

## 2 THE GATHERING OF DATA: BUILDINGS EXCAVATED IN ØSTLANDET

An essential basis for my studies of the conditions of ownership is the systematization and comparison of settlement-site evidence from Østlandet, as hitherto there has been no synthesis of the evidence (Ch. 2). Here, I shall briefly describe how the archaeological evidence has been created. The aim of this chapter is first and foremost to make the point that area stripping by machine was introduced at a very late juncture, and began to make a real difference even later. The presentation of the history of data collection is based upon published literature, and a thorough review of the evidence which this study is based upon will appear in Chapter 6.

Archaeological fieldwork in Østlandet cannot really be viewed in isolation from fieldwork in the rest of Norway and may rather roughly be divided into three periods. In what I have described as the First Golden Age, the ‘building ruin phase’ before the Second World War, Norwegian field archaeology was at the same level as elsewhere in Scandinavia (Ch. 2). After area stripping by machine became established in Danish, and then in Swedish, archaeology, Norwegian settlement archaeology was left behind (Ch. 2). Only in the last two decades has this method become an integral or ‘internalized’ part of Norwegian archaeological practice, and I speculate we may be on the threshold of a new Golden Age (Ch. 2).

### THE ABSENCE OF AN OVERVIEW

In 1907, Shetelig (1909) carried out the first published excavation of Iron-age farmhouses in Norway. Gabriel Gustafson’s journal notes from 1893 reveal in fact that he had already, 14 years earlier, investigated a building ruin at Ødemotland on Jæren, but these excavations were never published (Kallhovd 1994:102). Deserted farms from earlier periods had, however, been known about long before they were blessed with the attention of archaeologists. As early as 1745, Governor Bendix Christian de Fine (1870:109–10) referred to deserted farms on Jæren in *Stavanger Amtes udførlige beskrivelse* [A comprehensive description of Stavanger Amt]. He refers to building ruins, walls and fields, and was in no doubt that these were remains of the agrarian settlement of earlier periods, and must at least pre-date the Black Death. In 1842, Jacob Neumann referred

to the foundations of boathouses and buildings at Ferkingstad on Karmøy, which were later investigated by Jan Petersen. Nicolaysen (1862–6:313) reproduced de Fine’s description in *Norske fornlevninger* [Norwegian archaeological remains] but made no attempt to add any comments of his own.

It therefore took a long time from buildings, and then the other parts of the farm or the agrarian unit, being recognized by archaeologists to their becoming the object of archaeological investigations (Pilø 2005; Løken et al. 1996; Gjerpe 2016). It was only in 1935 that Sigurd Grieg undertook the first archaeological excavation of a building ruin in Østlandet, at Langset in Østre Gausdal. Down to 1938, he excavated what he understood to be five ruins of the Viking Period in Gudbrandsdalen (Grieg 1938), although they were subsequently dated to the Medieval Period. It is still the case that relatively few Iron-age settlements have been excavated across Østlandet compared with, for instance, southern Vestlandet or Denmark (Østmo 1991; Løken 1998a; Bårdseth 2006; 2008; Martens 2007; Gjerpe 2008a).

Recently, Eriksen (2019) has produced an overview of farm settlement of the Late Iron Age within what is now Norway. We have, however, no recent, comprehensive overview of excavated building ruins or farmsteads of the Early Iron Age or Medieval Period in Norway. Substantial methodological work was thus necessary as a foundation for this study. This could, to some degree, be based upon extant publications. Bjørn Myhre (2002) and Ingvild Øye (2002) provided references to many major excavations and important results. Dagfinn Skre (1996) offers an overview of building practice in Norway in the period AD 400–1400, and in the same year Trond Løken, Olle Hemdorff and Lars Pilø (1996) published an account of building ruins from Norway, investigated with the aid of area stripping by machine.

There are also a number of works which provide local or thematic overviews. Until recently, the majority of the synthetic studies had been produced with a focus on Jæren or Agder, the areas with far and away the majority of excavated buildings and farms. It was the Migration Period in particular that was the focus of Petersen’s (1943; 1954) and Asbjørn E. Herteig’s (1955a) work. Odmund J. Møllerop (1958) and

Wencke Slomann (1971) addressed themselves to the whole of the Early Iron Age, while Bjørn Myhre (1972; 1980; 1983) considered both the Early and the Late phases of the Iron Age. Trond Løken (2020) synthesized the Forsandmoen Bronze Age and Early Iron Age settlement. Settlement research in Østlandet and Agder was reviewed by Einar Østmo (1991), who summarized knowledge of the farm as it was around the time at which area stripping by machine came into use in Østlandet. Jes Martens (2007) published radiocarbon-dated three-aisled buildings of the Iron Age excavated down to 2002 in the same region, while more recently Karl Kallhovd and Frans-Arne Stylegar (2014) have published an updated overview of the settlement evidence from Agder. Gro Anita Bårdseth (2006) has published buildings excavated in Østfold down to 2006, while Iron-age farms in North Norway have been presented by Olav Sverre Johansen (1979). Geir Grønneby (2005) offers a short introduction to building ruins uncovered by area stripping by machine in Trøndelag, and Søren Kiinhoff (2005; 2013) has done likewise for the west of Norway. A number of investigations in Møre og Romsdal have been published by Bjørn Ringstad (2000). My compilation of the evidence from the Iron Age in Østlandet (Chs. 6–7) is thus just one of several works that are needed in order to produce a comprehensive picture of agrarian settlement in Norway.

### THE FIRST GOLDEN AGE: BUILDING RUINS

The first systematic recordings of ruined building foundations and farmsteads in Norway was undertaken by Tor Helliesen on Jæren at the end of the 1890s (Helliesen and Løken 1997). He did not, though, conduct any excavations. Shetelig's excavation (1909) of two building ruins of the Migration Period at Vestad in Varhaug on Jæren in 1907 was therefore the first such fieldwork in Norway. These excavations of more than a century ago were the start of the first Golden Age in Norwegian building research, which has also been labelled 'the building ruin phase' (e.g. Martens 2004:4, *hustuftfasen*). Subsequently, through to the end of the 1930s, a series of buildings were excavated on Jæren, at Lista, and in Sunnmøre (Gjessing 1917; Bøe 1925; Petersen 1926; 1933; 1936; Lindøe 1931; Grieg 1934). In the 1930s, Norwegian settlement-site excavations and studies were of the same quality as elsewhere in Scandinavia, as is illustrated by the fact that Grieg, Helge Gjessing, Gutorm Gjessing, Shetelig, A. W. Brøgger and Petersen are referred to in Märten Stenberger's *Öland under äldre järnåldern* (1933).

Magnus Olsen (1926:32–5) summarized the knowledge of individual buildings immediately before the results of Petersen and Grieg's major excavation campaigns were published. The buildings are usually 10–20 m long and 5–6 m wide, although the largest are more than 50 m long. The low walls of turf and stone led Olsen to infer that the buildings must have had low walls. He also wrote that as early as the 5th century the building had practically reached its final form with parallel rows of roof-bearing posts, at least one hearth, higher walls, and in some cases a large hall. Although Myhre (1980) modified this 'status quo of research' somewhat, it only changed significantly following the excavations at Forsand in the 1980s (Løken 2020). Much more detail is now known, and it is clear that the banks of stone and turf did not form the walls themselves but rather just an outer protective skin. It is also clear that far from all of the buildings have wall banks, and that three-aisled buildings were in existence as early as c. 1500 BC. All the same, Olsen's summary can in many ways be applied to the buildings discovered through area stripping by machine. It is also worth noting that Olsen (1926:32) was clear that the buildings belonged to a common Scandinavian tradition, the point that to some extent became forgotten when area stripping by machine produced new evidence in Sweden and Denmark (Ch. 3).

Although Jæren and southern Vestlandet were at the centre of Norwegian farm research, some excavations were also carried out in Østlandet in this period. Grieg (1938) was, as noted, the first to excavate and publish Iron-age buildings in Østlandet, and for a long time those structures constituted a high proportion of the known Iron-age buildings from the region (even though, in fact, Grieg's ruins have been reinterpreted and dated to the Medieval Period: see Finstad 1998; 2009). His excavations also represented a major proportion of the sites dug before area stripping by machine became common. I shall therefore take a brief look at his assumptions in the context of his excavation and publication of building ruins from Lista. Grieg had a fundamentally evolutionary perspective, and was critical of the Swede Gerda Boethius who "over-emphasizes the importance of the carpenters of the Early Iron Age." "Both internally and externally, these buildings must have looked primitive," wrote Grieg, and "It is, however, certain that from the outside these [buildings] must have appeared particularly plain and not much to look at" (Grieg 1934:103, 105, 113, translated). Grieg found great variation in the building-types. In addition to both short and long

longhouses with earth-fast posts, he discovered a type of longhouse that did not have earth-fast posts; square buildings with entrances at the corners; and irregular buildings with bowed walls and gable ends. He later commented that the lack of post-holes could be due to the state of preservation or to their having been missed during excavation (1934:116). Grieg was also of the opinion that the buildings had walls of earth and stone that were at least a metre high, with internal wooden panels or daub. The wooden panel was not necessarily placed immediately against the external wall, in his view, and there could have been a gap up to a metre wide between them. Where post-holes are found, the roof was supported by earth-fast posts, by preference with a longitudinal ridge, and the walls were only the outer skin of the building. The form of the walls and the position of the post-holes mean that in certain cases one may have had a hipped or bonnet rather than a box gable roof. The turf roof had a base lining of bark (Grieg 1934:102, 110, 111). Grieg (1934:94–5) did have some scientific analyses undertaken, and both charcoal and the contents of what was thought to be ancient dung were determined to species. He also emphasized that building practice was adapted to local conditions (1934:98). He was particularly preoccupied with the notion that the choice of roof-structure must have been conditioned by available building timber, and argued for the use of markedly bent deciduous timber because there was a lack of spruce or pine that would have grown straight. In fact, pine charcoal has been found in two different hearths, but Grieg attached more importance to the situation on Lista in his own day, when there was a lack of naturally straight building timber.

Most of the buildings published in 'Jernalderhus på Lista' [Iron-age buildings on Lista] were excavated by Helge Gjessing, but some by Grieg himself. It is not difficult to see that there was a difference in quality between the two excavators, and Grieg himself (1934:116) commented that his excavations had tell-tale signs of inexperience. It must be accepted, too, that the quality of Grieg's excavations was not equivalent to the best of his time, something he recognized himself. It would also appear that Grieg attached greater importance to evolutionary theories than to the archaeological evidence. He ignored, for instance, the pinewood charcoal, rather than the vegetation of his own day, and thus could maintain his belief in primitive buildings. Conversely, he was also open to the possibility of different types of building having existed side-by-side. On the basis of the weakly identified buildings from Lista, though, it is appropriate to

ask whether such open-mindedness was the product of an inability to recognize patterns.

I have already shown that the five buildings which Grieg (1938) excavated in Gudbrandsdalen in the 1930s were the first that were investigated in Østlandet. Shortly afterwards, in 1942, Gutorm Gjessing excavated two buildings at Land. The amateur archaeologist Aksel Helmen, who took part in both Grieg's and Gjessing's excavations, dug a further building ruin in Land in 1948 (Helmen 1953). Gjessing's two sites had no datable material, and were inferred, on typological grounds, to be of the Stone Age. They were not published by Gjessing himself, and they came to be forgotten as time passed, probably because of the inadequate dating evidence. Even now the buildings cannot be dated with certainty. A quick look at the published plans (Helmen 1953:19, 22) does, however, indicate that they could be from later periods.

Grieg excavated at speed: the building at Søndre Nygård in Oppland, for example, was excavated and recorded over just two July days in 1935 (Finstad 1998:71). At that time, little consideration was given to the possibility of the buildings or settlements having had multiple phases, and archaeologists were not aware that post-holes normally pertained to earlier buildings with earth-fast posts while the visible wall banks and walls were from later buildings either with or without earth-fast posts. Before 1950, it was also not the usual practice to identify or record as many post-holes as the positions of the roof-bearing posts would subsequently allow one to reconstruct (Myhre 1980:174). As already noted, Finstad has re-assessed Grieg's and Helmen's evidence and undertaken his own, minor excavations of some of the ruins. Grieg and Helmen believed that the buildings were large, composite, and of the Viking Period, and that the sites were single-phase. Finstad observes that there are several phases at the sites investigated, and (to simplify the case a little) argues that the individual buildings actually comprise several smaller structures of the Medieval Period. The post-holes which Grieg and Helmen linked to stone foundation walls are interpreted by Finstad (1998; 2009) as poorly preserved traces of three-aisled buildings with earth-fast posts of the Iron Age.

#### NORWEGIAN SETTLEMENT-SITE RESEARCH IN THE PAUSE POSITION

Anders Hagen's excavations at Sostelid (1953) can be regarded as the last of the building ruin phase. Hagen found very little new in respect of the buildings

themselves; his important contribution in terms of field archaeology was to expand the excavations to include the wider farmstead context and traces of cultivation. At the same time, his dissertation pointed the way forward in that he placed the buildings within both a Scandinavian and a European framework.

After the publication of Hagen's dissertation on Sostelid, many years passed in which primarily an increasing number of ruins with visible wall banks were being investigated. The majority of the excavations, therefore, took place in areas which have not been farmed in modern times and the buildings were, as a result, considered to have pertained to marginal farms. First and foremost, these excavations contributed more detailed knowledge of aspects that were already known. In the light of Thomas S. Kuhn's (1962) philosophy of science, the collection of source evidence can therefore best be described as 'normal science'. Concurrently, the methods were gradually improved, and agrarian settlement was investigated in new areas, including North Norway and the mountain regions of Vestlandet and Østlandet (Martens 1973; Johansen 1979; Bjørge et al. 1992; Martens 2009). The situation was still that it was mostly buildings of the Early Iron Age that were examined, although the addition of buildings from both earlier and later periods increased: Ytre Moa, for instance, was excavated during this time (Bakka 1965). Little happened in Østlandet in this period either.

The most important step forward was the greater use of natural scientific methods than before, both in the discipline as a whole and within settlement-site archaeology. Pollen analysis is no new method in the context of archaeology but it gained ever greater significance, and eventually phosphate analyses, analyses of macrofossils, and radiocarbon dating were also employed in excavation of settlement sites (Provan 1971; Mydal et al. 1979; Prøsch-Danielsen 2005; Soltvedt 2005). The excavations at Ullandhaug of 1967–68 are similar in some respects to the earlier excavations in southern Vestlandet. They stand apart, however, in that macrofossil, phosphate and pollen analyses were undertaken, along with radiocarbon datings. Furthermore, relatively large areas were deturfed, albeit not using a mechanical digger. The thorough review of the functional and spatial subdivision of the Iron-age building undertaken by Myhre in Volume 1 of *Gårdsanlegget på Ullanhaug* (1980) achieved considerable impact in Norwegian, and to some extent in Scandinavian, archaeology. Volume 2, in which the scientific analyses were to be presented, never appeared however (although some material was published in the form of articles: Simonsen 1968; Provan

1971; Lundberg 1972; Rindal 2011). In connection, amongst other things, with watercourse studies in Vestlandet, building ruins where the possibility of cereal cultivation was low or non-existent were excavated, and these have therefore been interpreted as, amongst other things, shieling structures (Randers 1986; Bjørge et al. 1992; Randers and Kvamme 1992; Indrelid 2009:122). Larger buildings in areas where cereal cultivation must have played a minor role are known from Østlandet too (Martens 1973; Mikkelsen 1994; Martens et al. 2007).

Other important steps forward in this period were that more building ruins predating the Roman Iron Age were excavated. At Oгна on Jæren two buildings of the Bronze Age and two of the pre-Roman Iron Age were excavated in the 1960s (Skjølsvod 1970a; 1970b). The Bronze-age buildings were post-built with wall trenches that functioned as foundations for the walls, hitherto a little-known feature of Bronze-age settlement in Norway or indeed within Scandinavia. Already at the end of the 1930s, Harald Egenæs Lund (1937; 1939) predicted that Bronze-age buildings with no visible wall banks but with daub-lined walls would be found (Ch. 3.2.1). Around 30 years later, the first almost complete longhouses with no surviving wall banks were found sealed by a burial mound at Stokkset, Sande in Sunnmøre. Egil Bakka then excavated two three-aisled longhouses of the Late Neolithic. This excavation, however, remained unpublished for a long time, and has had little influence on the methodology of Norwegian archaeology (Johnson and Prescott 1993). In Østlandet too, post-holes and hearths were found without influencing matters: for instance, beneath the graves at Hunn, underneath Hvaler church, and at Skjellbanken on Kråkerøy (Hagen 1954; Johansen 1955; 1957). At that time, Norwegian archaeologists should have been fully familiar with open-area excavation through C. J. Becker's (1966) comprehensive publication of Grøntøft in Jutland, Denmark. The discovery of the settlement traces noted here ought therefore to have led to the use of machine stripping in Norway at a much earlier point. But that was not the case.

Three possible explanations of the late introduction of this method to Norway have previously been suggested (Løken et al. 1996:10–12). The large number of visible agrarian settlement structures, especially on Lista and Jæren, may have led to a mental block against the idea of buildings with no surviving wall banks in cultivated ground, but that was not the case in Denmark, notwithstanding the fact that it should be noted that far fewer ruins with visible wall banks are known there. It has also been claimed

that Brøgger's (1925b) insistence on the absence of permanent settlement before the time of Christ, combined with the known and visible agrarian structures of the Roman Iron Age and Migration Period, and the assumption that those of the Late Iron Age lay beneath modern farmsteads, seemed to imply that there was no reason to strip large areas (Løken et al. 1996:10–12). Furthermore, the archaeology of heritage management was bogged down in work on cultural monuments of familiar form, and financial resources were directed to known ancient monuments. It is perhaps Shetelig (1945:48) who enunciated most clearly why there was little purpose in searching for settlement traces in the fully cultivated lands of the present:

But it is precisely the connectedness of the long history of the farm that means that it is difficult for us to grasp what form a Norwegian farm really took in the Early Iron Age, because the buildings were for the most part always rebuilt on the same foundations on which the old ones had stood before they collapsed; or, if the settlement was relocated, earlier wall foundations would, in the course of time, have been cleared in the course of cultivation... The only chance would be if farms or small groups of farms that were occupied in the heathen era were abandoned and left waste ever since; and such lucky hits we must truly be thankful for, from which we now know a considerable number of farming settlements left undisturbed from Prehistory [translated].

#### THE SECOND GOLDEN AGE? OPEN-AREA STRIPPING BY MACHINE

The first time that a digging machine was used to remove topsoil in an archaeological excavation in Norway was during the excavation of cooking pits at Oddernes in Kristiansand in 1960 (Skjelsvik 1960). Exactly ten years later, Bjørn Myhre (1973b) was the first to publish buildings of the Iron Age found in a cultivated area where there were no visible traces at ground level. The two buildings at Gjerland in Førde, Sogn og Fjordane, have subsequently been interpreted as part of a 'courtyard site' [Norw. *ringtun*] (Randers 1989). The buildings are well defined, and post-holes for roof-bearing posts, walls and separate gable posts and hearths were recorded. The dating of the buildings to the Early Roman Iron Age relies upon a single radiocarbon date, and no datable artefacts were found with these buildings. Myhre took the view that the sparsity of finds and the lack of culture layers meant that the buildings had not been regular residences or that this settlement was short-lived. Since broadly

similar buildings were known in Denmark (Becker 1966) this looks like a conclusion that is firmly rooted in the 'primeval farm model': the tenet of continuity and a distinctively Norwegian settlement history (Pilø 2005), and no less the heritage of the 1814 generation (Ch. 3). The conclusion also contrasts starkly with Lund's earlier suggestion, which has in the course of time proved to be correct. In the 1970s, prehistoric buildings were also found with the aid of area stripping by machine at Oddernes (Rolfesen 1976) and Augland (Rolfesen 1992) in Kristiansand, Vest-Agder, and at Bernem in Overhalla, Nord-Trøndelag (Farbregd 1980). The method therefore had a slow start, and had been employed several times before the great breakthrough took place (Løken et al. 1996).

The Second Golden Age in Norwegian settlement-site research was also introduced in Rogaland, in this case at Forsand in the 1980s. Under the direction of Trond Løken, the topsoil was removed from wide areas, and a number of well-defined and dated buildings of the Bronze and Iron Ages were excavated and published (Løken 1987b; 1988; Løken and Særheim 1990; Løken 1991; 1997; 1998b; 1999; 2001b; 2020). This made it clear that the method has immense potential, even in Norway. For this method to have become internalized, it was perhaps equally important that those involved in the project determinedly disseminated their knowledge in respect of practical fieldwork. As a student from the year 1994 and a field archaeologist from 1996, I now realize that they were virtually evangelizing for this method. Their *Maskinell flateavdekking og utgravning av forhistoriske jordbruksboplasser: en metodisk innføring* [Open area stripping by machine and the excavation of prehistoric agrarian settlements: a methodological introduction] (Løken et al. 1996) is still standard literature for this method of excavation in the case of Norway. During the 1990s, as a result, open-area excavation by machine stripping was internalized in Rogaland, and gradually over the rest of Norway, much later than it had been in Denmark (Becker 1966) and Sweden (Säfvestad 1995). It is thus only in the case of Norway that this period can be described as a Golden Age (Martens 2004). In a wider Scandinavian perspective, I would rather describe the last 20 years in Norwegian settlement archaeology as a desperate attempt to retrieve the neglected, not only with regard to full engagement with the source evidence but also in terms of theoretical development. The number of excavated buildings from prehistoric agrarian contexts has certainly multiplied many times over, but the corpus of evidence is still slender compared with that in Sweden and Denmark. Open-area

stripping has not led to any substantial increase in the number of medieval buildings known in Østlandet either (Martens 2004).

### *Iron-age settlement in Østlandet*

Prior to 1991 very few buildings from agrarian contexts of the Iron Age were known in Østlandet. Even fewer had been thoroughly investigated, dated and published (Østmo 1991). Trond Løken's excavation at Opstad (1978) confirmed, however, that three-aisled buildings with earth-fast posts but with no visible wall banks were present in Østlandet too. A well-dated and firmly identified ruin was excavated at Tingvoll in Sarpsborg in 1990 (Andersen 1991) but not published until much later (Bårdseth 2006). In 1989–90 Iron-age buildings were found for the first time in Østlandet via the use of area stripping by machine, at Korsegården, Akershus (Uleberg 1990b; 1990a). Individual elements such as post-holes, hearths and other structural traces had previously been found at several sites but no clear building plots had been identified (Hagen 1954; Johansen 1955; Skre 1985; Hernæs 1989; Pedersen 1990b; for additional unpublished excavations see Østmo 1991; Helliksen 1996b). The finds did, therefore, provide information on the location of early settlement but could not be used for any architectonic details. They can also be regarded as the product of the widespread employment of inexperienced field archaeologists and excavation circumstances that were far from ideal. There is no overview of the seniority and experience of the excavation directors in respect of open-area excavations of the 1990s, but it is illustrative of the situation that in 1996 I was appointed director of an excavation in cultivated land with a total of three weeks' experience of this technique, on a site that had already been stripped when I arrived (an experience that was not unique to me: pers. comm., Unn Pedersen). The result of the excavation was more or less as one might have predicted, and in retrospect I am relatively sure that a three-aisled longhouse, perhaps with evidence of ironworking, was missed.

Alongside the remains of buildings that were discovered more or less by chance, aerial photography was used to search for buildings in ploughed land. Round or oblong cropmarks were assumed to show building plots. The oblong cropmarks, such as those that were excavated in part at Virik in Sandefjord, have since been identified as definitely parts of a three-aisled building with wall trenches (Haavaldsen 1983). The cropmarks at Korsegården also proved to derive from three-aisled buildings and other settlement-site

activity (Jacobsen 1990; Skre in Østmo et al. 1990:40; Uleberg 1990a; 1990b).

The first regular open-area excavation which revealed buildings around the Oslofjord was, as noted, carried out at Korsegården in Follo, Akershus, by Espen Uleberg (1990a; 1990b). The internalization of the open-area technique coincided with periods of massive development activity and led to a radical growth in the number of known building plots, from the Iron Age and other periods. The major surge in the number of Iron-age buildings is well illustrated by the fact that Jes Martens (2007) found 54 radiocarbon-dated three-aisled longhouses that had been excavated down to 2002 in the Museum of Cultural History's area of responsibility (Østlandet and Agder). In my own research, which does not cover Agder or western Telemark but perhaps has less strict criteria, the quantity is around three times greater just a decade further on (Ch. 6), while the number has increased further in 2021, amongst other things as a result of the excavations at Dilling in Østfold, where more than 130 buildings or parts of buildings have been excavated. The great majority of these were of the pre-Roman and Roman Iron Ages but some were also from earlier and later periods. Martens (2007) found eleven buildings of the Late Iron Age while Eriksen (2019) found 24 probably or possibly dated to the Late Iron Age in this region. Several major excavation projects in which Iron-age buildings constituted a significant part of what was found were published in the Museum of Cultural History's *Varia* series or similar publications (Berg 1997; Helliksen 1997; Bårdseth 2007a; 2007b; 2007c; Gjerpe 2008a; 2008e; Simonsen and Martens 2008; Gjerpe and Mjærum 2012; Mjærum and Gjerpe 2012; Gundersen 2016). All of the excavations from the period 2001–06, both with buildings and without, were published together (Ystgård and Heibreen 2007; Bergstøl 2009; Berg-Hansen 2015). Buildings are also noted in several volumes of the *Varia* series whose main topic is some other type of ancient monument (Bergstøl 1997:16–26; Ballin 1998:100–14), and some buildings have been published in articles, often in local historical or other periodicals, that have not been subject to peer review (Uleberg 1990b; 1990a; Risbøl 1997; Guttormsen 1998; 2002; 2003; Berg-Hansen 2010a; Reitan 2010; Rødsrud 2011). Far too many of the management-directed excavations in Østlandet remain unpublished. The research-directed excavations, by contrast, have for the most part been published (Skre 1998; Gustafson 2000; 2001; 2005a; Pilø 2005). In 1993, a possible cult building or hall of the 7th century was found a little to the south of

Lillehammer (Haraldsen 1994). It was subsequently excavated, but no information from this fieldwork is available. This building thus does not exist in a scientific context and so cannot be afforded further attention. All accessible reports down to 2014 are, however, included in the collection of data.

#### **SUMMARY: FROM ONE GOLDEN AGE TO ANOTHER?**

Allowing for a degree of simplification, the increase in the number of excavated buildings in Norway and in Østlandet can be divided into three periods. The first of these began in 1907 and lasted to the Second World War. In this period, it was ruins with surviving wall banks that were excavated. Research was focused on building practices and the buildings as housing, and much less upon the buildings as part of the farm. This was possibly due to the fact that the majority of the buildings were found in southern Vestlandet, in areas which were regarded as marginal at the time of excavation. In this period, knowledge of the buildings grew massively, and the scholarship gradually established itself as commensurable with that in Denmark and Sweden even though Swedish building excavations, for instance, were undertaken 20 years before the first in Norway (cf. Petersen 1933:1). I have therefore labelled this the First Golden Age in Norwegian settlement-site research.

The increase in the number of excavated buildings in Gudbrandsdalen and in Østlandet in this period was quantitatively and perhaps also qualitatively weaker than it was in Sørlandet and Vestlandet. After the Second World War there was more or less an end to major, research-directed excavation projects in Norway. At the same time, the grip of continuity scholarship hardened (Ch. 3). As open-area excavation by machine progressively became integrated into Swedish and Danish archaeology, Norwegian settlement research gradually became less compatible with that in the rest of Scandinavia. I consequently regard the long period from the Second World War through to the 1990s as an interval in the 'pause' position. During this period, very few buildings were excavated in Østlandet. In the 1990s, however, open-area excavation by machine was internalized in Norwegian archaeology too, and entirely new evidence, qualitatively and quantitatively, was produced, this also applying to Østlandet. Nevertheless, Norwegian settlement-site research remains at the time of writing only slightly commensurable with that in Denmark and Sweden. The collected source material is also much poorer. All the same, we have many reasons to suggest that this will become the Second Golden Age. The increase in new evidence is great, but the buildings must be published, or made accessible to researchers in other ways. This study will contribute to that, but it is vital that it is followed up by others.