (Bergstøl and Reitan 2008:24).

”Funnet av boplassen viser at det kan være en kjerne av realitet i historien fra sagaene, og kan tyde på at kontakten mellom samisk og norrønt samfunn var mer omfattende enn man tidligere har antatt. Arkeologen Neil Price viser til samiske trekk blant annet i de rike gravene i Vendel og Valsgårde i Uppland i Sverige, som tyder på at kontakten mellom samiske og norrøne samfunn ikke bare har foregått langt sør, men også på et høyt politisk nivå” (Bergstøl and Reitan 2008:26).

Hege Skalleberg Gjerde (2010) – Tilfeldig? Neppe. Finsk-ugriske smykker i Sør-Norge, in *Viking*

”Likhetsstrekk til samisk, sjamanistisk religionspraksis utelukker imidlertid ikke norrøn religionspraksis. Flere har påpekt likhetene mellom norrøn og samisk religion og mytologi, og mange er enige om at den norrøne seiden er en form for sjamanisme” (Gjerde 2010:54).

”Parallellene mellom norrøn og samisk mytologi og religionspraksis er påfallende, og om innflytelsen har gått fra det norrøne til det samiske samfunnet, eller omvendt, har blitt debattert i lang tid” (Gjerde 2010:55).

”I den grad det har vært samer i Sør-Norge/Midt-Skandinavia, må vi tro at fellesskap, nettverk og interaksjon med den øvrige, norrøne befolkningen har vært avgjørende. Men hvordan skal da rekkeildstedene og permiske dyreanheng forstås? Er de likevel uttrykk for signalisering av ”samiskhet” i opposisjon til det norrøne samfunnet, eller kan de rett og slett ha vært en mer integrert del av det?” (Gjerde 2010:57).

