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The aim of this project is to challenge established theories on how the Bronze Age landscape in Scandinavia in general, and Southwest Norway in particular, is formed, reformed and discursively constructed. The Bronze Age landscape in Norway has never been studied in its own terms. The archaeological material is usually compared with finds from areas further south, and Southwest Norway has been considered as a periphery, and even a colony, of centres in Denmark. What is different has either been neglected or given a less fortunate place within systems of evolution. The centre as a starting point for evolution and diffusion has created a myth of totality – an entirety that gives the impression of an inseparable entity of centre and periphery. For that reason the periphery is reduced to the centre’s ideas of it, in terms of what is identical with the centre’s own interpretation of the world. Then the periphery does not exist and extend beyond being an “other” in a binary hierarchy, and becomes the second part in one and the same reality.

Instead of seeing the periphery as a passive space of adaptation, my point of departure has been to study such a border area as a zone of transformation, expressed by hybrid material representation and a different way of constituting monuments and landscape, which goes beyond the condition given within a centre-periphery relation. My intention has been to create an archaeological thinking that critically responds to all binarism by interjecting “an other” set of choices. By doing so, the original binary opposition is not dismissed, but subjugated to a creative process of restructuring, which is drawn selectively from the two categories of oppositions, to open new spaces and material initiatives. This “thirling” is meant to produce an accumulative trialectic that is open to additional otherness. From this position I have argued that Southwest Norway should be considered as a liminal place that has the ability to create new and unforeseen connections between human and space. I have observed that the margin can be a space for meeting and breaking, where new objects and social systems are created. It is a location where established categories of knowledge can be challenged and where differences represent more than oppositions.

The main sources for this landscape analysis are rock art and grave monuments, which traditionally have been seen as elements in an agrarian territoriality. Within the concept of a South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture, Southwest Norway has got a position as an agrarian periphery and a northern front against a wild and unmanageable nature. However, the result of this work illustrates that both rock art and grave monuments in this region are parts of a maritime production of space. Except for a general addressing of water and sea, location, construction and composition of rock art and grave monuments articulate an integrated set of references, where travels in life as well as in death are voiced.
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CHAPTER 1.
Introduction

“...After all, since two terms are not sufficient, it becomes necessarily to introduce a third term... The third term is the Other. “
“...is there ever a relation only between two terms...? One always has the Three. There is always the Other.”


1.1. CHOOSING THE MARGIN

Difference is a perception of otherness that brings us to a position where we are neither completely ourselves, nor absolutely the other, but at a place where something new can be created. We are not longer where we were, or where we are, do not exist as we used to. Through processes of translation and negotiation the difference might bring us towards crises, but also into new rooms and out of established identities. Such a journey is expressed by T. E. Lawrence in his book *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* where he writes:” …the effort for these years to live in the dress of Arabs, and to imitate their mental foundation, quitted me of my English self and let me look at the West and its conventions with new eyes: they destroyed it all for me.” (1997:14). The Arabic desert became a place, which made Lawrence neither an Arab nor an Englishman, but gave him an hybrid identity beyond existing categories, not primarily as a change in time, but as a movement in space. Jonathan Rutherford sees Lawrence’s desert as a metaphor for marginality where he rejected the one without catching the other, but created a third (1998:9-12).

From this “third” position the perceiving subject represents a multiple and hybrid identity that is incomplete and open-ended, transformational rather than something wholly. It undermines the idea of essentialism and brings forward the unfinished. The use of the margin as a location can be seen metaphorically, referring to displacement of a centre-built “grand narrative”, but also a real topic for research that forms the basis for an alternative epistemology, which goes beyond the established dualism of centre and periphery (hooks 1984; 1990). It might be understood as an in-between space, which is locally placed and globally related. From there the margin can be a position for cognition and perception, a place from where the world can be seen. Then the question of location will create both an ontology and epistemology, which form the frame of what constitutes reality and how we can come to know a particular society.

Certain people and landscapes have always been given a marginal position so that others could be defined as central. Foucault uses the “Ship of Fools” as a metaphor for marginality (1989a). Like the margin, the “Ship of Fools”, represents a given location on the edge of a defined system of reason and order (see also Foucault 1989b). To “choose the margin” might create a discourse where perception is ascribed spatiality beyond such a hegemonic power, and a material world, which includes objects that this power has excluded from its system. Henri Lefebvre sought to open the closed binarism between centre and periphery by introducing a third possibility (1980; 1998; see Soja 1998). He insisted that two terms, and the oppositions and antinomies between them, are never sufficient (1980:125). There is always a third term that disrupts, disorders, and reconstitutes the conventional binary oppositions into “an Other” that comprehends, but is more than the sum of two parts (1980:143, quoted from Soja 1998:31). This “third position” might be seen as a first step towards a transformation of the either/or rhetoric to the more open thinking of both/and also (see Soja 1998:60-61).
Fig. 1.1.1. 
The research area of Rogaland. 
Dotted line: southern border of the research area.
Fig. 1.1.2.
The 14 sub-areas selected for the primary investigation. These sub-areas cover landscapes in the region of Jæren, Ryfylke (the Boknafjord basin) and Karmøy.
Dotted line: southern border of the research area.
Where Lefebvre uses the antireductionist phase “il y a toujours l’Autre”, Soja introduces the term “trialectics” to describe the mode of dualistic thinking and to give Lefebvre’s triple dialectic a new understanding. Deeply inspired by Soja’s project, and in dept to his ideas, my aim is to create an archaeological thinking that critically responds to all binarism by interjecting “an Other” set of choices. This might stimulate a search for difference and otherness beyond what is taken for granted. By doing so the original binary opposition is not dismissed, but subjected to a creative process of “restructuring”, which is drawn selectively from the two categories of oppositions, to open up new space and material initiatives (Soja 1998:5). Soja’s “thirding” produces an accumulative trialectic that is open to additional otherness. Then earlier knowledge can stand against the hyper-relativism, which often is associated with such an epistemological openness.

In the development of a trialectic archaeology I shall try to de-centralize the role of marginal cultures in the search for a wider sphere of material practice and production. This necessitates an epistemology where differences can be exposed beyond a system of binary structures and the hierarchical order that always follows a centre-periphery relation. I would like to create a trialectic archaeology, which can replace the monolithic and hegemonic thinking with diversity and multiplicity. This implies a rejection of the abstract, general and universal in the light of the concrete, specific and particular. These ideas are not new in the tradition of archaeological critique. Nevertheless, a trialectic approach might renew what constitute landscape and material culture beyond the traditional dualistic thinking.

**Aims and intentions**

Southwest Norway has been considered as a periphery and even a colony of centres in Denmark. For that reason monuments and landscapes have never been studied in their own terms. Archaeological sources are usually compared with finds from areas further south, particularly Jutland north of Limfjorden. What is different has either been neglected or is given a less fortunate place within the system of material and social evolution. Another strategy has been to use direct analogies where things that look alike are described as if they were identical.

Southwest Norway has been given a marginal position, partly because of its geographical location on the northern edge of the “South Scandinavian Bronze Age Culture”. A borderline has been drawn between the distribution of earthen burial mounds, localized mainly in the region of Rogaland, and the cairns further north along the coast. Through this division, the grave monuments of Rogaland have uncritically been associated with burial mounds in Denmark, and because of their supposed similarities, been included in a South Scandinavian monumental tradition. The same boundary is elucidated by the large number of objects of
South Scandinavian types, and the scattered distribution of such artefacts further north. A third element is the dense concentration of so-called agrarian rock art, which is recorded in Southwest Norway.

An underestimated point is the way both northern and southern elements are included and transformed into a hybrid material representation in Rogaland, particularly in the regions of Jæren and Karmøy. Instead of seeing Southwest Norway as a periphery or a passive space of adaptation, my point of departure will therefore be to study this area as a zone of transformation, expressed by a hybrid material production and a different way of constituting monuments and landscape, which goes beyond the condition given within a centre-periphery relation. I shall argue that this marginal position should be considered as a liminal space, which has the ability to make new and unforeseen connections between human beings, objects and space. By doing so, I hope to show that the margin might be a place for material meeting and breaking, where new objects and social systems can be created. It may be seen as a location where established categories of knowledge can be challenged and where differences represent more than oppositions.

With this approach I hope to challenge established theories about how the landscape is formed, reformed and discursively constructed, and to problemize the way spatial and temporal systems contribute to sustain and legitimate an oppositional spatiality. This concerns methods of classification that give the periphery a cultural lag, but also models that lock reasoning in a dualistic unity. When arguing from a thinspace position it will be of importance to seek undetected rooms that have been reduced through the creation of such a dualistic totality. This is primarily related to monuments and landscape, which cannot be treated by virtue of the difference-ness they represent.

Even if this project is geographically limited to Southwest Norway, it is my hope that the result of the investigation might be of general importance for the study of marginality, and especially for the critique of the centre-periphery rhetoric that dominates the study of the Nordic Bronze Age, and which until now has sustained its existence through a repeating dualistic logic. This research has to a certain degree been based on a tradition where different systems mutually confirm each other and thereby create a state of normality. The basis for the critique ought not to be sought within the epistemological framework that so far has been valid. The centre-orientated episteme still dominates the forming of spatial and temporal models, even if the investigated areas are defined as marginal. In spite of a homogeneous theory of knowledge there are alternative investigations, and it is such works that have been the primary source for inspiration.

To elucidate this approach relevant examples will be given priority more than total spatial analyses. Nevertheless, it will be necessary to use a broad material basis to emphasize
contrasts and to satisfy a demand of representativity. Therefore Rogaland has been chosen as the primary area of investigation, and grave monuments and rock art as the main empirical foundation. Even if a total comparative analysis with other regions in Scandinavia has not been made, examples from most of the Nordic area are included. The selection of sources is based on a supposition of the influence rock art and burial mounds had on the organization of real and imagined landscapes of the Bronze Age. Even if settlement sites are known, the visual objects from this period consist mainly of rock art localities and grave monuments.

Despite the spatial and temporal coalescence between rock art and burial mounds these sources have seldom been included in a common spatial analysis. For the study of the Bronze Age in Rogaland such a comparative analysis has never been made. To clarify possible connections between rock art, monuments and landscape it will be of importance to observe how they are included in a common set of references. These might be articulated through associative relations and homogeneous symbols that circulate between different, but integrated, contexts.

**The status of archaeological sources in Rogaland**

The Archaeological museum in Stavanger has the responsibility for prehistoric landscapes and ancient monuments in Rogaland. After the administrative border between the museum territories of Bergen Museum, University of Bergen and Stavanger Museum was established by law in 13. July 1905, most of the archaeological material found in Rogaland has been kept in Stavanger Museum. Archaeological finds and reports from excavations and fieldwork carried out before 1905 are primarily filed in archives at Bergen Museum, University of Bergen and Museum of National Antiquities, University of Oslo. Some of the Bronze Age monuments were excavated before 1905, and their records are divided between the museums in Oslo, Bergen and Stavanger.

When Archaeological Museum, Stavanger was separated from Stavanger Museum in 1975, establishing a comprehensive and complete archive of archaeological finds, reports and sites from the county Rogaland was given priority. The archive includes original material from after 1905, but information and reports from investigations made earlier have also been copied and filed. Archaeological sites and monuments have continuously been registered and mapped under the direction of Økonomisk Kartverk, a national institution, which delegates authority to the archaeological museums. These maps and archives give priority to visible monuments, but include information about landscapes and natural environments as well. Acquisition lists of archaeological objects are published in numerical order in the museum’s yearbook, which is a practice maintained since the 1850’s. With access to this information a complete overview of all registered monuments and artefacts from the Bronze Age have been obtained.
The archives at the five archaeological museums in Norway are organized after a common practice, based on the geographical areas of municipalities and farms. For each farm there is a separate file containing information about finds and monuments, as well as documentation and correspondence related to archaeological fieldwork, surveying and mapping. The archives ensure compatibility and therefore comparability of the whole material, and thereby create continuity in time as well as in space. The principle of this ordering is to set up “empty” forms of categories before the material is manifested, in order to be manifested. The information is thereby standardized and separated from every context. Like the finds and monuments themselves, the information is preserved, classified and tagged according to the principle of the discipline of archaeology and the ideal of a scientific epistemology. The structure of the archives has a form of systematisation that is used to preserve information through the mediator of practice embodied in an archaeology that seeks an objective presentation of monuments and landscapes. This structure of organisation has been taken into consideration when handling the archaeological information for this thesis.

The protection of ancient monuments in Norway is closely integrated in the organisation of general spatial planning. For that reason archives are mainly related to the geographical landscape. As Archaeological museum, Stavanger is an interdisciplinary institution the archives also contain information about geology, climatology, and vegetation history. The organization of the archives mirrors the strong position research into the history of farms has had in Norway, and Rogaland in particular. Therefore they focus on the role of farmers and farms in the organization of landscapes from the Iron Age until today. From a Bronze Age perspective the boundaries and territories of ancient farms are of less relevance, since the Bronze Age society in Southwest Norway seems to have been maritime related more than agrarian based.

The structure of the thesis

The thesis is divided into eight chapters. They are introduced by a methodological chapter, the aims of which are to work out a thridspace epistemology that might have the capacity to include hybrid aspects of the monumental production of space (Chapter 2). This thridspace position is meant to create a foundation for a critique of the dualistic thinking, which so far has rejected hybrid aspects of material production. A thridspace epistemology should be seen as an alternative to the oppositional thinking that until now has dominated spatial studies of Scandinavian Bronze Age, and the dualism that structures much of the general archaeological discourse. By choosing the thridspace position I hope to open an agenda for new material and spatial initiatives, which is marginally and locally based, rather than centre-periphery related.

To create an interpretative foundation for the further discussion, the relevant research-history is outlined, where ideas that have dominated spatial studies of the Bronze Age landscape and the position of rock art and grave monuments are emphasized (Chapter 3). Special attention is given to how typology and diffusionism contributed to legitimate a spatial dualism that indirectly is the basis for the opposition between centre and periphery. This binarism has to a high degree been used to elucidate the evolutionistic contrast between an established agrarian culture in the south and a hunter-fisher related life style in the north. It is important to show how these models managed to monopolize spatial and temporal explanations, and divided the North Scandinavian and the South Scandinavian Bronze Age into an impassable dualism.

Chapter 4 discusses physical factors like topography, transgressions and history of vegetation, but also variables like light and water, because they seem to be important for the location and representation of rock art and burial mounds. These elements form the basic structure of the landscape, but it is also important to emphasize how they are integrated in the monumental production of space. Of special interest is to study the way water is included, both as a factor for localization and as an architectural element. Through a deliberate integration between human and nonhuman properties, it might be possible to moderate the established dichotomy
between nature and culture. A consequence will be that both monuments and rock art should be seen as landscape phenomena rather than stylistic expressions of design and general iconography of the period. To emphasize different grades of hybridity and integration, it will be necessary to focus on the conditions that made burial mounds and rock art different from what was common in the contrasting landscapes of Denmark and Northern Germany.

Chapter 5 gives a presentation of rock art and burial mounds and their localisation in the landscape milieu of 14 investigated areas. The main topic of the thesis is the relation between rock art, grave monuments and landscape. Since the southern part of Jæren is covered by thick Quaternary sediments, carvings on solid rock have not been found there. This area is therefore not included in the study (see Fig. 1.1.1-1.1.5.). I would, however, emphasize that also this part of Jæren is of importance for the understanding of the Bronze Age of Rogaland in general. A distinction has been made between earthen barrows and stone built cairns. The description of each sub-area has an introduction with a schematic overview of the recorded monuments from the Bronze Age. They are numbered according to the register linked to land-use maps (Økonomisk kartverk – ØK), which refers to other maps, aerial photographs and archive numbers. Still visible monuments are identified with a letter R, the others with a letter X. Where no ØK documentation exists, there is a reference to the map and number originating from the register of Tor Helliesen (H.no. or H.X.no., where X indicates that the monument has been destroyed). Even if the thesis is primarily about rock art and burial monuments as landscape phenomena, the objects from graves are also presented with museum number and date according to the six-period system of Montelius.

Chapter 6 presents an analysis of the real and imagined expression of rock art in the Bronze Age landscape. Of special interest is the position and composition of carved ships, which are the most common rock art motifs in Rogaland. This discussion is founded on an alternative way of thinking time and chronology, which is spatially based more than temporally constructed. The validity of this system will be discussed in relation to three models that are based on the composition of images. Even if these models cannot be applied to all rock art localities in Rogaland, clear tendencies that indicate a certain degree of representation are indicated. Characteristic for the compositions is that the ship images change within the frames of established narratives where new forms are included through the acceptance of earlier stylistic traits. In this way a locally based temporality is created as the ships incorporated traits from several periods. Thereby they become hybrids that surpass clearly defined types within universal typological schemes.

In practice it is the carvings themselves that have come to dominate the discussion about rock art in Rogaland. For that reason panels of prehistoric pictures are usually recorded and understood as if they were laid out on a flat surface in a neutral environment. When the rock is considered at all, the main point of interest has been its position in the landscape. This thesis makes a major point of going beyond the two-dimensional record, which has been constructed so far. An alternative is to interpret the images in relation to the characteristics of the rock. This will include rock faces and forms, and geological features like clefts and cracks, pattern of fissures, veins of quartz, and water that often washes the surface of the stone, and sometimes runs to its interior.

The effect of the compositions is not only to show how ships are travelling through visible and invisible rooms or across fearful waters, but also to evoke their disappearance into another world. This process will be studied through the way ships are vanishing through the rock surface, and through the progressive loss of lines and details which can be seen when ships are sailing towards clefts and cracks. In these cases ships seem to become less apparent, and sometimes the outline of the vessels loses lines and definitions. Such a series of fragmentation is underlined by shallow drawings where the crew are lost. In other cases they are sailing half empty. The disappearance of human elements might provide a metaphor for human mortality. The upturned boat, sometimes represented by the rock itself, is even more
expressive. Could it therefore be that the progressive disappearance of vessels and their crew represent the travel from life to death? This connection might even be more relevant when barrows are addressed. With such an approach a new form of connection between rock art and grave monuments is created. This relationship will be elucidated in Chapter 7.

Both monuments and rock art sites seem to demonstrate a connection between the interior and exterior, and the landscape they are part of. It will be investigated if these elements are united by a similar set of symbols, and if they play an integrated role in a common narrative where travels are a connecting link. The maritime position of monuments and rock art articulates the importance of mobility, but such a localisation also gives associations to transgressions and transformations. In this way the organisation of the material landscape is related to the structuring of a mental space. This does not mean that the ordering of a physical world may directly be transferred to a mental reality, but that factors like localisation and construction might generate a set of interpretative metaphors as a basis for the derivation of ideas about mental aspects of space. Thereby burial mounds and rock art might be seen as meeting points between everyday life and cosmology – connecting elements between real and imagined travels. They become material manifestations of a spatial organisation, but also coordinators of a cosmological order.

Chapter 8 discusses the main tendencies of the monumental production in Rogaland. A different material and social agenda than that, which has traditionally been related to the South Scandinavian agrarian culture, will be indicated. For that reason material culture in the margins must be considered as something more than a colonial response from the centre. Rock art and grave monuments in Rogaland have not produced a space in relation to, in opposition to, or as a corrective to, centres in the south, but something that is both similar and different, and therefore something in itself. This prospect thwarts the binary hierarchy of centre and periphery, and creates a much more complex spatial and material system.

Time and typology

Even if questions will be asked about the principle of typology and the way this method has been used to develop a superior chronology for the South Scandinavian Bronze Age, the established time schemes will be of guidance for the dating of rock art, objects and graves in Rogaland. These schemes will, however, be moderated according to local variables that challenge the generality of the existing typological systems.

Until recently the absolute chronology of Montelius’ six-period system was mainly founded on comparison with central European and Mediterranean archaeological material. Scientific methods like radiocarbon analyses and dendro-chronology have now led to major alterations in the dating of the Bronze Age periods. A recent study of all available radiocarbon dates from South Scandinavia has concluded that the Early Bronze Age began about 1700 BC and ended about 1100 BC with each of the three periods lasting about 200 years (Vandkilde, Rahbek and Rasmussen 1996:195). Dendro-dates from oak coffins have indicated that period 2 only lasted for about 100 years, between 1400 and 1300 BC, and that period 1 accordingly should be dated to 1700-1400 (Randsborg 1992; 1993a; 1996:68). This chronology is applied in a recent work about carvings on bronzes (e.g. Kaul 1998:88). This thesis, however, uses the absolute chronology suggested by Helle Vandkilde (1996). The number of radiocarbon dates from the Late Bronze Age is few, but it seems most probable that each of periods 4, 5 and 6 also lasted for about 200 years (Vandkilde, Rahbek and Rasmussen 1996:196).

The change in sea level might be of importance for the date of rock carvings, since some of the carved images are located close to the shore. The shore displacement curve for the Bronze Age has not, however, been studied in detail for Rogaland, and the few available C-14 dates of shore lines will therefore only be tentatively used in the chronological discussion (Prøsch-Danielsen 2002).
CHAPTER 2.
Archaeology and other ways of seeing

This is the story of a house. It has been lived in by many people. Our grandmother, Baba, made this house a living space. She was certain that the way we lived was shaped by objects, the way we looked at them, the way they were placed around us. She was certain that we were shaped by space. From her I learn about aesthetics, the yearning for beauty that she tells me is the predicament of heart that makes our passion real. A quiltmaker, she teaches me about colour. Her house is a place where I am learning to look at things, where I am learning how to belong in space. In rooms full of objects, crowded with things, I am learning to recognize myself. … Look, she tells me, what light does to colour! Do you believe that space can give life, or take it away, that space has power? … Baba dies as an old woman, out of place. Her funeral is also a place to see things, to recognize myself. How can I be sad in the face of death, surrounded by so much beauty? Death, hidden in a field of tulips, wearing my face and calling my name. Baba can make them grow. Red, yellow, they surround her body like lovers in a swoon, tulips everywhere. Her soul on fire with beauty burns and passes, a soul touched by flames. We see her leave. She has taught me how to look at the world and see beauty. She has taught me “we must see.”

From the essay “An Aesthetic of Blackness: Strange and Oppositional” by bell hooks (1990:103).

2.1. TRANSIT TO THIRD SPACE

Look at things, and you will see what is, and what is not – the real and the imagined – a combination of the abstract and the concrete, which present itself simultaneously in material and ideas, near and distance. Things can appear as a place where all places are – where everything meets, the place in space that contains other places. A duality, which combines, and at the same time refers to something beyond itself – a third space, or a meeting point of the possible and impossible; boundaries, but also boundlessness. Henri Lefebvre (1980; 1998, see also Shields 1999), bell hooks (1984; 1990; 1992; 1994), and Edward Soja (1989; 1990; 1991; 1997; 1998) have taught me to look at things, and to see them through the concept of space and not only time. They have inspired me to rethink the relation between time and meaning. Traditionally time has been considered as the dynamic of change – the source of renewal and innovation: a structuring element of events and places, the new and the old. They have inspired me to rethink the relation between time and meaning. Traditionally time has been considered as the dynamic of change – the source of renewal and innovation: a structuring element of events and places, the new and the old, of what is and what to come. As expressed by Soja, time has been “the entire ontological storyline of becoming of being and society – while the empirical dead weight of space was shuttled into the background as extra-social environment, a stage for the real action of making history.” (1998:166).

Spatial aspects have often been frozen to a background or a scene – an external container of social life. Space has become an independent factor for movements of things and time – something that surrounds us as an empty homogeneous room, not an integrated lived area, which we fill with quantities and qualities (Bachelard 1994). Space has been treated as dead, fixed and un-dialectical; the immobile part of society, when time is richness, fecundity and life (Foucault 1980:70). It has been a tendency to think of space as an abstract, a metaphysical context of life rather than a structure we create with objects and ideas (Ross 1988:8). Then space become something we live inside, rather than living inside social relations that produces space (Foucault 1986a:23; 1986b). Foucault sees space as a social category and more than a material reality, different from a room, and something else than a scene. It might be considered as a medium for actions and aims, but also a principle of understanding, a tool for theory, to which time and memory of course is linked.

Lefebvre goes beyond the debate about the nature of space, which considered people
and things merely “in” space, to present a theory of different systems of spatiability (1998). Then space is not just a physical order of things, but also a spatial pattern and social action, as well as a historical construction. Arrangements of objects, landscapes and architecture are concrete elements of this process. Space is both produced and productive: it is something that involves history rather than being created separately from society. Lefebvre thinks of space as a form of social production, a particular “kind” of space, and a system of places and landscapes (see Shields 1999:157). This spatial-territorial ordering has a specific material history and a cultural morphology that reflects a consistent order.

The space that people produce both reflects and influences the way they see the world (Tuan 1974; 1977). Depending on location, the world will be viewed and valued differently (Bender 1998:25). An implication of this statement might be that there is not one space, but different spaces or landscapes – a bricolage of places, half-places and non-places. George Benko focuses on the meaning of the French word “mil-lieu” which can be understood as what is lying “in-between” (1997:26). Such an in-between-ness does not represent delimited units, but openings and connections, which create places through movements and hybrid processes. Just as important as separate objects, will then be the relations and the system of references they include, in accordance to both human and nonhuman properties. Such connections may reduce simple oppositions, as well as the division between nature and culture.

With the same movements in mind, Benko investigates how non-places can change to be places, as they become elements in a new and broader context (ibid.:23-26). Such non-places might be seen as borders or margins. These terms are problematic because they can be said to exist everywhere since a culture is not homogeneous (Rosaldo 1988:77, Rouse 1991:17). But this statement gets easily turned into relativism where borders can be found everywhere and nowhere (Heyman 1994:46). However, a general trend is that borders or margins are always linked to a centre in a binary way, and its existence is limited by this duality (e.g. Anzaldua 1987; 1990, Gupta 1993, Kirby 1995; 1996).

Such borderlands are not necessarily geographical peripheries, but they are localized in the periphery of a cultural system of space, where places are ranked relatively to each other (Shields 1991:3-5, see also Blaut 1993). This classification has been linked to an order of places and practices, ideas and modes of social interaction that belong to “the other” in a spatial hierarchy. Edward Saïd has demonstrated how “the other” has been localized at the periphery of civilisations (1985). This exclusion depends on a strategy of what Saïd has called “positional superiority”, which puts the centre in a whole series of possible relations with the periphery without letting it expand beyond the power of dualism (after Shields 1991:5). Instead of seeing centres and peripheries as different scales of space, the concept has been given an ontological quality within an impenetrable entity.

Said introduced “Orientalism”, as a traditional way of seeing the Orient. Inspired by the concept of “Orientalism”, we may introduce the notion of “Peripherism” as a way of thinking about peripheries: an –ism or an ideology based on a theory of a specific power relation. In this orientalistic-peripheristic approach, the centre is constructed as the dominating subject that creates space and history, while the periphery is operating without such qualities. Just like the idea of “Orientalism” has been used to create a particular impression of the Orient, “Peripherism” is forming the periphery into something that is neither real nor natural. Like the centre, the periphery is an idea, turned into a practice that has a history and a given geography (Saïd 1985:5). By this is not meant that the peripheries are without any form of reality, but that the idea of the marginal cannot be fully understood independently from the mechanism of a dualistic power and its handling of otherness and differences.

An alternative might be to see the periphery as a transformable zone expressed by a hybrid material representation, and a different way of constituting objects and landscapes, which goes beyond the condition given within a centre-periphery relation. In this thesis, I will argue that Southwest Norway should be considered as a liminal space, or a third space,
where societies have included, translated and transformed material elements in the monumental production of space. They have accepted and copied, but also created something new and different beyond the condition of “Peripherism”. For that reason interpretation of archaeological remains from this region cannot uncritically be deduced from a centre-based location that so far has defined and classified this material in time and space. Although these qualities must not be approached as a fixed marginal ontology, but as a theory which may serve as a starting point for a critique of a postulated centre-periphery relationship between Southwest Norway and Denmark in the Bronze Age. The potential might nevertheless have a wider influence for the general discussion of dualism and other spatial oppositions used in archaeology.

Material culture in such an in-between space can be seen as meaning-carrier and transforming entities integrated in an alternative social and spatial process, which moves between different forms and status in a spirit of otherness beyond being a reactive product of a centre. Ana Louis Keating defines such a position as a “threshold location”, understood as a transitional “between and betwixt space” which has the ability to make new and unforeseen connections between material beings and space (1996:2). It is a place for meeting and breaking (Donnan and Wilson 1999:10) where new subjects, gender and social systems are created (Hall 1990:34), a location where established categories of knowledge can be challenged (hooks 1990), and where differences represent more than oppositions (Gupta, Ferguson and Rouse 1992, McMaster 1995, Moore 1997, Soja 1998).

This in-between space may be seen as a place for incommensurable contradictions, a zone of cultural and material overlapping that is characterized by a mixing of styles (Gupta and Ferguson 1992:18); a liminal space for cultural play and experiment (Turner 1967). Accordingly the material forming of such places involves a high degree of hybridity. The importance of hybridity is not to combine two original elements from which a third emerges (Bhabha 1990a:108, see also Bhabha 1990b). Hybridity is the “third space” which enables other positions to occur (ibid.:211). This “third space” displaces the histories that constitute it, and set up new material and spatial initiatives. This brings about a continuous reinterpretation of meaning that challenges an evolutionistic logic and a dualistic organisation in which such temporal systems get its legitimacy (Bhabha 1994:36-37, 164).

Such a hybrid composition applies to series of shifting and crossovers of entities from different time and space, to be shared in the creation of monuments and landscapes. They have what Bruno Latour calls a “relative existence”, where meaning is created through material circulation, and via alternating frames of references (1999:156). This process of production will not follow a linear evolution, but a temporality that is both successive and sedimentary. This dynamic between renewal and replacement can be illustrated by Latour’s concepts of “association” and “substitution”, where “association” defines new connections between material forms and objects, while “substitution” refers to replacement. Association and substitution can then be seen as two intersecting dimensions in the production of space, but with different importance when constructing centres and peripheries.

To seek connection in time and space is an important part of making a centre. Connection in time will legitimate the continuity of the centre, as well as the quality of stability and tradition, while connection in space will support the idea of expansion and colonization. Temporal connection has been explained through evolution, and spatial connection by diffusion. The centre as a starting point for evolution and diffusion has supported the myth of a totality – an unbroken connection between centre and periphery – an imagined entirety that gives the impression of an inseparable entity. Such a dualism makes no room outside itself, since what we know about the periphery, is already defined by the centre. Then the periphery never exists and extends beyond being an “other” in a binary hierarchy, and becomes the second part in one and the same reality. Like the concept of “Orientalism”, this reflects a move from an epistemological definition to an ontological character.
Within such a total approach, each material being is given meaning according to its relationship with this totality, because the totality has access to the truth and is itself the key to its own system. This wholeness is given status as something universal and “neutral” with nothing external to contradict it. It is thinking time and space as coalescing with itself, contemporaneously and definitely. Everything there is, is incorporated in this totality, and material traits and features get meanings through what is identical with the whole. Thus the material is meaningful only in relation to what is known by “the whole”, without regarding other interpretations that could have been possible. Then the periphery is reduced to the centre’s ideas of it, in the light of what is identical with the centres’ own interpretation of the world. It gives the centre a position to pass judgement over the outside world on the basis of its own integration in “the whole”. Within such a centralistic approach thinking becomes a mirror of the centre’s thoughts about the periphery and not according to its own potentiality. It creates an “archa-ego-logy” where the centre is behind and before the unknown.

By reducing the periphery to the centre’s idea about it, we place all hybrids and unfamiliar forms within an established frame of references, so it loses its character as something different. Such a reductionism is necessary to sustain the idea of centre-periphery as a totality. Therefore hybrid objects and relations have been excluded from such homogeneous systems. They refuse to conceptualise hybrids before passing them through processes of comparison, because they are not considered as sufficient to identify borders, or to distinguish one object from another, and in the last instance separate the centre from the periphery. Differing from “pure” types and well defined objects, hybrids must be seen as a mixture of elements which are articulated within different contexts and systems of references, beyond being a result of a predictable line of dualistic connections. It is through the possibility to substitute or replace one element or relation with another that objects may come into articulation, and space into production.

In contrast to the centre’s strategy to connect, an in-between space might be seen as a zone for transformation and replacement where material elements are recomposed through renegotiation of landscapes. Such a space will then perform an alternative material genealogy created through a higher level of hybridity. This material inscription may be produced through substitution that allows new translations, while some connections are kept intact. To define a hybrid entity one should not look for defined types in traditionally systems of categorisation, but rather for lists of material elements and references, and the processes of associations and substitutions they are passing through. This might open for a range of material variations, with different levels of intersections.

2.2. TOWARDS A TRIALECTIC EPISTEMOLOGY

According to Lefebvre, two terms – and the oppositions and antinomies that are created between them – are never sufficient (1980:143). There is always a third term that makes connections, and challenge the binary oppositions as something more than the sum of two components (1998:410-411). To Lefebvre, all forms of reductionism start with dualism, an either/or opposition between two terms, concepts or elements (1980:225). He saw such oppositions as a “double illusion” which mutually draws power and legitimacy from each other (1998:27-30). They “refer back to the other, reinforce the other, and hide behind the other.” (ibid.:27). The “double illusion” consists on the one side of the “illusion of transparency”, and the “realistic illusion” on the other side (ibid.:27). The “illusion of transparency” reigns within philosophic idealism, while the “realistic illusion” is related to a naturalistic and materialistic view (ibid.:30). In archaeological thinking in general, and spatial studies in particular, double illusions are not colliding in an antagonistic seeking to destroy each other, but they try to find basis for existing within the contradictory presence of each other, within the double illusion of centre and periphery, nature and society, subjectivism and objectivism.
Explanations that have dominated the archaeological understanding of spatiality can be related to what Soja has called “Firstspace epistemology” (1998:74-78). This approach is primarily directed towards the material and physical space that separates the poles of “thing-in-themselves” and the society or “people-among-themselves” (for further discussion see Latour 1993:95). Truth is explained by nonhuman factors, and falsehood through the construction of social categories (ibid.:95). Archaeological analyses built on such a foundation will focus on the relation between activities and locations as quantitative and measurable patterns of material distribution across space and places in mapped landscapes. The question of space will become a question of spatial relation between objects, not the meaning of the creation, and the relation itself. It often explains human spatiality by mathematical models or multivariable statistical analyses, which are influenced by a functionalistic approach.

When only emphasizing the material and physical space, “Firstspace epistemology” is a first step towards a formal scientific spatiality (e.g. Malmer 1985; 1989a; 1993). The need of a precision level similar to that of natural science necessitates a large amount of data and an accurate method that makes it possible to handle a continuous accumulation of data. The demand for exactitude has lead to an unfilled need of empirical sources – a never-ending circle that is reinforced by this tradition’s lack of theory, and which easily make such studies into a “realistic illusion”.

During the last years we have seen a widespread reaction against the “Firstspace epistemology”. This critique can be related to what Soja calls “Secondspace epistemology” which has focused on the conceived space rather than the perceived space, from the basic viewpoint that spatial knowledge is primarily produced through ideas and thoughts (1998:78). This does not mean a total rejection of material reality mediated through “Firstspace epistemology”, but that knowledge about the material world is created through ideas: materials are primarily mental things or social constructions. In archaeology, this critique has materialized itself in several publications about rock art and landscape (e.g. Nordbladh 1980, Tilley 1991, Hauptman Wahlgren 1995, Bradley 1997, Goldhahn 1999a; 1999b, Helskog 1999, Nash and Chippindale 2002), and grave monuments and landscape (e.g. Barrett 1988; 1990; 1994, Barrett, Bradley and Green 1991; Tilley 1994, Thomas 1995; 1996, Bender 1995, Olausson 1995, Widholm 1997, Bradley 1998, Edmonds 1999, Cooney 2000). This perspective has opened for studies of mental aspect of space (e.g. Ashmore and Knapp 1999, Muir 1999) and socially built places (e.g. Parker Pearson and Richard 1994). But in “Secondspace epistemology” objects often count for little to the advantage of mental and social construction of landscapes. The meaning of nature and the physical space is reduced, and the society carries the full weight of explanation. Then the material and nonhuman world explains neither truth nor falsehood. As all sanctions are given by a mental construction or by society, the material and nonhuman properties are the passive part in a human created landscape. When mentality defines reality, it runs the risk of producing its own explanations. Then we are close to what Lefebvre has called the “illusion of transparency” (1998:30).

Like Lefebvre, Soja is searching beyond the dualism, which is created between Marx’s historic materialism and Hegel’s idealistic philosophy, to make a trialectic spatiality, which simultaneously includes the concrete and the abstract, the material and the metaphorical (1998:64-65). Lefebvre and Soja eliminate this two-dimensionality by introducing a third term: “Other than”, or as Soja says: “Thirding-as-Othering” (1998:60). This third space is not an additive combination of former oppositions, but rather a deconstructing and tentative reconstruction of their supposed combination: an open alternative, which is both similar and different. It challenges the dualistic concept either/or in advantage of both/and-also, and launches a critique of all forms of binary logic. “Thirding-as-Othering” produces what Soja calls a cumulative “trialectic” which is radically open for otherness (1998:61). “Other than” is not something located in-between the polarity of nature and society, centre and periphery, or represents their sum. It is lying beyond these concepts; in a third world, which actively
transfers the real and the imaginary simultaneously. It might be seen as a place where everything meets; a room for movements towards differences and otherness. A strategic place beyond what is taken for granted.

In a “Thirdspace epistemology” the production of space is to be explained by hybrid objects which are a mixture of elements with references to different time and space, created by individual and collectives which activity is delegated into human and nonhuman properties (see Latour 1999:176-178). It might be seen as a human production, but is not only socially constructed (Lefebvre 1998:158). It is rather a process that simultaneously involves both human and nonhuman factors (e.g. Austad and Øye et al. 2001). This creates what Latour calls quasi-objects, or hybrids (1993:51). The creation of such objects may be said to occur when elements and forms are processed through a production of space that recombines, reforms and socializes them within different systems of references. These processes are, at one and the same time, both social and asocial, real and imagined, produced by nature and constructed by subjects (e.g. Bradley 2000). Nature and society should therefore not be seen as two distinct poles of oppositions, but as Latour claims, as one and the same production of successive stages of “societies-natures”, where the work of objectification and spatialization is a mediator and the very centre of this relation (1993:94). It fills the gap between the human and nonhuman, in the empty room between Firstspace and Secondspace. This Thirdspace may be a place where empirical elements, forms, styles, and raw materials are produced through associations and substitutions, carried out within series of translations, circulations and displacements in order to recompose social links where humans are the mediators and the intersection of the two poles of oppositions.

2.3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

To access this information a specific methodology needs to be outlined one that can articulate trialectic ideas within a framework of material and spatial observations. Both Firstspace and Secondspace epistemology present a set of methods used for spatial studies in Southwest Norway, but they are mainly derived from the concepts of “Peripherism” and “Agriculturalism”. These perspectives have focused on the distribution of monuments in relation to fixed resources and a stable pattern of agrarian settlement. The foundation of such interpretations has been spatial analogies derived from social models of Early Iron Age farm structure, or settlements patterns documented in Demark, especially in Jutland (Løken 1990; 1998a; 1998b). This comparison has mainly been based on a core-periphery model where the centres innovate and the peripheries imitate (Malmer 1981, Kristiansen 1987b; 1998a, 1998c, Prescott 1995a)

It is difficult to imagine Rogaland without the sea. The sea is present everywhere. It surrounds, binds and divides – produces sounds, smells and colours. Southwest Norway is a water-landscape where the sea acts in an inter-play with fjords, rivers and lakes, as well as bogs and wetlands that cover large areas. Within this seascape, water has been a central element both for localisation and creation of rock art and grave monuments. Water is a frame, but also an integrated element of architecture (see Bradley 1993, Richard 1996). The maritime performance, and the importance of ships, both as motifs on rock and as stone constructions in grave monuments, indicate a strong relation with water: not only as sailing routes, but as an expression of spatial and cosmological order, where travels in life as well as in death are voiced.

Until now a maritime perspective has mainly been discussed in relation to economic aspects of exchange and establishment of alliances (Randsborg 1993a, Earle 1997; 1998 et al., Kristiansen 1998a, Kvalø 2000). The meaning of sea faring has been connected to a social elite and the constitution of political power within the framework of a chieftdom model anchored in a spatial structure of centres and peripheries. Thus the act of travelling becomes
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a kind of individual self-realisation between the social leaders that only indirectly affect the
general spatial practice. This idea might be acceptable if considered in relation to the monu-
mental burials that only a limited number of people where given, but less relevant for the
collective idea that is communicated through the depiction of crews onboard the carved
ship, or according to the maritime grammar that is characterizing the interplay between
carvings and graves, independent of social ranking.

I intend to challenge “Agriculturalism” and “Peripherism”, and the spatial limitations
these explanations have given the monumental production of space in Southwest Norway.
For that reason it will be of importance to focus on how monumental milieus are created –
not through delimited agrarian units, but via lines, in-between-ness and mobility. Then loca-
tion of places has to be acknowledged through movements between monuments, not only
by the objects themselves. This strategy of identification goes beyond what is positively
given. Just as important as the monuments, are the relations and the systems of references
they include, in accordance with both human and nonhuman properties. Then monuments
will not appear as independent bodies, but open themselves towards the world, at the same
time as they incorporate it. Such connections might reduce the division between nature and
culture, and moderate the monuments’ status as the only carriers of time and meaning. On
the same conditions as abstract chronological systems are used to date monuments, their
position within a spatial pattern might just as well contribute to define (con)-temporality.

An alternative to the immobile role monuments have been given within the dominating
episteme is an approach that emphasizes mobility. Instead of classifying monuments and
rock art within an agrarian territoriality, they might be connected to maritime passages and
waterways. It presupposes that the monuments are discussed in relation to variables that
refer to movements, like: 1) *lines (paths)*, 2) *milieu*, 3) *edges*, 4) *nodes*, and 5) *landmarks*
that might unveil a mobile creation of places. None of the variables exist in isolation. They over-
lap and pierce one another in a wickerwork of relations, especially in West Norway where
objects seldom appear as independent bodies. This does not mean that the landscapes have
no forms, but that they seldom appear as bounded and rounded entities. Horizontal exten-
sion is characterized by topological continuity rather than classical axiality (Norberg-Schulz
1993). This creates lines and fragmented forms instead of order, where objects exist within a
network of relations and references. Within such an inter-play landscapes does not present
monuments and rock art, but react on them, take part in them, and make them interpretable.

The five variables mentioned above will be used to locate such connections and articu-
late the production of space in Rogaland. They are primarily formulated by Kevin Lynch as
a part of a visual method used in his study of city design (1979), and later developed into an
archaeological landscape discourse by Terje Gansum, Gro Jerpåsen and Christian Keller in
their analysis of grave monuments from Iron Age in East Norway (1997). This visual land-
scape method has also been used in spatial studies of Bronze Age monuments in Hordaland
(Osterdal 1997; 1999, Wrigglesworth 2000), but will here be developed in a different empiri-
cal and theoretical context, which primarily is maritime based. In relation to the quality of
the landscape, the question asked, and the theory used, the variables can be given the fol-
lowing frames and premises:

**Lines (paths)**

Lines and paths might be seen as channels for movements. They create passages that are
basic for mobility and connections. Movement is important for the realization of space and
cognition of landscapes. How we move towards a certain point affect the visual perception.
Such paths may be coastlines, fjords, rivers and valleys, or the moraines that create physical
and visual lines between monuments in Rogaland.
Milieu
Milieu might be seen as a landscape room that is opened or enclosed by topography and natural lines of divisions. Like physical forms, light and vegetation are important for identifying the character of different landscape milieu.

Edges
Edges might be boundaries or linear breaks of continuity like shores and mountain ranges. They are lateral references rather than coordinating axes. Such edges might be barriers that enclose a milieu, but also an opening into something new and different. Edges have a character of in-between-ness, like the ridges separating the sea and the lakes at Jæren where several monuments are documented.

Nodes
Nodes are meeting-points, or strategic spots in the landscape, which are intensive foci for travelling. They might be places of breaking and beginning, where the sea ends and the system of fjords starts, or where the open agrarian land is meeting highlands and moors. A node marks a shift from one structure to another – a liminal position between different forms and elements.

Landmarks
Landmark might be seen as another types of point-reference. They are primarily external elements that cannot be entered, except from caves that represent frequent landmarks in the landscape of Southwest Norway. They might be monuments or rock art localities. Some landmarks are distant. They can indicate a direction like a seamark, even a mobile point like the sun.

The visual landscape method is organized from three basic components where the location of the monuments will be the starting point from where possible relations are interpreted:

a) Identity
b) Spatial relations
c) Meaning

Landscapes can be seen as a scene of material and spatial performance, created by human and nonhuman property, and defined by articulation elements. To define an object, I will not look for types and traditionally categories, but rather a list of articulation elements and the individual and collective capacity to connect and replace them through the production of space. Articulation elements will be studied as materially performed in stages of connection and substitution, which circulate through a series of translations, transformations and displacements. Translation might be seen as material communication and negotiation between different forms of elements. Transformation is more a question of manipulation, while displacement refers to a new collective material structure and spatial practice. Grave monuments and rock art sites might be seen as places where such processes appear – a meeting point where things are brought together, and where relations and references are linked in space as well as in time.

It will then be of importance to explore how articulation elements are translated, transformed and displaced within different spatial levels. Categories of articulation elements to be emphasized in this analysis are:
The articulation elements that stick together can be said to exist – they have an identity. This existence is extracted from the unique connection drawn by associations and substitutions, with a temporality that is both linear and sedimentary. What in the end defines an in-between space is the complexity of these factors, and the hybrid level they may create. Articulation elements might be seen as the quality of objects that give them distinctness. It is that of shape, form and colour which facilitates the making of valid identity. Articulation elements are limited to physical perceptible objects, but it is taken for granted that material production and spatial arrangements should be used to reinforce meaning, not to negate them. The importance of articulation elements is not primarily how they are ordered in the production of grave monuments and rock art localities, but the way such compositions refer to each other and the surrounding landscape in the creation of the related milieus.
CHAPTER 3.
Returning to Bronze Age research

Deeper into the country than you expected
And discovered that the field behind the hedge
Grew more distinctly strange as you kept standing
Focused and drawn in by what barred the way.

From the Field of Vision, in *Opened Ground* by Seamus Heaney (1998:342)

3.1. IN PRAISE OF AN IMPERFECT HISTORY

The aim of this chapter is to present approaches and theoretical frameworks that have governed spatial studies of the Bronze Age, primarily in Southwest Norway, secondarily in Scandinavia. Thematically the presentation is limited to a critical discussion of the dualism which has been created between a South Scandinavian and a North Scandinavian Bronze Age, and the influence such oppositional thinking has had on the establishing of a centre-periphery relation between Southwest Norway and Denmark. This focus has been chosen in accordance with the primary objective of the thesis that seeks explanations beyond such a dualistic approach. Within this thematic framework other related problems will be discussed, especially those concerning theoretical and methodological models that postulate evolution and diffusion as incentive powers for the production of space, as well as for the meaning of monuments and rock art. The intention is to create a foundation for the following analysis which aim is to challenge existing interpretations (see Chapter 6-7).

This historiography will, like others, be characterized by a subjective view since it concentrates on a limited number of themes. To a certain extent it is also a personal appraisal when choosing archaeological works that have been most important for this debate. A balanced selection is made even more difficult because of the political undertones that still influence the centre-periphery discussion in Scandinavia; in the most extreme rhetoric this subject has been coloured by a colonial attitude towards modern marginal positions. Considering such limitations the aim is still to integrate a representative selection of archaeological works, and to give as correct as possible presentation of other researchers’ views within the social and historical context they were part of.

3.2. ANTIQUARIANISM AND THE PROSPECT OF MONUMENTS

The first systematic memoirs about the kingdom of Denmark-Norway are from the 17th century. Records about topography, plants, place names and ancient monuments were collected and described, including the county of Rogaland (de Fine 1745). According to the antiquarian episteme, prehistoric monuments were often connected to persons and events mentioned in the Norse sagas (e.g. Kraft 1830:267-268, see also Strøm 1888). The role of the monuments was to elucidate histories mentioned in these early documents, and not to go beyond the chronology of written sources. Documentation of sites and finds was not the primary aim for antiquarianism. More important was to collect objects of bronze and gold that could be found in burial mounds (e.g. Neumann 1839:239). The searching for artifacts is seen through the many craters found in monuments from the Bronze Age. Some of these destructions have a documented history (e.g. Nicolaysen 1866; 1876, Bendixen 1877), but in most cases such a description is lacking. Egil Bakka calls the antiquarianism "the age of mound excavations in Norwegian archaeology" (1993:97). The number of large Bronze Age
monuments in Rogaland made this area more attractive for antiquarian activity than the rest of the country. This has left behind an insufficient record and some times contradictory information about finds, as well as the construction and location of monuments.

Christopher Prescott (1994) describes antiquarianism as the pre-paradigmatic phase according to Kuhn’s paradigm theory (1970). It is characterized by random fact-gathering and a great variation in explanations of similar phenomenon (Prescott 1994:89). The interpretations had a personal character based on individual intentions and experiences, without the ability to agree on common aims and directions (Svestad 1995). In Norway the antiquarianism has been considered as a spare time activity for the upper classes, and their interest in the specific and the curious. In Rogaland this was a field dominated by priests, teachers and military officers who at that time represented a certain cultural leadership and therefore had an influence on the interpretation of prehistory and on peoples’ attitudes towards ancient monuments (Slomann1964, Hernæs 1997, Opedal 1998, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a). It is important to mention that antiquarianism was operative at a time without juridical lines of guidance and a collective institutional practice (Solli 1996, Trøim 1999). For that reason the antiquarian activity had a divided character, and its intentions and results must be evaluated both according to those who wanted preservation and further research, and those who considered the monuments as a playing ground for private interests.

Among the serious antiquarians was the president of the parliament (Stortinget) and founder of Bergen Museum, Wilhelm Frimann Koren Christie, who argued for a more systematic archaeological practice (Christie 1837:367-377). As a part of this project he saw the importance of a chronology and applied Thomsen’s three-period system (1836) in his analysis of the Bronze Age objects from Rogaland (Christie 1842c). This attempt was strongly opposed by the Danish archaeologist Jens J. A. Worsaae who was a student of Thomsen (see Kristiansen 1981). He re-explained Christie’s interpretations according to a methodological approach on seriation, stratification and representation, and tried to guide Christie’s antiquarianism towards what he meant was a more scientific archaeology (Worsaae 1843). In this discussion Worsaae argued that most of Norway was situated outside the general European cultural flow, and he doubted that there had been a real Bronze Age outside Rogaland. This statement was supported by several Norwegian archaeologists like Ingvald Undset (according to Shetelig 1922:356), and later by Brogger (1925a) and Gjessing (1944).

Worsaae continued to extend his arguments about the isolation of Norway, but made an exception for Karmøy, Jæren and Lista, which he included in the South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture (Worsaae 1881). He claimed that there existed a border north of Rogaland, which separated a North Scandinavian and a South Scandinavian material complex. Worsaae did explain the presence of monuments and metal in the northern area as the result of an immigration from Jutland (ibid.:72, 87). He proposed a similar development in Sweden where he found a cultural border north of Scania. The same picture was presented for the Late Bronze Age, and he claimed that bronzes found to the north of ”the Old Danish Lands” were not only imported from Denmark, they also lacked the quality, quantity and variation that was necessary for a satisfactory definition of a Bronze Age.

Worsaae meant that Denmark was a centre in the Scandinavian Bronze Age, from where the culture spread outwards until it completely lost its vitality further north and east (1881:87). He also claimed that the material situation in Denmark gave evidence of an activity characterized by luxury and prosperity, while the people of Northern Sweden and Norway still used tools made of bone and stone, and their subsistence was mainly based on hunting and fishing. Worsaae’s explanations were based on the ideas of evolution, migration and diffusion. His interpretations contributed later to the notion of a culture dualism that included Rogaland and Lista in a South Scandinavian Bronze Age. By doing so, he formalized an interpretative platform for the ideas of this region as a permanent periphery of Denmark.

Even if several researchers supported Worsaae’s view, and many still pursue the same
attitude, there are reasons to ask if his arguments were guided by a centrist that is characteristic for an archaeology of colonialism, more than an intention to understand objects and monuments within their own context. By this is not meant that the idea of Southwest Norway as a periphery is without any form of reality, but that thoughts about the peripheral cannot be fully understood and separated from the fact that Norway until 1814 was subordinated Denmark, and between 1814 and 1905 was partly governed by Sweden. In this historical context Norway had a political status of being both a colony and a periphery. It can therefore be useful to ask if it is the same form of “Peripherism” that is the reason why the Bronze Age in Southwest Norway even today is considered as a periphery, without the ability to create its own history beyond the dualism archaeologists still predict.

3.3. DIFFERENCES AND DUALISM

Archaeological research between 1890 and 1960 has been classified as a culture-historical archaeology (Trigger 1989:148-206). Bjørnar Olsen describes this phase of the discipline as culture archaeology because of the importance the concept culture had during these decades (1997:31). Bruce Trigger claims that culture-historical archaeology represented a break with the evolutionistic archaeology, which had been formulated by Thomsen (1836), Worsaae (1881) and Montelius (1885/1986). According to Trigger the evolutionistic episteme was primarily occupied with the temporary qualities of objects, and the internal evolution of archaeological sources that could be organized into systems of chronology and typology. At the end of the 19th century archaeologists were more engaged in the idea that differences in the archaeological material were not only the result of evolution through time, but created by geographical variations (Olsen 1997:32). The concept culture was therefore developed as an analytical tool to structure spatial variation within different geographical levels.

Archaeologists working within this episteme saw it as a major task to map the distribution of archaeological material for further identifications of different cultures. Such culture groups were defined according to similarities in the archaeological material. Physical resemblance then became a criterion for identifying spatial patterns, using a scale from simple distribution maps to interpretations with political intentions. In the most extreme explanations material similarities were transformed into ethnic groups or peoples, or were considered as immanent qualities of folk with a common identity (e.g. Kossinna 1902; 1911; 1926; for a wider discussion see Veit 1989). For others, material similarities could represent adaptation to a common environment (e.g. Brogger 1925a; 1925b, for further discussion see Nordenborg Myhre 1994, Helliksen 1996). In Norwegian archaeology this nature-determinism was also a step towards functional thinking. Nevertheless they all mediated similarity as an ideal criteria for cultural identification. Such an intellectual condition neglects the presence of differences within one and the same defined category. This process of reduction was an expression of a centrist that perceived prehistory from the viewpoint of a geographical or epistemological centre.

Trigger claims that culture-historical archaeology displaced the evolutionary approach with the ideas of diffusion and migration (1989:150), while Olsen means that this is a simplified statement and argues that evolution was a supplement to diffusion (1997:33). The following presentation clearly demonstrates that typology and evolutionism was not only supplementing, but also integrating elements of a theory that gave diffusion a temporary dynamics. It was the fusion of typology and diffusion that legitimated the idea of the periphery’s continuous cultural backwardness. Typology became the assistant of diffusion and vice versa. In this way they acted within a double illusion, which mutually referred to each other while creating a contradictory whole of time and space.

It is important to mention that Montelius was the leading scholar among those who developed the methodological foundation of typology (1885) as well as diffusion (1899). He
was acclaimed as the most distinguished interpreter of the cultural development of Europe by establishing the so-called school of "ex orient lux" (Renfrew 1987:36-37). The idea of culture spreading from Eastern Mediterranean or the Near East, to South Scandinavia in the Early Bronze Age was one of the questions that occupied Montelius most (1899; 1903). Since it was not possible to find evidence for a direct contact between these two areas, similarities in the archaeological material had to be viewed in a typological perspective. Montelius’ theory of diffusion is therefore closely connected to his typological method, as in later works within the culture-historical episteme in Scandinavia.

The attempts to classify material groups in cultures and culture areas influenced also the interpretation of cairns and earthen barrows in West Norway. The spatial distribution of these two types of monuments was seen as an expression of a dualism between a South Scandinavian and a North Scandinavian Bronze Age culture. A common evolutionary origin of both cairns and barrows was sought further south, but they were related to separate cultures with different economic structures (see Brøgger 1925a; 1925b, Gjessing 1944) Within this system of oppositions Rogaland represented a northern border for the distribution of barrows. This position gave Rogaland status as a margin of a settled agrarian population with a cultural basis in the core areas of Denmark, especially in Jutland. Other variables, like objects of bronze and gold, and the so-called agrarian rock art, were taken as support for the manifestation of a similar border. What has been understated is that Southwest Norway was also a meeting zone for cairns and barrows, as well as for constructions which are a hybrid mixture of elements from both north and south.

Haakon Shetelig argued against such a culture dualism, showing that barrows as well as cairns belonged to a common European world of ideas, and that both types of monuments had their origin in the Mycenean culture (Shetelig 1925:78, 96, 99, see also de Lange 1912a:31). Thereby, monuments in general became evidence of a common cultural heritage, which had been spread through evolution and diffusion from the Mediterranean, via Central Europe, to Scandinavia. Even if Shetelig emphasized an evolutionistic course of development that interpreted Denmark as an innovative and progressive centre for further evolution in Scandinavia, this was only considered as a local process within a larger spatial order (see Shetelig 1925:90).

In opposition to Worsaae, Shetelig argued that Norway had had an authentic Bronze Age and that the burial monuments were an expression of such a culture (1925:90). For Shetelig the Bronze Age monuments represented a decisive new element that could be taken as an evidence for the way Norway had been drawn into "the general European development of the period’s burial custom" ("de almene europeiske bevegelser i periodens gravskikk") (ibid.:89). In his opinion the burial monuments represented the introduction of a new cosmology, which was part of a common European spiritual movement. He also suggested that the monuments should be interpreted as an expression of the development of an early state, especially at Lista, Jæren and Karmøy which had a "barrow culture" similar to the one found further south. The cairns, however, represented a common Norwegian-Swedish burial custom in areas further to the north (ibid.:90). But in general he meant that the Early Bronze Age marked a change in organization that expressed a break with the Stone Age culture of the past (ibid.:93).

A.W. Brøgger, however, claimed continuity from the Stone Age as artifacts made of bone, flint and stones were still in use into the Bronze Age period (Brøgger 1925a:130). He argued that monuments with rich graves were not accepted within areas of a traditional Stone Age culture, and that a South Scandinavian Bronze Age did not exist outside Lista, Jæren and Karmøy (ibid.:129, 133-134, 206-207). The idea of a cultural border was also based on the fact that only poorly equipped graves were found in the cairns, they contained objects of stone and occurred in ecological zones different from the agrarian landscape of the barrows (ibid.:105, 207, 133). From this evidences he developed the idea of a culture
dualism between a hunter-gatherer population in the cairn-based areas and people with an agrarian economy in Southwest Norway (ibid.:207). He concluded that an authentic Bronze Age did not exist outside Lista, Jæren and Karmøy, but rather "a Stone-Bronze Age" that was not very different from earlier traditions (ibid.:110, see also Gjessing 1944, Prescott 1994; 1995a; 1995b).

Brøgger saw the stone build cairns, in opposition to the earth-constructed barrows, as an expression of what was distinctive for Norway. For him this was a life with long traditions, well adapted to a specific nature and balanced integration with landscape and environment. According to Brogger the cairns should be considered as a "homely" response to the South Scandinavian Bronze Age. They represented a local culture that had accepted and integrated few external elements, while the local character was kept intact. By taking such a position Brogger moderated Shetelig's idea of an evolution that was propelled by waves of diffusion from south. He did not totally reject external influence, but he was critical to its importance and dominance. More specific he claimed that the "Norwegian" area was situated outside the major European flows of diffusion and migration, but the population was nevertheless influenced from outside. In opposition to Shetelig, who saw external impulses as a force of change, Brogger emphasized the importance of an internal evolutionary development that was adapted to the natural environment.

As an alternative to Shetelig's idealistic approach, Brogger placed himself in a more materialistic tradition that focused on a functional adaptation to environment and traditions, which he meant was decisive for material production and social organization. Within such a concept of explanation the interrelationship between nature, technology and economy became important for the study of innovation and change. With such a position Brogger’s materialistic functionalism might be related to a Firstspace epistemology, while Shetelig’s socially based ideas may be connected to a Secondspace epistemology. While Shetelig was open for a European influence, Brogger's interpretations were coloured by a nationalistic understatement where landscape and nature created a special and specific culture.

Guttorm Gjessing drew the conclusion that Brøgger completely rejected the existence of a Bronze Age in Norway (1944:17), but such a view must be moderated because Brogger actually argued for a Stone-Bronze Age (Brøgger 1925a:104, 110). Gjessing supported Brogger's view that a complete Bronze Age culture was not found outside Lista, Jæren and Karmøy, but contrary to Brogger he claimed that the rest of Norway still lived in a "pure" Stone Age (Gjessing 1944:24, see also Gjessing 1943). This view was founded on a broader specter of archaeological material than was available for Brogger, and was especially based on the stratification of settlement layers in caves and rock shelters (Gjessing 1943). His analysis indicated that the subsistence of the inhabitants was based just as much on hunting and fishing as on agrarian activities (Gjessing 1943:25, see also Brogger 1908; 1910, Shetelig 1920, Bøe 1934, Lund 1951, Odner 1969, Myhre 1981, Prescott 1995a, Todnem 1999). Gjessing interpreted the material found at such localities as evidence of a population with a half-nomadic life style (1943), with a mixed economy and a culture that had its roots in a Stone Age tradition (1944:25). Therefore Gjessing, like Brogger, was of the opinion that cultural change is mainly the result of internal evolution, which to a certain degree depended on an adaptation to nature and local environment.

Also Egil Bakka argued that the Bronze Age material from Lista, Jæren and Karmøy was of a special character, but he was critical of the argument that quantity alone should be decisive for a pronounced cultural division (1993:91). Although the building material is different in barrows and cairns, Bakka insisted that the burial custom was similar, and the culture found north of Rogaland was not so different from the South Scandinavian Bronze Age (1963, see also Bakka 1972; 1973; 1980, Bertilsson 1980). A qualitative analysis of climate and natural conditions in West Norway led him to the conclusion that cereal growing and husbandry had also been important on many localities within the distribution area of
Bronze Age cairns (1993:92). Especially the middle and inner parts of the fjords in Hordaland and Sogn and Fjordane have large continuous areas of arable land (ibid.:92). Similar conditions are found in the parishes of Sandeid, Olen and Etne where stone build cairns, as well as earthen burial mounds, rock art localities and hoard sites of a South Scandinavian character, are registered (Nissen Fett 1968, Mandt Larsen 1972, Myhre 1972, Indrelid 1991, Johansen 1993, Vevatne 1996; 1997). On this background Bakka argued for a Bronze Age culture north of Rogaland, with a relatively permanent settled population that based its subsistence on a mixed economy, and had a differentiated social structure with leading farmers or chieftains at the top of the social hierarchy (1993:90). Later investigations have shown that cairns seldom are found directly on the arable land defined by Bakka, but are usually localized on bare rocks, mountain tops or promontories along fjords and sailing routes, where they mostly are facing the sea (Østerdal 1999).

Prescott means that Bakka’s research belongs to a culture evolutionistic episteme, in tradition with Shetelig (1994:95-96). This might seem relevant when Bakka discusses interaction and relations between a Nordic and an Arctic Bronze Age (1976, for further discussion see Bolin 1999:18-21), but is less obvious in his works on the Bronze Age of West Norway (e.g.1972; 1993). I would like to claim that his analyses are based on quantitative criterions, but with an empirical treatment of the archaeological sources, which he analyses inductively and qualitatively within a functionalist framework of interpretation (Bakka 1993:95-99, 104). From this position he describes a spatial pattern of settlement and social organization that is partly built on diffusion and evolution, but at the same time emphasizes the importance of adaptation to the local environment. Bakka sees cultural change as the result of a reciprocal influence of both internal and external factors, in opposition to his predecessors who took a more either/or position. Like Gjessing he suggests a settlement system that was based on a mixed economy, but ascribes agriculture a greater importance, both as a form of subsistence and as a resource for surplus production that was decisive for the development of a new social order.

Odmund Møllerop is one of the few archaeologists who have studied the rich Bronze Age material from Rogaland in particular (1963a). He focuses on the construction of the monuments rather than a traditional study of objects within a simple centre-periphery concept (ibid.:41). Even if artifacts found in Rogaland indicate contact with the Danish area, it is his opinion that the burial mounds should be seen in a wider geographical and cultural context (ibid.:47). To illustrate this he classifies the monuments in three groups:

1) Naked cairns of stone
2) Cairns of stone with a thin cover of earth.
3) Earthen mounds with a central cairn of stones covering the burial chamber.

Monuments of group 1 he explains as a Scandinavian-Baltic phenomenon with roots in the late Stone Age. Møllerop claims that such cairns can be dated to period 1 and 2 of the Bronze Age (1963a:42). He indicates that the idea of cairns was diffused to Rogaland from the east. Monuments of group 2 are interpreted as a “homely” type created locally as a mixture of cairns and earthen mounds of the Danish type. This should have happened during period 2 (ibid.:42). He finds that monuments of group 3 are similar to the Danish earth and turf constructed mounds, except from the burial chambers which are constructed differently in the two areas (ibid.:42). According to Møllerop’s classification the cairns are the oldest monuments in Rogaland, indicating that contacts to the east were established earlier than towards the south. But so far it has not been possible to date cairns to period 1 in Rogaland, and the earliest known burials from cairns as well as mounds are from period 2. Therefore, Møllerop’s idea of early eastward contacts can be considered as an interesting hypothesis more than a truth.
Møllerop’s study of burial chambers led him to propose a connection between Rogaland and South England, Western France and Ireland, and he sees these regions as potential areas of origin for construction elements found in Rogaland (1963a:47). A main evidence for such connections are the many decorated grave slabs with abstract motives (Møllerop 1967, see also de Lange 1912a). Møllerop argues for an established contact beyond Denmark, directly to central areas within the so-called Atlantic Bronze Age culture. A similar idea was raised by Eva and Per Fett based on their research of rock art in West Norway (Fett and Fett 1979, for comments see Burenhult 1979, Malmer 1979). Møllerop’s hypothesis was a new contribution to the investigation of the Bronze Age in Southwest Norway, as he challenged the accepted dualism between Rogaland and Jutland (see also Marstrander 1978; 1979a; 1979b). Schetelig also saw the importance of cultural connections outside Scandinavia (1908), but Møllerop was seeking for evidence of such relations beyond a traditional route of diffusion (1963a). Nevertheless, his analysis must be classified within a traditional concept of dualism, since he primarily focuses on the spreading of agriculture from Denmark to Norway, and the integrating role objects and monuments had in this process.

Jan Petersen is the first archaeologist that formulated an alternative to this agriculture-based approach in his study of cairns and barrows at Lista (1926). More than others Petersen focused on the monuments’ close relationship with the sea, and suggested that they should be interpreted within a maritime landscape concept instead of an agriculture guided ideology (ibid.:158). The location is for Petersen a major criterion for interpretation. He is one of the few who expresses how important the sea was, without taking a detour via an agrarian based society and its needs of exchange and contacts. A primary relationship between the sea and the monuments is therefore suggested by Petersen, instead of the secondary connection that so many archaeologists have predicted.

Nearness to the sea was also decisive for Sverre Marstrander’s interpretation of the Bronze Age monuments at Lista (1950). Like Petersen he focused on the maritime character of the monumental landscape and their references to the sea. One of his main intensions was to moderate the old discussion of a dualism between a settled agrarian population and a more mobile hunter-gatherer culture, as argued by Brøgger (1925a) and Gjessing (1944). Marstrander describes how this debate led to intellectual drought without any inspiration for new interpretations (1950:63). As an alternative he emphasizes the importance of trading and sea-faring, and the influence these factors may have had on the establishing of a monumental space in Southwest Norway (ibid.:63). Within a broader inter-European trading system he considers the coast of Southwest Norway to have been a "contact zone" where new ideas met old traditions (ibid.:66). Characteristic for such a position is that some elements were copied, while others were adjusted to local conditions. Marstrander sees the "contact zones" as gateways for impulses from an European Bronze Age, which not only were manifested in the form of monuments and objects, but also through a new world of ideas that were expressed through the symbols of rock art (ibid.:66).

The "contact zones" were also "intermediate stations" for long-distance trading routes to the north and east. Within this extensive trading system the importance of bronze was not connected to its function, but to its quality as a standard of value and means of payment. Marstrander criticizes Gjessing for one-sidedly emphasizing the physical form and function of bronze objects. Instead he claims that their value must be considered within wider social and economic frameworks. According to Marstrander’s interpretation it is the metal in itself that was important, not the objects as tools. He is looking for their social and symbolic meanings, beyond their physical forms and functions. This view separates him from the Firstspace epistemology of Brøgger (1925a) and Gjessing (1944), and places him, together with Shetelig (1925), within a more idea-based Secondspace epistemology. This is also underlined by Marstrander’s focus on qualitative criteria, more than the quantitative arguments, which were important for Brøgger and Gjessing when they rejected the idea of a
Bronze Age in Norway.

So far this historiography has shown how archaeological cultures are defined and separated according to three levels of interpretation. These levels might be organized along a spatial and temporary axis within a superior framework of oppositions. On the epistemological level there is an opposition between a materialistic Firstspace epistemology (Brøgger 1925a, Gjessing 1944) and an idea-based Secondspace epistemology (Shetelig 1925, Marstrander 1950, Møllerop 1963a, Bakka 1993), which leads to an opposition between nature and society as factors for defining cultures and emphasizing material production and social organization. On the empirical level the spatial distribution of cairns and barrows has been taken as evidence for an agrarian settled population with a metal-using Bronze Age culture in opposition to a hunter-gatherer culture with a basis in Stone Age ways of life. This meeting of differences has mainly been localized to Southwest Norway, which from an economic and geographic perspective has been defined as a periphery to central areas in Denmark.

Mats P. Malmer claims that the criteria used for a well-defined culture ought to be so distinct that it clearly can be separated from other cultures (1962; 1973:59). The same condition is demanded of Anders Hagen (1970). It might be a subject for discussion if such criteria can be realized without reducing the concept of culture to a spatial distribution of objects and monuments (for further critique see Burström 1991:24). Hans Bolin has raised the question of a dualism between the coastal and inland areas in his study of the Bronze Age of Northern Scandinavia, and has argued for a culture concept which is overlapping, multicultural and formed by different traditions, activities and types of knowledge that is coming together within one and the same landscape (1999:25, see also Hyenstrand 1987, Bolin, Kaliff and Zachrisson 2001, for an alternative approach see Baudou 1989; 1992, Forsberg 1989). Then culture becomes a changeable phenomenon that is mediated between different groups and individuals, and can on an overall level refer to what is both common and different.

A hybrid culture concept will in a similar way emphasize how material elements are articulated and circulated within different contexts and systems of references, across established categories, and borders between nature and culture. It will focus on how material elements are translated and transformed, not in a dualistic opposition to, in relation to, or as a corrective to – but as something both common and different. Instead of defining culture groups and material categories, a hybrid culture concept will elucidate material overlapping characterized by a mixture of styles and elements.

3.4. WHEN ROCK ART BECOMES A MARGINAL MANIFESTATION

Rock art in Scandinavia has been considered as a separate entity, and interpreted from an isolated perspective. To some extend rock art research has been treated as its own discipline which operates outside the main archaeological discourses (for a critique see Moberg 1971:223, Nordbladh 1987:144, Bradley 1997:7-8, Hauptman Wahlgren 2000:67). This situation has a double-sided weakness that isolates rock art studies, at the same time as archaeologists working with other sources only sporadically include rock art in their interpretation of prehistory. When carvings are brought in, it is mostly used to explain cosmological and symbolical aspects of society. I do agree with Carl Axel Moberg when he claims that “rock art research will be better the less it is only rock art research” (1971:230). But this statement concerns also other isolated subjects, as well as all kinds of thinking that seek understanding from separate sources, without seeing how they create associative relations to each other and to the surrounding landscape (for further critique see Bradley and Nordenborg Myhre in press).

Scandinavian rock art has traditionally been separated into agrarian and hunting rock art, or South and North Scandinavian rock art. This classification has been based on form,
distribution, dating and interpretation of images (Mandt Larsen 1972:9). The hunting rock art is chronologically related to the Mesolithic/Neolithic period, while there have been a consensus among archaeologists that South Scandinavian rock art was made by Bronze Age farmers within a context of monumental graves. This division has proved problematic to maintain, but difficult to ignore, as it has dominated the rock art research in Scandinavia since the early 20th century.

Hunting rock art has also been called arctic rock art, which refers to subsistence and its geographical distribution. It has also been described as naturalistic in opposition to the more symbolic style of agrarian rock art. Guttorm Gjessing divided rock art into three levels of development, from simple naturalism to a high degree of complexity (1936:186). He argued that the naturalistic images had their origin in the hunter's "un-reflected imitation of nature", but gradually they became more schematic, before ending up as the symbolic forms of the Bronze Age agrarian carvings (ibid.:158). The background for such a categorization is the evolutionary thought that the Bronze Age agrarian society belonged to a higher level of civilization, and for that reason was more complex and elegant in its expression.

The main motifs of hunting rock art are different kinds of game (Bøe 1934, Gjessing 1932; 1936, Bakka 1975; 1976, Hagen 1969; 1990, Sognnes 1990; 2002, Baudou 1993, Forsberg 1993, Ramstad 2000). Human images are seldom found, except in relations to animals. Such combinations are interpreted as hunting scenes, related to hunting magic and mythology. They are often considered to have had a functional motivation, more than ritual and symbolic significance (for an alternative interpretation see Tilley 1991, Helskog 1995, Walderhaug 1995, Bolin 1999, Gronnesby 1998a; 1998b). North Scandinavian rock art has to a higher degree than the South Scandinavian pictures been subject to functionalistic interpretations within the framework of ecology, economy and adaptation (Hauptman Walhgren 2000:75). They have been connected to local subsistence, isolation and evolutionary processes of nature-determination. In that way the hunting rock art is considered different from the agrarian carvings, which explicit and implicit are linked to culture influence from a broader European context. When the two main types of rock art appear in the same area the agrarian rock art has been given status as the influential and innovative power that brings the world forward (e.g. Hagen 1969:172-132; 1990:106).

The ship is the most typical image in agrarian rock art. It dominates the panels in South Scandinavia in general (Malmer 1981) and especially in Southwest Norway (Fett and Fett 1941). Other images are simple or parallel circles, spirals or wave-like motives. Common are also depictions of body parts like hands and feet. Human figures appear as lines, representing the crew on ships, or they are presented as images in more scenic compositions. Pictures of wagons, snakes or trees are found in a more limited number. In Southwest Norway agrar-

Fig. 3.4.1. West Norway in general, and Rogaland in particular, represent a dense concentration of so-called agrarian rock art. Characteristic for the distribution of these carvings is, however, their location near the sea and central waterways on northern Jæren and on islands in the Boknafjord basin (From Prøsch-Danielsen 2002)
ian rock art appears also on grave slabs, stone circles or isolated boulders or slabs found in burial cairns and barrows.

Both hunting and agrarian rock art are represented in West Norway, and they are both found close to water. The hunting rock art is mainly distributed in the northern and middle parts of West Norway, especially at the localities of Vingen and Ausevik in Sogn and Fjordane (Mandt 1995, Walderhaug 1995). The agrarian rock art is concentrated to Jæren and Lista (Fett and Fett 1941), with smaller pockets of distribution in Ølen and Etne, which mark the border between the region of Rogaland and Hordaland (Nissen Fett 1968, Mandt Larsen 1972, Vevatne 1996). Southwest Norway may be defined as an area that is unilaterally characterized by agrarian rock art. Only two localities with hunting motifs has been found in Rogaland (Bang-Andersen 1992), and one near Lista (Gjessing 1923; 1925, Hagen 1976).

Besides agrarian and hunting rock art, cup-mark sites can be considered as a third group. They are mainly found in sub-alpine areas in Hordaland and Sogn and Fjordane, at the outskirts of modern cultivated land (Mandt Larsen 1972:88, Mandt 1995:265-266). A similar localization is registered in East Norway (Østmo 1990:12, fig. 105, Innselset 1995) and in parts of Sweden, like Uppland (Kjellén and Hyenstrand 1977:94) and Bohuslän (Bertilsson 1987:70). In general the number of cup mark localities are few in areas where agrarian rock art is represented (Mandt Larsen 1972). As a contrast to this situation, cup marks in Southwest Norway are found in contexts that include complex system of other images as well as burial monuments. As in the rest of South Scandinavia cup marks appear both on separate localities, on grave slabs, or together with other motifs on open panels (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:146-151).

3.5. ROCK ART RESEARCH IN ROGALAND

Eva Fett and Per Fett were the first to carry out a systematic recording of rock art in Southwest Norway (1941). Their book is mainly a presentation of carvings, but it also contains an analysis of the images, their composition and chronological condition. They present ideas about society and religion, but are cautious to separate between what they find possible to have knowledge about, and what is built on a highly hypothetical ground (ibid.:12-13). Primarily, Fett and Fett mapped the distribution of images, and secondarily, they related this material to landscape and topography because they assumed that the localization of rock art was decisive for its meaning (ibid.:13).

Their registering showed that ships were the most common motifs both in Rogaland and at Lista, as in the rest of South Scandinavia. Ship images appear within the whole area and on most localities. In Rogaland there is a concentration at the coastal zone of Sola (Hedland, Hellestø, Vigdel, Ølbør), around Hafsfjord (Haga, Revheim, Sunde), north of Stavanger (Dusavik, Rudlo, Tasta), and on islands between the sea and the fjords of Ryfylke (Bru, Mosterøy, Nag, Åmøy) (Fett and Fett 1941: Pl.1). A similar localization was found at Lista where most rock art localities are related to the sea (ibid.: Pl. 42). It is a common feature that the sites are situated close to water, which sometimes even overruns the images from springs above or sources from the interior of the rock.

Fett and Fett documented ship images on rock surfaces and boulders. In several occasions ships were depicted on grave slabs that probably can be dated to the Early Bronze Age according to the chambers’ construction, size and position in the monuments (see Chapter 6.9.). No datable objects can, however, confirm this (see Lorange 1883:87-88, 109, Helliesen 1903:55, Fett and Fett 1941:79). A possible ship motif is documented on a slab which was part of a stone circle in Stavhaug at Borsheim (Helliesen 1906:75, de Lange 1912a:7, Fett and Fett 1941:84-85). For Fett and Fett the ship image became a leading typological element from which further chronology could be derived. Their typology was based on two categories of ship images, the so-called normal forms and the variants (ibid.:116-132). A detailed classifi-
cation was founded on a typology of form elements, according to the idea of an internal evolution (1941:Pl.82). In principle they used the same method as developed by Montelius when he created the typology of bronze objects (1885), and which Malmer later used in his general dating of Scandinavian rock art (1981).

It has been an accepted method to support the dating ability of such typological systems through a comparison of ship motifs on bronze objects (Kaul 1998, for a critique see Althin 1945:58, Nordbladh 1980:27). The origin of the method may be ascribed to Bror Emil Hildebrand who compared rock art motifs at Ekenberg in Östergötland with swords and daggers from the Bronze Age (1869:425). The most exposed object for such an analogy has been the ship motif on a sword from Rörby on Zealand, and on the bronze mounting of a horn from Wismar in Mecklenburg. These objects are still used as chronological anchors for typological systems of South Scandinavian rock art (Malmer 1981, Østmo 1990, Kaul 1998).

A problem that will be discussed later is that ship images of the Rörby type have been accepted as the origin for all typological systems (see Chapter 6.8.) With this position it has become a truism in systems that mutually confirm each other, "a realistic illusion" or a never-ending circle, which legitimates

Fig. 3.4.2. Ships at locality III on Åmøy where 1200 images are recorded within a 1.5 km long shore zone (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)

Fig. 3.4.3. Southwest Norway can be defined as an area that is characterized by agrarian rock art. Outside Rogaland the Lista peninsula marks another region for an extensive concentration of similar motifs. A sequence of ships from Pennen at Lista (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)
its existence through a constant adding of confirming data. It is unfortunate that the Rørby ship has been given an innovative status that presupposes a diffusion from places with few rock art sites to areas with a great variety of rock art images, created in associative relations with monumental landscapes and societies, which in Rogaland was maritime based more than agrarian founded.

Fett and Fett classified the ships in stages of evolution. The main trend is that one-lined ships appear earlier than two-lined ships (ibid.:134). Both Ekholm (1917:280) and Gjessing (1935:135) had suggested a similar chronological development. The one-lined ships on rock art sites might therefore be older than the two-lined Rørby type which Malmer (1981:12), and later Kaul (1998), defines as the earliest typological form. Three one-lined ships are documented on a slab from a grave cist at Rege in Sola, which probably can be dated to period 2 (Lorange 1883:87-88, 109, Helliesen 1903:55, Fett and Fett 1941:79, Myhre 1981:73).

Based on stylistic analogies from local find contexts, it might be claimed that one-lined ships probably were used in Rogaland in the Early Bronze Age, and they may be older than, or contemporary with, the two-lined Rørby-type (see Chapter 6.8. and 6.9.).

Next to ships, circles are the most common motifs. Fett and Fett have characterized them as "sun images" (1941:123-124). Usually they are drawn with a single line, but several parallel lines are also found. On grave slabs circles may occur as the only image (Austreim), sometimes together with ships (Rege I, Harvaland) or more abstract motifs (Hodne I). Fett and Fett found that circles often were depicted above ships, probably designed as part of a major plan (Revheim, Åmøy II, Rudlo, Hellesto) (ibid.:129). In general there is a close connection between ships and circles, sometimes the "sun images" are found inside ships, attached to ships, or just above ships (ibid.:130). Such combinations may give associations to stone circles and ship shaped constructions that are documented in monuments from Early Bronze Age at Ringen on Karmøy and Særheim at Klepp (Hyenstrand 1968, Hedengran 1991, Artelius 1996, Nordenborg Myhre 1998b, Sjureike 2001).

Human images on rock art are usually given a male identity (Haupman Wahlgren 2000:80). Timothy Yates argues that human pictures are expression of an aggressive masculinity (1993). This conclusion is drawn from the phallic representations and the different scenic relations they are meant to be part of. The only symbol connected to women is ar-
Fig. 3.5.1. Fett and Fett’s ship typology for Rogaland makes a division between normal forms and variants. The principle of this system of classification is mainly derived from Montelius’ typology of objects (From Fett and Fett 1941)

Fig. 3.5.2. Malmer’s ship typology for South Scandinavia is constructed of separate elements from the whole area (From Malmer 1981)
gued to be the cup marks (Almgren 1927, Brøndsted 1958, Glob 1969, Mandt 1986, Bengtsson 1999, Lindgren 1999). Oscar Almgren claimed that the making of cup marks symbolized the fertilization of Mother Earth (1927:255), and Johannes Brøndsted considered the cup marks to be fertility symbols that represented different generations (1958:24). Peter V. Glob suggested that they were expressions of the female sex organ (1969:170, see Bengtsson 1999), while Gro Mandt (1986:122pp.) and Britta Lindgren (1999:45-46) see them as female markers when they appear between the antlers of animals or between the thighs of human images. Gro Mandt is one of the few archaeologists who has discussed the representation of female characteristics in South Scandinavian Bronze Age and studied gender in relation to rock art motifs from West Norway (1987; 1995, for similar studies of North Scandinavian rock art, see Helskog 1995).

In Rogaland and Lista human images are mainly depicted as lines symbolizing the crew on ships, but sometimes they can be found as a part of more complex compositions. Ceremonial scenes with ships, animals and human beings seldom occur in Rogaland (Dysjaland, Helland, Amoy) (Myhre 1964, Møllerop 1949), and so far they are not represented at Lista. In Southwest Norway it is the people’s collective relation to ships that were of importance, expressed through sex- and age-neutral identical lines representing the crew. Such images make males as well as females invisible, both as individuals and as members of a group (see Hedengran 1993).

3.6. SHIPS AND THE IDEA OF FERTILITY

Fett and Fett were reserved in their interpretation of the connection between rock art and Bronze Age religion. As a part of their carefully outlined project they saw the combination of ships and ”sun images” as a symbolization of an agrarian fertility cult (1941:13, 130, see also Brøndsted 1938). Such ideas had already been advocated by Oscar Almgren, who claimed that rock art was related to an agrarian cosmology, and that the images had been made as ritual parts of a fertility cult (1927:232). He also proposed a connection between the localization of rock art sites and cultivated fields from the Bronze Age. Earlier Gunnar Ekholm had interpreted rock art as part of a death cult after having made a comparative study of images on grave slabs (1916; 1917; 1921). He focused on the care the dead had been given, and came to the conclusion that the cult of death could not be separated from life. For Ekholm rock art became an integrated part of both life and death (1922:220). Hauptmann Wahlgren argues that the difference between these two interpretations was that Almgren believed that rock art depicted the actual cult itself, while Ekholm considered them to be symbolic representations (2000:71).

It was also the symbolic meaning of rock art that was important for Fett and Fett (1941:12-13). The localizing of the sites near water, and not primarily on arable land, was interpreted as an indirect expression of fertility cult. Based on the idea that water represents purification and revival Gro Mandt later argued that rock art’s closeness to water symbolized regeneration and growth (1972:138, with references to Eliade 1958:188-189, 194). The relationship between fertility cult and rock art was thereby explained both through the connection between rock art sites and arable land (Almgren 1927), and through the theory of a symbolic meaning of water (Fett and Fett 1941, see also Mandt Larsen 1972).

Almgren’s theory of the agrarian localization of rock art, and the panels’ direct expression of a fertility cult, has in different ways influenced later rock art research in Scandinavia. His ideas of fertility became a foundation for a religious-historical discourse within the framework of a Secondspace epistemology, while his spatial aspect of rock art being located near arable land, followed the ideals of a Firstspace epistemology. These two approaches have acted in a dim antagonism between physical factors and religious structures, as well as between an objective and a subjective aimed archaeology. Instead of claiming that Almgren’s
theory as a whole came to dominate all rock art research in Scandinavia, as proposed by Hauptman Wahlgren (2000:7), it is more precise to say that he set an agenda for future research on rock art, that was either ideological and religious related within a Secondspace paradigm, or physical and spatial dominated within a Firstspace paradigm. Almgren thereby created a dicotomy that he himself did not see as a contradiction, but which later developed into an opposition.

Few researchers have studied rock art within a clearly expressed religious-historical paradigm in the way Almgren did when he created a whole pantheon of gods (see also Görman 1987, Hygen and Bengtsson 1999, for critique see Nordbladh 1986). But his use of religious-historical analogies was important for later archaeologists like Bertil Almgren (1962), Sverre Marstrander (1963; 1969) and Peter V. Glob (1969). His theories on fertility cult, and the symbolic meaning of ship and sun images for the expression of Bronze Age cosmology, are still debated, but now within the discourses of structuralism and postmodernism, which may be related to a Secondspace epistemology (e.g. Nordbladh 1980, Hedengran 1995, Olausson 1995, Kaul 1998, Widholm 1997; 1998, Goldhahn 1999a; 1999b; 1999c 1999d).

During the 1970s the traditional religious-historical focus created by Almgren was challenged by a spatial approach. The relationship between rock art sites and agrarian landscapes was systematically investigated in a number of local and regional studies with spatial methods characteristic for a Firstspace epistemology (Mandt Larsen 1972, Kjellén and Hyenstrand 1977, Burenhult 1980, Malmer 1981, Bertilsson 1989b). A central question for this research was whether rock art sites were localized near water or arable land. Åke Hyenstrand and Einar Kjellén’s studies in Uppland in Sweden showed that most rock art localities were found in the coastal zone (1977). Relation to water was also characteristic for rock art sites in Götaland (Burenhult 1980), Jarl Nordbladh came to the conclusion that rock art in Kville parish in Bohuslän is placed at sheltered bays and straits from where there is visual contact to the open sea (1980:32). Ulf Bertilsson, however, found that rock art sites in Northern Bohuslän were closely connected to agrarian land (1980). The same tendency has been proposed by Sverre Marstrander in his study of rock art in Östfold, where the sites often face the fields (1963:53). Several of these spatial projects have a distinctive theoretical framework that is structural and post-structural based (e.g. Nordbladh 1978; 1980).

Almgren’s theory of an agrarian localization was also the main prospect for Gro Mandt Larsen’s spatial analysis of rock art in Hordaland (1972:10, 93, 141). Her conclusion was that most localities are placed along the fjords of Hardanger, Sunnhordland and Midhordland (ibid.:86). On a regional scale most rock art sites are found in areas with a potential for agriculture, while cup marks mainly are distributed in mountain valleys near summer farms (setre/støler) used in recent times (ibid.:88, Tab. IX). Locally there is not an unilateral connection between rock art and existing arable fields (ibid.:41). On the other hand it is interesting that most localities are situated near water, like lakes, streams and springs. In all 103 of 143 sites, spread over 54 of 81 localities, are found close to water (ibid.:93). In addition 45 sites on 14 localities are placed near pathways known from historical times (ibid.:93).

Mandt Larsen explains this pattern of distribution as a consequence of a more complex economic structure in Hordaland than in the agrarian regions of Rogaland, Trøndelag and Østfold (1972:141). She considers Hordaland to have been an agrarian margin where the ecological conditions favoured husbandry and a pastoral economy more than cereal growing. Although a mixed farming economy was in need of a fertility cult expressed through rock art (ibid.:41), Mandt Larsen found the concept ”agrarian rock art” insufficient according to the local conditions. As an alternative she chose to call it ”avlekunst” which mean ”art of breeding” or ”art of reproduction” even if the types of depicted images are similar to those found further south (ibid.:11). According to Mandt Larsen such a denomination will include both agriculture and husbandry, and are at the same time related to a fertility cult. There by the local ecology and economy defined the meaning of the fertility cult.
Despite local and regional differences Mandt Larsen considered the rock art of Hordaland to belong to a general South Scandinavian system of ideas. With this position she coincides with Shetelig’s (1925) and Bakka’s (1963) interpretation of the region’s stone built cairns. Like Fett and Fett (1941), Mandt Larsen saw the relation between water and rock art as a symbolic expression of a fertility cult. Even if both Mandt and Fett and Fett used ideas from Almgren’s works, and to a certain extent were inspired by his approach, their interpretation of carvings were in principle more related to Ekholm’s ideas about the symbolic representation of rock art.

3.7. MAKING THE MARGIN

Malmer is one of the few who has made a comprehensive analysis of rock art in the whole of South Scandinavia (1981). He concludes that in a broad geographical perspective there is no connection between the best agricultural landscapes and the distribution of rock art sites. For that reason he considers rock art to be a marginal phenomenon in relation to the agrarian centres of Denmark and Scania, where most bronze objects are found (1981:103). His interpretation is founded on an attitude that new ideas had their origin in South and Central Europe. From there they were spread northwards to Denmark and Scania together with metal and the knowledge of agrarian technology, before reaching regions in Norway and Sweden where the ideas were adjusted to local traditions and environments. It is at these northern outposts that rock art primarily was created, more as a substitute for metal and agrarian production, than an indigenous material expression.

This form of “Peripherism” is created within a frame of diffusion that is diffuse and basically elite orientated. It conceals the idea of colonialism as a necessary factor for development, and it confirms the division between those who innovate and those being innovated. Instead of seeing cultural change as something that take place in a meeting between differences, or between external and internal factors, diffusion considers such a relation to be an effect of processes which begins in a centre. Most diffusionists will claim that only a small number of such places are to be found. Such uniqueness is the main content of the idea that maintains diffusion as a theory, and the centre-periphery model as an explanation. “Peripherism” presupposes that some societies need diffusion to initiate change, while others are carriers of the unique resource of being an innovative power. Accordingly evolution outside such core areas is dependent on ideas that were spread from centres when the situation was suitable. This means that changes in peripheries take place on the premises of the centres. A carrying idea is that centers possess something that others wish to have, either to be equal or to obtain a special position in the local community. This is the paradox of diffusionism that similarity must never be identical, only a copy or a reflection that visualizes the imitation and substitution of a dominating and continuously adjusting regime. Thus material culture in the periphery can never be an indifferent difference.

It is within the same paradox that diffusion shows its weakness as a chronological support, because it continuously has to balance its temporality at a pivotal point of what is meant to be similar, and what is seeking similarity, but is not given the right to be different. Diffusion is therefore dependent on a power that sustains the divergence between what might be called authentic and what is a copy. This gives the theory spatial power and temporal legitimacy – not because of its dynamics of alternating ability, but because of its regulating character within the same dualistic power structure. Accordingly change is not something that unresolvedly opens for differences and hybrids, but something that carries on and develops an idea of the authentic that is already meant to be there. This form of temporality excludes differences and hybrids, because a demand for difference will undermine the need of diffusion and the temporal towing which diffusionism offers the peripheries. It is within this “double illusion” that evolution and diffusion legitimate each other, and is unified in a
centre-periphery model. In general, diffusion and evolution might be seen as un-separable twins in any time-space archaeology.

In general rock art research in Scandinavia has been occupied with the definition and classification of types of images, which are studied in time and space. The depicted motifs have been classified in geographical, chronological, economical and religious categories, and finally included in major systems of classification, such as Malmer’s typology of rock art (1981). Ideals and methods taken from traditional studies of objects have been transferred to the Bronze Age’s world of pictures and symbols. This undermines the meaning of their context – their spatial relationships, and the system of references they operate within. Instead the focus is directed towards typological relations between selected images and elements, which are mapped across landscapes and places in time and space, or as in Malmer’s work, correlated by statistical analyses and ecological and nature-deterministic models where everything is seen from an agrarian centre.

Until now South Scandinavian rock art has been interpreted as expressions of an agrarian culture, a substitute for a complete agrarian society, or an attempt to adjust the agrarian world of ideas. As a critique of such an agrarian determinism I shall focus on the close relationship between water and rock art, and the dominance of ship images on most panels in Rogaland. To mark this alternative route I will introduce the concept of “maritime rock art”, not to draw attention to another kind of economic life style, but rather to direct the thoughts towards mobility as well as real and imagined travels across water and sea. The maritime perspective of ship images has been used to explain trading routes, rivalry and warfare (Malmer 1981; 1989b; 1993, Bertilsson 1987; 1989a; 1999, Larsson 1993; 1999, Nordblad 1989, Randsborg 1993a), but then rock art is considered as a mean to understand other relations, without interpreting the motifs themselves (Hauptman Wahlgren 2001:88). Such explanations emanate from established models of society, and rock art is used in an already presupposed argumentation. Even if ship images may have had such a meaning, there is also room for interpreting rock art as an element of transformation where they represent the travel between life and death or the real and the imaginary world.

3.8. SEARCHING FOR THE FARM

On a more local level Bjørn Myhre has studied social organization and development of a monumental landscape in the parishes of Sola and Madla, which represent areas with a high density of finds from the Bronze Age (1981, see also Myhre 1979a). The foundation of his analysis is a system-theoretical model which seeks to understand the relation between available resources, graves and settlements (ibid.:1981:87). Myhre shows that the settlement material from the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age is mostly localized near sea shores, rivers and lakes (ibid.:61), with an assemblage of flint tools which indicates that fishing and hunting was the basic subsistence. The burial monuments, however, are found on the moraine ridges that were suitable for agriculture (ibid.:85). Myhre identifies a system of polygons to illustrate how the monuments are distributed within the border of farms known from historical times. From this position he indicates a continuity of settlement, and a correspondence between the building of monuments and the establishment of agriculture. Within this spatial structure he sees the Bronze Age monuments as centre in territorial units. They express leading families’ or chieftains’ right to land. To each territory belonged the moraine ridges with monuments, lower grounds with fields and pastures, and shore zones that gave admission to harbours and navigation at sea (ibid.:87). With this sort of organization each territory made use of a composite selection of landscape types where different resources could be exploited.

The borders between the exploitation zones within each polygon is defined on the basis of the localization of monuments, without taking contemporary settlements into consider-
ation. According to the model, monuments and metal objects found in graves were the foundation for power and ownership of land (ibid.:91). Two different social and economic groups are defined on this basis and Myhre proposes that hunter-gatherer subsistence was subjugated to a monumental agrarian culture. Even if the relation between these groups is explained within the framework of independent exchange, it is the agrarian form of life that set the agenda for the social and spatial order. To underpin the hegemonic position of the agrarian spatiality, Myhre includes rock art and relates the motifs to a fertility cult reserved for the agrarian population (ibid.: 99). The idea of fertility is also determining his interpretation of hoard sites (ibid.:94, 100, see also Johansen 1993). At this point Myhre’s analysis belongs to a long tradition that primarily relates grave monuments, rock carvings and hoard sites to an agrarian culture.

The hypothesis that burial monuments were placed near settlements is connected to the idea that the institution of farms was the source for historical progression and development. The farm became the main premise for an evolutionary process and a spatial organization that made other types of cultural landscapes and other forms of economies marginal and even secondary. Myhre’s work has been relevant for the study of agrarian settlement of later periods, but it is problematic to transfer the same agrarian structure back to the Early Bronze Age. In general it is unfortunate how monuments, rock art and hoard sites uncritically have been related to an agrarian social organization and its cosmology (see also Johansen 1993). So far there have not been documented any major settlements near rock art and large monuments in Rogaland. What has been found is a complex settlement structure that is of a hybrid character in relation to established categories as subsistence and artifact assemblages.

3.9. HUNTING, HERDING AND FARMING

The centuries around 2400 BC have been considered as a period of change in Norway. The new bifacial flint technology was introduced, and new forms of weapons and tools appear in Rogaland. The geographical distribution of such objects is somewhat different from archaeological finds from the Middle Neolithic Period. Many of the settlements, graves and hoard sites of the so-called Battle Axe Culture, from about 2800-2400 BC, are recorded in regions with a potential for agriculture, and this distribution pattern is reinforced during the Late Neolithic. A large number of objects like daggers, sickles, and arrowheads of flint are found in agricultural areas, while most finds from woodlands and mountains are made of slate, quartz and quartzite. This pattern of distribution has been interpreted as an expression of an economic specialization, between farmers and hunter-gatherers (Hagen 1946; 1983:103, Magnus and Myhre 1986:93.).

Regional studies in Hordaland and Sogn and Fjordane have concluded that the pattern of settlement changed in the Late Neolithic Period. Most of the fishing and hunting sites near the shores were deserted to the advantage of light arable soils in the middle and inner parts of the fjords (Bakka and Kaland 1971, Johnson 1993), or at favorable localities along the coast from West Norway to Troms in the north (Johansen 1979; 1990, Indrelid 1997:85). Pollen analyses, ostological material, and microfossils of seeds and grains, have been taken as evidence for the final establishment of agriculture as the main economy in most regions in the Late Neolithic Period (Prescott 1995a; 1995b, Myhre 2002:67).

If we leave this general geographical perspective and focus on local investigations, a more differentiated picture of economy in the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age appears, even in landscapes with a potential for agriculture. The coastal site at Slettabo in South Jæren is an example of a settlement where hunting and fishing was the major economy, but where evidence of husbandry on a small scale was found (Skjølsvold 1970; 1972; 1977, see also Glørstad 1996). The site was situated close to the shore in a landscape with islands and narrow straits. A large number of bones from a variety of fishes and sea birds, as well as from
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deer and seal, were recorded. Agriculture and husbandry seems not to have had a major impact on the hunting-fishing economy of the population that lived at this shore settlement, neither in Late Neolithic nor the Bronze Age (Skjølsvold 1977, Holberg 2000).

A small settlement from the Late Neolithic Period have been excavated at Rugland in Hå, only 5 km to the north of Slettabø, but in a different environment zone on the slope towards the low mountains (Bakkevig 1982, Lindblom 1982, Simonsen et al. 1982). The investigation of the site brought forward hazelnut shells, a few seeds of barley, bones of fish and birds, and a fishing hook made of a bone from sheep, which were all found in relation to the central fireplace. The environmental studies and the few finds indicate a site for temporary use for a small group of people with a highly mixed economy.

In the vicinity of Slettabø in Hå there are also found similar settlement sites from the Bronze Age near the shore or on the outskirts of agricultural land at Jæren. On some sites, like Kvianes and Sandve, there were small oval houses with turf walls (Skjølsvold 1970), while others must have had a more simple hut construction since only floors of packed stones were found during the excavation (Skjølsvold 1977; 1980). Especially along the shores of Klepp and Sola many similar hut floors are registered (Gjessing 1920:137, Myhre 1981:45, 84, see also Myhre 1979b; 2002). Hunting, fishing or husbandry must have been the most important economy in households like this. Similar rounded or oval huts from the Bronze Age have been excavated many places along the coast of West Norwegian, but also in sub-alpine and mountain areas, and everywhere they are interpreted as settlements with a mixed economy where cereal growing must have been of little or no importance (Nærøy 1994:204, Indrelid 1994:222; 1997:78, 86, Myhre 2002:67).

Hybrid sites like these from the Bronze Age were the key element for the discussion about a culture dualism that took place in most of the last century. From these settlements come mainly tools and weapons of flint, stone and bones, and fishing, gathering and hunting seems to have been the basic form of subsistence. Brøgger (1925a) claimed that such settlements represented a population of hunter-gatherers that lived in the outskirts of a more settled farming society with a metal-based culture, while Gjessing (1944) proposed that their inhabitants belonged to a half-nomadic culture with a mixed economy. The sites have also been interpreted as hunting and fishing stations used temporarily during the seasons by agriculturalists from nearby farms (Brinkmann and Shetelig 1920, Shetelig 1925, Bakka 1993). Lately they have been related to an agro-pastoral population using marginal area as summer farms [Prescott 1995a; 1995b]. A fourth explanation is that such settlements belonged to the bronze using farmers, but they represented a social strata with an economic specialization that was incorporated in the society through a re-distributive economy and organization (Myhre 1981:91, Magnus and Myhre 1986:186-189).

3.10. CAVES AND ROCK SHELTERS

A similar mixed economy is particular well documented in the many rock shelters and caves found along the coast, as well as in valleys and in mountain areas of West Norway. Several of them have been used during the Bronze Age. The bone material is often well preserved, and it has given information about a wide range of species of animals, birds and fish. In the lowland near the coast different types of fish and shellfish, sea birds and mammals like elk, deer, and seal are found, while the sites in the mountains provide bones of reindeer, ptarmigan and hare. Also animals important for their fur or hide were hunted, like beaver, weasel, marten, otter, fox, wolf or squirrel. When bones of domesticated animals like sheep/goat or cattle occur, they are usually few, and fossilized cereals are seldom found.

Caves and rock shelters have been interpreted as settlement sites. They are often localized in areas with good possibilities for hunting and fishing, like Skipshelleren in Vaksdal, Ruskeneshelleren in Bergen, Gronehelleren in Solund or Skjonghelleren in Giske (Hagen
Even in the sub-alpine zone, settlements in rock shelters have been used by a population with a mixed economy as for instance Ullshelleren in Valldalen (Odner 1969:31-34) and Skrivarhelleren in Årdal (Hufthammer 1995, Prescott 1995a:96-108, 114-120). In Ullshelleren rock art of the so-called agrarian type are documented in a context with bones of domesticated animals, and pollen from a nearby bog has been taken as evidence for agriculture. Grains of barley, bones of sheep and cattle from stratified layers in Skrivarhelleren may indicate the same. But like other settlement sites, hunting and husbandry seems to have been the main economy.

Analysis of the osteological material, have made it possible to clarify at which time of the year caves and rock shelters were used. The bones indicate an intensive phase during the summer with a general length of time between April and October, but this is not a definitive conclusion. Analyses from Ruskeneshelleren show that sheep and goats were culled as half grown lambs between November and March (Hufthammer 1995). In Skjonghelleren bones of birds that live in the area at wintertime, were found. It can therefore not be ruled out that many caves and rock shelters were used the year round (for a discussion see Odner 1969:86pp., Hagen 1983:161pp., Hufthammer 1995, Prescott 1995a:133pp., Indrelid 1997:58pp.,102).

Localization near hunting and fishing grounds is characterizing most West Norwegian caves and rock shelters, but in Southwest Norway they are often found in areas with an agrarian potential. Stratified layers from the Bronze Age have been excavated in Gåsehelleren and Tjorahelleren I and II in Sola (Myhre 1981:84) and Goahelleren and Vistehola in Randaberg (Brogger 1908, Todnem 1999). All of them are situated at North Jæren where most material from the Bronze Age are registered, in the vicinity of burial monuments, rock art and hoard sites (Gjessing 1920, Lund 1951, Myhre 1981, Todnem 1999).

Seen in relation to Lewis-Williams and Dowson’s idea that rock art refers to both the internal and external world (1990), caves and rock shelters might be considered as an expression of the invisible landscape of the rock (see Chapter 6.6.). Compositions of ships sailing towards cracks and clefts might indicate a reference to the inner space of the rock. This process can be observed in the way ships are vanishing through the rock surface, but also by a progressive loss of lines and crew while sequences of ships are sailing towards the interior (Bradley, Jones, Nordenbørg Myhre and Sakett 2002). An animated effect of such compositions is strengthened by the purling water that is coming out of the rock. In this way the inner room of the rock became a source of water – a place from where liquid appeared.

In opposition to the exposed rock surfaces, caves and rock shelters are closed rooms. Rooms to enter, rooms to be surrounded by. They have been seen as an associating link with the unknown (Bjerke 1995:145), "the other side" (Skeates 1991:127), or as a passage to the underworld (Eliade 1970:51), where death, darkness and regeneration took place (Saunders 1994:172). Fragments of human skeletons have been found in 23 caves and rock shelters in South Norway (Todnem 1999:103). In this material both sexes of all ages are represented (ibid.:103). Based on the available C-14 dates the skeleton samples have been divided into two phases of intensive use, one during the Late Mesolithic and the other at the transition between the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (ibid.:104, tabell 1). A nearly complete skeleton of a 12 year-old boy was found in Vistehola (Brogger 1908:26). Individual fragments, especially hands, feet and skulls, are found in Vistehola, Tjorahelleren and Goahelleren on Jæren, and in Skipshelleren in Nordhordland (Fürrst 1908:103, Bøe 1934, Todnem 1999:103). From Åkvikhøla in Helgeland come five bones from hands and feet (Nummedal 1920:18pp.), and from Ruskeneshelleren in Bergen several finger bones of a 12 year-old boy (Brinkmann and Shetelig 1920:9, 59). Such finds give intuitive associations to rock art where hand and foot images are common motifs.

The skeleton material is found in stratified layers together with shells, animal bones, charcoal and artifacts (Bruen-Olsen 1992:71, Indrelid 1997:55, Myhre 1981:37pp.). There are seldom clearly defined grave contexts. An exception is the skeleton of a 17 years old boy.
that was uncovered in a pit in Grønehelleren in Sogn and Fjordane. His head and both arms were placed on seashells, while layers of pebbles from the beach were found both over and under the skeleton (Todnem 1999:105). Together with bone fragments of three grown-up humans in Ruskeneshelleren lay a flint dagger from the Late Neolithic Period (Holberg 2000:14), while a quartz stone was found close to the jawbone of a child (Brinkmann and Shetelig 1920:8pp.,59). Shell, pebbles and quartz are also known from Early Bronze Age grave contexts (see Chapter 7.4.), while several sequences of rock art ships are organized in relation to bands of quartz, which appear to represent the sea in these compositions (see Chapter 6.5.).

Early studies of caves and rock shelters focused mostly on questions related to settlement and economy (Brøgger 1908, Gjessing 1943; 1944), and explanations and methods followed the ideals of a Firstspace epistemology. Recently Ragnhild Todnem has challenged this functional episteme using theories related to a Secondspace epistemology, as she interprets caves and rock shelters mainly as burial places and rooms for cult (1999:110). Based on a Thirdspace epistemology such sites might be related to several categories simultaneously, not in contradiction to each other, but rather as complementary and explanatory ideas that are transformed into new spatial contexts and connections. In this way caves and rock shelters may be considered as something that integrates and incorporates elements from graves, rock art and hoard sites.

3.11. PASTORAL SETTLEMENT AND AGRICULTURE

Until the 1980s there was little knowledge about the pattern of Bronze Age settlement in Norway. Theories concerning settlement systems were mostly based on the distribution of graves and rock art sites (Bakka 1963, Møllerop 1963a, Myhre 1981). Especially burial monuments were taken as evidence for where the agrarian settlements might have been. Monuments were also sources for the idea of a stratified society with a dominant agrarian population in opposition to more mobile groups of hunters and fishermen. New investigations have contributed to a reinforcement of the agrarian domination, and its role in a core-periphery relation. The agrarian position is strengthened by the interdisciplinary research of the latest excavations where analyses of pollen and macrofossils have been used to demonstrate connections between houses and cultivated fields (Løken, Pilø and Hemdorff 1996, Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 1988; 2000, Løken 1998a; 1998b; 1998c; 1998d; 1999; 2001). Just as important for the obtained results is the applied theory and methods that were transferred from the Danish settlement discourse. This research has been more determined to trace Danish parallels than to focus on what might have been different.

So far the earliest long houses in Southwest Norway are found at Voll and Sorbo at Rennesøy. They are 10-14 meter long and 4,5-5,5 meter broad and are dated to the transition between the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Høgestøl 1995:131). Similar houses are uncovered at the neighboring island of Talgje (Hemdorff 1993), at Jåttå and Røyneberg in North Jæren (Hulth 1997), and Kvåle in Time (Børsheim et al. 2001). They are all two-aisled with a row of posts along the middle line of the house. Traces of barns have not been found, and they are interpreted as living quarters. Similar houses are known from most of South Scandinavia (Björhem and Säfvestad 1989:81-87). Microfossils of barley or wheat from layers in the houses at Kvåle, Voll, Sorbo and Talgje indicate that cereal growing was part of the economy (Soltvedt and Mydland 1995, Soltvedt 2000, Børsholm et al. 2001).

During period 2 the building custom changed in South Scandinavia and the northern parts of the Continent (Björhem and Säfvestad 1993, Nielsen 1999:161). Three-aisled houses with two parallel lines of roof-bearing posts became common, allowing the buildings to be made broader and longer (Komber 1998). Such houses from period 2 and onwards have recently been found also in Rogaland. The best examples come from Forsand in Ryfylke
where indications of 19-22 meter long and 7-8 meter broad buildings were uncovered (Løken 1998a), but also at Austbø at Hundvåg in Stavanger (Gjerland 1989, Juhl 2001a). Similar houses have only been identified at a few other sites in South Norway (Helliksen 1997:30-41, Berg 1997:22pp., Løken 1998b:178, 189). None of the Norwegian houses from the Early Bronze Age have produced evidence of barns with stables, which were common in Denmark from period 2-3 (Bech and Mikkelsen 1999:74, Nielsen 1999:161).

The houses at Rennesøy, Talgje and Austbø are all localized at the coastal areas of the Ryfylke islands, near shores and harbors. Rock art localities are found in the same area (N: Hundvåg, Åmøy, Bru, Mosterøy and Nedre Tasta), but not in the near vicinity of the house sites. The localization of the settlement at Forsand differs from the others as it was found at the meeting of two major fjords, Lysefjorden and Høgsfjorden, in a border landscape between fjords and valleys leading to the mountains. None of the houses excavated are closely related to burial mounds or rock art sites.

The earliest C-14 dates of cereal grains in West Norway are from the Late Neolithic Period (Nærøy 1994, Gundersen 1995, Indrelid 1997:83), and just as early are datings from Austbø at Hundvåg and Kvåle in Time on Jæren (Juhl 1999:10, Soltvedt 2000:13, Juhl 2001b:Table 1, Børslie et al. 2001). Microfossils of grains from the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age are found at settlements with longhouses, as well as in smaller huts and rock shelters. Most of these cereals are of simple types of barley (*Hordeum vulgare nudum*) or emmer (*Triticum dicoccum*), einkorn (*Triticum monococcum*) or spelt (*Triticum spelta*). During the Late Bronze Age more complex types of cereals became common, like hulled barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) (Bakkevig 1982; 1992; 1998:56, Soltvedt 1999:65-66; 2000:60). The use of new cereal types has been taken as evidence for a climatic change (Bakkevig 1998) or better manure fields (Pedersen and Widgren 1998:380).

The oldest field system found in Southwest Norway are dated to 2000 BC and are documented at Kvåle in Time (Juhl 1999:10; 2001b:Table 1). From the Early Bronze Age are cultivated layers investigated at Line in Time (Lillehammer 1994:88), Løbrekk in Strand in Ryfylke and Osterøy in Hordaland (Julshamn 1998:108). A fossil field system with furrows from the use of ard has been uncovered underneath a burial mound from period 2 at Støle in Etne (Myhre 1972; 1977). At several other places in West Norway there are recorded evidence for extensive cereal growing, while a more intensive cultivating technique with better practice for fertilizing became more common during the Late Bronze Age (Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 1988, Diinhoff 1997a; 1997b, Julshamn 1998:96,107, Løken 1998b:184, Valvik 1998:93pp., Åstveit 1998:117pp.). The earliest field fences are also from this later period (Juhl 1999:10; 2001:10-11).

At Forsand in Ryfylke it has been possible to follow the development of settlements from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Iron Age. In period 2-3 there were two settlements, while the number was enlarged to five in period 5-6 (Løken 1998a). As a part of this progression agrarian land of about 4,5 km were split up in smaller units, each of them used by a family based settlement (Løken 1998b:187). Instead of the Early Bronze Age longhouses the later periods was characterized by smaller constructions, divided into a living room and a barn with stables for the cattle (Løken 1998a:117). A similar development has been demonstrated in other parts of Rogaland and South Norway, leading to a larger number of settlements in the Late Bronze Age that were depended on a mixed farming of agriculture and husbandry (Pedersen 1990, Hjelle and Kaland 1994:17pp., Diinhoff 1997a; 1997b, Juhl 2001a:49; 2001b:22).

New investigations of deforestation and the development of heath vegetation in West Norway have shown that this change was not the result of climatic deterioration about 500 BC, but was brought about by farmer’s more intensive use of the landscape. Clearing of woodlands for pastures and fields, regular burning and cutting of heather, as well as winter grazing gradually led to a changing landscape (Kaland 1979:48-54). A recent analysis of 58
pollen diagrams from localities at Lista, Jæren and Karmøy shows that deforestation and the expansion of heath-lands was a continuous process from the Late Neolithic onwards. It has not been possible to trace any abrupt change in vegetation during the Early Bronze Age, but the major breach happened during the Late Bronze Age period 5 (900-700 BC) when open heathland was established at Jæren and in most costal areas of Southwest Norway (Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:36-41). On Karmøy and the islands in the Boknafjord basin evidence has been found for a gradual deforestation throughout the Late Neolithic Period and Early Bronze Age, and the heathland was fully established in Pre-Roman Iron Age, approximately 200 BC (ibid.:40).

The agricultural expansion in the lowlands is mirrored by an increasing use of highlands and mountain areas. Already in the Late Neolithic Period there are indications of intensive use of mountain valleys for pastures and hunting, but during the Bronze Age a larger number of settlement sites seems to be established, and traces of human activities become more visible (Hagen 1987). The extensive evidence from the rock shelters Ulshelleren in Roldal and Skrivarhelleren in Årdal has already been mentioned (Odner 1969, Prescott 1995a). On the mountain plateau of Hardangervidda a large number of small houses and huts have been excavated. Pollen analyses indicate extensive use of the pastures both on the open plateau and in the neighboring valleys (Hoeg 1989:407, Mikkelsen 1989:296-298, Indrelid 1994:232, 297, Moe 1996). In Skrivarhelleren pieces of bronze objects were also found and evidence of bronze casting (Prescott 1995a:96, 114-120). The intimate relations between the lowlands and the mountains are well documented by a number of hoard sites with bronze objects found along natural paths leading to the highlands, like for instance in Øvre Gausdal and Lom in Oppland, Rennebu and Oppdal in Sør-Trøndelag, Stryn and Gloppen in Sogn and Fjordane, as well as in Sokndal and Suldal in Rogaland (de Lange 1912b, Bjørn 1926; 1936, Hoigård Hofseth 1980, Johansen 1993:160-169, Jensen 1997:315-316, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:187-189).

3.12. FROM AGRARIAN SPATIALITY TO AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF MOBILITY

Spatial studies of Scandinavian Bronze Age have usually been based on settlement archaeology with an agrarian perspective. Such an approach is predominant also in works about Southwest Norway, where monuments, rock art and hoard sites mainly have been understood in relation to a permanent population of farmers (Fett and Fett 1941, Møllerop 1963a, Bakka 1972; 1993, Myhre 1981, Hagen 1983, Johansen 1986; 1993, Løken 1989a, Prescott 1995a). Human activity has been interpreted within an agrarian territoriality based on the axiom of a sedentary settlement structure. Within such a spatial concept the geographical distribution of monuments and rock art have been the localizing factors for reconstruction of settlement pattern and territories (Myhre 1981, Johansen 1986, see also Kristiansen 1987b, Larsson 1993).

This perspective has governed the questions asked and the methods used, and therefore being decisive for the selection of sites to be investigated, and for what have been looked for during excavations, as well as for the interpretation of sites, finds and landscapes. The foundation for such an agrarian approach has been spatial analogies derived from social models of Early Iron Age farm structure, or from a settlement pattern that is better documented in Denmark (Løken 1990; 1998a:188). This use of such analogies is characterized by a determination to seek similarity and evolutionistic continuity rather than to look for differences in time and space. Spatial research about monuments and rock art in Southwest Norway has therefore left behind "unexplored rooms" beyond a similarity that is known from other periods and places.

This form of archaeology has underestimated the importance of mobility. It has to a high degree been ruled out, despite the fact that most of the rock art images consist of ships, and
that many of the carvings and monuments are situated close to the coast, at straits or inlets to fjords, near natural harbors, as well as along waterways and paths documented from later periods. Instead, focus has been directed towards the economic and social meaning of farms, and the development of settlements, house constructions and technological details of buildings, agrarian activity and field systems, which have been compared with archaeological material from Denmark. This comparison has mainly been based on diffusion within the frame of a centre-periphery model. When mobility has been emphasized, it is usually connected to exchange of objects and resources between elite groups, in situations where the centres innovate and the peripheries imitate, where the former leads and the others were led (Kristiansen 1987b; 1991; 1998a, Prescott 1995a, Kristiansen and Rowlands 1998).

Such explanations are based on different variations of the world system model (Wallerstein 1974; 1980, Rowlands 1976; 1980; 1987, Friedman and Rowlands 1977, Ekholm and Friedman 1979, Hopkins and Wallerstein 1987). In general such a model emphasizes the economical and political dominance of core areas, while the development of peripheries is dependent on their secondary position in a system of exchange. Within this concept space is structured through diffusion, and time through evolution (e.g. Kristiansen 1998a:50-51, fig.18; 1998c). The world system model has been the basis for different archaeological variants of centre-periphery models, which have been applied on the study of Scandinavian Bronze Age (Rowlands, Larsen and Kristiansen 1987, Kristiansen 1999b, Kristiansen and Rowlands 1998, for broader geographical context see Champion 1989, Frank 1993, Frank and Gilles 1993, Sherratt 1987; 1993; 1994, Barrett 1998). In Nordic archaeology, agrarian evolution has been a structuring factor for social stratification and spatial position within a centre-periphery hierarchy (Kristiansen 1987a; Kristiansen 1998a, Prescott 1995a).

What is missing in the study of Southwest Norwegian Bronze Age is a critical approach beyond "Peripherism", "Agriculturalism", and the double illusion of diffusion and evolution, which has determined the understanding of the production of space. Such a study necessitates new questions, which go beyond an agrarian spatiality and the duality that is created between centres and peripheries. A new perspective is needed, in which spatiality, temporality and society are more than subjects connected to agriculture and the time cycle and movements connected to this subsistence. Richard Bradley expresses a similar intention for his study of rock art within the Atlantic Bronze Age when he draws attention to two relations that might be of relevance for the investigation of Early Bronze Age in Rogaland (Bradley 1997). First, the importance of agriculture is often assumed more than proved. It has been sufficient to identify one or a few domesticated resources to postulate a permanent settlement based on agriculture (ibid.:6). Therefore there is only a limited room for mobility when agriculture once has been demonstrated. Second, this approach overlooks the fundamental observation that in many regions permanent settlement has not been documented before after 1000 BC (for further critique see Rowley-Conway 1995). Until then the most significant prehistoric features in the landscape are burial monuments and rock art. Traditional landscape archaeology may therefore be challenged by what Bradley calls the "archaeology of mobility" without excluding agriculture and husbandry (1997:6).

Instead of regarding monuments and rock art as central places of an agrarian settlement, I will rather consider them as sites that signal mobility and communication, not only in the landscape, but also from a seascape perspective. Tim Ingold makes an interesting distinction in his analysis of interaction between hunter-gatherers and permanent settled farmers, and their different attitudes to landscapes and territoriality (1986). He finds that mobile groups are related to the landscape through "sites and paths" (ibid.:153). Their territories are considered in terms of trails running through the landscapes, and views across it, in contrast to agrarian societies that see the landscapes through field systems, fences, and boundaries (ibid.:153). Ingold proposes that such a practice can function through "advertisement". This type of information is mediated through what he considers as "langue of signs", written in
the landscape in form of material culture (ibid.:46-47). Such “advertisement” might be seen as “messages” in places where groups of people with different forms of life come together.

Thereby monuments and rock art may be seen as expressions of a complex situation of communication in forms of “advertisement” and “messages”. They may mediate something, which is both common and different for people living within the same area, and at the same time refer to material and ideas beyond what is seen. They represent something real, but also something imaginary, beyond the place where they are found. The archaeological sources from Southwest Norway represent several hybrid elements, expressed through landscapes, forms for settlements, burial customs and rock art, indicating a complex and composite economy and custom of life.

Mobility in the Mesolithic and Neolithic Periods has been much studied in Norway. Seasonal hunting expeditions from the coastal areas to the inland were common, and when pasturalism became a major part of the economy the cattle was brought to the lush pastures of the mountain valleys in the summer season. This form of mobility continued also during the Bronze Age, as indicated by settlements and rock shelters (Mikkelsen 1989, Indrelid 1994, Prescott 1995a, 1995b). During the Late Neolithic trade in flint and flint objects between Denmark and southern Norway is well documented, and the intensive maritime traffic across the Skagerrak continued in the Bronze Age.

Burial mounds and rock art from this period have, however, always been connected to a settled agrarian population. It is the aim of this thesis to study the role of these monuments for travels across sea and land according to the theoretical approach that is outlined above. This new theory will be a challenge, not only for this work, but for archaeology in general.
CHAPTER 4.
Landscape and seascape in Southwest Norway

When mist forms over the firth
It slows the gulls that drift around the quay
To something like a standstill
- only the barest
wing beat troubles the air, the pearl and grey
of light becoming flesh, then vanishing.

From «Of gravity and light», in *The Light Trap* by John Burnside (2002:34)

4.1. THE LIGHT

Light, topography, vegetation, and water influence the perception of landscapes, and the way monuments are visualized and related to each other. The aim of this chapter is to outline ideas on how these elements may have contributed to the monumental forming of landscapes, and the constitution of relation between places. Among the discussed elements the light has a primary position since it gives the surroundings its basic atmosphere, while topography and vegetation express something more concrete. Even more real are materials like rock, sand, and water. Grave monuments and rock art sites might be seen as meeting points for such elements or hybrid entities that present nature as a place. With this position they become participating and explaining factors for the landscape they are part of.

To travel from the open, agrarian space of Jutland to West Norway, is to move from an entirety to processes of fragmentation where forms are broken up without beginnings and ends. It is like entering the second day of creation when everything is about to take place. Here the major morphology of the southern landscapes come to an end. Even if some of the features and forms appear at Lista, Jæren and Karmøy, they are not present further north. When things do not represent themselves as limited entities, but are expressed through incompleteness, we are finding ourselves in a landscape that can be characterized as anti-

---

Fig. 4.1.1.
Light forms the landscape and creates a special atmosphere
(Photo: O. Hvoslef, Dreyer Bok)
Then it is not the «eidos» of things that is of importance, but the wickerwork of relations between human and nonhuman properties. Among the Nordic countries the anti-classic forms are most significant in Norway, especially the western part where mountains disintegrate into cliffs and fjords towards an exposed archipelago and the open sea. Here the landscape does not consist of clearly delimited masses but are dissolved in fragments and repetitions.

Christian Norberg-Schultz discusses what the relationship between light and landscape means for the manifestation of things. He argues that the interplay between these factors is of another character in the Nordic countries than within the classic concept of landscape created from Euclid’s geometry (1993). In the North the sun is never in zenith, so the light reaches objects at an angle, from where it breaks up their forms through a play of light and shadows (Norberg-Schultz 1993:11). This does not mean that light creates things, but it influences the way they are visualized and exposed. In the sunny rooms of the south each object becomes individual, and substantiated with a separate form and distinct character (ibid.:47). For Plato the essence of things were their appearance or the «eidos». Things as independent bodies are also eminent in the classic figurative art, where objects in principle are individually placed. Then a visible whole is created and each object becomes a centre of its own. In contrast to the unfinished and changeable Nordic landscape, the classic space is a defined room, with plastic forms and distinct shapes.

This does not mean that the landscapes of West Norway have no forms, but they seldom appear as bounded and rounded entities. Lines, however, are the predominant features, not as uniting elements, but as linear arrangements of places without clear connections. Then the landscape becomes an undefined variety without distinct borders and obvious geometric forms. The horizontal extension is characterized by topologic continuity more than a classic axial form. This creates fragmented features instead of order, and places become indistinct or something that cannot be clearly bounded. Instead they exist within a network of relations and references. Within such a landscape monuments and rock art sites are places that participate in, represent, and explain the relations they are integrated in. Then the landscape does not present monuments and rock art, but reacts on them, takes part in them, and makes them interpretable. (For a discussion on landscape, spatiality and an archaeology of mobility, see 3.12 and Chapter 8).

Within such an «unfinished» landscape clearly defined spatial categories like culture groups are of little relevance. The same might be said about boundaries expressed through distribution maps, poly-
gons or other methods that seek to separate distinct categories. They get their legitimacy from a Firstspace epistemology that bases its spatial logic on measurable and separate entities. In this way the objects are ascribed as «eidos» according to Euklid's terminology and the classic concept of landscape. Within this episteme, relations will be of no scientific value, since they are not empirically provable, only expressed through associations and visual communication. Different from associative and relational landscape studies, a Firstspace epistemology will de-contextualize objects to the advantage of general spatial systems that seek connections between measurable relations. Since boundaries do not exist without openings and connections a fragmented and hybrid landscape cannot be reduced to one unit. In this a landscape objects do not appear as independent bodies, but as things that open themselves towards the world, simultaneously as they incorporate it.

**Fig. 4.1.4.**
It is not the «eidos» of things that gives the landscape of western Norway its character, but the wickerwork of relations between human and nonhuman elements. From Byberg at Jæren. Tormodsvarden, which is a cairn from the Bronze Age, is seen in the distance (Photo: E. Egeland, Dreyer Bok)

**Fig. 4.1.5.**
In western Norway the landscape does not consist of clearly delimited masses, but is dissolved in fragments and repetitions. From Brekkeheia in Rogaland (Photo: P. F. Pallesen, Dreyer Bok)
Fig. 4.1.6. Lines are the predominant features of the landscapes of Rogaland. From the milieu around the lake Orrevannet (Photo: U. Bergsgaard, Dreyer Bok)

Fig. 4.1.7. The straight coastline strengthens the linear grammar of the landscape of Rogaland (Photo: O. Hvoslef, Dreyer Bok)

Fig. 4.1.8. The landscapes of Rogaland are rather characterized by topological continuity than axial forms. From Orresanden towards the reef of Jøren (Photo: P. F. Pullesen, Dreyer Bok)
4.2. THE LAND

Karmøy is the northernmost region in the research area. It belongs to a narrow strip of lowland between the sea and the mountainous inland, the so-called «strandflat», which is a geomorphologic feature along the coast between Jæren and Troms (Larsen and Holtedahl 1985). There is a distinct difference in the Caledonian bedrock of Karmøy, which divides the northeast and southwest parts of the island. The metamorphic lavas and phyllite in the northeast produce a fertile soil (Menuge et al. 1989, Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:9). Most of the grave monuments from the Bronze Age are registered within this area (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a). In the southwest of Karmøy the granitic bedrock gives a more acid soil of low fertility, which is reflected in the poor vegetation (Lundberg 1998). Except from some scat-

Fig. 4.2.1. The Bronze Age cairn Kongshaugen is situated on one of the most exposed nodes along the waterway of Karmsundet, near the lighthouse at Høyeværde (Photo: AmS)
tered barrows, only few sites and objects from the Bronze Age have been recorded in this part of the island.

The islands between Karmøy and the mainland of Jæren are made of soft phyllite, metabasalt and thrustened Precambrian rock of different compositions (Prøsch-Daniel-ensen and Simonsen 2000:9). These islands make an archipelago that reach from the outer coast to a widespread system of fjords, creating lines of communication that combine the sea with the valleys and the mountains. Some of the largest rock art sites are situated on these islands (Bru, Åmøy, Mosterøy, Hundvåg), and at exposed nodes and meeting points at the inlets to the fjords (Tasta, Nag). The northern part of Jæren, is topographically and geologically similar to those islands, while the rest of Jæren, is almost completely covered by thick Quaternary deposits (Sejrup et al. 1998, Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:9). In the north, outcrops of phyllite create rocky hills between fjords, sounds and bays, in contrast to the wide landscape of South Jæren. The rock art sites are mainly registered in this northern area (Revheim, Aubeberget, Sunde, Harestad, Rudlo), while burial monuments are documented along the whole coast of Jæren.

South Jæren is a sediment-dominated rim of lowland between the sea and the highlands, exposed to the North Sea without protecting skerries and islands. In contrast to the rest of West Norway, South Jæren is almost completely covered with thick glacial deposits, of a thickness up to 130 m (Sejrup et al. 1998, Prœsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:9). The general stratification of the glacial deposits is characterized by shifting series of glaciofluvial deposits, glaciomarine clays and diamicton (Semb 1978, Andersen et al. 1987). A late Weichselian erosion has exposed these series in a mosaic pattern resulting in a subsoil with diverse fertilities (Semb 1962). The deposits consist of sand, gravel and clay, and the landscape is ordered into areas of low moraine hills, sandy plains, lakes and large areas of wetland (Semb 1978). The Jæren landscape repeatedly experienced marine
transgressions and regressions, and the shape of the coastline has shifted several times (Thomsen 1982a; 1982b, Bird and Klemdal 1986). Many of the lakes near the coast were parts of fjords and bays before they were dammed up by beach ridges after 6-5000 BP (Proesch-Danielsen 1995; 1996; 1997). Several of the grave monuments from the Bronze Age are situated on these ridges between the sea and the coastal lakes.

The landscape of islands and fjords in the north opens up for a wider space in the south, where intimacy is replaced by endlessness and the unfinished. This difference must have been even more obvious before the period of intensive cultivation in the second part of the 19th century. The landscape was then characterized by a number of boulders left by the glacier after its final retreat. Today most of the stones are cleared and used in the many stone fences that make the modern lines of the landscape. Many of the removed boulders might have been decorated with rock carvings or cup marks. This has to be taken into account when the question of representation is considered.

4.3. DEFORESTATION AND HEATHLAND

Recent pollen analyses at Lista, Jæren and Karmøy show that the deforestation and expansion of heath-land was the result of a process that began in the Early Neolithic Period and was completed in Montelius’ period 5 (900-700 BC) (Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:36-41, see also Hoeg 1999). After the deforestation heath was the dominant feature for several millennia in the landscapes bordering the North Sea (Hjeltines 1997). New investigations have shown that this change of vegetation was not a result of climatic deterioration as earlier assumed, but was brought about by farmers’ more intensive use of the landscape. Clearing of woodlands for pastures and fields, regular burning, cutting of heather, and winter grazing gradually led to the open landscape (Kaland 1979:48-54; 1986).

This is the conclusion of pollen analyses from 58 sites in Southwest Norway (Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000). «Region A» of the investigation, which is represented by 19 localities, includes Karmøy, the Boknafjord area, and the Stavanger peninsula (ibid.:11). The palynological signals from these sites have a local or an extra-local significance as defined by Jacobson and Bradshaw (1981). In region B 18 sites are investigated, mainly from the lowland of Jæren. This region is considered to have the best distribution of local, extra-local and regional pollen diagrams (ibid.:11).

Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen’s results show a gradual development of deforestation, with some pronounced periods of clearance that can be summarized as followed:

![Distribution of till and Quaternary deposits (marked grey). The eastern limit of the southwestern coastal heath section and the division into four regions are shown (From Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000)](image-url)
Phase 1 from 4000-3600 cal BC (The Mesolithic/Early Neolithic transition). During this period, the first indication of deforestation is recorded at 35% of the sites.

Phase 2 from 2500-2200 cal BC (The Middle Neolithic II/ and Early Late Neolithic transition). During this period, early deforestation is recorded at approximately 60% of the sites.

Phase 3 from 1900-1400 cal BC (The Late Neolithic to the Bronze Age period 2). During this period, the process of deforestation had begun at around 80% of the sites.

It was also possible to separate a fourth phase around 800 cal BC (Late Bronze Age period 5) and a fifth around 400 cal BC (Early Pre-Roman Iron Age).

In region B the deforestation and development of heath-land was a more or less continuous process, with distinct stages during phases 1 and 2 (ibid.:23,41). Early heath establishment can also be seen in region A, but the deforestation was more scattered in time, and the process continued until the Early Iron Age when the heath-land was fully established (ibid.:40,41). This is a similar vegetation development as in Denmark and Sweden where it has been connected to the introduction of agriculture (For Denmark see Hedeager and Kristiansen 1989, Odgaard 1994, for Sweden see Berglund et al. 1991, Olausson 1993a; 1993b, Welinder 1998).

Phase 2 of the deforestation process took place during the same period as major changes are documented in the archaeological material. The bifacial flint technology was introduced and new forms of weapons and tools appeared in most parts of West Norway. A large number of objects like daggers, sickles and arrowheads are found in Rogaland. This happened simultaneously with the introduction of an agro-pastoral economy (Prescott 1995a; 1996).

The analysis also shows a considerable impact on forest vegetation in phase 3 (1900-1400 cal BC), which corresponds with the second half of the Late Neolithic to the Bronze Age period 2 (ibid.:41). The earliest grave monuments in Southwest Norway are dated to Montelius period 2 (see Chapter 7.1.). They were mainly built on the moraine hills of the middle part of Jæren (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:120). None of the monuments at Karmøy are so far dated to period 2, but they seem to have been established in early period 3 (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:137). This means that the first grave monuments of Southwest Norway were built in a partly opened and cleared landscape. Irrespective of typological system (Fett and Fett 1941, Malmer 1981, Kaul 1995), many rock art localities can also be dated back to period 2. This is of major importance when relations between grave monuments, rock art and landscape shall be analysed.

A large number of radiocarbon dates of post-holes and hearths at the settlement site of Forsandmoen in Ryfylke show that the first houses were built during period 2, while a major expansion took place in the Late Bronze Age period 5-6 when the open heath-land had been completely established (Løken 1998c). Therefore the settlement activity at Forsand, as well as on Jæren, occurred during the same phases as the deforestation process. Contemporaneously with the settlement expansion in the coastal regions the alpine and sub-alpine areas were also more intensively used. For a visual analysis of grave monuments and rock art sites it is important to notice that the landscape was mainly open and deforested.

4.4. THE SEA

It is difficult to imagine Rogaland without the sea. The sea is everywhere present. It surrounds, binds and divides – produces sounds and smells. Southwest Norway is a water-landscape where the sea acts in an inter-play with fjords, rivers and lakes, as well as the bogs and wetlands that covered large areas. Within this seascape water is a central element both for the localizing and the articulation of monuments and rock art. Their maritime settings and the importance of ships, both as motifs on rock art and as stone constructions in grave monuments indicate a strong relation with water. This connection does not only express the
importance of sailing, but also a social and cosmological order where travels in life as well as in death are voiced. Thus both the real and the imaginary aspects of travel are important for the monumental organization of the landscape. To extend the connection between real and imagined travels, and their meaning for the monumental production of space, it might be useful to elucidate some central assumptions for a maritime realisation in these areas.


The North Sea and Skagerrak are demanding waters with dangerous waves and strong currents (Oi 1987). Based on knowledge collected from recent shipwrecks, especially exposed places have been mapped along the coast of Norway. Out of 24 dangerous areas, 6 were registered between Karmøy and Lista. The reason while these places are dangerous is not only the shallow waters, but the difficult currents and waves created by the energy released when the Norwegian Coast Current and the North Atlantic Current meet a complex submarine topography (Oi 1987:36). These conditions presuppose navigation in a visible as well as an invisible seascape, which has both real and imaginary references. The ship can be seen as a meeting point between an open surface and what is to be found below. The depth of the water has been considered a metaphor of time depth (Bachelard 1982:51), while the surface of the ocean might be seen as an expression of space. In such a way the ship becomes a place were time and space are united.

The dominating currents near the coast of Southwest Norway carry waters of different kinds. The water brought from the Atlantic has a salinity higher than 35 thousandth, in contrast to the low content of salt in the coastal waters (Kvalø 2000:46). The Norwegian Coast Current is bringing a mixture of the brackish water from the Baltic Sea and the Jutish straits, which meet the local fresh water at the coast of Southwest Norway. The interrelation-ship between these different currents is dominating the coast from Skagerrak to Finnmark, and creates particular difficult sailing conditions off Southwest Norway (Oi 1987:35).

The speed of the currents is strongly affected by the conditions in the Skagerrak, which functions as a pressure basin where large quantities of energy are periodically accumulated. When a strong wind is blowing, a surface current creates difficult wave conditions near the coast (Kvalø 2000:47). With wind from west-southwest, water will be concentrated at the inner part of the Skagerrak, preventing the flow of coastal currents. When the force of the wind diminishes, or is turning east, the water will flow westwards with a great speed (Ording 1993:13). After such an «eruption» coastal currents with the strength of 3-4 knots has been measured (Oi 1987:35). This phenomenon might also create malstroms with a speed of 2-3 knots from the surface to a depth of 75 meter. The tide, however, is of less importance in these waters. The difference between high and low tide is only 0,3-0,4 meter, and the tidal flow is normally less than 0,5 knot (Oi 1987:35).

The open and exposed coastline west of Karmøy has made the narrow sound of Karmsundet important by being a protected sailing route with good harbours. This might be one reason why so many monuments were build along the northwest part of the sound from the Early Bronze Age to the Viking Period (Hernæs 1997, Opedal 1998, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a). Some of the coastal areas between Karmøy and Jæren are also exposed to the North Sea, and extremely difficult current conditions are caused by a major flow of water coming
from the deep Ryfylke fjords. There is, however, an archipelago of islands that offers protection and natural harbours. These islands represent the largest density of rock art in Rogaland, while only a limited number of grave monuments has been found.

The coastline is naked and inhospitable west of Jæren, but there are four areas with sheltered harbours, where a concentration of monuments and rock art sites are recorded. In the north, near the mouth of Hafrsfjord, are the central areas of Revheim, Madla, Sunde. Further to the south there were protected bays near Ølbør, Vigdel and Rege, and along the lower watercourse of Sele-Byberg-Skasvannet. South of the reef of Jæren (Jærens Rev), the lagoon of Orrevatnet could be reached via a short, navigable river (Thomsen 1982a; 1982b). There are few natural harbours from the reef of Jæren to the island of Eigerøy. The waters are generally shallow, open for all wind directions, and the currents and waves make it difficult to pass. Even with a breezy wind it can be unpleasant to cross the sea outside Jæren in a small boat. The seasonal variability of the sea, currents and wind will therefore be important factors for the study of maritime travels in the Bronze Age.

4.5. THE VOYAGE

Until now maritime realisation has mainly been discussed in relation to ideological and economic aspects of exchange and establishment of alliances (Randsborg 1993a, Earle 1997, Kristiansen 1998a, Kvale 2000). The meaning of sea faring has been connected to a social elite and its constituting of power within the framework of a re-distributive chiefdom model. Thus the act of travelling becomes a kind of individual self-realisation that only indirectly will affect the general spatial practice. This idea might be acceptable if only the few monumental burials are taken into consideration. It is, however, less relevant if seen in relation to the collective idea that is communicated through the identical and homogeneous depictions of crew members on rock art ships, the equality of the rock art, and the maritime grammar of the landscape, which is independent of social ranking. Travels by boat across sea had also the potential to create a special social connection between those who sailed together, and to acquire the common experience that was necessary for surviving during such dangerous voyages. It is the meaning of travelling in relation to such a spatial order that will be given priority in this thesis (see Chapter 6-7).

Within a Firstspace epistemology space has been ascribed an independent ontological status as a geometrical dimension, a limited surface or volume. Thereby space becomes a neutral background for movements of time and people. From a Secondspace position Christopher Tilley has argued that space is ontologically constructed through people’s practice and experience (1994). Space then exists on people’s own conditions. This is explained through a «socio-spatial dialectic». But if space only exists as a social construction, how is it possible that space can act as an independent element in a dialectic process without being reduced to a predetermined social category?

Within a Thirdspace epistemology travels will be seen as a position where the ontological status of space can be changed. To travel creates a shifting spatial experience, where temporality and distance get different meanings. To travel is to move between separation and renewal, between the known and the unknown. It is to be in a state of «beyond» that is reinforced by the challenges a maritime realisation implies. Travels might be seen as a non-place – a place for the undone and, therefore, the uncertain. It can be a place of crises, but also of movements into new rooms and out of established identities, not primarily as a change in time, but as movements in space. The ship is in itself a non-place or a meeting point between a submarine power and a visible topography, between a temporary depth and a spatial distribution, which is limited and indefinite at one and the same time. Thus the ship becomes a place where time and space come together. Seen in this way the ship is not an object «in» space, but a place in itself.
CHAPTER 5.
Monumental milieu in Rogaland

5.1. SEEING THINGS – THINKING SPACE

Rogaland lies between the sea and the mountains – sheltered and fertile, but also scanty and naked. The North Sea to the west, full of dangers, but also a challenge to travellers and those seeking contact. To the east, highlands and mountains tower grey against the skyline, unsafe like the ocean. Beyond the horizon to the south, Lista stretches out its land, bordering to Jutland and seeking Europe. Here, between limitations and possibilities, Rogaland is situated, with a face towards the sea and a doorway to the highlands beyond. Rogaland covers 9000 square kilometres and is Norway in miniature, including both protected and open coastlines, wide, fertile plains, deep, long fjords, valleys, lakes and high mountains. In many ways, Rogaland may be seen as a meeting point between the open, agrarian landscape of Denmark and the fjords and coastland of west Norway. These are the topographical conditions for dividing Rogaland into three regions: Dalane, Jæren and Ryfylke with the Boknafjord basin (see Fig. 1.1.3. and 4.3.1.).

Dalane differs greatly from Jæren, since it is a mountainous area dominated by rocks poor in plant nutrients and phosphate (Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:9). Superficial deposits are rare and thin, and are usually found on valley floors like Sokndal, where most rock art has been found at sites overlooking the River Sokna. Grave monuments and stray finds from the Bronze Age are mainly found on coastal terraces near the mouth of the River Tengs north of Egersund, but also on the island of Eigerøy where drumlins and glacial sediments form the basis for open, fertile land. With its natural harbours on an otherwise open, rough coast, the island is a maritime link between Lista and Jæren.

In contrast to the rocky landscape of Dalane, southern Jæren is covered by thick Quaternary sediments. Here the lines in the landscape are not created by topographical contrasts, but by the changing stratigraphy of the sea, the sky and the horizon. The impression of a linear layout is made stronger by the exposed coastline, which at some places is broken by cliffs carved out of the Lista moraine. Even though these landscape elements characterize the forms, the light and the atmosphere of the northern coast of Jæren, they are complemented here by a fragmented, broken, small-scale topography.

Unlike the flat land of the south, northern Jæren is covered by a thin layer of sediments interspersed by low hills and rocky outcrops. Together with the scattered moraines, this creates a hilly landscape, divided by fjords, lakes and islands. Northern Jæren includes the parishes of Sola and Madla and the area around Hafsfjord, from where the Stavanger peninsula reaches northwards towards Randaberg (see 5.10. and 5.11.). To the south, the Klepp district may be seen as a transitional area, but both topographically and archaeologically it is natural to include it in this region.

The same can be said about the islands in the Boknafjord basin in the western part of Ryfylke, where the major concentration of rock art sites has been recorded on Åmøy, and smaller localities are found on Bru, Mosterøy and Hundvåg (see 5.13.). Rock art is also known on the southern shores of Boknafjord, which leads towards the extensive fjord system of inner Ryfylke. Northern Jæren and the Boknafjord basin therefore have a good potential for studying spatial relations between landscape forms, rock art and grave monuments, and, together with Klepp, this will be the main area for investigation. Even though there are few examples of carvings on solid rock in Klepp, the largest number of decorated grave slabs have been recorded here (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:146-151, Syvertsen 2002:159).
Topography and monumental integration

The landscape of northern Jæren is mainly characterized by drumlins and long ridges of moraine (Birkeland and Jorde 1978, Thomsen 1988). To emphasize monumentality, visibility and a linear structure, such elevations have been preferred places for raising barrows. This is particularly well expressed by the linear cemeteries on the low ridges at Kleppe/Braut, Særheim/Anda and Rege (see 5.3., 5.4., 5.8.). Another distinct feature that has a similar linear appearance are the many strandlines. These former beach ridges may be divided into two groups, the late glacial strandlines found about 24 m above present sea level, and the postglacial Tapes terraces formed in Atlantic time and situated around 9-11 m above present sea level (Fægri 1940, Prøsch-Danielsen 2002). Especially in the area around the Revheim bog and the rock art site at Fluberget, strandlines help to create a framed landscape room and accentuate the monumentality of the grave monuments relative to the sea and the shoreline. The same can be said about the barrows at Sunde, whose location on such terraces makes them visible from the entrance to Hafsfjord (see 5.10.).

The study of strandlines and transgressions in Jæren started early last century (Øyen 1903, Reusch 1907, Bjørlykke 1908), but a systematic chronological system was not established before 1940 (Fægri 1940), and the absolute chronology based on C-14 dates is from the last 30 years (Simonsen 1972, Anundsen 1985, Prøsch-Danielsen 1993, Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000). The most recent investigation shows that the sea level in northern Jæren was about 7 m above the present level in the Late Neolithic or the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. This is partly based on a single C-14 date from Hålandsvannet 2 and partly on local analyses related to the rock art sites at Fluberget, Aubeberget, Tasta and Bru (Prøsch-Danielsen pers. com.), but it agrees with a regional pattern found for the rest of Jæren (Thomsen 1982a; 1982b), the islands in the Boknafjord basin (Prøsch-Danielsen 1993:48) and Karmøy (Thomsen 1988, Prøsch-Danielsen 1993:48). From about 1700 BC, the shore displacement curve becomes less steep, and between 1530 and 1130 BC the sea level was 4-5 m higher than today (Prøsch-Danielsen pers. com.). In the Early Bronze Age the shoreline was therefore different from today, with some good harbours at the otherwise open coast. (For documentation and further discussion see 6.10.).

An archipelago begins at the entrance to the Boknafjord basin, and several of the small islands have the shape of grave monuments situated on open water; some give associations to upturned boats. Such islets can be seen from the rock art sites at Åmøy, Bru, Tasta and Nag. A continuous system of islands of different shapes and sizes spread from the outer coast towards the many fjords in Ryfylke. They should not be considered as isolated, topographical units, but as places that have facilitated contact and communication, mostly by sea. The sea has been decisive for travels along the fjords in Ryfylke, where narrow valleys and mountains make other forms of communication difficult. Such physical conditions made travelling by sea more important than over land.

Rock art and grave monuments are mainly found on the outer islands, forming a gateway and framing the fairways to the fjords beyond. Compared with Jæren, Ryfylke has few monuments, rock art sites or stray finds. Characteristic for the known grave monuments is their transitional position between different types of landscapes, or at places where fjords meet, as for instance the linear arrangement of cairns at Hebnes in Suldal (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:123-124). Without exception, they are placed near fjords, or overlook lakes and lines of communication. Most monuments in Ryfylke are in areas with Cambro-Silurian bedrock, where moraines and strandlines provide a fertile milieu in a landscape otherwise dominated by mountains and water. So far, little figurative rock art has been found, but scattered sites with cupmarks have been recorded in these maritime surroundings (see Fig. 1.1.3.).

The open coast of Jæren and the mountainous parts of Ryfylke meet in the landscape of Karmøy. Even though the island of Karmøy is wide and open, the mountains are close by and completely dominate the landscape north of Karmusund. The topography and vegetation of
Karmøy vary in keeping with the diversity of the Caledonian bedrock (Menuge et al. 1989). In the northeast, the bedrock consists of phyllite and metamorphosed lava that produce rich soil, whereas granite in the southwest gives more acid, less fertile soil (Lundberg 1989). The southern part of Karmøy has only a few scattered Bronze Age monuments, but many more are found in the northeast of the island where a number of barrows have been placed on a prominent area of high ground offering a wide view over Karmsund. Unlike the location of these barrows, cairns are placed on the strandlines lining this strait. The only figurative rock art site found on Karmøy is on a sloping surface facing the sea on the west side of the island (see 5.15.).

**Rock art – research – motifs – landscapes**

The engravings in Rogaland are concentrated on the Stavanger peninsula, the outer islands in the Boknafjord basin, and the central part of the moraine plain of Jæren. Otherwise, isolated sites are known from the Sokndal-Egersund area, the Haugesund-Karmøy district and the fjords of Ryfylke (see Fig. 1.1.3., 1.1.4., 1.1.5. and 3.4.1.).

Both barrows and rock art have traditionally been linked with an agrarian economy and cosmology. For that reason, rock carvings have been embellished with the term «agrarian rock art». Seen from a macro-perspective, and in relation to the general agrarian conditions in Norway, Jæren, Karmøy and the islands in Boknafjord have good potential for agriculture, and early agrarian settlement has been documented there. However, a different impression is gained when the location and context of the rock art sites are considered on a micro-level. It is then found that most of the 150 rock art sites recorded in Rogaland are in marginal agrarian areas. With few exceptions, they are located on sloping rock surfaces, facing open coastlines or sheltered fjord basins, rivers, bogs and wetlands. From such a perspective, the term «agrarian carvings» is misleading (see Chapter 6).

Rock art in Rogaland has been known since the 1860s when the first engravings were reported from the island of Bru (Nicolaysen 1867:67). A diagram showing when new rock art localities were found during the period between 1865 and 1995 indicates a similar increase in numbers per decade over the years, but with a specially high frequency of finds in the 1930s (Bang-Andersen 1999:2, Fig. 2). The reason for this is mainly the pioneer work done by Eva and Per Fett, and their systematic mapping of rock art in Rogaland and Lista (Fett and Fett 1941). Since then, new research on rock art has not been given priority. Exceptions are a few unpublished MA theses (Johnsen 1974, Sør-Reime 1982, Johnsen 1982, Vinsrygg 1982), publications written for a wider public (Sør-Reime 1987), and short articles related to the discovery of new localities (Møllerop 1949, Skjølsvold 1960, Myhre 1964, Bang-Andersen 1992). Several recent papers discuss problems related with the conservation of rock art, as part of a national plan for its preservation (Bang-Andersen 1999, Hogestol et al. 1999). Until now, there has been no systematic analysis of the relationship between grave monuments, rock art and landscape.

Of the 150 localities known from Rogaland, 110 (73%) concern carvings on bedrock or boulders and the remaining 40 (27%) are grave slabs or flagstones, some of which may originally have been split from solid rock (Bang-Andersen 1999:3). Only one rock painting has so far been discovered, under an overhanging cliff that falls steeply into a narrow sound, Rennarsund, in the lake district southeast of Stavanger (Bang-Andersen 1992). Because of its topographical location and style, and the motifs of elk, red deer and roe deer, the red ochre-stained panel is interpreted as belonging to a hunter-gatherer tradition. Based on the existing typology, this tradition is dated in Scandinavia to the Neolithic or late Mesolithic Period. Such a chronology is also based on the evolutionistic view that, since agriculture was not well established before the Late Neolithic, hunters’ motifs should be older.

Based on their motifs, the engravings may, in general terms, be divided into four groups. The first is dominated by ships or boats, but footprints, hands, circles and other figurative depictions are also found. It is important to note that depictions of individual humans, ani-
mals and wagons rarely occur. Human and animal figures are only known from three sites, Dysjaland (Møllerop 1949), Hedland (Myhre 1964) and Åmøy (Fett and Fett 1941). An animal figure is also found on a slab from Ølberg. At Dysjaland and Åmøy, the human figures are few and sketchy, with no erotic elements like phallic men, female body parts or copulations (see 5.7., 5.13.). In this respect, the images found in Rogaland differ from the sexual prowess common at a number of contemporary sites in Bohuslän (Sweden), eastern Oslofjord and around Trondheimfjord. Human beings at sites in Rogaland are mainly seen as crew members on ships.

The second group comprises only cupmarks and makes up 50% of all the rock art sites in Rogaland. The size of the cupmarks differs from 2-20 cm and the depth from 1-5 cm. They often occur on boulders or outcrops, which are found throughout the entire distribution area. However, concentrations occur in the central and inner parts of the Boknafjord basin and in outer Ryfylke, where cupmarks are the only examples of rock art. Many cupmark sites are known from near concentrations of barrows, as at Rege, Kleppe and Braut (see 5.4. and 5.8.).

A third group consists of panels where a combination of line figures and cupmarks is found. It is normally impossible to decide whether these mixed engravings are contemporary and integrated – or represent temporally and socially different events. Distinct and general patterns are also difficult to see. There is, however, a tendency for cupmarks to be placed on the upper and lower levels of panels. They are concentrated on the Stavanger peninsula and the southernmost islands in the Boknafjord basin. Most localities are found on Åmøy, where more than 1150 carvings and cupmarks have been described from a 1.5 km length of shore (Fett and Fett 1941). They account for 1/3 of all the rock art figures in Rogaland, and the ship is everywhere the dominating image (see 5.13.).

The fourth group consists of decorated grave slabs, which have been found in 35 barrows or cairns (Syvertsen 2002:158). Most of them come from graves dated to the Bronze Age, but some slabs with cupmarks belong to Iron Age graves (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:146-151). In addition 40 decorated slabs have no recorded context, but the reports dealing with them indicate that many were found near grave monuments from the Bronze Age, or at locations where barrows from this period once stood. The number of decorated slabs found in Rogaland is higher than anywhere else in Norway where only 25 have been found (Syvertsen 2002:158).

The geographical distribution of decorated slabs in Rogaland shows a major concentration on the central part of the Jæren plain, mainly in Klepp and northwards to the Stavanger peninsula (see Fig. 3.4.1.). Most of the slabs are decorated with cupmarks, but also with other motifs known from open localities, especially circles and footprints, as well as a limited number of ships. The decorated slabs are alone in having abstract patterns with no specific functional references, but with associations to the sea, the sky and the horizon. Images like waves and ships may also be seen. The slabs are placed in different positions in the inner part of the monuments. Most of them were constructional elements in cists; either end slabs, side slabs or capstones. Their decorations tend to face into the cists. Otherwise, decorated slabs or boulders are found in kerbs round cairns or barrows, or as part of small circles built of slabs.

Objects and monuments

Grave monuments from the Bronze Age in Rogaland aroused an interest among early antiquarians (de Fine 1745). Except for a few who attempted to seriously record and map the mounds (Christie 1842b, Kraft 1830), most were driven by systematic treasure hunting, using the size of the monument to indicate what objects were likely to be found (see 3.2.). Not before the last part of the 19th century did the Bronze Age graves achieve status as valuable objects for research, but like everywhere else during this early phase of archaeology, it was the artefacts that were in focus (Nicolaysen 1876, Bendixen 1877, Lorange 1876).
Although the artefacts dominated Bronze Age research in Rogaland until the 1970s, the relationship between the monuments and the landscape was elucidated as early as about 1900. From 1898 to 1912, Tor Helliesen systematically mapped prehistoric monuments in Jæren, thus producing detailed descriptions and extensive map coverage from the time before modern agrarian mechanisation. Helliesen was not an archaeologist himself, and therefore did not get the position he deserves in the history of the discipline. He was educated as a zoologist and a draughtsman, and with these qualifications was able to systematise and to present material cartographically. All his maps and descriptions of monuments are published (Helliesen 1900-1912), and later updated and adjusted to be recorded on land-use maps (Økonomisk kartverk - ØK).

Despite having systematic, updated sources, Bronze Age research has never been given high priority in Rogaland. This is obvious when comparison is made with the many studies of the landscape and agrarian settlements from the Roman Iron Age and the Migration Period, already well established during the 1920s (Petersen 1933; 1936, Myhre 1980). Such an agrarian perspective has recently been integrated into several analyses of Bronze Age settlements (Løken 1998a; 1998b), and even Bronze Age monuments are included in an agrarian spatiality (Møllerop 1963a, Myhre 1981). The same agrarian dominance is distinct in the study of artefacts, be they metal objects from graves and hoards (Johansen 1993), or stray finds of flint and other stone (Bakka 1993, Solberg 1993; 1994). Alternative interpretations of burial monuments are found in unpublished theses (Larsen 1996; 1997, Kvalø 2000). A maritime perspective on landscape and monuments is also a marginal Bronze Age research topic in Rogaland (Lund 1938, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a, Kvalø 2000).

Rogaland has the highest density of dated grave monuments in West Norway, as well as of stray finds of metal, stone and flint (Bakka 1993, Solberg 1993; 1994). In an overview, Egil Bakka (1993:35, Table 1) showed that more than half the 234 Bronze Age metal objects found in West Norway are from Jæren (121), and 19 of the 35 from Ryfylke have been found on Karmøy (see also Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:161). Jæren and Karmøy together account for 140 of the 234 metal objects, about 60% of the total number from West Norway. Bergljot Solberg (1993:25, Table 2) demonstrated the same tendency for the lithic material from the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age, based on the number of flint daggers, bifaced axes, axes with an expanded edge, shaft-hole axes, flint sickles and spoon-shaped scrapers. Of a total number of 1971 lithic artefacts from West Norway, 62% are from Rogaland and 43% from Jæren, mainly from Klepp, Sola and Madla. The same tendency is present for the distribution of grave finds from the Early Bronze Age, as about 70% come from Jæren and Karmøy (Solberg 1993:133).

In detail, most grave finds are in northern Jæren and the northeastern part of Karmsundet. In Jæren, there is a high concentration of dated burials in the middle and outer parts of Klepp, the Hafsfjord area and northwards to the Stavanger peninsula. In a South Scandinavian context, Rogaland represents the northernmost area for Bronze Age barrows. The presence of such monuments here distinguishes this region from the rest of West Norway, as well as from the area east of Lista, where cairns are the only Bronze Age grave monuments. Even though some barrows in Rogaland and Lista are built of a mixture of earth and stones, they differ clearly from the bare cairns. Southwest Norway may therefore be seen as a meeting place for different building traditions, expressed by a hybrid combination of building materials. This is underlined by the fact that cairns are found in this district, too, especially on the Boknafjord islands and in Ryfylke. The barrows, which are mainly confined to Jæren and Karmsundet, contain many metal objects and the highest number of decorated slabs.

Even though numerous grave goods have been recorded, the context between them and specific monuments is often unclear. Such grave goods should not be considered reliable spatial indicators, but they express a chronological and material tendency within an area. Grave mounds that are not reliably dated to the Bronze Age by grave goods represent a
problem in the context of this study, and have to be identified and defined using other criteria. Variables like location, size and construction may help, but just as important is the linear grammar that seems to characterize the internal organization of the monuments. So far, reliable radiocarbon dates have only been obtained from single barrows at Særheim in Klepp (Bertelsen 1970) and Ringen on Karmøy (Sjurseike 2001), and from a burial cists in one of the barrows beside Karmsundet (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:161). This means that context-related grave goods, together with the variables mentioned and the few radiocarbon dates, will be the basis for dating the monuments.

Location, size and linear arrangements

Burial monuments from the Roman Iron Age and the Migration Period are mostly found in grave fields related to two distinct landscape contexts, either close to ancient farms, sometimes even on their infields within ancient stone walls (Myhre 1980), or along the raised beaches of central and southern Jæren (Lillehammer 1996). The shore-related monuments are of various forms, including long barrows, round barrows, boat-shaped and tri-radial monuments. Some of these are dated to the Viking Age (Lillehammer 1996). Like some of the Bronze Age grave monuments, most of those on strandlines are built entirely of stones, but as they are usually situated below the Bronze Age sea level, they can be dated to a later period. In general, both the farm-related graves and the strandline mounds are smaller than the Early Bronze Age ones, which have also been given a more monumental appearance through their location on the crests of moraine ridges. This monumental appearance is strengthened by the habit of placing Bronze Age barrows in a linear arrangement along elevations in the landscape, overlooking natural passages for movement and travel. Bronze Age monuments that are not arranged lineally are often found on promontories facing the open sea or a fjord, where natural sailing routes meet.

Besides their location, other criteria used to identify Bronze Age monuments are their size and construction. Most Iron Age graves are less than 15 m in diameter and 2 m in height, whereas a large number of Bronze Age mounds are between 15 and 40 m in diameter, with an average of 20-25 m, and are 2-3 m high (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:132-133). However, since grave monuments have often been damaged and their size and shape altered, this variable cannot be used uncritically. Like Bronze Age monuments, the Iron Age ones were sometime built of stones, sometimes of earth; hence it is difficult to separate them by their construction and exterior alone. Where grave goods and radiocarbon dates are not available, and the monument is not part of a linear alignment, the other variables mentioned will be used to identify Bronze Age monuments, taking into account the uncertainties mentioned above.

Names and numbers

The introduction to each of the sub-areas presents a list of grave monuments and rock art localities. They are numbered according to the register linked to the land-use maps (Økonomisk kartverk - ØK), which refers to maps, aerial photographs and archive numbers. Monuments that are still visible are identified with a letter R, and the others with a letter X. When no ØK documentation exists, there is a reference to the map and number originating from Tor Helliesen (H.X. no.). For an overview of the sub-areas see Fig. 1.1.2.

5.2. SUB-AREA 1: DELINATION OF THE TJØTTA – RE PASSAGE

Tjøtta (18) HX14. Klepp: barrow, EBA/LBA-EIA (B.4894)
Tjøtta (18) HX15. Klepp: barrow, period 2 (S.4265)
Re (3) HX22. Time: barrow, period 3 (B.5002)
Line (5) HX11. Time: barrow, period 1 (?) (B.4911)
Hognestad (9) HX1. Time: barrow, period 2 (S.6400, S.9784)
Auglend (10) HX2. Time: barrow, EBA (S.2405)
Herikstad (11) HX3. Time: barrow, (S.4745)
Holen (21) 514.F10.R16 (H7). Time: barrow, period 2 (B.5000)
Sub-area 1 is limited by two major river systems running from the highlands across an open, moraine landscape to the exposed coast in the west. To the south, the River Hå marks a transition to a wider landscape room where this tripartite, horizontal stratigraphy is extended, creating a more homogeneous topography. To the north, however, a complex network of rivers and lakes introduces a more fragmented, hilly terrain that stretches northwards into Klepp. Seen in this way, this sub-area is a transition zone between the glacial plains that characterise southern Jæren and the undulating landscape of northern Jæren where ridges and hills play a more direct role in shaping the coastline. Since farming was intensified and modernised at the beginning of last century fields and pastures have been cleared, and lakes and bogs drained. What was once wetland has been transformed into a modern agrarian landscape where only the sea and surviving lakes represent the maritime focus. Only grave monuments have been recorded from the Bronze Age, but some of the boulders that used to be strewn over the landscape may have held figurative rock art or cupmarks.

The barrows are mainly found in the middle landscape zone, where they stand on moraines, some of which form continuous ridges separating river valleys and bogs, and offering views of the sea and the sailing route along the coast in the west; the barrows also mark lines of movement through central Jæren. They therefore address both the coast and the transverse waterways that connect the inland districts with the sea. More than marking the waterways, they overlook them in an interplay of distance and monumentality. With such a position, they appear as orientation points along the central mid-line of Jæren, as well as landmarks seen from the sea.

The barrows at Line, Re and Tjøtta mark and overlook an intersection between the N-S overland route and the E-W waterway that leads from the coast via two lakes, Orrevannet and Ergavannet, along the River Rosland towards another lake, Frøylands- vannet, and the highlands of inner Jæren. The only information about the barrow at Line is that a palstave from period 1 was found there in 1879. A barrow at Re, which was 20 m in diameter and 1.8 m high, contained the blade of a dagger from period 3. Along the same ridge at Re is an alignment of five large barrows that probably date from the Early Bronze Age. One of the Tjøtta monuments was excavated by J.A. Bjerkan in 1922. It was a composite barrow with a thin cover of turf, and near the centre was a slab-lined cist overlain by two capstones. A belt plate, a tutulus, fragments of a brooch and a piece of unburnt bone lay on the floor of the cist. The grave can be dated to period 2. In another Tjøtta barrow, a boulder with three cupmarks had been used as an end stone in a cist from the Iron Age.

On Holen, a hill overlooking the influx to Frøylands- vannet, four barrows are aligned at the edge of a WNW-ESE orientated terrace. This situation offers a view over the central stretch of the waterway and parts of the overland route to the north. Two of the barrows were excavated by Gustav Gustafson in 1893. One of the largest was 20 m in diameter and 2.5 m high. A slab-lined cist near the centre contained a brooch, a dagger and some potsherds from period 2. The smaller barrow was 10.5 m in diameter and 1.5 m high. Only 1 m below the surface, just south of its centre, was a small cist built of standing slabs, with one capstone and a paved floor. It was partly filled with earth in which a saw blade of bronze and some scattered pieces of bone and charcoal were found. The burial custom...
and the saw blade indicate a Late Bronze Age date.  

The monuments at Hognestad, Auglend and Herikstad were situated on low elevations south of Holen. In 1936, Arne Bang-Andersen excavated the Hognestad barrow that was 19 m in diameter and 2 m high. Beneath a central cairn, he found a cist made of standing slabs, four capstones and a floor comprised of seven small, flat stones. Two of the capstones were decorated with cupmarks. Earth in the cist held the blade and the pommel of a dagger, two potsherds, some fragments of charcoal and burnt nutshell, a piece of unworked flint and some decomposed bone.  

A decorated slab was found in a barrow at Auglend, which was 11.5 m in diameter and 1 m high. No information exists about its context, but its size, shape and ornamentation indicate that it belonged to a cist. One side is decorated with three semi-circles comprised of five concentric lines placed between two bands made up of three horizontal lines. Below the lower band is a zigzag pattern of lines. Similar decorated slabs have been found at Soyland in Hå, Hodne and Børshem in Klepp (see 5.5.), and Skjølingstad and Austreim in Karmøy (see 5.13.). Another slab, 20 cm long and 12.5 cm broad and decorated with five cupmarks and two wavy lines on one side and one cupmark on the other side, was found in a small cairn at Herikstad. Its context is not known.  

Otherwise, half a neck-ring of bronze from period 5 has been found in a bog at Salte. The character and context of the find have led to the interpretation of the ring as a hoard (Johansen 1993:163, Jensen 1997:66-67).

5.3. SUB-AREA 2: THE RIDGE OF SÆRHEIM

Sub-area 2 is a continuous ridge between a lake, Frøylandsvannet, and a valley that is bordered to the west by a similar, parallel ridge with Bronze Age barrows. The former ridge is one of the most distinct features in Jæren and can be considered a landmark. It offers a wide view over the central parts of Jæren, towards the sea and the coast in the west and the highlands in the east. An old road runs along its crest and is thought to follow the line of a Medieval trackway crossing Jæren. It is called «Den gamle kongeveien» (the old King’s Road) or «Postveien» (the Postal Road), and runs in a straight line from a crossing point over the River Rosland, marked by Bronze Age barrows at Line, Re and Tjotta. In a central position on the ridge is an outcrop of rock called Tinghaug (the Thing Mound), near which a large number of Iron Age barrows and a court site are situated. This is thought to have been a political centre during the Migration Period and the Viking Age (Magnus 1975). Whereas all the monuments at Tinghaug face the open agrarian landscape to the south and west, the Bronze Age barrows are situated further north along the crest of the ridge and overlook both the inland and the coastal areas. This is particularly noticeable for the large Steinhaug cairn at Særheim (see below).
Tu and Hauge are situated on the southeast slope of the ridge. Only one Bronze Age barrow has been recorded at Tu, and a period 3 sword was found in it in 1870. The exact location of the barrow is not known. A palstave from period 2 was found between two stones in a bog somewhere at Tu. The way it was placed indicates that this was a hoard (Kock Johansen 1993:163). A similar axe from the neighbouring farm of Hauge is interpreted in the same way (ibid.:163). A 43 x 17 cm slab decorated with six cupmarks has been found in a modern stone wall at Tu. Another cupmarked boulder has been found at Hauge. Three of these cupmarks are clearly man-made, but 13 may be natural (Fett and Fett 1941:96).

Steinhaug at Særheim
Steinhaug, on the crest of the ridge, is the name of a cairn that measures 40 m in diameter and is 2 m high. It is located 95 m above sea level, and holds a dominating position in a landscape otherwise characterised by moraine ridges. Today, the view from the cairn is
reduced by dense woodland, but when it was constructed most natural lines and landmarks in this part of Jæren must have been visible. In a monumental interplay with the natural forms of the landscape, Steinhaug might itself be seen as a landmark at a central point on this ridge. Besides its role in the organisation of such a superior landscape room, it contains a complex inner structure consisting of circular walls, pits, a burial cist, a ship construction and several boulders and slabs decorated with cupmarks and rock art.24 The southern part of the cairn, a small trench in the northern half and some small areas to the east and south of the cairn were excavated in 1969-70. The total area excavated measured 570 m². Because of the special architecture of the monument, the excavated area was preserved and is still open to visitors.

The excavation revealed that the outer part of the monument was built of moraine stones and the inner part mainly of trimmed slabs. The central part of the cairn may contain a primary grave. A cist aligned NNW-SSE is situated just south of the centre.25 No objects were found there. The southern part of a ship-shaped stone construction consisting of low walls of small slabs placed in two horizontal layers can be seen west-southwest of the cist. It is one of five similar constructions from the Bronze Age found in southwest Norway. In common with a similar construction at Kviljo on Lista, a piece of quartz was placed at the bow. Quartz was also found in the ship setting at Ringen on Karmøy (see 5.15.). The location of the construction between two circular walls marks a liminal position that animates movement, a mobile expression that is contrasted by a stone with two footprints and boulder with a row of six cupmarks close to the bow of the ship.26 The boulder forms a barrier, but there is an opening on each side. The ship setting, the cist, the footprints and the line of cupmarks all point towards these openings and refer to the lake, Frøylandsvenn. Outside the openings, the two outer circular walls converge into one.

Twelve cupmarked slabs were found in the southeast part of the excavated area.27 All were randomly placed, except one that covered a stone, and, like the boulder, this had a row of six cupmarks. The same number of cupmarks was cut into another boulder 2 m further
Beneath the cairn, a number of flint and quartz tools and chips were found together with pottery sherds. The lithic material was mainly dated to the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age and was interpreted by the excavator as evidence of early settlement (Bertelsen 1970:12). This conclusion was partly based on typology and stratigraphy and partly on the disproportion between the simple character of the artefacts and the size of the cairn. Objects of quartz and flint appear in Bronze Age monuments elsewhere in Lista and Rogaland, both as specific artefacts and as chips and fragments that do not fit into traditional type definitions. Several Bronze Age hoards have also contained such material (Johansen 1993:167-168). However, this lithic material is important as a *terminus post quem* for the dating of the cairn.

A pit surrounded by standing slabs was found outside the double circular wall. It was interpreted as a grave, but no objects or bones to confirm this were found. Phosphate analyses gave high values that may just as well be related to other types of activity or to lengthy use of the place. Four additional pits filled with charcoal and burned stones were aligned E-W, the easternmost two being located under the outer part of the cairn. Uncalibrated C-14 dates of charcoal from these pits show that they were used between 700 and 300 BC, and therefore give the latest possible date of this part of the cairn. Even though these dates mainly come from the outer edge of the cairn, together with the stone artefacts they indicate continuous use of the area from the Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Within this chronological framework, the central part of the monument is thought to date from the Early Bronze Age, probably periods 2 and/or 3. The boat-shaped construction also supports this because such constructions in grave monuments in southern Scandinavia are only known from period 3 (Hedengran 1991, Artelius 1998, Nordenborg Myhre 1998b).

The interior of the cairn and its position as a landmark placed near a main line of communication imply movement and mobility. The orientation and reference of the boat-shaped construction, the cist, the footprints and the alignments of the cupmarks, in interplay with the opening and closing of the circular walls, are the main indicators of such dynamism. The sailing direction of the ship towards Froylandsvannet strengthens this impression. Interpreted
in this way, Steinhaug becomes a place where real and imagined journeys come together, both the physical and the metaphysical, a meeting point for travels in life and in death.

A smaller barrow used to be present just southwest of Steinhaug. It was 21 m in diameter and 2.5 m high\textsuperscript{32}, but if a circular, 2.5 m broad, earth and stone bank round its base is included the monument was about 26 m in diameter.\textsuperscript{33} The bank may have had a similar function to that of the circular walls within Steinhaug. No details about the construction of the barrow are known, but a cist was found at its centre in 1879. It contained a tutulus, two arm-rings and a brooch from period 2.\textsuperscript{34} About 3.5 m southwest of this central grave was another cist which was filled with earth containing fragments of burnt bones.

**The barrows at Anda**

Even more distinctly than the Særheim monuments, the barrows on the neighbouring farm of Anda overlook the valley to the west and face the Kleppe-Braut ridge with its large grave monuments. This area thus marks the end of a continuous line of barrows along central Jæren, and the beginning of more coast-related, westward-facing monuments (see 5.4.). Six barrows with Bronze Age finds have been recorded at Anda. The four largest are situated on the top of a terrace facing west and northwest, and the other two are on the east side of the moraine, on a small hill between Froylandsvannet in the south-southeast and the Anda wetlands in the north-northwest. Hence, these two groups of barrows belong to different visual systems; the largest ones are part of a set of monuments with a broad context, while the smallest ones, together with a barrow on the neighbouring farm of Laland, belong to a more local context. Common to all these monuments is their focus on Froylandsvannet and the lines of communication that lead to the highlands of Høg-Jæren.

The two groups of monuments are not only distinguished by their location and size, but also by the artefacts found in them. Vadlarhaug, the largest barrow at Anda, 24 m in diameter and 4 m high, stood on the top of the ridge.\textsuperscript{35} It had a similar position to the Særheim barrows and was situated along the same NNE-SSW line across the ridge. Several slab-lined cists were found here, but the only find recorded was a clay vessel from the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{36} Gronhaug stood on the same line, but on a lower terrace, and was similar in size.\textsuperscript{37} In 1874, Anders Lorange excavated the centre of this barrow and found a slab-lined cist that contained burnt bones, fragments of flint, including bits of a flint axe, and pottery sherds.\textsuperscript{38}

On the west side of the terrace were two barrows of a similar size. The highest was Ørnavoldshaugen. It had already been partly flattened when it was recorded.\textsuperscript{39} When it was excavated in 1867, two cists were found in its eastern half, partly overlapping each other.\textsuperscript{40} The lowest cist contained a dagger and a brooch dateable to period 2,\textsuperscript{41} while the other contained a similar brooch and two knives, one complete and one only preserved in fragments, also dateable to period 2.\textsuperscript{42}

Three barrows are still preserved at the edge of the terrace, facing the valley and the Braut-Kleppe ridge in the west. Bronze Age artefacts have been found in one of these, Toftehaugen.\textsuperscript{43} An excavation of its northwestern part in 1882 disclosed a sword from period 2 in a slab-lined cist which was 2.8 m long and 0.62 m broad.\textsuperscript{44} A damaged cist, 2.2 m long and 0.60 m broad, was found near the centre of the barrow, and a third one in the east part of the barrow. The same size and alignment of the other two monuments along the edge of the terrace indicate that they, too, are from the Early Bronze Age.

The two barrows on the east side of the ridge are only 13-14 m in diameter and about 1 m high.\textsuperscript{45} A socketed axe from period 4 was found in the northern one, together with fragments of bones and a piece of tooth from a carnivore.\textsuperscript{46} The nature of these finds is interesting since the barrow is situated near a natural routeway to the highlands. A cist in the other barrow contained two arm rings from period 2.\textsuperscript{47} Unlike the cists on the west side of the ridge, which were lined with slabs, this one was constructed of moraine stones.\textsuperscript{48} It was partly filled with earth that contained burned bones, and is thought to be the primary grave in the mound.
5.4. SUB-AREA 3: THE BRAUT – KLEPPE HILL

Kleppe (1) HX5. Klepp: barrow, EBA-IA
Kleppe (1) HX6. Klepp: barrow, EBA-IA
Kleppe (1) 514.D8.R30 (H7). Klepp: barrow
Kleppe (1) 514.D8.Rxx (H8). Klepp: barrow, period 3 (S.1638)
Kleppe (1) HX11. Klepp: barrow, period 2 (B.2344-45)
S. Braut (20) 514.D8.R14 (H1). Klepp: barrow, period 2 (S.1272-74)
N. Braut (21) No record. Klepp: barrow, period 2 (S.4227a-b)
Most barrows in sub-area 3 are located on the Braut-Kleppe ridge, which runs parallel with the Anda-Særheim ridge (see 5.3.). Both are N-S orientated and have Early Bronze Age monuments along their crests looking down on the natural line of movement in the intervening valley. They differ from Iron Age monuments in size, form and location. Artefacts from the Early Bronze Age have been found in four of the barrows, and a cist characteristic for this period is still visible in a fifth. Other Bronze Age finds have been made in the same area.

The northernmost barrow at Kleppe is 35 m in diameter and 2.0 m high. Its size and location on the highest point on the ridge indicate an Early Bronze Age date. A group of barrows has also been recorded near the border between the Kleppe and N. Braut farms. When one of them was destroyed in 1872, the farmer found a slab-lined cist that contained a tutulus and fragments of a brooch from period 2, together with burnt bones. A knife from period 3 was found in a cist in another barrow in 1887. Plundered Bronze Age cists are still visible in two of the neighbouring barrows at N. Braut. Their sides are built of ordinary stones and their ends of standing slabs.

Another barrow at N. Braut was excavated in 1922 by J.R. Bjerkan, and in a stone-walled cist he found a belt plate and two arm-rings from period 2, together with fragments of unburnt bones. A secondary grave from the Early Iron Age was found in a nearby barrow in 1962, indicating that the monument had been built in the Bronze Age. In the southernmost barrow in this group, on S. Braut farm, a slab-lined cist was uncovered in 1881, and a gorget, a tutulus and two arm-rings from period 2 were found.

In the valley between the two ridges, close to the border between the two farms of N. and S. Braut, a gold spiral ring from period 3 was found in 1902.

In addition to their visual contact with the monuments on the Anda-Særheim ridge in the east, these barrows overlook water in the west, first the large Orrevannet lake and further away the dominating sea. Their location offers a wide view over the sailing route from Obrestad Lighthouse in the south to the northern part of Jæren, and the monuments form landmarks visible from the sea. Moreover, the shore displacement curve shows that Orrevannet, which is now situated 3.8 m above sea level, was a lagoon in the Early Bronze Age connected to the open sea through a narrow channel (see 5.5.). This made it a sheltered harbour, the first on the route from Eigerøy in the south.

The stretch of open sea west of Jæren is considered one of the most dangerous in southwest Norway (see Chapter 4). Combined with its practical value of having contact with the open sea, this underlines the importance of present-day Orrevannet as a harbour and a meeting point where several functions and lines of movement came together. Through internal interplay, the barrows around the lake may have acted on different spatial levels, being included in a superior
organisation of space as well as a local system. The dominating location of the barrows on the Braut-Kleppe ridge gave them a special position within the superior spatial framework that was primarily related to traffic along the coast and secondarily to the area around Orrevannet.

5.5. SUB-AREA 4: THE REEF OF JÆREN AND THE ENCLOSURES OF THE ORRE LAGOON

Orrevannet was dammed up on the inner side of the Lista moraine and the beach ridges made by the Atlantic transgression. A narrow rim of land became a liminal room between the sea and the lake. While Iron Age cemeteries are situated near the shores, Bronze Age barrows are located along the crest of the moraine at Borsheim and Hodne. Another group of barrows overlooks the passages into Orrevannet (at Orre) and Ergavannet (at Erga and Vik). A third group stands on marked elevations to the east of the lake (at Nese and Friestad).

The barrows at Orre

When the sea level was about 5 m higher than today, the present River Orre was a narrow, about 100 m long, channel between the sea and what is now Orrevannet. There were bays at either end of this channel, one opening towards the sea in the west and the other towards the former fjord basin in the east. On the promontory north of the channel, an alignment of four barrows face the bay and the entrance to the basin. Ljoshaug is the largest of these. It is located on the highest point, near the end of the promontory, and is about 38 m in diameter and 4-5 m high. Its location and size make it a dominating monument in the landscape around Orrevannet, and it is easily visible from the sea. A tutulus from period 2 has been found in Ljoshaug. No finds have been made in another alignment of barrows near Ljoshaug, but the size and location of the barrows indicate that they, too, are from the Early Bronze Age. Two more large barrows that may well be from the Bronze Age used to be present on another elevation near the inlet. A spearhead from period 2-3 has been found at the outlet of the channel, and other stray finds from Orre are a spearhead from period 2 and a socketed axe from period 3.

The line of barrows at Orre overlooked the channels between the sea and the lakes.
Fig. 5.5.1. Sub-area 4. T. Helliesen’s map of 1909 with monuments from the Bronze Age.
Orrevannet and Ergavannet. From what is now Ergavannet, an inlet led to Horpestadvannet, from where the River Rosland provided access to Froylandsvannet and on to the highlands of Høg-Jæren. A barrow that was 20 m in diameter and 3 m high, situated on a hill at Erga, contained a cist in which a tutulus from period 3 was found, and fragments of a sword from period 2 came from a barrow on a distinct lookout point at Vik. A slab decorated with 17 cupmarks has been found at Horpestad on the north side of Ergavannet.

The Orre barrows also had a third context as they marked the beginning of a number of monuments on the strip of land formed by the Lista moraine which now separates the sea from Orrevannet. It continues northwards to the reef of Jæren, where it passes beneath sea level. No Bronze Age barrows have been recorded between Orre and Reve, but a spearhead from period 4-5 has been found at Reve. However, an alignment of barrows is situated along the top of the narrow ridge between Hodne and Borsheim. Four of these can be dated to the Bronze Age, while five more may be from this period.

**Hodne and Borsheim**

The monuments at Hodne and Borsheim appear to have been specially sited to be visible from both the sea and Orrevannet, and they form a monumental front facing the sailing route to the north. Unlike the jewellery-dominated graves of central Jæren, these barrows belong to a group of coast-related monuments in northern Jæren which contain weapons. One example is the richest barrow at Hodne where a period 3 sword was found in a slab-lined cist. Like other barrows along this strip of moraine, this was about 20 m in diameter and nearly 2.5 m high. A gold arm-ring was found beneath the floor stones of the cist, and, like the sword, it was dated to period 3.

A grave slab decorated with a four-ringed sun symbol was also found in this barrow. Another slab decorated with a four-ringed circle was found in a neighbouring barrow. This sun symbol rested on three parallel, angled grooves placed above a horizontal line. The form and size of the slabs indicate that they once belonged to cists. A period 3 dagger was found in a slab-lined cist in the centre of a third barrow at Hodne. Another gold arm-ring from period 5 is a stray find from a place where a barrow once stood.

Stavhaug ends the alignment of barrows along the strip of land on the north side of Orrevannet. It stands on the slope of the Bore hill and commands a wide view over the sailing route towards the north and over Orrevannet in the south. The earliest known measurement shows that Stavhaug was about 31 m in diameter and 3.5 m high and would therefore have been clearly visible from both Orrevannet and the route along the coast. No datable finds have been reported from the barrow, but an excavation by Gustav Gustafson in 1899 revealed a regular circle made of six slabs. Three of the slabs are still preserved. Two of them are decorated with three and four cupmarks, respectively, and the third has an abstract pattern that may be interpreted as an upturned ship, but other associations are possible. The circle was constructed 1 m above the ground surface and burnt bones lay between the slabs. At the base of the northwest part of the barrow was a slab-lined cist whose floor was composed of a layer of beach pebbles. It contained unburnt bones and traces of copper verdigris.

**Nese and Friestad**

Early Bronze Age barrows have also been recorded in a third area near Orrevannet, at Nese and Friestad. Unlike the barrows at Orre, Hodne and Borsheim, which seem to relate to two distinct directions, those at Nese and Friestad are primarily visible from the close vicinity of the lake. Hence, they seem to have been more intended for the local milieu than a more far-reaching, superior space. Whereas height and overview are characteristic for the barrows on the Braut-Kleppe ridge in sub-area 2, outlook and horizon are catchwords for the Nese and Friestad barrows. Since a short channel connected what is now
Orrevannet to the open sea, a harbour may have existed at Nese to serve the Braut-Kleppe ridge, which could be easily reached via Friestad. A period 3 sword has been found in a barrow at Friestad, and a slate pendant, a two-edged piece of flint and two tutuli from period 2 have been found in one of the Nese barrows. A slab decorated with 13 cupmarks may also have come from the same barrow.

5.6. SUB-AREA 5: THE GRUDE – BORE ENTRANCE

Bore (45) HX07. Klepp: barrow, period 5 (S.1389)
Bore (45) HX10. Klepp: composite barrow «Molkhaug», period 2-3 (S.6020)

Bore is a hill rising above Orrevannet, and is the last topographical feature to be considered around this lake. It overlooks a valley that leads from central Jæren. Another hill, Grude, on the other side of this valley, has a similar location, and between them a narrow passage runs northwards into a different type of landscape. The liminal position of these hills mark a transition between the undulating moraine landscape in the south and the rougher
terrain of northern Jæren with its higher hills and rocky outcrops, where lakes, bogs and rivers are the main connecting and integrating elements. The nature of the grave monuments shifts with these changing topographical conditions, interacting with new landscape forms and elements, and rock art sites acquire a more dominating position in the organisation of the landscape.

The River Figgjo runs at the northern foot of these two hills, strengthening the liminal position of the passage. The Figgjo flows from the highlands of Høg-Jæren down the Gjesdal valley to a lake called Grudevann, from where it meanders over a flat area between there and the coast, which is a drained plain situated only 7 m above sea level and which must have been continuous marshland during the Bronze Age. The two cairns at Grude, Store and Litle Grudhaug, primarily relate to this plain, but also face the coast and the sea further north-northwest. At the same time, they overlook the passage below, especially the western one, in which a period 2 sword was found in a slab-lined cist. When it was first recorded, the cairn had been badly damaged and was only 15 m in diameter and 2.0 m high. Among the stray finds from Grude is a socketed axe from period 3, and a slab with six cupmarks.

To a greater extent than the Grude graves, the barrows at Bore are orientated towards the passage below. This impression is underlined by their location along the edge of a terrace facing eastwards, but even from there the sea is still visible in the northwest. Molkhaug, overlooking the narrowest point of the passage, is one of the few Bronze Age barrows that has been properly excavated by an archaeologist (Lund 1934) and it is a problem that the structures revealed during this excavation might not be representative for other less well-investigated monuments, where the hunt for artefacts was the primary goal. The excavation showed that Molkhaug was a composite barrow constructed of a mixture of stones and earth overlain by plain earth. It was 18 m in diameter and 1.8 m high. Two cists and a third structure made of slabs were found in the centre of the barrow. Cist 1 was aligned WSW-ENE, the same orientation as the Figgjo valley, and cist 2 was orientated N-S, parallel to the passage. Hence, their orientation is consistent with the two main lines in the landscape, expressed and reconciled at one location.

Cist 1 was placed at the centre of the barrow. It was covered by several layers of slabs, and filled with earth that contained burnt bones. Cist 2 was located 1.5 m north of cist 1. It was also filled with earth, in which a fragment of a human skull was found. In one corner was a layer of periwinkles (Littorina littorea) mixed with cremated human bones. In addition, there were calf, sheep and dog teeth and fragments of pottery and raw flint. A tutulus can be dated to period 2. The contents of the grave show a hybrid mixture of maritime and pastoral references, and no clear distinctions had been made between human and animal bones.

The third structure was a small room made of four slabs, placed at the same level as the grave cists. It was covered with two slabs. The upper one had traces of fire, and the lower was decorated with 28 cupmarks on its underside. The room was 30 cm long, 30 cm broad and 12 cm high. It contained a pebble of white quartz resting on a layer of charcoal. Quartz has otherwise been found in connection with a boat-shaped construction at Kviljo in Lista and in the cairns at Særheim and Ringen. Veins of quartz also occur at rock art sites, especially in connection with ship motifs and circular figures. The use of quartz in connection with burial structures and ship images conjures up a number of associations that may be related to its colour and its capacity to produce fire. Fire can be associated to travels in life as well as in death.

The other barrow at Bore has not been professionally excavated, but a pot that contained burnt bones, a pair of tweezers and fragments of a button from period 5 was found in a cist in 1881. Later, two slabs with cupmarks were found in the ruins of the barrow.

Among the stray finds from Bore is a dagger from the River Figgjo dated to period 3. Like the spearhead found near the River Orre (see 5.5.), the dagger may be seen as marking an important liminal passage through the landscape.
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5.7. SUB-AREA 6: ALONG DRAINED WATERWAYS OF SKAVSVANNET

Sele (51) HX8. Klepp: cairn, period 3 (B.2598)
Hedland (24/3) R11240024016 (H18, H20). Sola: rock art site and two barrows
Hedland (24/3) R11240024017. Sola: boulder with cupmarks
Hedland (24/5) R11240024010 (H1). Sola: cairn «Tormodvarden», EBA-IA
Hedland (24/8) R11240024001. Sola: rock art site (see Hellestø R11240024004)
Hedland (24/8) R11240024002. Sola: a sloping rock with one cupmark
Harvaland (26) HX1. Sola: barrow, BRA (S.6472)
Dysjaland (27/1) R11240027001. Sola: rock art site
Dysjaland (27/1) R11240027008. Sola: boulder with rock art
Dysjaland (27/5) R11240027005 (H5). Sola: barrow «Lynghaug», EBA-IA
Dysjaland (27/11) R11240027003. Sola: rock art site
Dysjaland (27/14) R11240027002 (H8). Sola: barrow «Valhaug», EBA-IA
Tjelta (28/14) X11240028015 (HX2). Sola: barrow, period 2 (S.1262)
Tjelta (28/16) R11240028013. Sola: two barrows, EBA-IA
Tjelta (28/18) R11240028011 (H22). Sola: two barrows, one boulder with cupmarks
Tjelta (28/28) R11240028003. Sola: boulder with cupmarks
Tjelta (28/68) R11240028004 (H20). Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Ø. Stangeland (31) R0031002 (H3). Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Ø. Stangeland (31) R003100 (H5). Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Ø. Stangeland (31) HX9. Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Ø. Stangeland HX20. Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Lura (69) HX43. Sandnes: barrow, LBA (S.2400)

Between the Bore-Grude passage and the Hedland ridge is a wetland area of lakes, bogs and rivers separated from the sea by beach ridges of sand and stones. This weak protection against the rough North Sea led to continuous changes in the coastline. This process was strengthened by sand drift that helped to change the courses of rivers, thereby creating new connections between the sea and the lakes. The main access to these lakes was via the River Figgjo, which provided connections to Grudevannet, Selevannet, Bybergsvannet, Harvalandsvannet and the long, narrow Skasvannet that has now been drained. From Skasvannet, the isthmus at Soma could be crossed to reach Gandsfjord and the inner fjord system of Ryfylke. Sub-area 6 therefore was a meeting point between the rough, coastal sailing route and the less dangerous travels along the inland waterways. It is also a transitional zone between the outer coast and the inner communication routes along the fjords that led to central and northern parts of Rogaland and onwards towards the mountains.

Unlike the undulating moraines south of the Bore-Grude passage, the outer and middle landscape zone of this sub-area has more irregular terrain and is fragmented by lakes and waterways. While water and rock outcrops are typical for the coastal area, the moraine landscape of southern Jæren continues northwards to Gandsfjord. These are the natural conditions for a continuous network of rock art sites and grave monuments stretching northwards along the coast. Many slabs with cupmarks, so typical for southern Jæren, also occur in this area, but in general they are more related to the coast and the sea than further south.

The western monuments
The Bronze Age monuments have mainly been found near the coast, but are limited to three landscape zones, the coastal areas, the inlets to inland watercourses and the northern side of Skasvannet. A large barrow called Tangerhaug stands on a prominent point on the Sele
promontory, 500 m NNW of the outlet of the River Figgjo. Its dominant position is emphasised by its size, 31 m in diameter and 5 m high. It is still an important seamark and can be seen from a great distance, from inland as well as from the sea. When the sea level was 5 m higher than today, the lower stretch of the Figgjo may have been an estuary and a protected harbour. In 1875, a small slab-lined cist was found in the side of Tangerhaug. It contained burnt bones, charcoal and a pair of tweezers dated to period 5. A similar, but empty, cist was found nearby. The nature of the grave goods and the location of the chambers indicate that these were secondary graves.

A smaller cairn stood on the same terrace, but facing Selevannet, the River Figgjo and the inland waterways. Two gold arm-rings from period 3 were found underneath a slab, together with burnt bones, charcoal and fragments of pottery. The date of the grave goods from these two monuments, together with the precise locations of the monuments in the landscape, may indicate that the inner sailing route was more important in the Early than the Late Bronze Age due to the higher sea level which made the inland waterways more available then. However, this idea is weakened by the fact that neither grave has been properly excavated and the primary burial in Tangerhaug is probably from the Early Bronze Age. A spearhead from period 5, found in Selevannet, may also indicate that the inland route was still usable in the Late Bronze Age.

On the northern side of the outer wetlands, a cairn called Tormodsvarden stands on a peak 96 m above sea level. It has a similar dominating position as Tangerhaug and is still used as a seamark. Its name, «varden», indicates that it was once a beacon. Tormodsvarden is only 20 m in diameter and 2.5 m high, but the prominence of the top, which offers a wide view over the coastline to the south and the entrance to the inland waterways, strengthens its monumentality. Kråkhaug, 700 m to the southeast, a height on the Hedland ridge, is located in this same visual corridor. Two barrows and one rock art site have been recorded here within an area of 60 m by 60 m. The largest barrow was damaged by the Germans during the Second World War when it was used as a lookout point and a cannon position, mainly because of its strategic location near the junction of various routeways. Considered in a superior visual perspective, the site overlooks the surroundings of Harvalandsvannet and also the Figgjo valley and the Bore-Grude ridges to the south. Two Bronze Age barrows, Svarthaug and Kjellehaug, also stand on prominent points in this same landscape, on Byberg, near the entrance to the inland sailing route.

The rock carvings
About 20 m southeast of the damaged barrow on Kråkhaug is a rounded outcrop of rock shaped like a burial mound and also resembling an upturned boat (Myhre 1964). On its south side, images have been carved on a nearly vertical surface that is about 10 m long and 1.5 m high. The pictures are
concentrated in the centre of the rock wall, and only 4 m separates the outer images. This visual expression of the rock art is primarily referring to the lakes and the wetland below, and secondarily to the barrows at Dysjaland and Byberg and the line of communication between Bore and Grude further south. Until the site was discovered in 1963, human motifs had seldom been found on rock art sites in Rogaland. One exception was the «herding scene» on a rock at Dysjaland found in 1947 (Møllerop 1949). There are also a few human images on Amoy (see 5.13. Fett and Fett 1941:126).

Otherwise, linear human figures are roughly depicted as crews on ships, but the motifs at Hedland and Dysjaland represent a more complex narrative than the similar, repetitive lines on ships that traditionally dominate the rock art of southwest Norway. The neighbouring localities of Hedland and Dysjaland are more similar to rock art found in southeast Norway (Marstrander 1963), Bohuslän and elsewhere in western Sweden (Nordbladh and Rosvall 1971, Bertilsson 1987).

Nine ships with traditional crew lines, two animal pictures and five human images are found at the Hedland locality. They are distributed over three panels separated by cracks in the rock. In this way, they express an interplay between the motifs and the geological structure of the rock face, between the two-dimensional picture scene and the three dimensions of the rock. The western group consists of three ships and one animal, carved below one another at three levels. All these motifs are orientated towards the crack in the rock face, at the same time as they visualise a direction away from the coast and towards the inland sailing route. To the east, the middle panel is limited by a crack that ends in a crevice at the edge of which four human figures have been carved. They have heads and are shown with sprawling arms and legs. The first in the row seems to be carrying a sword, the second is depicted with a phallus, and the third and fourth have no visible attributes. Above these four images, a fifth figure is depicted, more than double the size of the others. The real difference in size is strengthened through its location higher on the rock, on a place where it is tilting forwards slightly. This outline of the images on the wall creates a feeling of physical nearness, at the same time as distance is expressed. This impression is also made clear by the way the large human figure is holding an axe. It is not turned straight upwards, but is tilted forwards, thereby visualizing a threatening movement.

The distance between the two scenes is strengthened by the difference in the shapes of the figures. Whereas the legs of the small images are drawn as straight lines, those of the large figure are exaggerated in size, with prominent calf muscles. It is specifically the form of the legs that gives associations to the rock art of southeast Norway and western Sweden. At the same time, the head of the large figure is vaguely depicted. Despite its size, the body is minimized by being displayed in profile, and thus differs from the small figures, which address the landscape.
The impression of a form of contradiction or confrontation in the scene is made clearer through the location of the small figures at the edge of the crevice. By including the natural structure of the rock wall, tension and mobility are added to the motif, and at the same time a balance of power is maintained between the two groups.

Above this «battle scene» is a ship with regular, deeply carved crew lines, but with a space left open. Like the first three ships, this is also facing a crevice in the wall. It is relevant to ask whether the open space in the row of crew members is related to the human scene below and whether the crevice expresses a change in the near future, or a transformation connected with resistance and fear. The crevice can be seen as a space for transformation, referring to the inner landscape of the rock. The idea of such a transformation may be complemented by the third panel, where the motifs of four ships and an animal are not limited by a crack. The shape of the locality and the narratives of the picture sequences, related to both the two dimensions of the scene and the three-dimensional form of the rock, together with the character of the landscape and the position of the grave monuments, may express ideas of transformation and travel, in life as well as in death.

Similar images are depicted on a grave slab found close to a barrow on the neighbouring farm of Harvaland. The slab is decorated with two ships heading towards each other, both carrying a sun symbol. A third ship with a similar symbol is probably also depicted. The slab has probably belonged to a grave cist in the barrow, which like the inner landscape of the carved rock is dark and hidden, but also a place for transformation and renewal. In the same way as the movement in such a process is expressed by three-dimensional interplay between the structure of the outcrop and sequences of ship motifs, a similar dynamism is mediated on the two-dimensional grave slab, with the sun symbol as a third element. The two opposing ships express both mobility and immobility, contradictions that may be found in the monumental representation of both barrows and rock art sites.

Dysjaland is situated at the entrance to the routeway along Skasvannet. It is located on a low ridge limited in the southwest by the present Skas canal and in the north by a wetland, which was a continuous routeway between Skasvannet and Harvalandsvannet before they were drained. Three rock art localities and two barrows have been recorded at Dysjaland. The size, shape and location of the barrows suggest they can be dated to the Bronze Age. The largest barrow, Valhaug, is 23 m in diameter and 3 m high. Its size and location makes it visible from both routes into Skasvannet. In contrast to the dominating position of Valhaug, the smaller barrow, Lynghaug, is more directly related to the Skas canal, which was a stream flowing from Skasvannet before the latter was drained. No objects from the Bronze Age have been recorded in connection with Lynghaug, but it belongs to an alignment of barrows along the terrace stretching from Valhaug to the neighbouring farm of Tjelta.

50 m southwest of Valhaug is an outcrop of rock sloping towards Harvalandsvannet. On its southeast side is a vertical wall facing Skasvannet, and here a scene with images of five animals and a human is depicted. The locality is situated 30 m above sea level. The motifs are organised in the same direction as some glacial striations, following the curve of the rock and pointing upwards and eastwards towards the inland sailing route. This disposition of the images creates an expression of mobility and a determined orientation. The composition has been interpreted as a herding scene where a group of oxen or horses is being tended by
a human being and a dog (Møllerop 1949, Myhre 1981:98). The form of the animal heads has a certain similarity with heads depicted on the prows of rock art ships and the handles of bronze razors of types found in southern Scandinavia.

Three circles and a line are carved on a gneiss boulder 50 m north-northwest of the herding scene, and five circles and a cupmark are carved on a rock surface 500 m further northwest, overlooking the northern passage. A stray find of half a soapstone casting mould comes from Dysjaland. It was intended for casting socketed axes of a type dated to periods 5 or 6.

**The eastern monuments**

A linear arrangement of grave monuments and rock art sites is located along the ridge on the north side of Skasvannet, overlooking this important sailing route. In addition to Valhaug and Lynghaug on Dysjaland Farm, the group includes five barrows at Tjelta. A bronze arm-ring from period 2 was found in one of these barrows in 1881. It came from a slab-lined cist the size of a man in a barrow that was 19 m in diameter and 2.5 m high. The other barrows are of a similar size. Between two of them is a boulder with nine cupmarks carved on a surface facing Skasvannet. The barrows and the boulder were situated within an area of 90 m by 15 m.

Among the stray finds from Tjelta is a shafthole axe from period 1. A flanged axe from the same period was found in Skasvannet when it was being drained. A dagger and two flint axes, probably an Early Bronze Age hoard, have been found on the neighbouring farm of Gimra.

The Stangeland hill is situated near the eastern end of Skasvannet and is a continuation of the ridge that stretches eastwards from Tjelta and Gimra. No Bronze Age objects have been recorded from Stangeland, but their size, form and location suggest that four large barrows near the top of the hill are probably from the Early Bronze Age. They are between 21 m and 29.5 m in diameter and between 1.5 and 3 m in height. One half of a soapstone casting mould for a socketed axe from periods 5 or 6 has been found at Stangeland. The axe would have been of the same type as that made by the Dysjaland mould. East of Skasvannet, at the foot of the Stangeland hill, was a large area of wetland with a network of streams and bogs that stretched eastwards to a lake called Stokkavannet that was drained in 1915. From Stokkavannet, a passage led to Hafsfjord in the north and Forus and Lura on Gandsfjord in the east. The Soma hill rises from this wetland, and a slab with cupmarks has been found there. It probably belonged to a grave cist. A Late Bronze Age socketed axe was found in the nearby bog, Stokkamyra.

Between the wetland at Soma and Gandsfjord is an isthmus of dry land at Lura. A barrow, 16 m in diameter and 2 m high, once stood on a prominent hill overlooking this routeway. A small, slab-lined cist contained charcoal, burnt bones, pottery sherds and a piece of bronze mounting, probably from the Late Bronze Age. A bronze dagger from period 2 has also been found at Lura.

Bronze Age monuments, as well as finds and burial mounds from the Iron Age, are all entirely confined to the south-facing moraine ridges on the north side of Skasvannet. This may reflect continuity in the use of the landscape, but may also show that these landscape forms and their qualities were given priority in both periods, in contrast to the wetland and stony ground on the south side of the lake.

### 5.8. SUB-AREA 7: THE REGE MORAINES AND THE SEASIDE SITES OF ØLBERG AND VIGDEL

- Rege (17/57) HX5. Sola: barrow «Sødhaug», EBA
- Rege (17) HX7. Sola: barrow «Einarshaug», EBA [S.8726]
- Rege (17/57) R11240017003 (H16). Sola: barrow, periods 2 (S.1263-69) and 5 (S.1270-71)
Rege (17/57) HX17. Sola: barrow, EBA
Rege (17/57) R11240017004 (H18). Sola: barrow, EBA (B.4054, S.6502)
Olberg (20/12) X11240020005 (HX14). Sola: boulder with rock art
Olberg (20) R11240020006 (H19). Sola: cairn «Haugarhaug», EBA-IA
Olberg (20/1) R11240020007 (H23). Sola: rock art site
Håland (21/1,2) R11240021006. Sola: boulder with cupmarks
Håland (21/1,2) R11240021010. Sola: boulder with cupmark
Håland (21/1,2) R11240021010 (H16). Sola: barrow, EBA-IA
Håland (21/1,2) R11240021017. Sola: boulder with cupmarks
Vigdel (22/3) R1124002102. Sola: rock art site
Vigdel (22/6) R1124002201 (H2). Sola: cairn «Vigdelveden», EBA-IA
Vigdel (22) R1124002202 (H1). Sola: cairn «Gårdshaug», EBA-IA
The fragmented landscape of sub-area 6 continues here and is even more characteristic for the coast of Hellestø, Vigdel and Ølberg. Rocky outcrops and low hills are separated by sounds and bays where small vessels could find protected harbours. A number of rock art sites have been found here. In addition to a few sun symbols, ships are the dominant motifs. In contrast to the rough terrain bordering the coast, low moraine ridges typify the landscape behind, and Bronze Age grave monuments are situated on their highest points, especially at Rege. Boulders and outcrops of rock also occur on these ridges at Rege, Håland and Ølberg. However, despite the topographical differences between the coastal and inland parts, the whole area has a geographical and visual reference to the sea and the main sailing route.

To the north, the broken coastland and the inland hills meet at the marine, sandy plain between Rege and Sola. Based on an assumed sea level about 5 m higher than today, a large part of this plain must have been an open, shallow bay in the Early Bronze Age (Thomsen 1982b, Prøsch-Danielsen 1993:50, 2002:7). A narrow arm of the bay must have continued southwards to the foot of the Rege and Ølberg hills where a stream now flows from the valley and wetland separating them. This bay was protected from the sea by a beach ridge and a strip of land on the north side of Ølberg, and must have been a useful harbour for boats (Myhre 1981:46, Fig. 26). A number of finds have been made at the inner end of the bay, near the outlet of the stream, and these probably derive from a settlement site. They include three flint daggers, two flint axes and a large collection of flint arrowheads and debris (Myhre 1981:75). Most of the objects are from the Late Neolithic, but some show that the site was also used during the Early Bronze Age (ibid.:47, 93).

The rock carvings
A triangular outcrop used to be present on the southern terrace at Ølberg, overlooking the narrow bay and the outlet of the stream. It had seven ships carved on a vertical surface. All of them were drawn with only one line, and they had a complete number of crew lines. One of the prows was formed as an animal head. The rock has now been destroyed. It was located near a group of grave monuments, which, since they belong to a small cemetery, are thought to date from the Iron Age. However, the size and location of some of the mounds indicate that these might be from the Bronze Age.

Two ships have also been carved on the east side of a small outcrop at Ølberg, called Mælen. This rock stands out in the surrounding landscape of sandy areas and low outcrops, and can be looked upon as a monument in its own right. The ships are placed about 15 m below the top of Mælen, 19 m above sea level and 200 m from the shore. About 500 m northeast of Mælen is a cairn on an outcrop called Haugarhaug. These two peaks act as landmarks near the harbour at Ølberg. Additional cairns are also situated on other outcrops in this coastal area.
They cannot be dated, but all of them seem to be related to the sea, overlooking natural harbours in the vicinity, for instance Vigdelveden and Gårdshaug, both of which are visible from Mælen.\footnote{125}

A small slab decorated with an animal figure was found at Sola Airport, in gravel taken from Ølberg or Sola (Myhre 1981: 99).\footnote{126} Like the animal images at Dysjaland, the head and neck have a form resembling the images on prows of carved ships and handles of bronze razors found in Rogaland. The connection between ship and animal becomes more obvious if the slab is examined in an inverted position, as the shape of the body resembles a ship with crew lines (see, for instance, figure 51 at Fluberget, Revheim, group 1 on Åmøy and Bru 1).

Like the ships at Mælen, the rock art site at Vigdel is in the coastal zone, only 5.3 m above present sea level and 75 m from the shore. 28 ship images and pictures related to ships are situated on the east side of a smooth rock surface sloping at an angle of 45 degrees. From the site, a natural passage leads down to a bay called Kvernevika\footnote{127}, a name indicating that in historical times there was a water mill in the stream flowing at the foot of the rock art panel. In the Early Bronze Age, the bay was a sheltered lagoon where haven could be sought.

The many knolls and peaks along the shore at Vigdel are replaced by a more open landscape at Hellestø, where isolated rocky outcrops are scattered in sandy areas. On the southeast side of one such rock surface, 25 ships and one wheel-shaped circle are depicted (Fett and Fett 1941:82-83, Plate 39D). The locality is situated 100 m from the shore and 5.3 m above present sea level, but the long, straight beach, with dunes and a sandy plain behind it, strengthens the maritime character of the place. Most of the figures are now covered by sand, which is grinding the rock surface and smoothing the carved lines. The images and the composition of the scenes are therefore difficult to see, but according to early descriptions four of the
lower ships have prows formed as animal heads, similar to those at Ølberg. A circle with an internal cross, called a «sun cross» or a «sun symbol» (Fett and Fett 1941:23), also occurs here. This type of image is more common further north, where direct parallels are found at Tasta, Rudlo, Åmøy and Nag. The Tangerhaug barrow at Sele, in the south, can be seen from this rock art site at Hellestø.

While most ship images in this area are located near the shore, cupmarked boulders are situated on the hills behind. With one exception, they face towards the south and southeast, like the ship figures. In general, cupmarks are found on the upper level of rock art panels, and the sites are often located in the higher parts of the terrain (Mandt Larsen 1972). They thus express an outer limit in relation to other images, as well as in the landscape.

**The Rege barrows**

As in other parts of the central zone of Jæren, the Bronze Age grave monuments are situated on the top of moraine ridges. Four large barrows are found on the Rege hill, three of them on the crest from where there is a wide view over Sola Bay and the sea to the northwest. A large part of northern Jæren can be seen to the east and northeast, as well as the mountain ridge on the far side of Gandsfjord and the Ryfylke fjords. Because of their monumentality and their strategic position, archaeologists took an early interest in the Rege barrows, but it was chiefly the rich Bronze Age finds that attracted their attention.

Two undisturbed grave cists were found when the landowner removed sand and earth from the northern barrow. They were placed parallel with each other, to the north and south of the centre. The work had damaged the side wall of the northern cist, thus giving the landowner access to the richest Bronze Age grave found in Norway. Among the artefacts were a gorget, a belt plate, a tutulus, two arm-rings, a brooch and a dagger, as well as bronze decorations from a skirt. The jewellery and the type of dress are characteris-
tic for richly equipped women’s graves from period 2 in southern Scandinavia. This richly furnished cist had sides built as dry walls of flat stones, and each end had standing slabs. The slab at the western end was decorated with three double-ringed circles, three cupmarks and one groove. There was one capstone and one slab on the floor (Fett and Fett 1941:78, Plate 38C). The southern cist was similar. A collection of burnt bones was found in one corner, together with a pair of tweezers and a knife blade dated to period 5.131

This find was the incentive for Anders Lorange to begin an excavation of the three Rege barrows the next year. He started at the southern barrow, which was then 21 m in diameter and 3 m high. He dug a trench from the west side towards the centre where a high, upright slab nearly reached the top of the barrow. Beside this vertical slab was a construction that he interpreted as a dry-stone bench made of small, horizontal slabs. In front of, and partly within this structure, lay sherds of pottery and traces of bronze verdigris. An oval slab was placed horizontally on the bench. Lorange noted 13 cupmarks on the upper side of the slab. When Gabriel Gustafson examined the slab later, he found three ships, seven cupmarks and four footprints on its underside (de Lange1912a, pp. 3, 9, 24, Fig. 4). Lorange had interpreted the stone bench as an altar, but an alternative interpretation was proposed in 1981.
after an investigation of another barrow at Rege that was 16.5 m in diameter and 1.5 m high (Skjølsvold 1960, Myhre 1981). A similar construction was found then, but it clearly formed the base of a cist. This indicates that Lorange’s stone bench once belonged to a cist that had been damaged during earlier plundering (Myhre 1985:100). A slab decorated with two cupmarks found by Lorange near the top of the mound may have come from the same cist.

Lorange afterwards investigated the middle barrow, without finding the treasures he sought, only a slab-lined cist filled with earth. Like the cists in the other barrows, its sides were constructed of small, horizontal slabs using a dry-stone technique, and a large, upright slab stood at each end. The cist indicates that the mound was originally built for an inhumation burial in the Early Bronze Age. A slab decorated with 17 cupmarks was found in a stone wall just south of the barrows. Its size and form indicate that it originally belonged to a destroyed cist. Another slab with five cupmarks is reported to have come from a grave at Rege (Fett and Fett 1941:80).

Like at Ølberg, a number of cupmark localities have been noted in the vicinity of the Rege barrows. A cupmarked boulder just north of the barrows has been blown up and destroyed (Ab. 1883, p. 88) Three cupmarks in an area of 3 x 3 m have been documented on a rock surface northeast of the barrows (Fett and Fett 1941:80). The outcrop has been badly damaged by fire, and other cupmarks may have been destroyed. Close to the barrows lay a small, cupmarked fragment of a slab (Fett and Fett 1941:80). At the eastern foot of the Rege hill, about 100 cupmarks have been found on three boulders (Lund 1935:53). In 1937, Fett and Fett investigated all the other boulders on the ridge without finding new cupmarks.

5.9. SUB-AREA 8: THE IN-BETWEEN SPACE OF TANANGER PENINSULA

Jåsund (1) R0010005 (H8). Sola: barrow «Sothaug», period 3 (S.7425, C.1045)
Myklebust (3) X003020 (H11). Sola: barrow, EBA/LBA (S.269-71, S.1282)
Tjora (10) R0010005 (H5). Sola: barrow «Kongshaug», EBA-IA
Tjora (10) R0010006 (H9). Sola: barrow «Vedesvarden», EBA-IA
Tjora (10) R00100011 (H7). Sola: barrow «Svarthaug», EBA-IA
Sola (14) R0014001. Sola: barrow «Store Melhaug», periods 3 (S.2950) and 5 (B.3333)
Sola (14) X0014002. Sola: barrow «Lille Melhaug», periods 3 (B.1011, B.430), 3 (S.2882) and 5 (S.1261)
Haga (6) HX23. Sola: rock art slab (S.946)
Little Meland (2). Sola: cupmarked slab (S.10130)

Sola is a low hill similar to the one at Rege, and between them Solavika was an open bay that stretched eastwards from the sea towards Stangeland in the Early Bronze Age. These hills were landmarks both for voyagers at sea and travellers over land. To the north, much of the present wetland between Sola and Tjora was also under water. Near a small lake, Kolnestjernet, a protected lagoon was connected to the sea via an open bay, and a similar bay stretched westwards from Hafsfjord. A channel between the fjord and the sea may have been navi-
gable in the early part of the Bronze Age, but land uplift probably turned it into a narrow isthmus in the Middle Bronze Age. There were sheltered harbours here near the foot of the Sola and Tjora hills. On the east side of Sola, there was also a shallow bay that stretched from the southern shore of Hafrsfjord towards the hills at Skadberg and Stangeland, where a small stream runs today. This stream gave access to the inner parts of Skasvannet and Stokkavannet. A socketed axe dated to period 3 has been found close to a rock outcrop near the shore of Hafrsfjord.141
The monuments

Two Bronze Age barrows, Store Melhaug and Lille Melhaug, are known to have been present on the northern part of the Sola hill. Store Melhaug is still well preserved at this important location between the open sea and Hafrsfjord. Lille Melhaug was destroyed by the Germans during the Second World War, when it was used as an observation point and a cannon site. It stood just north of Store Melhaug. From here, the sailing route along the coast was in sight and the barrows overlooked the channel between the sea and Hafrsfjord, as well as the harbour areas below, both to the west and east.

The visuality and monumentality of both the Melhaug barrows is underlined by their location in an otherwise flat, exposed landscape. In 1900, Store Melhaug was 25 m in diameter and 3.5 m in height, while Lille Melhaug was 24 m in diameter and 3 m in height. They have probably been even larger, especially Store Melhaug which was excavated by Anders Lorange in 1879. The monument was mainly built of sand and earth that covered a central cairn. Between the cairn and the outer part of the barrow was a circular dry-stone wall made of trimmed slabs. Three secondary grave cists were built into the wall, two of which had the same size as the primary burial in the central cairn and are therefore probably from the Early Bronze Age. One was filled with dark earth, while parts of an unburnt skeleton were found in the other.

On the south side of the wall was a small cist made of six slabs. It was also filled with dark earth mixed with burnt bones. Underneath the layer of earth, on the floor of the cist, lay a razor, an arrowhead and a bronze pin dated to period 5. The central grave in Store Melhaug was smaller than the one in Regehaugen, but it was constructed in the same way with dry-stone walls of small slabs at the sides and one upright slab at each end. The floor was made of slabs placed on a layer of pebbles. A still preserved, unburnt skeleton with bent knees and the face turned eastwards rested on a layer of earth. Layers of birch bark covered the capstone. Besides the four graves excavated by Lorange, a fifth grave was later found in Store Melhaug. It contained a bronze knife from period 3.

Little information exists about Lille Melhaug, but we know that a sword, a button and fragments of bronze from period 3 were found in 1834 in a central cist. Three cists have later been unearthed near the edges of the barrow. One of them contained burnt bones and fragments of a bronze knife from period 5, and from a second cist came a knife and fragments of unburnt bones from period 3. Only an oval stone was found in the third cist. Other grave finds from Sola have not been connected to specific barrows. Two daggers and a razor from period 3 with a handle in the shape of a horse’s head were found in a grave in 1834. A brooch from period 2 was also found the same year, and a socketed axe from period 5 came from an area close to the Melhaug barrows.

The Tananger peninsula stretches northwards from Sola, and along its middle part is a rocky ridge. Tjora stands on a height on the west side of the ridge, and several barrows have been recorded here, some perhaps dating from the Early Bronze Age because of their size and location. Orshaug, Elhaug, Kongshaug, Vedesvarden and Svarthaug are placed on rocky outcrops on a line pointing northwards from the Melhaug barrows. A bronze spearhead from period 2 was found in Elhaug. Further information is lacking. These barrows face the sea in the west and also overlook the passage and harbour area between Tjora and Sola, corresponding to the Melhaug barrows on the Sola hill.

A barrow that is 19 m in diameter and 2 m high stands on the highest point of the Myklebust ridge, at the north end of the Tananger peninsula. It was probably even larger before an excavation in 1878. Little information exists about the barrow, but it is known to have been built of moraine stones, covered by a 1 m thick mantle of earth. In the south side of the barrow was a slab-lined cist that contained sherd s of pottery and a collection of seashells. The slab at the south end was decorated with three pairs of footprints and 12 cupmarks.

Fig. 5.9.2. A cist slab with three pairs of footprints and 12 cup-marks was found in a barrow at Myklebust. The cist contained shards of pottery and a collection of seashells. Two other slabs with cup-marks were found in the same barrow (S.269-271) (Drawing by T. Helliesen, 1902)
Two other slabs were found in the same part of the barrow, and these were decorated with 11 and 4 cupmarks, respectively. The largest and northernmost barrow on the Tananger peninsula is Sothaug, situated on a terrace overlooking the passage from the open sea into the sheltered area of Hafrsfjord. It is 40 m in diameter and 5 m high, one of the largest Bronze Age barrows in Norway. Another Early Bronze Age barrow had a similar position at Nordre Sunde on the opposite side of the narrow passage, and together they marked the inlet to the fjord (see 5.10.). Sothaug has never been archaeologically investigated, but when earth was taken from its centre in 1842 a slab-lined cist similar to those at Rege and Store Melhaug was uncovered. A partly preserved, unburnt skeleton dressed in clothes of woven wool was found in the cist. A sword dated to period 3 lay on the skeleton. A fragment of a bronze button probably comes from the same grave.

The rock art
All the grave monuments are located on the higher ground of the peninsula, but two stray slabs bearing rock art have been found on the shores of Hafrsfjord. One from Haga is decorated with two, possibly three, ships and 26 cupmarks, which are concentrated in two areas above and below the ships. Modern cut marks can be seen on the edges of the slab, and the report states that it had been removed from a rock. It is made of the same type of slate that is common on these shores (Fett and Fett 1941:77, Plate 38A.). The slab was found at a spot facing the largest island in Hafrsfjord. The other slab is decorated with 33 cupmarks and comes from a similar location at Litle Meland, just across the fjord from the rock art site of Fluberget at Revheim (see 5.2.10.). Among the stray finds from the Tananger peninsula are a spearhead from period 2 found at Somme and a socketed axe from period 5-6 from Myklebust. There are also a large number of sickles and daggers of flint, as well as axes of flint and other rock types, all dating to the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. Their distribution is more related to the sea than to Hafrsfjord (Myhre 1981:53, Fig. 33).

fig. 5.9.3. The barrow of Sothaug is situated at an exposed point near the entrance to Hafrsfjord. On the opposite side of the inlet the barrow of Mjukhaug has a similar position. Together these monuments frame the passage between the sea and the fjord (Photo: AmS)

fig. 5.9.4. A slab with two, possible three, ships and 26 cupmarks found at Haga near the shore of Hafrsfjord (Drawing by T. Helliesen, 1902)

5.10. SUB-AREA 9: ADDRESSING THE HAFRSFJORD BASIN AND THE PASSAGES BEYOND

Madla (38) HX5. Stavanger: barrow, EBA/period 5 (S.2357)
Madla (38) 3075.E8.R1 (H7). Stavanger: barrow, EBA/LBA (S.6655)
Madla (38) HX26. Stavanger: barrow, period 2 (B.4152)
Søre Sunde (40) 3075.D8.R06. Stavanger: boulder with cupmarks
Nordre Sunde (41) HX30. Stavanger: barrow, period 3 (S.400)
Nordre Sunde (41) 3075.D6.R31a (H5). Stavanger: cairn, EBA-IA
Nordre Sunde (41) 3075.D6.R31b. Stavanger: rock art site

Sunde, Revheim and Madla are located on the eastern shore of Hafrsfjord, between its narrow inlet in the northwest and the peaks of Madlatuene, which rise steeply from the fjord in the southeast. This area is situated on a long moraine ridge, and is limited by the sea in the north, Hafrsfjord in the south and two lakes, Hålandsvannet and Store Stokkavannet, in the east. Hålandsvannet has been partly drained, but with an original threshold height of 7 m.

Fig. 5.10.1. Sub-area 9. T. Helliesen’s map of 1902 with monuments from the Bronze Age
above sea level its basin was isolated from the sea about 2200-1400 BC cal.\textsuperscript{169}, during the Late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age (Prosch-Danielsen pers. com.). Later in the Bronze Age, the lake could be reached from the sea via a stream called Kvernbekken. A similar access to Store Stokkavannet was possible from Hafsfjord via the stream at Målaforen in the south. The area therefore primarily related to Hafsfjord and the open sea, and secondarily to the less exposed lake landscape behind. Rock art sites with pictorial motifs are mainly found on the shore zone along Hafsfjord, whereas burial monuments and cupmarked boulders are located on higher terraces from where the sea, the fjord and the lakes can be seen.

The rock art at Fluberget

Even though this area is referring to a large area around Hafsfjord, Madla and Revheim can be separated as a topographical unit situated around the wetland and boggy area of Revheimsmyra, located between moraine ridges and the outcrops of Madlatuene and Fluberget. This closed landscape room is dominated by the bog and the characteristic rock art locality at Fluberget.\textsuperscript{170} Fluberget is a high, elongate outcrop which, in profile, resembles an upturned boat. It has a most distinctive appearance and stands out from other forms and features in the local landscape. It is visible over a considerable area and is orientated on the entrance to Hafsfjord. It also seems to be aligned on Sothaug, the largest Bronze Age barrow in Rogaland (see 5.9.). Its southern edge ends in a steep cliff overlooking the bog where several bronze objects have been found. The most distinctive artefacts are two bronze lures dated to late period 5\textsuperscript{171}, two swords from period 2\textsuperscript{172}, and a socketed axe dated to period 3.\textsuperscript{173} A flint dagger, a porphyry axe and a boat-axe of local stone have also been found in the same area (Myhre 1981:101, Fig. 76). Apart from the lures, all these objects were found singly.

The contours of Fluberget are most obvious when viewed from the edge of Revheimsmyra, and it is on the steep southern face of the outcrop that nearly all the images were carved. Here the cliff is broken by series of cracks and crevices formed by ice and water.
These processes created polished chutes that run down the rock face to a small ledge at the bottom, where a pair of natural basins contain pools of water. The outcrop has other striking features: The rock has prominent veins of quartz. The cliff itself has a most distinctive appearance. The hollows formed by the glacier conceal some parts of the rock face and emphasise the positions of others, so that different sections can only be viewed in sequence. The movement of water across the surface of the rock introduces another dimension. Not only has it modified the rock so that different areas may be highlighted, it also creates an axis of movements extending from the top of the rock to the basins below the cliff. As a result, some of the carved motifs may be washed by water, whilst those on the ledge were filled with liquid.

170 images and 80 cupmarks have been recorded at Fluberget. As so often in Rogaland, the majority of motifs are ships, although there are also footprints, handprints and some abstract figures (Helliesen 1901:48, nos. 7-8, Fig. 2, Fett and Fett 1941:72, Plate 33). Most of the images are near the foot of the cliff, concentrated around the deepest hollow where water passes across and through the rock. A second, much smaller series occurs towards the northern edge of the site where the outcrop merges with farmland. The form of the rock sets up two distinct axes, both of which appear to be mirrored in the composition of the rock art (Bradley, Jones, Nordenborg Myhre and Sackett 2002). In each case, the images themselves seem to be transformed as the audience moves across the outcrop.

Fig. 5.10.4.
Two lures were found in the Resheim bog, which dominates the landscape of the southern side of the rock (Photo: AmS)

Fig. 5.10.5.
The lures from the Resheim were carefully dismantled and deposited in the bog (Drawing: AmS)
First, there is a series of contrasts between the images at the top of the outcrop and those towards the foot of the cliff. The motifs at the top are largely abstract, in contrast to those down below. On the other hand, there are certain similarities between the two groups. Footprints are found in both groups and they lead from the summit to the base of the outcrop, towards the edge of the bog. Cupmarks also occur in both groups. The closest link between the two groups is expressed through the ships. At the top of the outcrop, one of the ships is portrayed entering a spiral that might be construed as a tunnel leading into the solid rock (see Chapter 6). Towards the base of the cliff, there are equally incomplete images of ships that seem to be emerging from cracks. The prows of two of the ships may even be depicted end on. One is apparently emerging from a cleft in the rock face. The images may be linked by the passage of water across the rock surface and through the network of cracks into the inner landscape of the rock to gather in the basins below.

A second sequence of images can be recognised in the panels that extend along the base of the cliff, although here the pattern may be incomplete because some rock has been removed by quarrying. There may originally have been as many as six natural divisions extending along the lower part of the outcrop and marked by distinct hollows or clefts separated by projecting rock. Such subdivisions are also highlighted by cracks in the rock surface and by channels where water runs down the cliff face. Three of these topographical divisions have been damaged, and two more contain few carvings. The footprints follow an axis from the summit of the rock face to its base, while the carvings of ships have been organised in relation to quartz veins. These might suggest an image of the sea. Most of the ship carvings are found where the veins are horizontal and regular on the lower half of the cliff.
Not all the ships have the same character. Some are depicted in detail while others seem incomplete. The ships are generally following the same course, although the direction they are travelling is not fully consistent from one panel to another; or even within the same panel. Even so, the evidence suggests that some ships were transformed in the course of their journeys. In one case, a group of rather fragmentary vessels appears to be travelling towards a prominent crevice that is associated with a dense concentration of cupmarks. On the opposite side of this feature, they pursue the same course but are now complete and their prows are embellished with horses’ heads. In a second case, similar carvings are associated with a pair of abstract images like those at the top of the outcrop, and again the ships change their form from fragmentary outlines to entire vessels as they travel from left to right. More fragmentary ships are also portrayed above and below these images. It even seems as if the entire decorated surface contains distinct areas of whole and partial vessels, as if they had changed their character as they made their voyage across the site.
Some of the most obvious transformations occur where the surface is covered by running water, the movement of water apparently having provided a way of animating the carvings. The fragmentary ships seem to have entered the water as it issues from the solid rock and emerge with their prows embellished with animal heads. Perhaps a similar transformation was marked by the deposition of the musical instruments in the bog below. The similarity may even extend to the way in which both the lures had been reduced to eleven fragments. Depositions in bogs and wetlands may in general be related to a similar form of transformation.

Fluberget as a meeting point between central axes of movement, the boat-shaped form of the rock, and the dominating role of ships both as motifs and transformative elements, give associations to real as well as imaginary voyages. The presence of water expressed through the nearness of open sea, fjord and wetland strengthens this expression, as it refers directly to the sources of the water that flows over the rock and the ship motifs, especially those panels where stages of fragmentation and completion can be seen. The composition of these variables accentuates the meaning of real journeys, as well as imaginary aspects like travels between life and death. This relationship is also focusing on the visual and geographical connections between Fluberget and the grave monuments on the nearby heights, especially those on the moraine between Revheimsmyra and Madlamyra, the bog that stretches eastwards to the wetland of Madlaforen and the inlet to Stokkavannet. Thus, the barrows acquire a liminal position between two large wetland areas that even with a Bronze Age sea level were not connected to the fjord.

The sailing direction of most ships at Fluberget is parallel to the longitudinal orientation of the bog, and they are therefore travelling towards the barrows. There is direct visual contact between these sites that appear as distinct points in the landscape when seen from both the fjord and land. Three Bronze Age graves have been recorded from three different barrows on these heights. One had already been destroyed and another damaged when they were recorded in 1901. The existing barrow is 21 m in diameter and 2.5 m in height, a size that probably is representative for this group of monuments. An arm-ring from period 5 was found in a cist in the first barrow that was destroyed. The size and precise location of the slab-lined cist is not known, but the cist was probably a secondary burial. The damaged barrow contained a cist with a sword from period 2 and some unidentified objects. A slab with 12 cupmarks came from the existing barrow. Its size and shape indicate that it originally belonged to a grave cist. A sword from period 2 came from a destroyed barrow at Revheim, probably situated on the terrace just above Fluberget.

Fig. 5.10.10. The footprints follow an axis from the summit of the rock to the base where they enter several natural pools of water (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)
The rock art at Aubeberget

Less than one kilometre north of Fluberget is another rock art locality called Aubeberget (Skjølsvold 1960). In contrast to the boat-shaped profile of Fluberget, Aubeberget is a smooth, striated rock sloping towards the east shore of Hafrsfjord. Even though the shape and location of the two outcrops differ, there are several points of resemblance, expressed through the slaty nature and colour of the rock, the veins of quartz, the cracks and crevices, the purling water and the similar integration and organization of motifs in relation to these features. However, Aubeberget faces more directly towards the fjord, and visual contact with the burial monuments on the height behind is limited. As the base of the outcrop is only 5 m above present sea level and the outcrop is less than 150 m from the shore, the sea must have reached to just below the rock during the Early Bronze Age. From this low level, it is possible to see the entrance to Hafrsfjord, but the sea beyond is not visible. Even though Sothaug and other burial monuments on the Tananger peninsula were in sight, Aubeberget is related to the local landscape room and the environment around Hafrsfjord more than Fluberget with its superior exposure.

The images at Aubeberget are in an area measuring 40 x 14 m and can be divided into three panels, two on the eastern part of the outcrop and the third near the base in the west. Only one cupmark and a weathered ship with only 5 or 6 crew lines are to be seen between these panels, but since the rock surface is badly eroded, other figures may have disappeared, especially since the grooves marking the images are shallow, less deeply cut than at Fluberget. A total of 96 images have been recognised, 65 ships, and the rest circles, footprints, cupmarks and some unidentified figures.

The upper of the eastern panels (group I) consists of 22 ships, 9 circles and parts of several unidentified images. Eighteen of the ships have been carved horizontally, parallel to cracks from which water seeps to run over some of the figures in wet periods. Horizontal transformative associations like those at Fluberget cannot be recognised here. A transformation from fragmented to complete ships...
can probably be seen along the vertical axis from the top of the panel to its base. Even though this process cannot be combined with cracks in the rock surface, as on Fluberget, the images are concentrated in a limited area with purling water. However, the water may have caused the figures to be eroded, rather than being deliberately depicted in a fragmentary state. Despite the idea of a vertical transformation of ships, they seem primarily to have a horizontal orientation, following veins of quartz and the glacial striations on the rock surface.

A special feature is the sun symbol depicted onboard one of the few ships that is orientated towards inland. This motif is on the upper part of the panel. The image is placed in the middle part of the ship, where interconnected circles are also depicted just below the keel. Not only does this motif mark the upper limit of the panel, but one circle is being carried on a rod. Such an image is unique for Rogaland, but it is common in South Scandinavian rock art and is usually interpreted as symbolising a procession.

The panel below (group 2) consists of 29 ships, ten cupmarks, three footprints and some unidentified figures. Like those on panel 1, the ships here are placed parallel with the surface striations and orientated towards natural cracks that collect and channel water in wet weather. As at Fluberget, the footprints are near the base of the rock, where, together with cupmarks, they constitute the lower layer of the panel. Compared with other rock art localities in Rogaland there are relatively few cupmarks at Aubeberget. This tendency is also found at other sites near the coast, like Hellestø, Vigdel, Ølberg and Nag. Ten of the 12 cupmarks at Aubeberget are on panel 2. Some are carved close to ships, but compared with the general distribution of the images, they, too, are located near the base.

The third group of rock art is located 16 m further west and consists of one cupmark and 13 ships. Their oval shape and double lines distinguish them from the other single-lined ships on Aubeberget. They are placed in a 7 m long, continuous row. Quartz veins and ice striations emphasize their linear arrangement near the Bronze Age shoreline. Before the upper terrace was drained, this part of the outcrop was regularly overflowed by water from a small stream. The original extent of the wet area can still be seen from the colour of the rock surface around the three ships at the head of the procession. Twelve of the ships are heading towards a crevice that still collects water from the surface. The rear ship that is placed to the east of the crevice is distinguished by two sun symbols carried on rods, similar to the above-mentioned image on panel 2.

In front of Aubeberget is a boulder whose flat, upper surface is decorated with 10 cupmarks, most of them close to the edge facing the fjord and Fluberget.180 During the Early Bronze Age, the boulder must have been surrounded by water near the shoreline.
Monuments and rock art at Sunde

A similar boulder with 15 cupmarks has been recorded in front of the third site with figurative rock art on the east side of Hafrsfjord. A cairn is situated on the top of a rocky outcrop just behind the boulder and the rock art. No datable objects come from the cairn, but its form of construction and location indicate that it is from the Bronze Age. Like at Aubeberget, the boulder must have been near the shoreline, with rock art and a cairn on higher ground near by. The site overlooks the entrance to the fjord and has direct visual contact with Sothaug on the opposite side. The rock art panel measures 1.5 x 3.35 m and 11 ships and two cupmarks have been recognised. As at Fluberget and Aubeberget, the rock is slaty, but the site lacks their characteristic quartz veins, crevices and flowing water. The ships are, however, orientated in the same direction, which, here, means that they are sailing parallel to the fjord entrance.

A barrow called Mjughaug was situated on an outcrop overlooking the narrowest part of the passage into Hafrsfjord. An excavation in 1979 revealed a number of cupmarks on the rock underneath the monument (Braathen 1979:259, Hernæs 1999:455). When another barrow near Mjughaug was plundered in 1878, the blade of a bronze dagger from period 3 was found. The barrow was 6 m in diameter and 1.4 m high. These barrows had a similar position to the contemporary Sothaug on the other side of the fjord entrance, which was therefore flanked by Bronze Age monuments, similar to other marine passages into sheltered harbours along the coast of Jæren (see 5.5., 5.6., 5.6., 5.9.).

More examples of rock art are found along the crest of the ridge between Hafrsfjord and the lakes behind, and together with a number of barrows they represent a third kind of reference. Cupmarks dominate among the motifs, but figurative images also occur on two boulders. One of them, which must originally have belonged in a grave monument, is a slaty rock with a plane surface facing the fjord. The surface is eroded, but seven cupmarks have been recorded on its northern edge, and five ships can be seen on its northeast side. The ships have an oval-shaped keel, similar to the ones on panel 3 at Aubeberget and those at Ølberg (see 5.8.).

A small slab decorated with three cupmarks came from another barrow on the ridge. The barrow was aligned with three others. No objects can be associated with them, but their linear arrangement along the crest of the ridge indicates an Early Bronze Age date. Close to this line of barrows are two boulders with three and 50 cupmarks, respectively. Another boulder with rock art is situated 300 m from the shore of Hålandsvannet, with a location and a motif that address the inland part of the surrounding landscape. The decoration is unique and consists of parallel grooves with a few crossing lines, somewhat reminiscent of single-lined ships with crew lines.

Even though the monuments at Madla, Revheim and Sunde refer both to the inland area and the sea, Hafrsfjord represents the primary focus. This is especially so for the figura-
tive rock art sites that are dominated by ship motifs and located at sites where water plays a part in their organisation and presentation. This is most obvious at Fluberget, but also at Aubeberget, where water combined with cracks, crevices and quartz veins animates movements and transformations.

5.11. SUB-AREA 10: AROUND THE LAKE OF BØ AND THE HARESTAD BOG

Harestad (49) 0049002 (H26), Randaberg: cairn, EBA-IA
Harestad (49) 0049003 (H25), Randaberg: cairn, EBA-IA
Harestad (49) 0049005, Randaberg: rock art site, EBA-IA
Harestad (49) 0049009 (H22), Randaberg: cairn «Odderoysa», EBA-IA
Sande (53) HX10, Randaberg: barrow, EBA-IA
Indre Bø (54) X11270054001 (HX7), Randaberg: cairn «Storerøysa», EBA-IA
Indre Bø (54) X11270054002 (HX2), Randaberg: barrow «Rauhaug», EBA-IA
Ytre Bø (55) 0055001 (H4), Randaberg: cairn «Lynshaug», EBA-IA
Ytre Bø (55) 0055002 (H3), Randaberg: cairn «Borudla», EBA-IA
Ytre Bø (55), Randaberg: slab with cupmarks (S.7760)
Raustein (58) 0058001, Randaberg: boulder with cupmarks
Viste (59) 0059016, Randaberg: sloping rock with cupmarks
Viste (59) HX5, Randaberg: boulder with cupmarks
Viste (59) HX5, Randaberg: barrow «Kroshaug», EBA (S.3737)
Vestre Goa (60) 0060012, Randaberg: sloping rock with cupmarks
Vestre Goa (60) HX2, Randaberg: two barrows «Tvhaugene», period 5-6 (S.2083)
Grave monuments and rock art sites in this sub-area are related to two central landscape rooms where the sea, lakes and waterways are structuring elements. This is expressed firstly by three cupmark sites located at distinct points on the northern side of a bay, Vistevika, and the isthmus that now separates a lake, Hålandsvannet, from the sea, and secondly by how these localities are connected to the landscape and grave monuments on the terrace behind them via smaller streams. This waterway link between rock art localities and mounds may indicate why their locations were chosen. Hålandsvannet was isolated from the sea about 2000-1500 cal. BC, during the Late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age, but access from the bay was still possible via a stream, Kvernbebken.

The monuments
Like the cupmark localities at Vistevika, the Krosshaug barrow on the Viste ridge overlooked the sea and the sailing route along the coast. It was already damaged when it was recorded in 1897, but its bottom layer indicated a diameter of 25 m. With such a dimension, the barrow must have been a dominating point in the local landscape room, visible from both sea and land. When the barrow was removed in 1914, a cist was found at its centre. It was aligned ENE-WSW, the same orientation as the Vistevika shore and the channel into Hålandsvannet, as well as the alignment of cupmark localities and grave monuments. Little information was recorded about the barrow, but the cist was half full of earth and its floor was covered by pebbles and fine beach sand on which unburnt fragments of a skeleton and sherds of pottery were found. A large number of seashells lay both inside and outside the cist. Seashells and beach sand have been found in a number of Bronze Age graves in Lista and Rogaland, underlining the connection to sea and water (see Chapter 7).

Two barrows stood on a prominent site above the waterway linking Vistevika and Hålandsvannet, addressing both the inland and the sea and at the same time marking the transition between these two zones. The barrows were called Tvihaugene (The twin barrows), but one of them was removed as early as 1848. The northern barrow was badly damaged in 1897, but a cist was nevertheless uncovered. Few details about the cist and the finds made in it are known, but it contained burnt bones and pottery sherds. A casting mould for a socketed axe from periods 5 or 6 lay among the stones on its floor, but it is not clear whether it belonged to a primary or a secondary burial. In Rogaland, casting moulds otherwise occur only as stray finds, often without a clear context. This is also the situation for a mould for a socketed axe from period 4, found in the same area.

Further north, another east-west orientated bay existed in the Early Bronze Age. In recent times it was a wetland that surrounded a lake, Bøvannet, which is now totally drained and cultivated, but during the Early Bronze Age it was connected to the sea through a narrow channel. This area has moraine ridges on three sides, creating a limited landscape room. Grave monuments once stood on both sides of the channel, and two large cairns can still be seen further west at Ytre Bø. Artefacts from the first-mentioned graves are not preserved, but the location, construction and size of the monuments indicate an Early Bronze Age date. Two damaged cairns at Harestad stand in prominent positions on the outer edge of this landscape room. They are visible from one another, and can be seen from the whole area.

The rock art
On the rocky south slope of the northern ridge is a rock art site with 17 ships, two circles, one circle with a cross, five cupmarks and two unidentified figures. The panel measures 20 x 10 m and is located on a rock surface with a 40 degree inclination, just above the wetland of Harestadmyra (Skjølsvold 1960, Eide and Sør-Reiime 1988). A cairn called Odderøysa is situated on a prominent point on the ridge. In addition to the monumentality of the cairn, the point itself has the shape of a grave mound. It is called Varden and has therefore also
been a landmark in historical times. It offers a wide view over the sea and the coastal sailing route, and other rock art sites like Fluberget and Aubeberget (see 5.10.), Dusavika and Rudlo (see 5.12.), and Hundvåg, Bru, Åmøy and Hodnafjellet (see 5.13.) can be seen from here.

Like at other rock art sites in northern Jæren, the figures at Harestad have been carved on slaty rock. The surface is uneven with deep striations that have partly determined the
orientation of ship images. No quartz veins, crevices or cracks are present on the panel, but water flows over the images in wet periods. Like at Aubeberget, some of the ships have circular sun symbols onboard or on their prow. Two lure blowers may possibly be seen on one of the ships, but this interpretation is uncertain and the lines may be parts of a circle. The cupmarks occur on the upper, middle and lower parts of the panel and are mainly related to ship images. A slab with 15 cupmarks has also been found at Bø. Its size indicates that it may have belonged to a cist.200


Øvre Tasta (28) 3075.B6.R5, Stavanger: rock art site «Vardeneset»
Kampen (59) 3075.D10.R1, Stavanger: rock art site «Rudlo»
Kampen (59) 3075.D10.R2, Stavanger: rock art site «Rudlo»
Randaberg (51) 11270051003 (H8), Randaberg: cairn «Megershaug» and cupmarked boulder

The northern part of the Stavanger peninsula mainly has a different type of landscape, primarily expressed by the many low hills, fjords and islands which are typical elements of the fjord landscape further north. However, the open, fragmented, coastal landscape of Jæren is also present here, and the area is a meeting point in terms of geology, major landscape elements and natural history. Different elements are therefore transformed and blended, and a protected and fertile area with a better local climate has been created. Such a situation
is characteristic for the location of three rock art sites in this sub-area, as they address the maritime passage of Byfjorden that connect the mainland with the islands and sounds that are so typical of the outer Ryfylke basin.

On a promontory close to the entrance to Byfjorden, a boulder with 10 cupmarks stands close to the former site of a cairn, whose shape, construction and location indicated a Bronze Age date. The locality is called Megershaug, a name that refers to its size and monumental position in the landscape. The cairn was 18 m in diameter and 2 m high, and its centre contained a slab-lined cist in which only a few burnt bones were found. It was covered by three capstones. The burnt bones were mainly found on these stones, but also within the
Although the cairn stood at the entrance to the fairway through Byfjorden, it was mainly visible for those coming southwards along the main sailing route from the north. The rock art sites and Bronze Age monuments on the nearby island of Bru are also visible here (see 5.13.). The promontory also protects the harbour area in Randabergvika.

The promontory of Vardeneset, near Dusavika on Tasta, has a similar location. Its strategic position for traffic through Byfjorden is obvious from the modern navigation lantern on the site, and the place name that indicates an old seamark. On the rock surface just below the lantern are two rock art panels with six and two figures, respectively. The lower part of the panels is only 6.74 m above present sea level and must have been close to the shoreline in the Early Bronze Age. The surface has an inclination of 20 degrees. The rough surface has spots of quartz that have been incorporated into some of the motifs, which have been classified as «rammefigurer» (frame figures) similar to the ones found at Revheim, Sunde (Friheim), Hundvåg and Åmøy (Fett and Fett 1941:67, 127). An alternative interpretation is to see these motifs as upturned ships. Panel 1 has in addition two more complex figures that include single- and double-lined circles and concentrations of quartz. The linear presentation of the images, and the alternation between fragmented and complete grooves, underlines an intentional expression of movement.

Like the promontory at Megershaug, the rock art at Vardeneset overlooks the passage along Byfjorden and the main sailing route from the north. On the opposite side of the narrow sound is the island of Hundvåg where a large cairn and two rock art sites are also framing the passage (see 5.2.12.). Vardeneset and Hundvåg are therefore a counterpart to the position of Megershaug and Bru further north. One of the motifs at Hundvåg is a frame figure similar to those at Vardeneset.

The southernmost rock art locality on the west side of Byfjorden is located at Rudlo, a prominent hillock 50 m above sea level. From this location, all the main islands in the outer Ryfylke basin can be seen, as well as the entrance to the fjords to the east and north. Rudlo is a landmark that overlooks the other rock art sites along the fjord. Eighteen figures have been recorded here, spread over two panels. Panel 1 consists of eight ships, three cupmarks, one single- and one double-lined circle, and one circle with an inner cross. In addition, there are two pairs of footprints and a number of unidentified figures, all of which face the fjord. Panel 2 consists of only two pairs of footprints. The rock is phyllitic with cracks and crevices and concentrations of quartz, but these elements have not been included in the composition. Much of the site is destroyed, and other figures may have been lost.

Characteristic for the preserved compositions is that the cupmarks are aligned with the two largest ships on the lower part of panel 1. Above the smaller of these two ships is a single-lined sun symbol, whilst the double-lined circle is located close to the prow of another ship higher up on the same panel. Both the cupmarks and the sun symbols can therefore be related directly to the ships. The circle with an inner cross marks the upper limit of the figurative motives. Like on other rock art sites in Jæren, the footprints are placed on the lower part of the panel, and both pairs point towards the sea. Both pairs of footprints on panel 2 are orientated in the same direction, but point towards the inland.

5.13. SUB-AREA 12: THE ISLANDS OF ÅMØY, BRU, MOSTERØY AND HUNDVÅG

Meling (3) R11030003023 (4427.D4.R2). Stavanger (Åmøy): rock art site
The outer islands of Boknafjord represent a continuation of the landscape elements found in Jæren, but forms that are typical for the fjord landscape further north and east are also incorporated. This area may therefore be seen as a meeting point where geographical and geological structures are united and transformed into a continuous system of islands and maritime passages that lead towards the inner parts of Ryfylke. In this liminal position, the islands represent more than topographical units. They have an integrative role between the outer sailing route and the inner system of waterways, a position mirrored by the distribution of rock art sites and grave monuments at marked points along the major maritime passages. This is primarily expressed by the location of such sites along Byfjorden, Åmøyfjord and Askjesund. Here the rock art localities are mainly found in the shore zone, where both motifs and rock surfaces address the sea, while the grave monuments are situated on higher terraces behind. In contrast to the barrows in Jæren, the dominating constructions here are bare cairns. In general, these are smaller than the Jæren Bronze Age barrows, but larger than the Iron Age graves, which are mainly found in separate groups near ancient farm sites and settlement areas. There are, however, some cairns whose form and location alone are inadequate evidence to support a dating determination.

Like the area north of Hafrsfjord, the geology of the outer islands in Boknafjord is dominated by phyllite with layers of meta-arkose and quartzite. The rock art sites are mainly in areas where this kind of rock is exposed, often at places where quartz is a prominent element that may be incorporated in the composition of motifs. At Austre Åmøy, there are also a nappe sheet consisting of granodiorite, granite, tonalite and gneiss (Dahl 1990, Prosch-
Danielsen 1993; 2002:7). Austre Åmøy has the largest collection of rock art in Rogaland, altogether 1150 figures and cupmarks distributed over 21 localities. Twenty of these are found on the south side of the island, facing Åmøyfjord, and the last is on a hill on the north side with a view towards the point where Askjesund and Mastra fjord meet.

Åmøy

All the rock art on the south side of Åmøy is carved on solid rock within a 1.5 km long shore zone. The inclination of the rock surfaces varies from horizontal areas to nearly vertical walls, but they all face Åmøyfjord. This is a position they have in common with localities on the mainland and the island of Bru, as they mark this waterway. From the shore, the terrain rises gently towards the middle of the island, which is characterized by barren knolls and outcrops between small areas of Quaternary sediments. When Eva and Per Fett mapped the archaeological sites on the island in the 1930s (Fett and Fett 1941:21), the area was littered with glacial boulders, most of which have now been removed. The only rock art on the north side of the island is found on such a boulder, called Rosnessteinen. Most of its motifs face the fjord in the north.
The lowest images are situated 3.5-4 m above present sea level, which is the lower limit for rock art in Rogaland in general. Recent investigations on shoreline displacement in northern Jæren and on the Boknafjord islands show that the sea level about 1530-1130 BC was 4.2 m higher than today (Simonsen 1972, Prøsch-Danielsen 2002). This means that the lowest images on Åmøy were placed close to the Middle Bronze Age shoreline and may have been washed by seawater and waves (see Chapter 6).

The rock art on Åmøy was first investigated by Gabriel Gustavson in 1893 when he primarily described and sketched the images at locality I. In 1900, Tor Helliesen published an article on the Åmøy rock art, which also included figures from localities II, IV, V, IX and X. Further investigations were carried out by A.W. Brøgger in 1913 using photographic documentation and new drawings. During the 1920s, Eyvind de Lange began a similar project, but he was unable to conclude his work. It was Eva Fett who started a complete, systematic mapping and documentation of the rock art on Åmøy during the 1930s, first together with Harald Egenæs Lund, but Per Fett took part in the latest investigations and the final publication in 1941. Altogether they recorded 15 localities (localities I-XV), and these have recently been supplemented with individual figures and small groups (Høgestøl et al. 1999:8). Recent investigations on Åmøy are related to problems of conservation and presentation to the public after the sites were protected as an area of national cultural-historical importance (Høgestøl et al. 1999).

The research status of rock art studies on Åmøy chiefly rests on the early systematic mapping that began before farming was intensified (Fett and Fett 1941). Documentation exists in the form of drawings and photos, and both natural and artificial light were used to locate the figures (Høgestøl et al. 1999:26). The main focus has been on the images, their composition and their internal relations, and the aim was to achieve a precise interpretation of their composition. Much work has been invested in the use of objective documentation methods and the selection of representative types, always within the framework of the relation of the motifs to an agrarian culture. Landscape and seascape studies are only included to a limited degree, and the relationship to the sea is considered more as a limitation than a possibility. To a certain extent, the figures are related to the structure, colour and form of the rock, but mostly within the framework of conservation and protection, and not as active
elements in their general representation. This means that variables like water, quartz, cracks, clefts and other natural structures have not been included in the interpretation of the meaning of the place, or been related to the maritime references in the rock art.

As elsewhere in Rogaland, ships are the dominating motifs, making up 48% of the figures on Åmøy. The three most usual forms are 1) one-lined ships with a straight or curved prow, 2) two-lined ships with a straight or curved prow, and 3) contour-drawn ships with or without a hammered-out hull. A general trait is the occurrence of ships with prows formed as animal heads. Characteristic for the ships is that their keels are often drawn parallel to the water line and they are normally sailing from right to left. Ships are present at all the localities and often appear together with ring figures. This relationship is expressed in different ways, but a special motif that gives associations to the transformation and movement that are also expressed in other ways, is that ships are orientated towards circles, often multi-ringed circles that also include ships (group IV-2). This creates a depth effect of ships sailing into the rock. Rings also occur on the prows of ships, above ships and within ships. Altogether 58 circle motifs, consisting of single-ringed or multi-ringed images, have been recorded. Rings with spokes or crosses are more seldom. One example is a wheel-cross carried by a ship, which also seems to have a mast (VI-3).

Footprints are known from several localities in Rogaland, but Revheim and Åmøy stand out because of their number and variations. On Åmøy, 69 footprints have been found, singular or in pairs. They are spread over seven groups, but are specially concentrated at locality X, which is the westernmost locality and thus marks an outer border. Seventeen of the footprints are found in group X-1, which is situated nearest to the sea. Such a location expresses a tendency that is typical for Rogaland, where footprints in general are placed on the lower part of rock art panels (see I-8 and VI-5). Seen in relation to the Bronze Age sea level, these motifs must have been situated in the border zone between water and land, where they were continuously being washed by the sea, and their grooves often being filled with water. Even when the sea was calm, the locality was washed by water from the wetland above. The footprints at this locality, as on Åmøy in general, are orientated towards the sea, only a few face inland. Usually they have a simple oval form with contour lines, but some have a crossbar (group II, VI-5), some have four or five toes (group IV-2, no. 38) and some are completely hammered out (group I-6, nos. 1-4, 9-10). As at Revheim, footprints with cupmarks have also been found (group I-4, no. 9).

Animal figures are seldom found in Rogaland, but some examples from Dysjaland and Hedland were described in section 5.7. On Åmøy, two similar animal pictures are known (groups I-8, no. 52, VI-5, no. 58). In addition, an image carved with simple lines has – not convincingly – been interpreted as a swan (group IV-1, no. 12). Special for Åmøy and southwest Norway in general are the four naturalistic fishes depicted at locality I. With reference to their form, they have been interpreted as halibuts, but this determination of species is debatable. Of special interest is their over-dimensioned size compared with other motifs on the panel. The most common representation of animals is, however, the many ship prows with the shape of animal heads (e.g. groups I, III-1-3, IV-1-2, VI-5, X-4). They have a similar form to that found on many Bronze Age razor blades, which themselves are shaped like ships (Kaul 1995).

Human beings are, like animals, seldom depicted on rock art sites in Rogaland. Their distribution is similar to the animal motifs, as they are found at Dysjaland and Hedland, in addition to Åmøy where seven have been recognised (groups I, III, IV, VI and XI). These few examples are in contrast to what is otherwise common elsewhere in southern Scandinavia, where human figures are often depicted, both individually and in large scenic compositions. In such representations, they may be carrying weapons like axes or spears, and sometimes instruments similar to the lures from Revheim. Such depictions often present phallic men (Yates 1993). Like the other human images from Rogaland, it has not been possible to
determine the sex of the Åmøy figures. They belong to a pattern of sex-neutral and equal representations of humans, similar to how the crew lines are drawn on ships. This unambiguousness underlines the collective relationship of human beings to the ships, but there is also a contrast between the standardisation of humans compared with the variation of the ships.

A motif specific to Åmøy is the axes, of which seven examples have been recorded (Fett and Fett 1941, Plates I-11, no. 1, IV-1, nos. 6, 39, 40, IV-2, nos. 66, 71). Their types are difficult to determine, but they have some similarity with what have been termed procession axes. In South Scandinavia, such axes are usually found in hoards (Johansen 1993, Jensen 1997), often in a context related to bogs or water.209 The relationship to water is also obvious on Åmøy as the axe motifs are found at three of the eight localities that are continuously covered by surface water. Seen in relation to other images, the axes are often placed near the outer edges of panels, with no unambiguous connection with other figures.

A motif that is not easily defined is the «rammefigurer» (frame figures) that have mainly been found at Revheim and Åmøy, but also at Vardeneset and Sunde (Friheim). Both at Revheim and Vardeneset, they are carved at localities with much quartz on the rock surface, but the combination with this element is seldom found on Åmøy. However, many of the frame figures here have a shape that gives association to upturned ships or double ships with a common keel line (e.g. VI-6, nos. 7, 17). An ambiguity is thus expressed that may characterise the composite role and function of the ship, both in relation to opportunities and dangers, and its real and imaginary position.

The Åmøy localities

Locality I is the most complex210 and 460 figures have been recorded, spread over 16 groups (Fett and Fett 1941:33-45, Plates 9-15). They are concentrated in an area of 32 x 13 m and are carved on a striated rock surface that has an inclination of 20 degrees towards the sea in the south. The locality is only 17 m from the shore and 3-4 m above present sea level. The surface has several cracks, some of which seem to have determined the sailing direction of the ships. This is not consistent, but the joints have obviously been more important for the orientation of the images than the striations that cross the rock in a nearly vertical SW-NE direction. The rock is phyllite, mainly composed of quartz, muscovite and chlorite (Walderhaug and Bakkevig 1999:68). The quartz content is higher than usual in phyllite and higher than was found at the other localities investigated (Walderhaug and Bakkevig 1999:66, Table 1). On the rock surface, the quartz appears as lenses that in places have the character of broken lines. The largest concentrations of quartz are found at group 8, which is also dominated by surface water (I-8, Plate 23).

The combination of quartz and water helps to accentuate the figures in group 8 which, in addition, are finished works, as expressed by the deep carvings, complete crew lines, and prows shaped like animal heads. A four-ringed circle is depicted above the most distinct ships. It is partly carried on a ship, and it functions as a common point of reference giving an impression that the ships are sailing into the interior of the rock. The rings in the circle create a depth effect, which, together with the surface water, strengthen the impression of such a voyage. Another special aspect of this locality is the rich combination of different types of ships that appear together with human figures and animals, with cupmarks placed at the lower edge of the panel. In contrast to the central motifs of group 8, the ships gradually become more fragmented near the edges of the panel. This is expressed by their disintegrated and more standardised forms, and that they have few or no crew lines. Several of the ships are also more shallowly carved. However, other motifs are present outside the core area, like fishes and axes that differ from the ships by their clear, marked appearance. The arrangement of figures in group 8 may illustrate a spatial intention, but possibly also a chronological situation.
Fig. 5.13.3. The 15 rock art localities at Åmøy (From Høgestøl et al. 1999)
Locality II is situated 60 m southwest of locality I and contains 30 figures that are carved on a surface inclined 15 degrees southeast, facing the sea. The locality is 15 m from the shore, and 3.75-4 m above present sea level. The rock is mica gneiss dominated by quartz and muscovite, and quartz lenses and bands are clearly visible (Walderhaug and Bakkevig 1999:72). The surface is broken by a system of crossing cracks that have only partly been used to organise the distribution of the figures. The carvings are concentrated in an area of 4 x 3.5 m that is constantly covered by water. Most of the motifs are ships with shallow lines, and their forms are partly fragmented. They are orientated away from a four-ringed and a three-ringed circle, which are placed in the western corner (Fett and Fett 1941:45-46, Plate 13). Near the western edge of the panel, two footprints point towards the sea, and a ship with two Y-shaped figures marks the lower edge.
Fig. 5.13.5. Locality I at Åmøy (From Høgestøl et al., 1999)

Locality 1

Source: E&P Fett (1941)
Fig. 5.13.6. Locality III, group 1-2 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941, Høgestøl et al. 1999)
Locality III is 50 m southwest of locality II, and numbers 48 figures spread over five groups within an area of 12 x 10 m. Groups 1 and 3 are on a steep slope that falls towards the shore in the southwest, and group 2 is situated on the plane surface above. Groups 4 and 5 were further to the west, but have been destroyed by road construction. The existing groups are 12-20 m from the shore and 5-8 m above present sea level. Like at locality II, the rock consists of mica gneiss with up to 40% quartz that appears as nearly 1 cm broad bands (Walderhaug and Bakkevig 1999:66, Tables 1, 74). The rock is cut by deep cracks running N-S and E-W, which split the surface into small blocks. Most of the figures are placed where the surface is even, with an inclination of 20-30 degrees towards the sea. They are not carved on
Fig. 5.13.8. Ships at locality III, group 1 at Åmøy (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)

Fig. 5.13.9. Composition of ships at locality III, group 3 at Åmøy (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)
the areas richest in quartz, but where quartz-rich laminae are clearly visible. The motifs consist mainly of ships or fragments of ships, the most complete ones appearing in the middle and lower areas (III-3). There is also a human figure depicted in profile (18), and two over-dimensioned creatures are present on one of the ships. The ships on this panel are more deeply cut than the others and have the best marked animal-shaped prows. This group is therefore similar to I-8, where the surrounding ships near the edges showed a greater degree of fragmentation.

Locality IV is 300 m southwest of locality III and encompasses 96 figures that originally consisted of three groups, but group 1 was destroyed when a road was constructed through the locality. Group 2 is located on a surface with an inclination of 5-25 degrees towards the sea in the south, where the motifs are concentrated in an area of 16 x 9 m. The panel is limited in the south by a 2-3 m high road cutting, and from there the rock slopes upwards to the north where a depression in the rock surface marks a boundary. It collects surface water and prevents it from running freely over the figures. However, in wet periods, the water overflows the depression and trickles over the central part of the panel. The uneven structure of the rock surface is caused by alternating layers of quartzite and mica that bring about a special wavy pattern with a complex play of colours.

Like the composition at locality I-8, the most clearly carved ships are found near a four-ringed circle. This central symbol both orientates and partly includes ships of different types. This creates a depth effect and an illusion of ships sailing into the rock. Water and the wavy structure of the surface strengthen this impression. The association with the sea is most clear under circumstances when bands of quartzite can be seen in an interplay with sunlight and water. The ships around the central circle differ from the other figures on the panel because of their deeply carved lines and more complete forms. Most of them also have complete crew lines and prows with animal heads. A human-like figure is placed at the bow of one ship, pointing towards the circle. At the edges of this central composition the ships are more shallowly carved, have more fragmented forms, and their crew lines are more irregularly carved. Other figures, like axes, are also introduced near the periphery of the panel.

Group 3 lies 120 m further east, on rock inclined 15 degrees southwards, towards the sea. The panel is situated 3-4 m above present sea level and includes four undefined figures and two cupmarks (Fett and Fett 1941:51, Plate 20B). The rock is like that at the previous group,
Fig. 5.13.11.
Locality IV, group 2, section 1 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941, Høgestøl et al. 1999)
but the rock art cannot be related to a special structure beyond its clear maritime references.

**Locality V** is situated 60 m north of locality IV, on rock inclined 20-25 degrees southwards, towards the shore. The locality encompasses 50 figures, in three groups within an area of 40 x 2 m. Groups 1 and 2 are both covered by earth and vegetation. Group 3 seems to be of a similar character to the previously described group IV-2. Earlier documentation shows that the motifs consisted mainly of ships (Fett and Fett 1941:51-53, Plates 19B, 20A). In group 1, they appear in a fragmented form with irregular crew lines. A special feature is the three wheel-crosses that carry a number of ships, all orientated towards the east. Four of the six ships in group 3 belong to a rare type which Fett and Fett called F ships, and which are mainly without a crew (1941, Plate 82).

**Locality VI** encompasses 231 figures distributed among eight groups. All of them are situated on rock surfaces facing the sea in the south. The groups are spread over an area of 70 x 80 m, 3.5-7 m above present sea level. The figures are carved on rock surfaces where bands and lenses of quartz bring about a special structure and colour (Walderhaug and Bakkevig 1999:76-77). Groups 1-4 consist of small panels all of which are dominated by ship figures. A special motif is two ships seen from above (VI-1). Unlike at locality V-1, where wheel-crosses carry ship images, here there is an example of a similar circular motif being carried by a ship that is equipped with a mast (group 3). In the southern part of the locality, group 5 stands out among the others, especially because of a large, 5.5 m long ship that is surrounded by...
smaller ships located at the upper and lower edges of the panel. The ship is carved 4.4 m above present sea level, on a rock surface inclined 8 degrees towards the sea in the south. The surface is uneven with several pits, which are filled with water in wet periods, especially on the eastern part of the surface where a group of footprints is often covered by water. In contrast to the smaller ships, the large one has no crew, and belongs to the rare type which Fett and Fett called F-ships, four of which are found in group 3 at locality V (1941:Plate 82).

Groups 6, 7 and 8 are situated along an east-west orientated line that may be considered in relation to the idea of a middle focus that unites a common narrative. This is also a prominent feature at other localities (I-8, III-3, IV-2), and is here expressed both by the form of the motifs and the representation of the figures. The outer panels are entirely dominated by ships with fragmented forms, and in part shallow lines. There are few and only irregular crew lines, and most ships have a uniform shape. A motif that often occurs near the edges is double ships with a common keel line (VI-6, nos. 7 and 17). A contrast is the central ships of group 7, which have a more complete form and are surrounded by a complex group of ships where many types are represented. Unlike other localities where ships are orientated towards various cir-
Locality IV, group 2, section 2

Fig. 5.13.16. Locality IV, group 2, section 2 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941, Høgestøl et al. 1999)

= covered by lichen
ZZZ = exfoliation
Axes are well represented at locality IV. Like the general tendency at Åmøy, axes appear on the margin of the panels (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre).

Locality V, group 3 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941, Høgestøl et al. 1999)

Symbols:

- * = pointed
- zzz = exfoliation
- = lacuna
Fig. 5.13.19. Four of the six ships on locality IV, group 3, belong to the rare type which Fett and Fett call F-types. The line drawn from one of the ship has been interpreted as a fishing line, but it might be a paddle oar (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)

Fig. 5.13.20. Locality VI at Åmøy (From Høgestøl et al. 1999)
Section VI, group 5

Fig. 5.13.21. Locality VI, group 5 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941, Høgestøl et al. 1999)
cle motifs (e.g. I-8, VI-2), the ships on this panel are sailing away from the circles, which are depicted near the western edge. Their sailing direction is therefore from the sea in the west towards the fjords in the east. The three panels represent transforming stages of this voyage, where Åmøy itself may represent a middle point. The great surplus of surface water that covers the middle group of figures helps to reinforce the movable and transforming aspects of such a hypothesis.

Localities IX and X are the last rock art sites on the coast in this area. Locality IX consists of 93 figures distributed among eight groups, which are located in a row along the foot of a rock surface inclined ten degrees towards the sea in the south. The locality is situated 4 m above present sea level, and the central groups of figures are exposed to surface water that runs over the rock from above (IX-2 and IX-3). Like at the previous localities, the rock consists of phyllite with layers of quartzite and lenses of quartz. The dominating motif is the ship, but the eastern group also has a large number of cupmarks and small circles spread all over the panel (Fett and Fett 1941:58-60, Plates 23B, 25, 26A-C). Otherwise, the figures near the edges tend to be depicted with different degrees of fragmentation.

Locality X marks the end of a continuous row of outcrops. The surrounding terrain is grassy and damp because of water coming from the wetland above. Between the low, smooth rock surfaces are a number of boulders, but many more have been removed from the fields. When Fett and Fett studied the area in the 1930s, the present farmland had not yet been cleared, and such boulders were included in their investigation (Fett and Fett 1941:60). The figures at locality X are concentrated on a surface that is sloping towards the sea in the south. They are 3.5 m above present sea level and cover an area of 25 x 20 m. 193 figures have been recognised, distributed among four groups (Fett and Fett 1941:60-62, Plates 27-30A).

A prominent feature of this border locality is the many footprints. Seventeen of the 68 recorded are on the lowest panel (X-1). They mark the lower edge of the locality and, at the same time, a meeting zone between sea and land, and with the higher sea level of the Bronze Age, the shore may have been close by. Most of the footprints are carved below the largest ship, and all are orientated towards the sea. They are covered by surface water, which continuously fills the grooves and contour lines. An exception is the two footprints outside this group, which are orientated towards inland. Unlike most other localities with footprints, everyone in this group appears as single images. The other groups of figures at locality X are dominated by ships, and some also have small circles and cupmarks.

Behind the localities near the shore are a number of sites with fewer figures, but still with ships as the dominating motif (localities VII, XI, XII). Two loose slabs have been found on the ridge above. One of them is decorated with a ring figure, and its size and form indicate that it was originally a grave slab (locality XIV). A similar slab found at a place where a barrow once stood probably also belonged to a grave (locality XV). A two-lined ship with complete crew lines is carved on one side (Fett and Fett 1941:64, Plate 30G). The place where these slabs were found may indicate the general location of Bronze Age graves on Åmøy, but since few are known and the circumstances of the finds are inaccurate, such an assumption is uncertain.

**General views on the Åmøy rock art**

The large number of figures on Åmøy and the complexity of the figures and their composition makes it difficult to work out a clear pattern that can reveal an overall spatial notion. However, the localities have in common their relation to the sea and the maritime passage along Åmøy fjord. This is expressed in the arrangement of both figures and panels. The sailing direction of the ships, as well as their orientation in relation to the shore, also makes this clear. When the vegetation was more open, there was visual contact between the localities, and those near the shore could be seen from boats sailing close by. The contours of the
distinct figures are clearly visible, especially in a low, winter light. However, the visual position of these localities differs from that of localities like Fluberget, Varden and Rudlo, which are more prominent because of their special form and monumentality. Compared with them, the low sites on Åmøy are more modest and the rock art display requires nearness and physical presence.

In addition to their obvious communication with the sea, several of the localities are related to islets and skerries, which, seen from the actual rock art sites, have a form similar to burial mounds. This spatial interplay enlarges the perspective of the mobile and maritime representation of the rock art and adds a new aspect to the relationship between monuments and rock art, as travels and water become a common basis for both. This phenomenon is also present at the rock art sites at Bru and Nag.

Even though phyllite with lenses and layers of quartz and quartzite dominates the rock surfaces on Åmøy in general, and several of the localities are especially rich in quartz, this feature seems not to have been a decisive variable for the localization of the rock art. The quartz-rich laminae make the surface uneven, small-scale folding sometimes creating a wave-like pattern in the border zone between quartzitic and mica-rich layers (e.g. locality IV-2). Both the colour and form of these surfaces give associations to the sea, a relation that is strengthened through the linear representation of the ships and the visual interplay that is introduced because of their real nearness to the sea. The same processes can be recognised at Fluberget, Aubeberget and Nag.

In general, quartz seems to have been included in compositions with ships and circles, especially on the most central panels where figures are deeply carved and appear in complete forms with whole lines and full crews. Water often runs over such panels at eight of the ten localities close to the shore. The deep grooves and uneven nature of the surface collect water, thereby strengthening the impression of the maritime location of the figures. Seen in this way, the elements of the landscape itself are included in the composition of the rock art. This makes them typical for the place and locally anchored, at the same time as they refer to a superior idea.

Flowing water often appears in connection with footprints, but water also gathers in depressions in the rock surface where footprints are sometimes located (V-5, X-1). Such a location is also notable for some footprints on Fluberget at Revheim. Footprints are mainly carved at the lower edge of the panels, in the Bronze Age border zone between sea and land (I-8, V-5, X-1). These images are mainly orientated towards the sea, whereas those found higher up usually face inland. The location of footprints on either a lower or an upper part of panels can be found at several localities in Rogaland.

As in southwest Norway in general, the ship is the dominant motif on Åmøy, where all the main types are represented. Special for Åmøy is the role ships play in relation to multi-ringed circles, which appear as orientation points on several panels. This is expressed by how ships sail towards circles, which sometimes even include ships as part of their representation (IV-2). On one panel, ships are also orientated away from a group of circles (VI-7). The concentric configuration of the rings creates a depth effect that gives the impression of ships sailing into the rock. This impression is strengthened by the presence of water and the implied waves created by the quartzitic and mica-rich layering of the phyllite (IV-2). This two-dimensional expression creates an illusion of a three-dimensional representation, which also includes the inner landscape of the rock. At Fluberget, there is a similar composition where depth and tri-dimensionality is strengthened by the concave form of the rock surface. Links between the figures are otherwise created by their common orientation towards natural cracks in the rock surface.

Such factors weaken the idea of the supposed role of the rock art in an agrarian cosmology, and hence its meaning for the organisation of agrarian landscapes. In terms of location, composition and integration with forms and elements, the maritime and mobile aspects of
the rock art are more prominent on Ámøy than at any other site in Rogaland. Such relationships also add new perspectives to the relation between rock art and grave monuments. This point of departure strengthens the position of the rock art in a maritime-based spatiality, as well as for a cosmology connected with water and travels at sea. Even though rock art sites on other islands in the Boknafjord basin are of a more modest character, they all display a similar tendency.

**Bru**

The island of Bru lies west of Ámøy, at the meeting point between Byfjorden and Ámoyfjord and with a western front facing the sea. One rock art locality has been recorded and together with five cairns it overlooks the entrance to Byfjorden and the main sailing route. The site of a cupmarked boulder and a cairn at Megershaug, Randaberg, can be seen just across the fjord (see 5.13.). In addition, there are two cairns on the north side of the island, overlooking the sound between Bru and Sokn. Like at Ámøy, the bedrock consists of phyllite with distinct quartz-rich laminae, and a wave-like pattern is created by the numerous crenulations. This pattern strengthens the linear representation of ship figures and gives association to sea and waves. The rock art panels on Bru are not overflowed by surface water, and thus differ from those at Ámøy.

The rock art on Bru is carved on bare rock in a bay, Skjebavigo, where figures are found at three localities. **Locality I** consists of eight ships and one oval figure that can be interpreted as a footprint. These images are carved on a sloping surface inclined 15 degrees towards the sea in the southeast. The panel measures 4 x 2.5 m and is situated 4.0 m above present sea level. The ships have an oval form and incomplete crew lines. Because of the position of the rock art, the figures must have been exposed to waves and spray from the sea even in historical times. **Locality II** is 50 m further south and consists of 28 ships, most of which belong to a type which Fett and Fett (1941:Plate 82) classified as K ships. They also appear at Hellestø, Revheim and Ámoy (I-10), and have been dated on typological grounds to be among the oldest types (Fett and Fett 1941:134). Gutorm Gjessing (1935:130) considered this type to be a typological continuation of the Stone Age hide-covered boats. In addition, there are 17 lines on the panel, which may be seen as incomplete ships. The rock surface slopes towards the sea in the south at an angle of 40 degrees and the figures are placed 8 m above present sea level. **Locality III** consists of a single ship line with an animal head and is located 100 m south of locality II and 11 m above present sea level (Fett and Fett 1941:31, Plate 8B).
The cairns are distributed in both the lower and upper shore zones, where they occupy prominent positions overlooking the maritime passages in the south, west and north. Unlike Jæren, where barrows dominate, here most grave monuments are cairns. In general, the islands occupy a transitional zone between the distribution of cairns and barrows, even though the shape, size and location of the monuments are similar. Based on these variables, several of the cairns on Bru can be dated to the Bronze Age.

Special for both cairns and rock art sites on Bru are their liminal position between the sea and the more protected fjord landscape. Bare rocks and low vegetation have made the cairns visible from the sailing routes, and they also mark the entrances to the inner passages. With such a location, they have been seamarks as well as points marking a transition into another type of landscape.

**Mosterøy**

Mosterøy is situated north of Bru, between Askjesund and Mastra-fjord. The area around Dysjalandsvågen, which in the Bronze Age was a maritime passage between the two fjords, is a centre for Bronze Age monuments. Grave monuments and rock art localities that overlook both the passage and the fjord to the southwest have been found on each side of this bay. This kind of double reference is typical for a cairn at Askje on the east side of the bay, near the meeting point between these two passages. A nearby outcrop has eight cupmarks placed in two groups within an area of 1.45 x 0.3 m. On the opposite side of the sound is a boulder with 32 cupmarks, and two slabs with rock art have been found on the terrace behind. One is decorated with a ship, the other with five cupmarks. Their form and size indicate that they may originally have been grave slabs.

Protected by Hodnavika, but more obviously relating to the outer sailing route, a number of figures are carved on a bare rock inclined at an angle of 45 degrees towards the west. The rock surface is similar to Åmoy and Bru, but with fewer quartzitic laminae or quartz lenses exposed. It is 6 m above present sea level, and has a similar position as the rock art
sites on Bru. Within an area of 7.0 x 1.5 m are 24 figures, 14 ships, five cupmarks and five simple lines that appear to be incomplete ships (Fett and Fett 1941:28-29, Plate 4D). Five of the ships are especially deeply carved. They have double keel lines and are similar to some on Åmøy (I-3, I-8, VI-8), Revheim and Hundvåg. Like them, they have complete crew lines and are surrounded by ships that either are carved with shallow lines or are fragmented. Even though these rock carvings are located in a similar position to those on Bru, the ships differ in type. Nearby is a cairn with a slab-lined cist visible in its centre. The cairn is 10 m in diameter and 1.5 m high.

North of Hodnavika, a small outcrop with seven cupmarks is present on a hillock 70 m above sea level. From here, there is a wide view over the outer sailing route and towards Bru in the south, but the locality near the bay cannot be seen. From Haugvaldstad on Mosterøy comes a hoard with four flint daggers and a flint sickle. The daggers are of types VA and VIA. The character of this find is typical for Bronze Age hoards from the islands and in Ryfylke, and shows that flint objects dominate over metal, which seldom occurs. A similar hoard has been found on the neighbouring island of Tålejø.

**Hundvåg**

Hundvåg occupies a central position in an archipelago of smaller islands where the passage through Byfjorden splits into a system of fjords to the east of Stavanger. A ship figure has been carved about 8 m above present sea level on a rock facing Byfjorden and a bay called Breivika on the northern part of Hundvåg. Besides the primary reference to the fjord and the rock art site at Vardeneset near Dusavika on Tasta (see 5.12.), the islands of Åmøy, Bru and Mosterøy can be seen to the northwest. Where Hundvåg is closest to the mainland, a large cairn is situated on the highest point of the promontory of Ullsnes. It has been 25 m in diameter and 4 m in height and both its location and size marked this meeting point between waterways. Near the outlet of this passage, two ship figures have been recorded at Austbø. A third ship is found on one of the highest points on Buøy, a location that does not have physical proximity to the sea, but which offers a view in all directions. The rock art site at Rudlo in Stavanger can also be seen across Byfjorden (see 5.13.).

**5.14. SUB-AREA 13: BETWEEN OPEN SEA AND A SYSTEM OF FJORDS**

Melberg (36) 3720.F4.X4. Strand: slab with rock art
Melberg (36) X. Strand: boulder with cupmarks
Sedberg (37) 3720.F4.X2. Strand: slab with cupmarks (S.6524)
Sedberg (37) X. Strand: slab with cupmarks
Sedberg (37) X. Strand: boulder with cupmarks
Tveit (40) 3720.F4.R10. Strand: boulder with cupmarks
Nag (41) 3720.F4.R1. Strand: rock with cupmarks (Loc. III)
Nag (41) 3720.F4.R2. Strand: rock art site (Loc. IV)

East of the passages along Byfjorden and Åmøyfjord, a large system of fjords and islands opens up that is characteristic for the topography and landscape of Ryfylke. Within this major landscape zone, Mosterøy, Bru and Åmøy form a group of islands making up the western part of a large archipelago that stretches northwards to Nedstrandfjord. These islands can be seen as a transition to the fjords and mountains behind them. In contrast to the open topography and favourable microclimate of the islands, the fjords are deep and nar-
row, flanked by grey cliffs rising to mountain ridges more than 1000 m high. The fjords represent central lines of communication between the outer coast and the highlands and mountains through which there is access to eastern parts of Norway. Rock art, grave monuments and objects from the Bronze Age are few and scattered in Ryfylke, and are mostly concentrated on the islands and in the outer fjord zone.

Cairns are the main grave monuments in this district, while cupmarks are the dominant rock art motif in the northern part of Ryfylke. One cupmark locality has been found in the
Sauda mountains\textsuperscript{236}, and a few such sites occur in the valleys and near the fjord entrances at Sand\textsuperscript{237}, Jels\textsuperscript{238}, and Sandane\textsuperscript{239} in Suldal. A few localities are found on the islands of Finnøy\textsuperscript{240} and Rennesøy.\textsuperscript{241} Two slabs decorated with cupmarks come from Stjernarøy.\textsuperscript{242} Five ships carved on bare rock on the west side of the island of Ombo are the only exception to the many cupmark localities in this zone.\textsuperscript{243}

A much more complex group of rock art sites is found at Nag, on the mainland at the entrance to Idsøfjord in southern Ryfylke. At Nag, the open sea is still near and visible, and the islands of Åmøy, Bru and Mosterøy can be seen in the northwest. The rock art at Nag is located in the shore zone and is found at four localities within a space of one kilometre. \textit{Locality I} is the most complex and composite of these, and several elements are united and integrated with the rock and the character of the place. Seen from the sea, the bare rock has the form of an upturned ship with a characteristic, flat keel line and a prow that slopes gently towards the water. With an east-west orientation, this «ship» is pointing towards the passages along Byfjorden and Åmøyfjord.

The figures are carved 4.5-5.0 m above present sea level. Based on the shore displacement curve, the ship-like shape of the rock must have been clearer in the Early Bronze Age when only the upper part of the rock was visible. Under these conditions, the site stood out from the other rocks and the landscape in the neighbourhood. The ship-like shape is also apparent from the upper side of the rock when both the carvings and the sea can be seen simultaneously. From this position, the view includes a nearby islet shaped like a barrow. Like at Åmøy, this combination of grave-like physical features and rock art helps to create a connection between rock art and graves, where a common point of contact is water and maritime voyages which, together with the rock, may be seen as communication elements for transformation and continuity.

The figures on the northwest side of the rock, are carved in an area of 9 x 4 m. There are 38 figures, 29 of which are ships, seven multi-ringed circles, one spiral and one cupmark (Fett and Fett 1941:25, Plate 3A). The rock is phyllitic with lenses of quartz that, in particular, are integrated into the spiral and the circles. In places, the quartz lenses have a wave-like appearance, but less marked than at the Åmøy and Revheim localities. The ship figures can be separated into two groups, based on their location and form. The upper group consists of 14 ships that are classified by Fett and Fett (1941:120) as the Nag type. They are rare in

Fig. 5.14.2. Seen from the sea, the rock art site Nag I has the form of an upturned boat (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)
Rogaland, but variants are found on Åmøy\textsuperscript{244}, and at Vigdel and Revheim. According to the typology of Fett and Fett (1941:120, Plate 82), they are the oldest type of boat. They probably differed from the later, wooden boats by having a sheathing of hides (Gjesing 1935:130).

The other group of ships represents the usual configurations with double keel lines, which, according to Fett and Fett’s typology, can be classified as C, D and E types (1941:Plate 82). Like the ships of the former group, these are orientated towards the sea, and they are primarily concentrated around the multi-ringed circles with quartz and quartzite. Both the circle symbols and the largest ships are deeply carved and the ships are distinct and have complete crew lines. Ships at the edges of this central composition have more shallow lines and a more fragmented form. Like at Revheim and Åmøy, the concentric rings of the circles create a depth effect that may be signifying the voyage of the ships into the rock.

\*Fig. 5.14.3. The ship-like shape is also apparent from the upper side of the rock. From this position the keel lines of the carved ships are pointing towards an islet shaped like a barrow (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)\*

\*Fig. 5.14.4. The composition of carved images at Nag I (Photo: L. Nordenborg Myhre)\*
connection with the inner landscape of the rock is strengthened by a cleft that splits the surface and ends in a spiral. The cleft and the spiral mark a limit for the distribution of ships and may be seen as their common orientation point. Despite this imaginary voyage metaphor, the real reference of the ships is towards the sea.

Locality II is situated 40 m east of locality I and consists of a simple ship carved on a bare rock on an inclination of 20 degrees towards the sea in the south. The carving is 5.35 m above present sea level and the view is similar to that from locality I, including the barrow-shaped islet. The ship has shallow lines and no crew members. Locality III lies 900 m further east, and 20 cupmarks are found on a rock surface situated 6 m above present sea level and sloping towards the sea in the northwest. They occupy an area of 5 x 1.5 m. Localities I and II can both be seen from this point. Locality IV is found 100 m further southwest. Within an area of 6.5 x 2.0 m are four ships, one of which is carrying a wheel-cross. An over-dimensioned being is carved on the bow of one of the ships, and differs from the other crew members in both size and form. The figures are situated 5.0 m above present sea level, on a rock surface that slopes towards the sea in the southwest with an inclination of 45 degrees. Its location
therefore resembles that of the other rock art sites at Nag.

In addition to these localities near the shore, a group of more scattered sites are known on the moraine terrace above. Two boulders with cupmarks are found at Tveit\(^{245}\), and one at Prestegården\(^{246}\) has two cupmarks and one footprint. Two stray slabs have been found at Melberg and Sedberg. The former is decorated with a ship and a wheel-cross, a motif similar to that described from locality IV\(^{247}\). The slab from Sedberg is covered by 12 oval cupmarks that are partly connected through a system of grooves, which suggests that they were meant to contain a fluid.\(^{248}\) The location of these finds and the size and shape of the slabs indicate that they may have belonged to graves. A now removed boulder with cupmarks was recorded at the same place, as was a cupmarked slab found in a destroyed burial mound (Fett and Fett 1941:27-28).

Objects of flint or metal have not been recorded in this area, but several hoards come from the island of Idso, just south of Nag. Six flint daggers of type VIB were found together in a bog\(^{249}\), and a socketed axe of bronze from period 5-6 was later unearthed nearby.\(^{250}\) A flanged axe of bronze from period 1 also came from here, but its context is not known.\(^{251}\)

5.15. SUB-AREA 14: THE ISLAND OF KARMØY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, period 3 (C.566-570, B.999?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow «Knaghaug», period 3 (B.5046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, period 5 (B.4504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, period 3 (B.546-48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.21. Karmøy</td>
<td>stone setting (burnt bones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.26.R6 (B.30). Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, BRA (burnt bones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.26.R7 (B.31). Karmøy</td>
<td>clearance cairn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 36. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, LBR (cist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øgden</td>
<td>cairn, period 6 (S.3779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, period 3 (B.5765a-c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, EBA/period 5 (B.2772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow, EBA (S.6247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4.R10. Karmøy</td>
<td>barrow «Kubbhaug», period 3 (B5952a-c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Haugesund</td>
<td>barrow, EBA/period 4 (B.5875a-c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4779.G4.R2. Bokn</td>
<td>cairn, BRA (cists)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karmøy is the largest and northernmost island in Rogaland. It is a long, narrow, low island between the North Sea and the strait of Karmsundet, which throughout history has been referred to as an important, protected sailing route. In the Saga literature, Karmøy is called «Kormt», an old-Norse word for frame, meaning the fence or the wall that protects the fairway along the strait. Natural harbours and safe waters have strengthened the maritime value of the area, in contrast to the dangerous, open sea on the outer side of Karmøy, and especially the area called Sletta to the north of the island, where a combination of awkward currents and waves make it one of the most hazardous crossings along the coast of Norway (see Chapter 4).

The topography and vegetation of Karmøy are influenced by the contrasting composition of the Caledonian bedrock in the northeastern and southwestern parts of the island. In
the northeast, metamorphosed lava and phyllite produce fertile soils, while granite gives a more acidic, less fertile soil in the southwest (Lundberg 1998). Apart from some scattered cairns in the south, Bronze Age barrows are concentrated in the northeast part of the island, where they overlook Karmsundet. The Iron Age grave monuments are more spread over the landscape, but most of the large ones are near the strait, where they represent a continuity from the Bronze Age to the Viking Age (Hernæs 1997, Opedal 1998). The only definite rock art locality has been recorded on the west side of the island, facing the sea in the southwest. A more doubtful ship figure is found at Røyksund, on the east side of Karmsundet.

Karmøy marks the northern limit for the distribution of earthen grave monuments from the Bronze Age. Further north, cairns are the usual form of grave. Karmøy, having both

Fig. 5.15.1.  
Sub-area 14. Map with monuments from the Bronze Age
cairns and barrows, can therefore be seen as a south border zone for a northern Scandinavian burial custom and a meeting point for two different expressions of monumentality. However, the location of cairns and barrows along Karmsundet differs, the former primarily being situated near the shore and the latter on higher ground behind. Most of the barrows are on a continuous ridge parallel to the strait, and are concentrated in the Reheia, Gunnarshaug and Storesund areas. However, Håvardshaugen at Skjølingstad was on the northwest side of Karmøy, facing the sea and, hence, the outer sailing route. The cairns on Kongsheia, a western prolongation of the Reheia ridge, may be an exception as regards the location of cairns. However, although a find from one of them indicates a Bronze Age burial, their form, size and location are reminiscent of clearance cairns.252

Fig. 5.15.2.
The distribution of monuments at Karmøy, which demonstrates a linear organization along the passage of Karmsundet (From Nordenborg Myhre 1998)
Reheia

Of the three main areas, Reheia stands out both because of the size of the monuments and the richness of their grave goods. This is the most outstanding collection of large grave monuments from the Bronze Age found in Norway. When Bendix E.R. Bendixen mapped the area in 1876, he recorded seven large and 28 small barrows, as well as seven rectangular stone settings. In addition, the basal layer of several destroyed grave monuments was observed. Today, only 6 of the large barrows are preserved, and these show the marks of plundering and early antiquarian activity. We are left with insufficient, and partly contradictory, information about the finds and the construction of the barrows.

The first recorded finds at Reheia were made in 1823 and came from the largest barrow, which is now 30 m in diameter and 7.5 m high. A slab-lined cist that was aligned north-south, parallel with Karmsundet, contained a twisted arm-ring of gold, pieces of gold leaf and a sword that was later lost. A similar arm-ring has been found together with a sword in a barrow at Hodne in Jæren (see 5.5.), such objects have otherwise been recorded in more than 40 graves in southern Scandinavia (Broholm 1943:168). They mainly occur with weapons and have been interpreted as rings of alliance (Kristiansen 1982:70). In Denmark, their main concentration is in northern Jutland and the area around Limfjorden, which also in other respects shows the closest material contact with Rogaland. Such arm-rings have been found as far south as Schleswig-Holstein and the northern part of Niedersachsen. They are dated to period 3 (Broholm 1943:168, Møllerop 1963a:53).

The second largest barrow was excavated by four inexperienced students in the summer of 1831 (Christie 1842a:324). It is now 30 m in diameter and 6 m high, but was probably larger. In accordance with the excavation practice of the time, a 1.25 m broad tunnel was dug from one edge towards the centre, and it gradually became clear that a thick layer of earth covered a central cairn that had been built over a slab-lined cist. Two capstones were still in place, confirming that the cist had not been plundered. When they were removed, a double layer of birch bark was revealed, and underneath

Fig. 5.15.3. B.E.R. Bendixen’s map of Reheia with the local name Blodheia (From Nordenborg Myhre 1998)
the bark a skeleton dressed in woollen clothes. The information available about the kind of objects found in the cist and their state of preservation is contradictory (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:77-80), but from the grave goods recorded, a sword with a scabbard covered with red calf hide, pieces of a brooch, three bronze buttons and a textile fragment from the dress of the deceased still exist.\textsuperscript{259} The objects are dated to period 3 (Møllerop 1963a: 53). A C-14 date of 3145 ± 60 BP, calibrated to 1490-1320 BC, was obtained from a piece of wood from the scabbard\textsuperscript{260}, and, according to the existing absolute chronology, this should be period 2 (Vandkilde 1996). Examination of the pieces of wood revealed evidence of animal hairs, thus supporting the report that the scabbard was covered with calf hide. A bronze spearhead that belongs to the last part of period 2 or the beginning of period 3 (Jacob-Friesen 1967:293), is also recorded as being derived from Reheia, but it is uncertain whether it came from this grave.\textsuperscript{261}

A third major excavation was carried out at Reheia in 1839 by Jacob Neumann, who was then Bishop of Bergen (1839:213-240). He investigated one of the smaller barrows, which is now about 20 m in diameter and 3 m high, but was probably larger then.\textsuperscript{262} The excavation was a brutal meeting between the activity of the bishop and the «longue dure» of the Bronze Age, and most of the structures uncovered were overseen and not documented. When most of the barrow had been dug through, a small cist was found near one side. It was covered with a cairn and contained only burnt bones.\textsuperscript{263} The location, size and content of the cist indicate that the grave is from the Late Bronze Age or even later.

When Bendixen came to Reheia in 1876, his aim was to investigate one or two large barrows, a few small ones and a number of the rectangular stone settings to try to determine a possible connection between the different structures. The project was enormous, but unlike his predecessors Bendixen has left documentation that makes it possible to follow the different stages of his excavation. He started with one of the seven large barrows, which was already badly damaged and is now 30 m in diameter and 6.5 m high.\textsuperscript{264}

As in the other barrows, a mantle of earth covered a central cairn in which there was a slab-lined cist. The cairn was encircled by a stone construction. Pieces of charcoal were
found within the stone circle, the cairn and the earth mantle. The cist (Construction I) had been placed in the southern part of the cairn and was aligned north-south, parallel to Karmsund. Its walls were built of violet slate slabs. Burnt bones lay in the middle and northern parts, and Bendixen judged them to come from a child. Just outside the cist, he found a partly burnt, spoon-shaped scraper of flint. Another collection of burnt bones was found underneath a slate slab (Construction II). The central part of the barrow had been badly damaged by a secondary grave from the Iron Age, containing a shield boss, a button and some fragments of iron.

There seemed to be a connection between the large and small barrows in the cemetery, and Bendixen wanted to study them in relation to one another. His idea was that the small ones had been constructed as sites for cremation pyres or other burial rituals while the large monuments were being raised. He investigated one that was 5 m in diameter and 0.65 m high, and was close to the large barrow, no. 30. It was built of a mixture of stones and earth, which covered a layer of charcoal within a stone circle. No burnt bones or objects were recorded. However, finds and some grave constructions from the Late Bronze Age were recorded in a medium-sized barrow.

The third type of monument on Reheia is the seven rectangular stone settings. They lay in front of two of the largest barrows, and were similar in construction and size. Bendixen investigated one of the smallest, 5 x 4 m. Its sides were marked by stones and nearly one-metre-broad ditches. The inner part consisted of a mixture of earth, sand and gravel, covering a layer of charcoal. A central pit contained burnt bones and pieces of pottery, together with charcoal. Several of the other stone settings had rounded corners and were described as oval in form. The largest was 11 x 9 m and may be categorized as a ship setting, but since all of them are now destroyed, this cannot be confirmed. However, ship settings from the Bronze Age have been found in other contexts at Reheia, as part of the inner structure of barrows, for instance Knaghaug.
Knaghaug stood on a prominent hillock on the outskirts of Reheia. A period 3 sword came to light here when gravel was being taken in 1893. It was found underneath one of the many slabs in the barrow, and its context is not known. Gabriel Gustafson visited the site in 1895, but no excavation was carried out. Only when a golden berlock and a bronze cauldron from the Roman Period were found in 1903 did Haakon Schetelig begin an investigation of the damaged barrow, which was then 19 m in diameter and 2.3 m in height.

The barrow was badly damaged, but the central part was still preserved. It consisted of earth with scattered slabs and a few concentrations of charcoal (Construction I). An oval ship setting situated south of the centre was 3 m long E-W and 2 m broad N-S (Construction II). Its upper layer consisted of moraine stones that had been placed on a fundament of slabs. Below these slabs, a thick layer of marine sand had been deposited on another layer of slabs. A small slab stood at the northeast end of the ship setting to simulate a prow. Neither bones nor objects were found in relation to the ship setting.

Eight similar ship settings have been found in barrows and cairns in southern Scandinavia (Artelius 1996:34, Fig. 10), all near the coast or beside important maritime passages. Such positions are also typical for the three monuments with ship settings known from Rogaland (see Chapter 7). Besides Knaghaug, such constructions have been found at Kongshaug close to Karmsundet (Nordenborg Myhre 1998b) and in Steinhaug in Klepp, Jæren (see 5.3.). In Denmark and Sweden, there are ship settings in grave monuments dated to period 3 (Artelius 1996:60), mainly on the basis of typological analyses of bronze objects and pottery, but also because of the homogeneous form and size of these constructions. Only one of them has been C-14 dated (Artelius 1996:55). Even though the ship setting at Knaghaug cannot be precisely dated, the sword indicates a possible time for the construction of the barrow. The location of the construction in the centre of the monument shows that its first building phase may have been in the Early Bronze Age. This is also the general impression for the oldest bronze material from Reheia, where the earliest known grave goods seems to be from the transition between period 2 and 3.

Gunnarshaug
Gunnarshaug, with its two prominent monuments, Kubbhaug and Kjørkhaug, is located further north along the same ridge. Like the barrows at Reheia, they face Karmsund and are clearly visible from both sea and land. In 1902, Haakon Schetelig initiated an investigation of large barrows in western Norway, and both Kubbhaug and Kjørkhaug were excavated in 1905 to try to understand the Bronze Age burial customs.

A dagger blade from period 3 had been found in Kjørkhaug earlier, as had a spiral ring of gold that had not been given a number. Before the excavation, the barrow was 25 m in diameter and 3.5 m high, and except for a limited area just south of its centre, it seemed to be well preserved. It was mainly built of earth mixed with clay which contained patches of charcoal and scattered blades and debris of flint. Seven cone-shaped cairns were discovered in a shaft dug from the northern side to the centre. The largest was 2.23 m high and 1.90 m in diameter (Construction I). Some were nicely constructed with a foundation of stones and a mantle of clay (Construction II), while others were roughly thrown together (Construction IV). No bones or objects were found in relation to these cairns, which so far are exceptional features. Eyvind de Lange interpreted them as cenotaphs built for seven missing persons, and the barrow as their memorial (de Lange 1914:61-74). He referred to the Odyssey and its description of lost lives on voyages at sea (ibid.:74). Within the maritime context at Karmsundet, this is an idea that seems reasonable.

Like Kjørkhaug, Kubbhaug was largely built of earth placed as a mantle around a central cairn. A stone kerb could be seen at the foot of the barrow. Underneath the cairn was a 1.80 m long, 0.60 m broad and 0.40 m deep cist with side walls built of small, horizontal slabs and standing end slabs. Its floor was covered of small, flat stones and a layer of birch bark. The
Fig. 5.15.7.
The ship setting in the barrow Knaghaug
(Drawing by H. Schetelig, 1907)

Fig. 5.15.8.
The ship setting in the barrow Knaghaug, from Schetelig's excavation in 1907 (Photo: Bergen Museum)
Fig. 5.15.9.
The inner construction in the barrow Kjørkhaug, from Schetelig’s excavation in 1905 (Drawing by H. Schetelig)

Fig. 5.15.10.
From the excavation of the barrow Kjørkhaug in 1905 (Photo: Bergen Museum)
The capstone was ship shaped. The cist contained a cranium and other parts of an unburnt skeleton, together with a dagger blade, the needle of a brooch, a button, a pair of tweezers, and a razor in the form of a ship with an animal-headed handle. The grave can be dated to period 3.

The Kubbhaug dagger is similar to the one from Kjørkhaug. Altogether 18 daggers have been found in Rogaland, and four of them come from Karmsundet. Three of the 13 brooches recorded have been found along the strait, all accompanying male burials. Five of the seven buttons recorded also come from the area, while the other two being from Sothaug in Sola,
the largest Bronze Age barrow in Rogaland, and Lille Melhaug in Sola, which contained one of the richest male burials from period 3. Tweezers from the Early Bronze Age are, however, more rare, and the one from Kubbhaug is unique in Rogaland. Another pair of tweezers from Storesund is dated to period 4. A razor similar to the one from Kubbhaug has been found at Sola\textsuperscript{279} (see 5.2.8). Characteristic for these razors is their similarity with some rock art ships where the prow is formed as an animal head. A special feature of the Karmsundet graves is the use of birch bark both as a cover and underlay for the dead. The same can be said about marine sand and beach pebbles in graves at the strait.
Storesund

Further north on the same ridge, Storesund can be seen as forming a transition between Karmsundet and the outer sailing route. Two former barrows are thought to have been from the Bronze Age. Their exact locations are not known, but according to existing reports they were situated near Karmsund. One of them was excavated of Fridtjof Øvrebo in 1902. It was 20 m in diameter and 2.5 m high, and was already badly damaged. Near its centre was a slab-lined cist that was aligned NWW-SSE, parallel to the strait. The cist was built of standing slabs. On its floor was a layer of marine sand and moss, and some pieces of charcoal could be seen. The remains of an unburnt skeleton, a knife and a brooch from period 3 were found in the cist. A period 3 sword with a tongue-shaped grip was found in disturbed soil 0.5 m below the surface of the same barrow, but was probably out of its original context. A pair of tweezers from period 4, found in a slab-lined cist in 1872 may have come from the same barrow, but information is incomplete.

The other barrow at Storesund was excavated in 1934. It was situated 40 m from the shore and was only 14 m in diameter and 2.5 m high. The lack of conformity in the proportions given indicates that the barrow was originally larger. Like other barrows at Karmsundet, it had a mantle of earth over a central cairn that in turn covered a cist built of standing slabs. Unlike the other cists in the area, this was aligned E-W, and its front faced the sea in the west. The floor was made of slabs, and unburnt bones lay both in the centre and along the sides. As the southern side wall was damaged, the grave had probably been plundered and objects may have been removed. Only unburnt bones were found. The construction and the location of the barrow indicate an Early Bronze Age date.

On the opposite side of Karmsundet, a similar barrow once stood on a height that offered an open view over the strait. It had been built near where a stream flows onto the shore and, together with the other barrows at Storesund, it marked the northern end of the passage along the sound. When the landowner excavated the barrow in 1904, it had already been badly damaged by a gravel pit. It was then 22 m in diameter, but had probably been larger originally. The barrow was composite, but mostly comprised of earth. The remains of a stone kerb were still visible at its foot and a small cist, 85 cm long and 40 cm broad, made of six slabs came to light just north of its centre. It contained burnt bones, seashells and a knife from period 4. Several stray objects from the Bronze Age have also been found on the eastern side of Karmsundet, including an axe from period 1, a sword from period 3, and a dagger blade from the same period.

Decorated slabs at Skjølingstad and Austreim

Håvardshaugen used to stand on a height with a view over the outer sailing route and the sea to the northwest. When the barrow was about to be removed in 1907, Fridtjof Øvrebo investigated its basal layer, which was then 22 m in diameter. On its west side, a 74 x 38 cm slab of violet, chlorite-bearing slate had been used as a cover over a pot containing burnt bones. The slab was decorated with an abstract pattern of arcs and lines. The ornamentation on its lower part was a herringbone pattern that gives associations to waves. Above 12 semi-circles were carved, one outside the other, creating a depth effect. These elements may illustrate a connection between the sea and the sun, especially the sunset in summer, which is a striking experience at Skjølingstad.

The sun and the sea may also help to explain the ornamentation on a slab from Austreim at Karmsund. It is decorated with four concentric circles placed above a horizontal line. The slab was found at a place where a barrow had once stood, but a close connection between the two is not well documented. It has rounded corners, and its size may indicate that it originally belonged to a grave cist.
The cairn at Ringen and other shore-related monuments
In contrast to the barrows, cairns are situated at prominent points near the shore. They constitute a minority of the total number of grave monuments on Karmøy, but display the same kind of monumentality and often a greater inner complexity than the barrows. This is especially well documented at Kongshaug near Høyevarde Lighthouse at Ringen, which is situated on a promontory in Karmsundet. Kongshaug was excavated in 1963 because of plans for industrial development, but because the plans were changed, it became possible to preserve the bottom layer of the cairn. It had an oblong form, measuring 43 m N-S and 18 m E-W. Its height was about 2.5 m, but its proportions indicate an originally greater height (Møllerop 1963b, Sjursete 2001).

Kongshaug was mostly built of stones from the shore, and these covered a central cairn containing a cist, three concentric, circular walls and a boat-shaped stone setting, all of which are still preserved. The cairn and the surrounding walls were built of slabs. The centrally placed cist is aligned NW-SE, the same orientation as the strait. It is constructed of small, horizontal slabs and is situated on the highest point of the bedrock. The circular walls are also built of slabs standing up to 0.9 m in height. The inner one forms a continuous circle, but the others have an opening towards northwest. The boat-shaped construction is built as a prolongation of the outer walls, thus marking a transition between an open and a closed room.

Five burials were found during the 1963 excavation. The central cist was considered to be the primary grave (grave A). It contained the remains of an unburnt skeleton and a bronze ring that has since been lost. Grave B was related to the ship construction, grave C to the middle area just northeast of the central cairn and grave D to the inner wall. All these graves consisted only of small collections of burnt bones, charcoal and pieces of pottery. Grave E, however, contained a soapstone bead and about 100 potsherds dated to the Migration Period. It can possibly be related to a secondary monument built into the south side of Kongshaug.

The cairn was comprehensively re-excavated and reconstructed during the summer of 2001. The main aims of the excavations were to collect material for dating and to clarify the chronological relationship between different technical details. The excavators did not
succeed in recovering datable material from the constructions, but found a thin layer of charcoal in cracks in the bedrock below the central cairn and the circular walls. A C-14 date of 3582 ± 40 BP, calibrated to 2030-1870 BC, was obtained from underneath the cairn, and charcoal from underneath the inner wall was dated to 3180 ± 40 BP, calibrated to 1520-1390 BC. As the charcoal is equally distributed over the whole area, it is uncertain whether it is directly related to the building of Kongshaugen. It is more likely to result from clearance of vegetation by fire (see Prøsch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000:11). The dates anyway give a terminus post quem for the building of the cairn and the inner wall.

Burnt bones, two potsherds, fragments of a flint dagger and a piece of raw quartz were found underneath the central part of the cairn, but none of these finds have been possible to place chronologically. However, a C-14 date of 2870 ± 40 BP, calibrated to 1140-920 BC was obtained on bone from the central grave (grave A). This indicates that this burial may be from period 3 or 4, most probably period 3 since inhumance burials have not been proven as late as period 4. Period 3 also fits well into the general chronology of the large grave monuments at Reheia. The osteological analysis of the skeletal material showed that a young person between 17 and 20 years had been buried in the central grave. Tooth enamel from one or more animals was found with the human bones, a combination that was also present in the grave in the boat-shaped construction, where bones from an adult were found.

The inner architecture in Kongshaug represents several of the same articulation elements as can be seen in rock art, but here in a three-dimensional form. This is expressed by the use of ships and multi-ringed circles, especially illustrated by the constructions in Kongshaug where a ship is sailing in or out of the circles. An identical motif is depicted on rock art sites at Revheim, Ämoy and several other localities. The same arrangement appears in Steinhaug in Klepp, where the inner constructions are similar to those at Kongshaug.
Common to the ship constructions in these cairns is that they are placed in relation to openings in circular walls, and the ships are given a transgressing role as they express both movement and a breakthrough. Another connection is the use of quartz as a through-going element in both the forming and arrangement of ships and sun symbols in rock art, at the same time as it is incorporated in the inner construction of grave monuments like Kongshaug.

The closest local parallel to Kongshaug is a cairn excavated at Nedrebo, Austre Bokn. It was 12 m in diameter and 2 m high and, like Kongshaug, it faced a major maritime passage. Together with a larger, surviving cairn that is 21 m in diameter and 4 m high, it overlooked a strait called Boknasundet that leads towards Karmsundet.\textsuperscript{308} Even though no boat-shaped construction was uncovered, three concentric walls encircled a central cairn with a slab-lined cist that was constructed with standing slabs.\textsuperscript{309} In addition to this primary grave, two secondary graves were found, one of them a dry-stone walled cist covered by capstones, in which burnt bones and potsherds were found.\textsuperscript{310} Like at Kongshaug, the inner constructions underline the meaning of circle motifs, or sun symbols as Fett and Fett (1941:123) called them when they appear on rock art. Different types of circles are also used as decoration on the grave slabs from Austreim and Skjølingstad, and a four-ringed circle is the motif at the only rock art site found on Karmøy, a sloping rock surface at Seveland, which is facing the sea in the west.

**From masculine graves to feminine deposits**

The grave goods from the largest barrows at Karmsundet mainly consist of weapons and jewellery related to what is traditionally defined as male dress. Tweezers and a razor also belong to this masculine picture. Such objects have mainly been found in the primary graves in barrows, and on typological criteria they are dated to period 3. Both in types and time this is, materially speaking, in accordance with tendencies that have been pointed out in the finds from northern Jæren, especially the outer parts of Sola and the Hafrsfjord area, where there are also natural harbours and concentrations of rock art with a general reference to the sea.

This masculine, maritime connection contrasts with the more feminine finds from theLate Bronze Age. Apart from an arm-ring from period 5 that was found in a cist in a medium-sized barrow at Reheia,\textsuperscript{311} most Late Bronze Age objects are stray finds or belong to hoards. A Wendel ring with thin flanges from Kongsheia occupies an intermediate position as it was found at the top of a small cairn and may just as well have belonged to a hoard in a clearance cairn as a grave.\textsuperscript{312} The size and dense location of these cairns indicate that they are the result of clearance.\textsuperscript{313} On the Continent, mainly between the Rhine and the middle part of the Elbe, Wendel rings with thin flanges appear mostly in graves, whereas in Scandinavia they are usually found in hoards or as stray finds (Jensen 1997:66). Twenty such rings have been found in Denmark (Jensen 1997:66).

Nearly all the 18 rings found in Norway were discovered in similar locations. Besides the ring from Kongsheia, three are from Bjørnstad in Østfold\textsuperscript{314}, three from Follebu in Oppland\textsuperscript{315}, two from Vikedal in Hordaland\textsuperscript{316}, three from Stryn in Sogn and Fjordane\textsuperscript{317}, three from Gloppen in Sogn and Fjordane,\textsuperscript{318} and three from Oppdal in Sør-Trøndelag.\textsuperscript{319} Characteristic for these finding places is that they are near important, old trackways connecting valleys and mountain passes, often near passes linking eastern and western Norway. A typical example is the site at Follebu in Gausdal in Oppland where a track leads to Valdresflya and further west to Nordfjord where a total of six Wendel rings have been found in Gloppen and Stryn.

The Wendel ring at Kongsheia also comes from a location close to a main routeway, but unlike most of the others, Karmsund is a main waterway. The same can be said about the site at Skjærden in Stryn that is located in a wild, narrow fjord called Hyenfjord; these particular rings had been broken and afterwards fitted together with a leather thong (de Lange 1918:8). One of the rings from Oppdal in Sør-Trøndelag had been treated in the same way.
Other pieces of jewellery from the Late Bronze Age also seem to have been deliberately damaged, like a gold arm-ring from Stange on Karmøy, a gold neck-ring from Berge in Forsand, and a bronze ring from Salte in Klepp.

Some hoard sites with weapons from the Late Bronze Age are also situated near main routeways leading to the mountains. They include a sword of Hungarian origin from Storeidal in Sokndal and a sword from Hylsfjord in Ryfylke (see Fig. 1.1.1. and 1.1.5.). This fjord is one of the main communication lines between Ryfylke and the mountain passes to southeastern Norway. A Hallstatt sword was found in Ulvik in Hardanger close to a main routeway leading to the highland plateau of Hardangervidda, and on to the valleys of southeastern Norway.

These finds from the Late Bronze Age focus attention on the inland, the mountains and the eastern regions, away from the monumental, maritime, masculine culture that seems to dominate period 3 in Rogaland. Two neck-rings from Våre may be taken as an example of such a shift, as they were found outside the old central area of period 3 at Karmsund. They belong to a group of Wendel rings with broad flanges, which like the one from Kongsheia, can be dated to period 6, but they have a more westerly distribution pattern, reaching from Niedersachsen, Nordhessen, Tübingen and western Sachsen (Claus 1942:41, Müller 1968:263) to the River Main (Polenz 1974:157) and the Rhine and Mosel area (Behagel 1949:23, 32, 149, Joachim 1968:64; 1970:44, Haffner 1971:109).

The Wendel rings with broad flanges are often found in pairs, and traces of wear show that they were also used in pairs (Jensen 1997:68). Only four such neck-rings are known from Norway. Besides the two from Våre, a similar pair has been found at Tingvoll in More and Romsdal.

These types of artefacts differ from those found in hoards from the Early Bronze Age. They consist of axes from period 1 (from Haugesund and Våge) and an axe, a sword and a dagger from period 3 (from Sævik and Haugesund) (see Fig. 5.15.1.). A flint hoard from period 1, comprising two daggers and 40 flakes from Uvik also belongs to this group.

The Late Bronze Age hoards from western Norway are, to a greater degree than earlier, connected to paths and other routeways through the mountains and inner fjords. Pollen analyses and settlement sites also indicate that the sub-alpine zone was more intensively used then, and rock shelters and new house types became more common (Odner 1969, Indrelid 1994, Prescott 1995, Moe 1996, Myhre 2002). This expansion has traditionally been explained as a result of a greater need for pastures and other highland resources, but may just as well be considered as a consequence of a weaker maritime culture in the coastal areas, and a reduced western network that had been maintained through voyages. This idea is supported by the fact that the raising of large grave monuments came to an end, and even if some mounds were reused for burials in the Late Bronze Age, fewer finds are made on the coast. Such conditions open for questions about a weakened maritime society where ships, water and travels structured both a social and cosmological order in a meeting between the unknown and the homely. If ships built in graves and carved on rocks had their primary foundation in this culture, it will have consequences for the dating of most rock art along the coast of Rogaland.

NOTES

1 Since the main aim of the thesis is to study burial monuments and rock art sites in relation to the milieu they were part of, I have chosen to present the archaeological source material in chapter 5 instead of in an appendix, thereby to avoid a separation of archaeological material from the text where the contemporary landscape and seascape is described.

2 $3440 \pm 290$ BP, calibrated to $2200-1400$ BC (T-3303B) Prøsch-Danielsen pers. com.

3 The 4.2 m level at Breiavatnet is dated to $3090 \pm 160$ BP, calibrated to $1530-1397-1130$ BC (T-1165).
From Klepp, there is information about 30 slabs found in 12 barrows. In addition, there are 12 slabs without a documented context. Ten slabs have been recorded from five grave mounds in Sola, and seven slabs have been found in seven barrows in Stavanger. Five slabs come from seven graves in Time, and one or two graves in Karmøy, Rennesøy, Strand, Sandnes and Hå, respectively, contained decorated slabs (Syvertsen 2002:160).

B.4911, Ab. 1892, p. 126.

From Barrows:


514.F6.R4, R9, R10, R11 (H18, H24, H25, H26); they are between 29 and 32 m in diameter and 2.5 and 4.5 m in height.

The cist was 1.9 m long and 0.56 m broad and was aligned N-S. The capstones were 1.35 and 1.5 m long.


11 slabs have been recorded from five grave mounds in Sola, and seven have been found in seven barrows in Stavanger. Five slabs come from seven graves in Time, and one or two graves in Karmøy, Rennesøy, Strand, Sandnes and Hå, respectively, contained decorated slabs (Syvertsen 2002:160).

B.4998, 514.F10.R19 (H10). Ab. 1893, p. 152. The cist was 1.1 m long and 55-75 cm broad.

The cist was aligned NNW-SSE and was 2.0 m long, 53 cm broad and 30 cm high.


B.2405, Fett and Fett 1941:91. The slab is of sandstone and is 82 cm long, 66 cm broad and 9 cm thick.


S.4248, S. M. Aarsch. 1921-1924, p.15, no. 36.

B.2558, Ab. 1875, p. 185.

B.1001, Nicolsøen 1866:789-790, Ab. 1875, p. 185.

B.2684, Ab. 1875, p. 185.


514.D10.R17 (H8).

It is built of six standing slabs, two at each side and one at each end, and is 2.4 m long and 0.7 m broad.

The boulder is made of gneiss and mica schist and is 12 m² in size and 1 m high.

The cupmarks are about 5-6 cm in diameter and 1-2 cm deep.

S.9633 a-b.

According to the drawings of the profiles, no clear stratigraphy separated the bottom of the cairn from the older layers.

100-152 mg against a normal of 40-20 mg.

Report in the AmS Archive: 2340 ± 70 BP (T-991), 2460 ± 70 BP (T-992), 2470 ± 80 BP (T-1201), 2610 ± 80 BP (T-1314), 2380 ± 110 BP (T-1315).


Such banks around monuments have otherwise not been recorded from Jæren, but are known at both Lundehaugen and Kviljo in Lista.

B.3322, Ab. 1879, p. 74.

HX22. S. M. Aarsch. 1906, p. 52.

S.2050, Ab. 1898, p. 76, no. 23.


S.2975-2977, Ab. 1874, pp. 89-90, no. 44.


Ab. 1869, 84, no. 53, Ab. 1875, pp. 185-186.

C.4927-28. The cist was 1.89 m long and 0.63 m broad.

C.4929-31. This cist was 0.95 m long and had a similar breadth as the former.


S.1457, Ab. 1882, p. 142, no. 23.


S.3593, S. M. Aarsch. 1913, pp. 9-11, no. 21.

S.3672, S. M. Aarsch. 1913, pp. 29-31, no. 100, see Brøgger 1913:97-104.

It was 1.32 m long, 0.65 m broad and 0.40 m deep, and was aligned E-W.


514.D8.R29 (H18, H20), S. M. Aarsch. 1906, p. 86. Barrow H18 is 20 m in diameter and 2 m high, and its cist is 1.8 m long, 50 cm broad and 50 cm deep. Barrow H20 is 25 m in diameter and 2.5 m high.

S.4227, S. M. Aarsch. 1921-24, pp. 7-8, no. 15. The barrow was 18 m in diameter. The cist was 1.9 m long and 0.6 m broad, and was covered by a 1.6 m long capstone.


514.D8.R14 (H1). S.1272-74. Ab. 1881, pp. 25-26, no. 22. The cist was reported to be «the size of a man».

163
According to a report by Eivind de Lange dated 2.4. 1919, it was a composite barrow. The cist was placed at the centre and was aligned NNW-SSE. It was 1.94 m long, 0.55 m broad and 0.57 m deep, and was covered by an oval capstone.

S.4091, S. M. Aarsh. 1918-1920, pp. 15-21; see Marstrander 1977:43.

S.4158, S. M. Aarsh. 1921-24, p. 22, no. 47. The slab measures 1.15 m by 0.35 m; see Fett and Fett 1941:85.


S.3506, B. M. Aarb. 1912, pp. 32-33, no. 4. The slab is 0.95 m long, 0.58 m broad and 6 cm thick; see Fett and Fett 1941:Plate 40C.

B.4716, Ab. 1890, p. 126, no. 98.

S.7190, S. M. Årb. 1946, p. 166; see a report by Jan Petersen dated 3 August 1946.

S. M. Aarsh. 1905, p. 75, no. 2.


B.5611, Fett and Fett 1941:Plates 40F.


B.1010, Ab. 1875, p. 186.


S. M. Aarsh. 1906, p. 57, no. 18. The cist was 2.10 m long and 0.4-0.5 m broad.

B.4935, Ab. 1892, p. 132, no. 92.

S.5160, S. M. Årsh. 1930-32, p. 27, no. 92. The slab is 50 cm long, 34 cm broad and 10 cm thick.

Cist 1 measured 1.80 m by 0.4-0.5 m, and was 0.60 m deep. Three of the walls were built of small, horizontal slabs, and the east end consisted of just one standing slab.

Cist 2 was covered by two slabs. It was 1.50 m long, 0.30-0.40 m broad and 0.40 m deep.

S.6020.

S.6020, Fett and Fett 1941:86.

HX7. S.1389, Ab. 1881, p. 129, no. 65. The cist was described as having the length of a man and was aligned E-W.

S.6655, Fett and Fett 1941:86.


B.2397, Ab. 1875, pp. 186-187. The cist was square and had been built only 1.80 m into the side of the barrow.


S.3953, Oldtiden VIII, p. 145, no. 49.

R11240024010 (H1).

R11240024016-17 (H18-20).

R0025013, 5016 (H17, H18). T. Helliesen mentioned a slab-lined Bronze Age cist in Svarthaug. S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 76.

HX1. S.6472, S. M. Årsh. 1937-38, p. 13, no. 12. The slab is made of schist, and is 1.40 m long and 0.70 m broad; see Fett and Fett 1941:83, Plate 40G.

R11240027002 (H8). S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 75, no. 8.

R11240027005 (H5). S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 75, no. 5.

R11240027005 (H5). S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 75, no. 5.

R11240027003 and R11240027008.


S.1262, Ab. 1881, p. 123.

X11240028015 (HX2). S. M. Aarsh. 1902, pp. 71-73, no. 2.

R11240028011 (H22).
117 S.5885, S. M. Aarsh. 1932-33, p. 42, no. 34. The slab is made of schist and is 80 cm long, 50 cm broad and 4 cm thick.
120 B.4446, Ab. 1871, p. 63, no. 4.
121 B.2959, B.37770, B.3883, B.6316, B.8346.
122 X11240020005 (HX14). S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 62, no. 14, Fig. 5; no. 23, Fig. 6, Fett and Fett 1941:81, Plate 39A.
123 R11240020007 (H23). Fett and Fett 1941:81, Plate 39B.
124 R11240020006 (H19).
125 R11240020001-02 (H1, H2).
126 S.9783, AmS Tilvekst Vol. 1, 1971, p. 25. The slab is made of amphibolite that occurs locally. It is 30 cm long and 21 cm broad.
127 R1124002102. Fett and Fett 1941:81-82, Plate 39C.
129 S.1270-71. The cist was 2.15 m long, 0.60 m broad and 1.30 m deep.
130 Similar complete sets of period 2 jewellery have not been found in southwest Norway, but single artefacts of the same types occur in graves. Gorgets are known from Vigrestad in Hå (B.4320, Ab. 1885, pp. 77-78, no. 28) and Sør-Braut in Klepp (S.5700, Ab. 1879, p. 260, no. 111). Belt plates with similar ornamentation come from the same grave at Vigrestad (B.4320, Ab. 1885, pp. 77-78, no. 28), Orre in Klepp (B.859, Ab. 1879, p. 260, no. 111), Særheim in Klepp (B.3322, Ab. 1879, p. 230, no. 2) and Tjotta in Klepp (S.2463, S. M. Aarsh. 1921-24, pp. 23-24, no. 53). Eleven arm-rings similar to the Rege ones have been found in Rogaland. Except for the single arm-ring from Tjelte in Sol (S.1262, Ab. 1881, pp. 123-124, no. 20), all of them occur in pairs in graves, like those from Særheim (B.3322, Ab. 1879, pp. 77-78, no. 28), Anda (S.3672, S. M. Aarsh. 1913, pp. 29-31, no. 100), Nord-Braut (S.4227, S. M. Aarsh. 1921-24, pp. 7-8, no. 15) and Sør-Braut (S.273, Ab. 1881, pp. 25-26, no. 22). Daggers with a grip made of organic material have been found at Hognestad in Time (S.6400, S. M. Årsh. 1936-37, p. 16, no. 32) and Holen in Time (B.5000, Ab. 1893, pp. 153-154, no. 65). All these objects come from period 2 graves in barrows overlooking or marking important lines of movement in central Jæren.
131 Ab. 1882, pp. 86-87.
132 B.4054, S.6502, Ab. 1882, p. 109, no. 69. The slab is made of phyllite and is 2.25 m long and 0.4-0.7 m broad.
133 The same number has been confirmed by later studies, but Lorange’s description has been changed slightly (Helliesen 1902:56, Fig. 2, Lund 1935, Fett and Fett 1941:79, Plate 38D.
134 HX7. S.8726. The cist was 2.10 m long, 60 cm broad and 75 cm deep.
135 The wall was 17 m in diameter, 3 m broad and 1 m high; see an sketch in Myhre 1981:70, Fig. 50.
136 B.3333, Ab. 1879, p. 230, no. 3; see Myhre 1981:69.
137 Ab. 1882, pp. 88. The slab was 1.3 m long; it has been lost.
138 S.2950, S. M. Årsh. 1907, pp. 13-14, no. 40.
140 S.2882, S. M. Årsh. 1906, p. 112, no. 53, Fig. 4.
141 B.3915, Ab. 1880, p. 29.
142 B.906-9, Urda II, 1837-1842, p. 402, Plate XIV, Fig. 12.
143 B.449, Lorange 1876:37.
144 S.5000, S. M. Årsh. 1928-30, p. 10, no. 49.
146 S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 50.
147 Ab. 1879, pp. 144-146.
148 The wall was 17 m in diameter, 3 m broad and 1 m high; see an sketch in Myhre 1981:70, Fig. 50.
149 B.3333, Ab. 1879, p. 230, no. 3; see Myhre 1981:69.
150 The cist was 1.50 m long and 0.40 m broad.
151 S.2950, S. M. Årsh. 1907, pp. 13-14, no. 40.
The cist was placed 1.85 m above the ground. It was 2 m long, 0.6 m broad and 0.95 m deep, and aligned NNW-SSE.

C.1045. Only fragments of the dress are preserved, but the threads and weaving technique (Wool Tabby) are similar to what was common in southern Scandinavia in the Early Bronze Age (Bender Jørgensen 1991:117, 170).

S.7425, Ab. 1875, p. 187. The sword grip lay near the right hand of the deceased and the point was at the left shoulder.

C.1045, Ab. 1875, p. 187.

HX23. S.946, Ab. 1879, p. 260, no. 134. The slab is 1.33 m long and 0.94 m broad.

S.10130. The slab was found when a trench was dug at a place called Ausebakk. It measures 60 x 55 cm.


S.7425, Ab. 1875, p. 187.

HX23. S.946, Ab. 1879, p. 260, no. 134. The slab is 1.33 m long and 0.94 m broad.

S.10130. The slab was found when a trench was dug at a place called Ausebakk. It measures 60 x 55 cm.


S. M. Aarsh. 1902, pp. 50-52.

S.2357, S. M. Aarsh. 1901, p. 102, no. 23; see also Myhre 1981:176.


S.6653. The slab measures 82 x 57 cm. S. M. Aarsh. 1902, p. 50, no. 7, S. M. Aarsh. 1930-1940, pp. 35-36, no. 5.

S.1631, Ab. 1887, p. 134, no. 10.

S.7950, S. M. Årb. 1953, pp. 25-26, Fig. 4.

X11270054003-04 (HX2, HX7, HX10) at Indre Bø and Sande.

00550001-02 (H3, H4).

0049009 (H22).

0049009 (H22).

0049002 (H26) and 0049003 (H25).

0049002 (H26) and 0049003 (H25).

0049009 (H22).

S.7760, S. M. Årb. 1951, Fig. 2. The slab measures 55 x 35 cm and is made of phyllite.

11270051003 (H8). The cist was 1.75 m long, 50 cm broad and 25 cm deep.

S. M. Aarsh. 1898, p. 54.

S.3737, S. M. Aarsh. 1914, pp. 28-29, no. 64.

HX2. The cist was 2.5 m long, S. M. Aarsh. 1898, pp. 79-80. S.2083, S. M. Aarsh. 1898, p. 62, no. 2.

S.7950, S. M. Årb. 1953, pp. 25-26, Fig. 4.

X11270054003-04 (HX2, HX7, HX10) at Indre Bø and Sande.

0055001-02 (H3, H4).

0049002 (H26) and 0049003 (H25).

0049009 (H22).

S.7760, S. M. Årb. 1951, Fig. 2. The slab measures 55 x 35 cm and is made of phyllite.
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CHAPTER 6.
Travels in an archaeology of water

Something to do with time has all to do
With shape and size. The million shapes of time,
Its millions of appearances are the true
Mountain and moor and tingling water drop
Thus runs and hangs and shakes time towards a stop.

From *Selected poems* by Norman MacCaig (1997:30)

6.1. A SPATIAL EXPRESSION OF TIME

Before rock art and grave monuments will be dated and discussed within the framework that has been outlined above, the interpretation of these sources should be considered as open, but also limited by the intension that is articulated through their locations. Distribution and localization might give accessibility to the understanding of individual monuments, their mutual relationship, and their connection to the surrounding landscape. Links in such a system of relations may be seen as a mixture of elements with references to different time and space. They are created by individuals and collectives, which actively have articulated and transformed both human and nonhuman properties, and where the work of objectification and spatialisation is the mediator and the centre of these relations. Such relations must not be seen as a given set of connections, but an expression of a process that is both social and asocial, real and imagined, produced by nature and constructed by humans.

This system of relations goes beyond what is positively given. Just as important as the particular monuments is the interrelationship between them, the system of references they include and the space they produce. Then the monuments will not act as limited geographical units, but as meeting-points where such processes can occur. Seen from this perspective monuments exist within a dynamic of lines and in-between-ness, where they participate, represent and explain the relations in which they are integrated. Accordingly the landscape does not present barrows and rock art, but react on them, take part in them, and make them interpretable. This position will reduce the division between nature and culture, and the monuments should not be considered as the only carriers of time and meaning. Within this geographical system of relations, monuments does not appear as independent bodies, but open themselves towards the landscape, at the same time as they incorporate it.

Objects will therefore always appear as fragmented and unfinished, anchored in outer relations more than in inner dynamics. This undermines the importance of exact defined entities and their proposed role in the constitution of spatial and temporal systems. The same conditions reduce the idea of a South Scandinavian Bronze Age as a closed category where Rogaland together with other border areas represent marginal parts of a larger cultural entity. The imagination of a uniform South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture has been fundamental for the establishing of a typology and for the general arrangement of archaeological experience and empery. Even if there are similarities within the Nordic region, a continuous deducing from this total category has resulted in a confirmation of the constituting role of a centre in a superior spatiality. Until now this idea has promoted homogeneity on the expense of hybridity and otherness in the border areas, but it has also led to an underestimation of the originality that develops in every local milieu.

Not only does this total entity act within a spatial hierarchy that is divided in centres and peripheries, but the dominating typology is also adapted to the same ideology. Even if typo-
logy has contributed to an acceptable chronology (Montelius 1885; 1903), which through the years has achieved a general scientific value both for the study of objects (Randsborg 1992; 1996, Vandkilde 1996, Vandkilde et al.1996) and rock art (Kaul 1998), it is the internal development of style and morphology, more than spatial integration and position in local landscapes, that has been the basis for interpretation and dating. Through these systems of categorisation and hierarchisation a given number of entities and combinations has been presupposed. They have encouraged a research characterised by quantity and positivism. Interpretation and dating have therefore been considered as meaningful in relation to this entirety. This has led to a situation where totality and reason are inseparable, and where deviation is incomplete rather than different.

Such a totality-thinking makes objects to entities that consist of a number of composed parts or stylistic expressions. Thereby they become carriers of elements, more than being integrating and producing factors. On this basis they obtain identity, and redeem a claim of definition and dating. Thus the objects are given a limited form with a beginning and an end, which finally become permanent points in systems of evolution and development, where hybridity and difference are considered as stylistic and social incomplete and even primitive. In this way aesthetics is reduced to what is finished and complete, and objects are put in a scientific scale of values that favours some forms and combinations to the advantage of others. In archaeological literature “the others” are often described as copies or local variants instead of being objects connected to an alternative social and spatial process where unforeseen connections are mediated. Such an acceptation will be incompatible with a centre-orientated system building and the totality that is sought for through an evolutionistic and dialectic logic.

Archaeologists who have discussed the Bronze Age material from Rogaland, have argued for a close connection with southern areas, mainly Jylland and the Danish Isles (Marstrander 1950; 1977, Møllerop 1963a, Myhre 1981; 1985, Bakka 1993, Johansen 1993, Solberg 1993, Prescott 1995a, Løken 1998a, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a). These works have contributed to the idea of a uniform South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture, which has led to a systematic seeking for similarities rather than differences. An important part of these projects has been to adapt development and alteration of objects, styles, and technological details to abstract, centre-orientated systems for chronology and typology within the framework of a centre-periphery model. The enthusiasm for such a contact has not been shared of South Scandinavian archaeologists. From their position the interest in marginal areas has primarily been based on a need to give the centre a periphery where there was room for expansion and diffusion, without including a detailed analysis of landscape and archaeological material.

The aim of this project has not been to reject the idea of contact and similarity within the South Scandinavian region, but to make it clear how the production of local landscapes in Rogaland may have created other forms and combinations than those which are known from Denmark. Differences might be sought in the construction and location of monuments, or in quantitative variables like size and numbers. But the contrasts are primarily expressed in the way physical forms are included in the monumental production of space, for instance how water is incorporated in the articulation of rock art and grave monuments. It can also be observed in the use of different types of rock, crystals and minerals, as their colour, form and structure seem to have been selected qualities. Major spatial categories like natural passages, sounds and straits, islands, fjords, and mountains have been structuring elements for the organisation and location of monuments. These factors have contributed to strengthen their role in relation to linear and mobile aspects in the landscape.

Such a spatial approach does not imply a total rejecting of the established chronology, and the marginal role Rogaland has been given within a centre-periphery hierarchy, but it is an attempt to problemize a standardized picture that is created and recreated within the framework of a uniform cultural category. The aim is to show how material elements are
included, transformed and articulated within a local landscape context that is more maritime-focused than agrarian-based, and where sea and travels have been the connecting and constituting elements. To elucidate these characteristics it will be necessary to compare with other relevant regions in South Scandinavia. A total comparative analysis is not intended, but a juxtaposition of selected variables where the meaning of ships will be given a central role in relation to travels in life as well as in death.

6.2. CIRCULATION OF SHIPS

The ship is for Flemming Kaul “the symbol of the Bronze Age” (1998:110). Such a statement seems reasonable on the background of the many ship representations that are known within the Nordic area. In more than one thousand years the ship was the most prominent symbol (for a broader discussion see Glob 1962, Schjødt 1995, Skaarup 1995). Ships are presented in various types of material, as miniatures as well as monumental features, some times openly and exposed, other times hidden and inaccessible. Within this spectre of variations ships were constructed as oval stone settings both in and outside monuments. They shape objects and make motifs on bronzes, but most of all the ship is the major motif represented on rock art. This is particularly obvious in Rogaland where the ship is not only the dominating image, but at many locations almost the only motif.

Besides the open sites, carved ships appear on slabs and stone circles that form a part of grave constructions in monuments. Ships in such contexts are known from Järrestad (Althin 1945:Pl. 78) and Kivik (Randsborg 1993a) in Skåne, Sagaholm (Wihlborg 1978, Goldhahn 1999a; 1999b) and Hjortekrog in Småland (Widholm 1998), Tuehoje in Jutland (Kaul 1998), and Rege, Borsheim, Sør Sunde and Harvaland in Rogaland (de Lange 1912a, Fett and Fett 1941, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a, Syvertsen 2002). As physical forms and visual presentations the ships are circulating between visible and invisible rooms, simultaneously as they express a functional meaning. Thereby they occur in relation to the universe of death as well as in everyday life. The ship gets a connecting, but also a trangressional role that can be related to both real and imagined travels.

Traditionally ship representations have been considered as uniform, independent of their context (Kaul 1998:110), and the rock art ships were supposed to be characterized by few distinct variations (Malmer 1981:8). This made the ship acceptable as a leading typological variable, and their stylistic similarities could be seen as an expression of common ideas, which were created and sustained through diffusion within the framework of centre-periphery relations. According to this concept it was claimed that the custom of carving ships on rock was spread from south to north (Malmer 1981:32, Kaul 1998:76). This idea was based on the ship image on a curved sword from a bog at Rørby on West-Zealand (Mathiassen 1953:229; 1958:38, Aner and Kersten 1976), which because of its ornamentation has been dated to period 1 (Malmer 1981:38, Kaul 1998:88). According to the generally accepted absolute chronology this should be 1700-1500 BC (Vandkilde 1996, Vandkilde, Rahbek and Rasmussen 1996:196). The Rørby-ship has even been seen as the starting point for all ship representations – a “point zero” for the chronological sequence of the Bronze Age rock art ships (Kaul 1998:78). Kaul goes so far as to claim that the Rørby-ship should be seen as a “prototype” from which all ship-typology can be derived (ibid.:78).

It is, however, important to emphasize the sourcecritical debate that questions the contemporarity between picture and object on decorated metal items. This discussion elucidates the uncertainty of giving such depictions a decisive chronological value. In spite of this uncertainty, few have been critical to the mentioned date of the Rørby-ship, and thereby its meaning for the ship-typology in Scandinavia. As one of few scholars Ebbe Lomborg has suggested that the sword could have been imported, and that the ship figure was secondarily inserted (1959:117). He arrives at this conclusion because of the structure of the metal and
the absence of air bubbles which often is characteristic for Scandinavian bronzes (ibid.:118).

An objection to Lomborg’s view has been that both the ornaments and the ship image were made in the same technique (Mathiassen 1958:47, Gräslund 1964:301). It is also argued that a second curved sword from the Rørby-bog, and two similar ones from Scania, which probably had a common origin in Scandinavia, were not decorated with ship pictures (Mathiassen 1958:38, 44). It is not considered as likely that four similar swords should have been imported at the same time [Malmer 1981:32]. An additional argument for this view is an unpublished metal analysis made by P. Rønne who claims that not only were the curved swords made in the same workshop, but they might also have been cast in the same wax-model (Rønne 1990, quoted in Kaul 1998:73).

According to the present knowledge the dating of the Rørby-ship should be considered as uncertain. This is underlined by the passion and rhetoric that characterize the argumentation and the discussion, for instance in the concluding remark by Flemming Kaul where he claims that; ” with Rønne’s splendid new examination of the Rørby-swords, it has been conclusively demonstrated that the decoration, was not punched or engraved on the sword. The ornamentation has simply been carved on the wax-model and thus contemporary with the production of the sword, and same applies to the ship-representation.” (1998:74). This may be correct, but since the premises and the results of the analysis is not published, it is difficult to evaluate, and it is therefore dubious that Kaul uncritically give this work a decisive meaning for the establishment of a general ship-typology for Scandinavia. When Malmer claims that the similarity between the four curved swords should be taken as evidence for a common Nordic origin, this is not a convincing argument, either. The fact that only one of the swords was decorated with a ship image is weakening this assertion rather than supporting it.

Therefore, when Kaul argues that ”the curved sword from Rørby is of inestimable importance for our understanding of the ship iconography on the Bronze Age in general and for the dating of the large number of ships in rock carvings in particular” (1998:73), this statement should not be accepted without reservations. Beside the uncertainty that the present dating of the Rørby-ship implies, Kaul is reducing rock art to stylistic objects. Then the constituting role of carvings as a landscape phenomenon is underestimated. This is serious, especially when we know that ships on rock seldom occur in Denmark compared with the regions further north in Scandinavia. Even if a number of bronzes with such motifs are found in Denmark, the ship image has not acted as a constitutional element in the visible Bronze Age landscape to the same degree as in parts of Norway and Sweden. This means that the wide spectre of information, which can be obtained from the location of rock art ships, is not available in a similar way in Denmark.

In his eagerness to support the chronological status of the Rørby-ship as the origin of the Bronze Age tradition of designing ship images in Scandinavia, Kaul overlooks the fact that there existed older types of rock art ships further north. Even if some of these ships are classified among the so-called “hunting carvings”, they underline the importance of ships long before they appeared as a motif in Denmark. In general the “hunting carvings” are dated to the Mesolithic and Neolithic Periods, but it is an accepted view that the northern ship motifs were used also in the early part of the Bronze Age (Sognnes 1995:137, Walderhaug 1995:178). The distribution of these ships, and the time-depth they represent, make them a relevant reference for the understanding of the composition and meaning of ship images found in Rogaland, which can be seen as a meeting place for both northern and southern influences.

This is clearly expressed at the rock art site of Nag, where ships of the Rørby-type appear together with ships of a more northern character (see 5.14.). These ships are seldom in Rogaland, but they can also be seen at Åmøy (see 5.13.) [Fett and Fett 1941:130]. The nearest parallel is found at Evenhus in Trøndelag (Mid-Norway). According to Gutorm Gjessing the
origin of the Evenhus-boat was made of hides, belonging to the ship tradition of the Stone Age (1936:130). Fett and Fett argue that the Nag-ships should be interpreted in the same way (1941:116).

A northern connection might also be sought for a group of ships at Bru, which are similar to those found at Nämforse in North-Sweden (see 5.13.). This ship-type appears also at the sites at Viddel and Revheim on Jæren (see 5.8. and 5.10.), and at Hananger on Lista (Fett and Fett 1941:112). It is characteristic for these northern influenced ships that they seldom are recorded together with other rock art motifs on sites in Southwest-Norway. This is obvious at Nag where ships of the Rørby-type are found in connection with circles and spirals, while the northern types appear as separate depictions where also the crew is omitted. This stringent presentation is also characteristic for the ships at Bru and Hananger, and to a certain degree for those at Revheim.

More than indicating a connection between different geographical regions and chronological traditions, these localities mark an extension of the symbolic repertoire of ships. This is expressed through the acceptance of new motifs, but just as important is how they are integrated in the form and structure of the rock. The Nag locality demonstrates a difference between the scenes where the two ship traditions appear, as the ships of a northern type are carved on an even, continuous surface, while the group of Rørby-ships show a progressive fragmentation as they move towards a crack in the rock. Thereby a connection with the inner landscape of the rock is marked, which later seems to be a regular reference for the composition of ship panels in the Bronze Age. Characteristic for both groups of ships are, however, an orientation towards the sea and a common localization in the shore zone.
Malmer has defined another type of ship with both northern and western characteristics as D-ships (1981:39-40). They are mainly found in Rogaland and Trondelag, with scattered examples further north. In Rogaland this type is best represented at Åmøy where the longest ship has a length of 5.55 m. With such proportions this ship is the largest carved image on rock in West-Norway. Despite the northern and western distribution of this type, Malmer claims that the design of the D-ships first appeared on bronze objects in West-Denmark (1981:40). His reason for this statement is that: “The apparent paradox of the rare type D ship design being particularly easily datable by reference to examples engraved at bronze objects is easily explained in the contoured design are especially suited to the techniques of bronze engraving. It is indeed possible to suggest that the D ship design was created not as a motif for rock engraving, but to suit the particular techniques of engraving on metal. The curiously random distribution of type D rock-engravings in many area may be explained if such design spread partly or entirely by means of engraved razor, which were produced in West Denmark and copied on rock surfaces throughout Northern Europe.” (1981:40). So far neither razors nor other bronze objects with ship motifs have been found in Rogaland to support Malmer’s explanation.

In the same way as Malmer interprets D-ships as copies of depictions on bronzes found in Denmark, he ascribes the ships of Bru/Nag-type to the same marginal position. He claims that they are not only copies, but rather misunderstood versions of ship images on bronzes imported from the south (1981:40). This form of argumentation is forwarded in a rhetoric that illustrates a centre-periphery logic, as he first presents a number of premises to define what he calls “an innovation centre”, and afterwards uses them in a reversed burden of proof to declare peripheries as secondary areas because they cannot display the same material expression (1981:23). Thereby the peripheries get their status from what they don’t have, rather than from something they have, and there is not a logical connection between premises and proof in the actual defining of marginal areas. This means that material culture in the peripheries is not recognized on the basis of its own identity, but as an antithesis of a defined centre. This sort of statement is in opposition to Malmer’s description of his own scientific archaeology.

The ships of the Nag/Brü-type, as well as the so-called D-ships, should be seen as a northern and western phenomenon. With such a starting point they have included another and more composed spectre of impulses than what Malmer dictates, and they demonstrate a history of ships that goes beyond the chronological schemes both Malmer (1981) and Kaul (1998) predicted. This view is supported by the analyses of Gjessing (1936) and Fett and Fett (1941), which conclude that this ship type should be considered as belonging to a Neolithic ship-tradition. Such a position does not exclude Rogaland from an early southern influence, but it is important to emphasize that it took place in a meeting with an already established ship-tradition.

6.3. FLINT TRADE AND EARLY SHIP HISTORY

An extension of the ship history backwards in time would also explain the large number of flint daggers that were imported to Norway, especially to Rogaland, in the Late Neolithic Period (Solberg 1994, Apel 2001). Among the 1200 registered daggers in West-Norway, 513 are recorded as coming from Jæren (Solberg 1993:127). A smaller number of daggers are found at Karmøy. Most of them are concentrated to the northeast part of the island, where most grave monuments were raised in the Early Bronze Age. Besides the daggers, a comprehensive flint material that consists of axes, sickles and raw material in the form of cores, indicate that parts of the production were carried out on a local scale. In all the material from Rogaland represents the largest concentration of flint from the Late Neolithic Period that is recorded in Norway. Compared with finds from the rest of West-Norway, the daggers of
type I and II make up 44% of the total number, while types III-V is represented with 28% (Solberg 1994:114-115, see also Apel 2001:282-288). The same counts for daggers of type VI that is dated to the Bronze Age period 1-2 (Solberg 1994:115, Apel 2001:289. See also Lomborg 1973; 1975, Scheen 1979; 1980).

Such a comprehensive import of flint could not have been realised without a maritime contact across the Skagerrak. Ships of different forms must have been a presupposition for such an activity. Even if not all the flint were imported from Denmark (Johansen 1993:147), a close connection between Rogaland and North-Jutland, especially the Thy area, is commonly accepted (Vandkilde 1993:147, Solberg 1994:123). Apel argues for such a connection through a comparative analysis of flint daggers, which demonstrates similarity in technique and material (Apel 2001:312f). Based on his results it is possible to separate a western line of contacts, which besides Jutland and Rogaland includes the west coast of Norway and Trøndelag, from where there was an indirect route leading to North-Sweden (2001:307, Fig. 9:17). This connection tells about a general contact between different regions, but it also gives the background for an enlarged understanding of the northern influenced ship-types recorded in Rogaland (Nag, Bru, Revheim, Vigdel) and which share similar traits with ship carvings particularly from Trøndelag (Evenhus) and North-Sweden (Nämforsetn).

Together with Rogaland, Trøndelag represents one of the richest rock art regions in Norway, where more than 200 sites are registered (Sognnes 2000:130). Among these 50 are classified as “hunting carvings” (Petersen 1926, Gjessing 1935; 1936). Trøndelag is therefore a most suitable area to study the meeting between different rock art traditions (Sognnes 2002). A similar situation is found at the coast of Møre and Romsdal where both “hunting carvings” (Ramstad 2000) and motifs of South Scandinavian types are documented (Mandt 1984). Common for Rogaland, Trøndelag and the outer coast of Møre and Romsdal is the rich occurrence of flint daggers. Even if continuity from the Late Neolithic to the Bronze Age is obvious also in other West-Norwegian regions, the time-depth can be demonstrated on a broader quantitative scale in Trøndelag and Rogaland.

A similar continuity has been documented at Østfold on the east side of the Oslofjord. Østfold belongs to the East Scandinavian contact-line and can be seen as a northern extension of Bohuslän at the west coast of Sweden, where a major concentration of rock art is registered, but also a large number of flint daggers from the Late Neolithic Period and the Early Bronze Age. Nevertheless Einar Østmo is of the opinion that the figurative rock art in East-Norway in general correspond better with the distribution of metal finds than with flint daggers (1990:129).

In Rogaland, however, there is a clear coalescence between the distribution of flint daggers and that of metal objects, rock art sites and grave monuments. This is most obvious at Jæren, and can best be illustrated by finds from the Klepp municipality. Here more than 20 artefacts of flint and stone are documented per 10 square km (Solberg 1993:127 pp.), and more Bronze Age grave finds are registered than from the rest of Jæren. The period 2 grave finds from Klepp make up ca. 25% of the total number known from the whole of West Norway. There are no open rock art sites in Klepp, but 30 carved grave slabs are recorded from 12 grave monuments. The lack of open rock art localities is due to the few exposed outcrops and the glacial deposits that cover most of the bedrock.

A similar frequency of finds is documented from North Jæren and the nearest islands of the Boknafjord, but in addition a number of open rock art sites occur in this area, and some of them appear as prominent monuments in the landscape. The material from Rogaland therefore illustrates not only a historical and geographical continuity, but also a spatiality that implies visual contact between grave monuments, rock art localities and hoard sites of flint and bronze.

Even if the existing ship typology points out stylistic and iconographic similarities within most of South Scandinavia, it is obvious that the ship images in Norway demonstrate a
clearer spatial and monumental expression than in Denmark. More than being decoration, they appear as productive and communicative elements in the landscape, where they both visually and physically include human as well as non-human properties. Such a position opens up for new interpretations of the connection between ship images, grave monuments and hoard sites, which are not only chronologically orientated, but also spatially based. Thereby localization is emphasized as an important factor, implying that rock art sites should not only be seen as elements in a landscape, but as producing and uniting features.

This spatial position is expressed through how the form and characteristics of the landscape are included, transformed and articulated in the production of ship motives, not in opposition to more southern areas, or as supplementing and copying elements, like Malmer claims, but as something other and different that is both local and interregional at the same time (see 6.4.-5.). It is from such a foundation that a wider understanding of rock art chronology should be derived (see 6.6.).

6.4. DISTRIBUTION OF ROCK ART

Most figurative rock art in Rogaland are registered within a coastal zone less than 0,5 km from the present shores, but a small number of sites lie close to lakes, wetlands and drained waterways. Such a location indicates that rock art is related to a maritime environment, rather than being agrarian based as claimed by earlier research (Marstrander 1963, Mandt Larsen 1972, Hagen 1983, Magnus og Myhre 1986). The reference to sea and water seems to have guided the choice of location, as well as the internal organization of the motifs on the rock surface. Water is not only a visible part of the rock art landscape, but also an including and integrating element that has been decisive for the composition and production of images.

Within the framework of such a maritime setting the distribution of rock art sites can be separated in an outer and inner shore zone. Most localities lie between 10 and 60 m from the present waterline, while a smaller group has a more retracted location, situated about 200-500 m from the sea. This divided pattern is underlined by their height above the sea level, as the major group of sites are found between the contour lines of 4 and 10 m. Most rock art are found in the outer shore zone that marks a transition between sea and land, while the middle zone has not been given priority. It is tempting to see this geographical distribution as a deliberate choice of organizing the landscape, which probably can be related to the visibility and view over the most common sailing routes.

Rock art sites in the inner zone are often located at prominent points from where it is possible to overlook maritime passages, as for instance Åmøy XII, XIII, XV, Bueøy, Rudlo, Harestad, Revheim, Ølberg II and Hedland. Many of these sites have a double reference as they simultaneously are addressing two or more waterways. At the same time the primary focus seems to be directed towards central meeting points between the outer sailing route and inwards passages. Such crossing points often coincide with places that were well suited for harbours, and thereby underlining the importance of these locations. For the rock art sites at Rudlo in Stavanger the inlet to Byfjorden represents such a reference. From this place the rock art islands of Åmøy, Bru, Mosterøy, Bueøy and Hundvåg can be seen, marking the entrance to a system of waterways that connect the sea and the highlands. From the opposite side of the Boknafjord the localities at Åmøy XII, XIII and XV overlook the same lines in the landscape (see Fig. 5.13.1.).

While the view from Rudlo is towards the Ryfylke fjords and the main sailing route northwards to Karmøy, the locality at Harestad includes the outer coastline. The rock art site addresses the wetland at the south side of the outcrop, and the now drained lake Bøvannet, which in the Early Bronze Age was a protected lagoon that could be reached from the sea through a narrow channel. The outcrop is called Varden, a name that indicate that the place in historical times was used as a navigation point and a lookout post for traffic along the
coast. From the top of Varden it is possible to see the rock art localities at Revheim, Aubeberget, Nord Sunde, Sor Sunde, Rudlo, Dusavika, Bru, Hundvåg, Buøy, Åmøy and Mosterøy within a visual angle of 180 degrees. Thereby Varden represents a place from where all the main rock art sites at North Jæren and the Boknafjord region can be seen (see Fig. 5.11.3.).

The Hedland locality is situated near the top of a low mountain massif that stretches from the drained Byberg/Skas-watercourse to Ølberg harbour. From this point major parts of Middle Jæren can be seen, as well as the coastline southwards to Jærens Rev (the reef of Jæren) and the lake Orrevannet, which in the Early Bronze Age was a protected fjord with good harbours that could be reached through a narrow channel. With this distinct location Hedland introduces the concentration of open rock art sites at North Jæren, and is at the same time included in a visual interplay with the localities at Ølberg, Revheim and Harestad, which overlook the coast between Orrevannet and Boknafjord. This is also the core area of rock art in Rogaland. Such a distribution indicates that several of the inner localities are part of a regional organization of the landscape, while they at the local level mark central meeting points and the few natural harbours to be found along the coast of Jæren (see Fig. 5.7.1. and 5.7.4.).

Different from the superior spatial position of the inner rock art localities, the outer carvings seem to have played a more distinct role in relation to the same passages and waterways, since their visibility is restricted to observations from a maritime position. This position is strengthened by their location at rocks sloping towards the sea, or at outcrops and boulders close to lakes, rivers and wetlands. They are therefore difficult to see from higher ground, and the best view is from a sailing position. The shore displacement curve for the Bronze Age indicates that the waterline must have been close to several sites, and the images and their compositions were supposed to be seen from the sea, for instance the localities at Hellestø, Vigdel, Aubeberget, Bru, Nag, Hodnafjellet, Åmøy I-VI, IX, X, and the lower parts of Revheim, Nord Sunde and Dusavika. Some of these carvings must regularly have been washed by waves and water. With such locations rock art contributed not only to visualize a maritime landscape, but it was also created and recreated by water.

6.5. IN-BETWEEN VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE SPACE

Not only does the rock art interact with passages of movement in the surrounding landscape, but also with the rock itself. Observations from Rogaland show that the images should neither be treated separately from the landscape, nor from the rock on which they were carved. It has become clear that the pictures must be interpreted in relation to the characteristics of the rock. This includes rock faces and forms, as well as geological features like clefts and cracks, pattern of fissures and veins of quartz. A third factor is the water that often washes the surface of the stone and sometimes runs to the interior of the rock.

In practice it is the carvings that have come to dominate the discussion about rock art, while the rock itself appears to be of secondary importance. For that reason panels of prehistoric pictures are understood as if they were laid out on a flat surface. When the rock is considered at all, the main point of interest is its position in the landscape. There are of course exceptions. Helskog has recently drawn attention to the location of north Scandinavian rock art situated at points where the land meets the water, interpreting this observation in relation to arctic cosmology where the shoreline would mark a boundary between different worlds (Helskog 1999, see also Tilley 1996). It has long been recognized that the major complex at Nåmforsen was placed at another boundary, marked by a series of rapids (Tilley 1991, Goldhahn 2002). But it was Lewis-Williams and Dowson who first introduced the idea that the rock surface might be regarded as a membrane, through which living creatures and images could pass (1990). Like the coastal rock carvings considered by Helskog, it was a boundary, but in this case between the interior of the rock and the surface on which the images were carved.
Based on a similar concept of ideas a new study of the rock art at Revheim has been outlined by Bradley, Jones, Nordenborg Myhre and Sackett (2002). This work makes a major point of going beyond the two-dimensional record, which are provided by Fett and Fett (1941). In their study the carvings are published in a series of line drawings that depict them as if they had been drawn on a level canvas. Another way of recording this material is to include the rock itself and to search the surface topography, and the possibility it might have offered to people creating these designs. To illustrate the first point I will use some example from Revheim and Nag, and discuss the way rock faces and forms, cracks and clefts, veins of quartz and flow of water might have affected the composition and animation of the images. To extend the relevance of this discussion, examples from other sites will be included.

**Revheim**

The rock at Revheim has a most distinctive appearance and in profile it resembles an upturned ship. This ship-shaped form is visible over a considerable area and it is aligned on the Sothaug barrow, which is the largest Bronze Age monument in Rogaland. The southern edge of the outcrop is marked by a steep cliff which overlooks a bog where flint objects and Bronze Age metalwork have been found, among them two dismantled lures. The ship-shape form is most obvious when it is seen from the bog below, and it is on the steep southern face of the rock that most of the images were carved. Here the cliff is broken by a series of cracks and clefts that seem to be related to the flow of water across and through the surface of the stone. This process has led to a series of polished chutes running down the rock face to a small ledge below that preserves a pair of natural basins containing pools of water (see 5.10.).

The movement of water across the surface of the rock creates an axis of movement extending from the summit of the rock to the basin below the cliff. As a part of this process, some of the motifs will be washed by water, whilst those on the ledge are filled with liquid. Veins of quartz introduce another dimension by creating horizontal lines in the surface of the stone. These elements and the form of the rock, set up two distinct axes which appear to be mirrored in the composition of the art. First, there is a series of contrasts between the images on the top of the outcrop and those towards the bottom of the cliff. These may be linked by the passage of water across the surface of the stone and through a network of cracks into its interior. The motifs at the upper part of the outcrop are largely abstract, and in that respect they contrast with those below. On the other hand, there are certain similarities between these two groups. There are footprints in both areas that apparently pursue a course leading from the summit to the base of the outcrop, towards the edge of the bog. There are also groups of cup marks in both zones. The closest link is, however, expressed by the ships.

On the top of the rock one of the ships is portrayed entering a spiral, which could be construed as a tunnel leading into the rock. Towards the base of the cliff there are equally incomplete drawings of ships that seem to emerge from the cracks and the clefts in the rock face. This transformation seems to reflect the passage of water through the rock, from the summit through the natural crack to the basin below. Not only is the movement of water mirrored by the course taken by these ships, but the carved footprints indicate a similar path, and a number of them enter the pools at the foot of the outcrop.

The second sequence of transformation can be recognised along the base of the cliff, where the carved ships are organised in relation to horizontal veins of quartz that might suggest an image of the sea. In other cases a group of rather fragmentary vessels travels towards a prominent cleft in the rock face. On the opposite side of this feature they apparently pursue the same course, but now in a complete form, and their prows are embellished with horses’ heads. Like the ships that can be followed along a vertical axis, through the inner landscape of the rock, the ships that pursue the horizontal course change their form from a fragmentary outline to entire vessels as they travel from left to right.
Nag – and the barrow-shaped islets

Similar geological features can be documented on the rock art sites at Nag, a glacial strained outcrop situated near the shore at the entrance to the Ryfylke fjords. Seen from the sea, the locality again has the shape of an upturned boat with a characteristic flat keel and a prow sloping towards the waterline. The ship-shape profile of the rock faces the passage into the fjord and point directly towards a small islet which form resembles that of a round barrow located in open water. Islets shaped like burial monuments creates associations with real barrows built on islands along the southern coast of Norway (see 5.14.).

The carved ships at Nag follow a course across the outcrop, leading towards the barrow-shaped islet. This orientation is underlined by veins of quartz, which have a similar wavy character as the rock Fluberget at Revheim. The delineation of the ships and the linear structure of the quartz animate the entire composition, first with reference to a prominent cleft marked by two spirals, and then to the water and the islet beyond. The first ship in the sequence of vessels is clearly characterized and depicted with its crew, whilst those towards the cleft are only loosely defined. They appear as irregular and shallow, and the human element is lost. The fragmented line and the empty vessel might provide a metaphor for human mortality, and the upturned boat, represented by the rock itself, is even more expressive. Can it be that the progressive disappearance of ships and crews into the solid rock, mark a first stage of a symbolic journey from life to death? For the rock art site at Revheim this connection is made in relation to the Sothaug barrow, whilst at Nag a similar link is created by directing the carved ships towards an islet that has the shape of a barrow. In these terms drawings of boats, the rock on which they were made, and the surrounding barrows produce a narrative of “the ships of death”.

The carved ships at Nag follow a course across the outcrop, leading towards the barrow-shaped islet. This orientation is underlined by veins of quartz, which have a similar wavy character as the rock Fluberget at Revheim. The delineation of the ships and the linear structure of the quartz animate the entire composition, first with reference to a prominent cleft marked by two spirals, and then to the water and the islet beyond. The first ship in the sequence of vessels is clearly characterized and depicted with its crew, whilst those towards the cleft are only loosely defined. They appear as irregular and shallow, and the human element is lost. The fragmented line and the empty vessel might provide a metaphor for human mortality, and the upturned boat, represented by the rock itself, is even more expressive. Can it be that the progressive disappearance of ships and crews into the solid rock, mark a first stage of a symbolic journey from life to death? For the rock art site at Revheim this connection is made in relation to the Sothaug barrow, whilst at Nag a similar link is created by directing the carved ships towards an islet that has the shape of a barrow. In these terms drawings of boats, the rock on which they were made, and the surrounding barrows produce a narrative of “the ships of death”.

The carved ships at Nag follow a course across the outcrop, leading towards the barrow-shaped islet. This orientation is underlined by veins of quartz, which have a similar wavy character as the rock Fluberget at Revheim. The delineation of the ships and the linear structure of the quartz animate the entire composition, first with reference to a prominent cleft marked by two spirals, and then to the water and the islet beyond. The first ship in the sequence of vessels is clearly characterized and depicted with its crew, whilst those towards the cleft are only loosely defined. They appear as irregular and shallow, and the human element is lost. The fragmented line and the empty vessel might provide a metaphor for human mortality, and the upturned boat, represented by the rock itself, is even more expressive. Can it be that the progressive disappearance of ships and crews into the solid rock, mark a first stage of a symbolic journey from life to death? For the rock art site at Revheim this connection is made in relation to the Sothaug barrow, whilst at Nag a similar link is created by directing the carved ships towards an islet that has the shape of a barrow. In these terms drawings of boats, the rock on which they were made, and the surrounding barrows produce a narrative of “the ships of death”.

The connection between carved ships and barrow-shaped islets can also be observed at Åmøy (site III-1). Here a line of three vessels is related to a similar number of islets. These ships are not pointing towards the small islets, but are aligned along the shore as most ships at Åmøy. They indicate a loss of lines and crew along a vertical axis, but this transition may have a natural explanation, coursed by waves washing over the lowest part of the panel. A similar vertical transformation can, however, be observed at the rock art site at Penne on Lista and might be taken as an indication for a more general representative pattern.

Burial monuments on islets have not been recorded in Rogaland, but such locations are well known from other regions of southern Norway. At the coast of Lista three cairns are placed on elevations that were islets in the Early Bronze Age, but because of the present higher sea level only the cairn at Rauna is still situated offshore. These three monuments have all been visible from Penne, the main rock art site at Lista (Fett and Fett 1941:99). The ship images at Hananger are pointing directly towards Rauna, while those at Lunde are aligned on the Skipshaug monument. Most of the ships at Langeland and Kalleberg are also pointing towards the sea and the Gunnarshaug barrow on the former islet at Lista Lighthouse (op.cit.:113). Lack of such monuments at the coast of Jæren has a natural explanation, as this seascape is naked and exposed without islands and skerries. On the other hand the Boknafjord basin is an archipelago, and barrows and rock art are documented on almost every island, except on the smallest islets which themselves appear as monuments.

Three levels of space

Taking these observations into consideration rock art can be said to operate on at least three spatial levels which include: a) the inner room of the rock, b) the rock surface, and c) the surrounding landscape. Within this three-folded spatiality the rock surface represents a meeting point between a visual and invisible space, while the ships act as a connecting element that moves between the two spheres. Thereby the rock surface becomes a place where two worlds come together, and where the ship act as a communicative link that can cross borders. The outer landscape and the inner room of rock art lead to different sense experiences and create
contrasts between light and darkness. Water and travels are dominant elements in both spheres, but in the outer space travels are of a more real and everyday character. Seen in this way the rock surface may be interpreted as a place where real and imaginative journeys come together, and both concepts can be perceived at the same time. This interplay is created through localization, motifs and composition, and in the way the properties of the rock refer to lines, form and function of the landscape.

Like graves constructed within barrows, the inner landscape of depicted rocks represent invisible rooms. Such a comparison becomes relevant when we realize that carved ships are found on grave slabs as well as on open rock surfaces. In spite of their invisibility such ships appear with a transgressing capacity. This is expressed in different ways, but especially through their circulating and repeating role. When ships are repeatedly drawn in different contexts, an impression of movement is animated, which can be seen as a transgressing as well as a connecting element. It might be claimed that any connection implies transgression. The circulating role of ships marks such a transgression, which connects visible landscapes and invisible rooms. Thereby the ships’ access to a world beyond is also clarified. With such a position ships may be related both to a real and imaginative world, to travels in life as well as in death.

For the seafarers along the coast of Southwest-Norway death will always be present – a state of being in the borderland of death (see 4.4.). In general travels at sea imply dangers that create uncertain situations between the known and the unknown; where layers of new and old experiences are blended with what is seen and what is imagined. Seafaring is always to balance on a borderline between life and death. To travel is a state of in-between-ness, like the rock surface that is situated between the inner and outer landscape of the stone, and the ships between a real and imagined world – between the visible and invisible space.

In the same way as the rock surface represents a membrane between the visible and invisible, a ship at sea get a similar liminal position in relation to the open ocean and the submarine landscape. While the inner world of the stone is communicated through geological features, colours and forms, the sea mediates its existence through currents and waves that create changing structures and contrasts. Smells and sounds are also included in this maritime room of senses. The strength of these elements is dependent on wind and weather, which also balance the relation between life and death; make the real unreal and the senses senseless. Thereby the ship’s changing position and transgressing role creates openings between everyday life and cosmology. The water gets a comparable superior function that reduces all oppositions between nature and culture. It is therefore important that these elements should not be seen as closed entities within a dialectical logic, but understood from a dynamic basis where the real realises the imagined, and the visible bring about the invisible.

6.6. VOYAGE TO AN-OTHER WORLD

The effect of compositions is not only to show ships travelling through visible and invisible rooms or across fear-full waters, but also to evoke their disappearance into the other world. This process can be observed in the way ships are vanishing through the rock surface, but also by a progressive loss of lines and details. In these cases ships become less apparent, and sometimes the outline of the vessels is reduced to fragments. These series of fragmentation is underlined by shallow and irregular drawings, where some ships may be incomplete. Sometimes the crew are lost. In other cases they are sailing half empty. It has earlier been mentioned that the disappearance of human elements and the empty boats might provide a metaphor for human mortality (see 6.5.). The upturned ship, represented by the rock itself, is even more expressive. Could it therefore be that progressive disappearance of vessels and their crew represents the travel from life to death? Three models might serve as illustration for these processes of fragmentation (Bradley and Nordenborg Myhre in press 2004):
1. The simplest pattern is best described as “centrifugal”. This term refers to the overall organization of a group of images in which the largest and most clearly delineated carvings of ships are orientated towards the centre of the panel, and smaller and less detailed drawings are found around its edges. While this process expands, there is a tendency for the crew to be left out entirely. Sometimes the boats themselves lose definition until only parts of their outline can be seen. The drawings of ships at the outskirts of the panel are shallow or irregular, and often incomplete. The fragmentation of the images around the edges of the panel should not be due to later damages as well preserved drawings of humans and footprints are sometimes found in the same places. On certain sites all the ships share the same orientation whilst those towards the edges depart from the prevailing course. Some of them get lost, whilst other are turned upside-down. A central point for the centrifugal composition is often marked by spirals and parallel circles, which might be seen as tunnels leading into the solid rock.

2. Another pattern is closely related to this scheme. This composition has a linear outline, and it is seen when boats are following the same course across the decorated surface. In such cases they seem to recede in relation to their point of origin, so that the first vessels in the sequence are clearly characterized and depicted with their crews, whilst those towards the opposite limit lose definition. There is a more complex variant of this composition in which boats change their character as they move from one side to the other. This process of fragmentation can be followed in three stages: First, the ships appear as small and simplified motifs, orientated towards the centre. There they become larger and more clearly defined before they lose definition again.

3. In other cases groups of contrasting images are juxtaposed. This is most obvious where crewed ships are shown next to supposedly unfinished carvings, which depict the same elements in a more fragmentary state. Either the crews are indicated but their boats cannot be seen, or the vessels are shown but they are empty. The difference between this scheme and the other kinds of compositions is that groups of images are placed alongside one another. It does not show a progressive loss of details that characterizes model 1 and 2.

It would be wrong to impose such a scheme on every site, for there are obvious limits to its application. Nevertheless the models point out a general pattern that has been observed on several panels. With these examples it would be possible to make a link between the composition of rock art and the expression of death. This connection is even more interesting when
real and natural shaped barrows can be addressed. The factor of fragmentation can also be related to depositions of flint and metal work, which often are destroyed or dismantled like the lures from the Revheim bog. The vanishing ships might be seen as another form of deposition. The composition of rock art and preparation of votives may therefore both articulate a reference to the other world. More important is the circulation of a particular set of practices and ideas that seems to appear both in creation of barrows, rock art and depositions. These different elements will then not only be complimentary, but also supplementary factors in the production of space.

On a more methodological level the models challenge the basic principle of chronology. So far dating and interpretation of rock art have mainly been developed on the basic of typology (Malmer 1981) with cross-references too more datable materials from graves and hoards (Kaul 1998). The carvings are then understood through abstract systems of evolution, rather than spatial sequences of extensions. The temporal and the spatial positions unveil an epistemological crevice that cover the question if carved designs has been created at the same time or over a long period. There is no doubt that the rock art sites in Rogaland have been made over a passage of time. More important is the way each successive image might have been integrated in relation to those systems which were visible within the duration of time that carvings was created in Rogaland.

Features from all three models can be observed at Revheim. The centrifugal composition can be seen at both the entrance and the exit of a vertical axis of transformation (see 6.5.). It is introduced at the upper side of the rock, where ships are orientated towards a spiral and thereby the inner landscape of the stone, for thereafter to become visible again at the foot of the outcrop. The centrifugal pattern is most prominent at the lower part of the rock where the central ships are deeply carved and well defined, differing from those at the edges of the panel. This impression is strengthened by the composition of the images in relation to the concave form of the rock, where a crevice channels water coming from inside the rock. The linear outline is orientated around the same formation, but here the ships are organised at a horizontal level, and they are changing from a fragmented to a complete form as they sail from left to right. Both axes of transformation can be related to the inner landscape of the rock, which appears as a transforming room where water may be considered as a mediating and realising factor. The pattern of model 3 can only sporadically be observed, as the connection between images is not so obvious.

Model 1
Patterns ascribed to the centrifugal model seem to have been most common on rock art sites in Rogaland. Such compositions may incorporate whole panels, but also smaller groups of images. This situation can be observed at site I on Åmøy where some groups are partly framed by crevices in the stone, while others are limited by the composition they are a part of. There is a high degree of coalescence between these narratives and the division made by Fett and Fett (1941, Pl. 9-14). Among them group 8 appears as a central focus for the whole panel, as most features of the centrifugal model can be observed here. But also groups 2-7 demonstrate elements of the same pattern.

Most illustrative is the centrifugal model when multi-ringed circles or spirals make the central focus. This is most obvious for group I-8, but also for IV-2 where even ships are depicted in the circle. From these centres it is possible to pursue a progressive fragmentation of ships that gradually loses course and crew towards the edges. Common for site I and IV-2 is otherwise the complex composition of images that includes humans, animals, fishes, axes and foot prints, but most characteristic is the great variation of ships. This clarifies that the ships are not only losing lines and definitions, but that they also go through a transformation from diversity to similarity. Besides an alteration that demonstrates loss of form and identity, it also implies a movement from individuality to a higher degree of collectivity.
The fragmented state of ships at the edges of the panels is not due to different preservation conditions, since other images in the same margins appear as distinct and complete figures. This has interpretative consequences, but it also challenge prevailing ideas about composition and chronology of rock art, and it may undermine traditional criteria for how images are defined and understood within the framework of an evolutionary typology. Just as important as the ships’ transformation in time is their change within a spatial pattern. Even if such an arrangement implies degrees of temporality, the expressed composition is anchored in the place and the conditions given for the forming of a spatial grammar. Therefore variation and transformation cannot be explained only as the result of general typological processes. Just as important are the changes that can be observed and grouped together within different spatial levels.

The centrifugal model can also be observed in relation to more simple panels where only few images are represented, for instance at sites III-2 and VI-6-8 on Åmøy, at Løland and Hellestø, and to a certain degree Bru II. Within the given framework it has not been possible to separate a specific distribution pattern for the centrifugal model beyond the fact that both complex and simple compositions are documented in the outer shore zone where all rock art sites addresses water. Complex localities like Åmøy I and Revheim are found in a milieu where different models can be documented.

Model 2
Model 2 is best illustrated at Nag where the linear organized ships lose lines and crew as they move towards a prominent crack in the rock (see 6.5.). The ships are orientated towards the sea and the barrow-shaped islet near the shore. The pattern of model 2 can also be seen at Vigdel, but is more obvious at Aubeberget (group 3) where a row of ships is depicted along a horizontal line at the lower part of the outcrop, only four meters above the present sea level. During the Bronze Age they have marked the transition between sea and land, where they continuously have been washed by waves. Parts of the locality were also overrun by freshwater, coming from the wetland above (Skjølsvold 1960:5).

Like at Nag, the sequence of ships at Aubeberget demonstrates a progressive fragmenting, which culminates at a prominent cleft that channels water from higher grounds. On the
opposite side of the cleft there is an uncomplete ship with two vertical lines which both ends in a circle. The same image occurs other places at Aubeberget (group 2), and is also found at Revheim and on other localities in South Scandinavia. Kaul interprets these figures as sun discs that sometimes are carried on a pole or held by humans (1998:25). In Denmark a miniature version of such a disc, made of amber and bronze, has been found (Müller 1920:128, Brøndsted 1938:91). Kaul claims that such minatures are representations of large symbols that were used in ritual ceremonies (1998:20pp.).

The circle is a motif that often can be associated with carved ships. It is a common idea that the circle was a sun symbol, but since spirals and multi-ringed circles often are related to centrifugal compositions, they have been interpreted as imaginary tunnels for ships that were sailing into the inner landscape of the rock (see 6.5.). But in addition to the spiral and the multi-ringed circles other circular figures can also be seen, for instance simple rings or circles with an inner cross. Such images are often carried onboard ships. This is clearly expressed on the grave slab from Harvaland where a circle is connected to each of the three ships. Circles and ships are also depicted on the Harestad locality. A more complex composition appears at Nag where double circles (locality I) and a circle with a cross (locality II) are included in a linear sequence of ships. A third variant is represented at Aubeberget where the circles are carried on poles onboard ships. There is tendency that ships carrying circles are part of a linear organization, while circular motifs in centrifugal compositions primarily mark imaginary tunnels.

These observations will challenge Kaul’s interpretation that the main function of the ships was to carry the sun across the sky towards a new day (1998). The integration of rock and the rock art has brought forward a much more complex pattern where different types of images are included, and where circular images can be seen as imaginary tunnels, as well as navigating elements and sun symbols that were carried onboard ships between the visible and invisible world.

6.7. CHRONOLOGY AND COMPOSITION OF CARVED SHIPS

Flemming Kaul has claimed that we simply must tolerate that rock carvings can be dated “in exactly the same way as other objects from antiquity by the generally accepted typological method” (1998:89). By treating carved images at the same level as portable objects he ignores the fact that rock art is a landscape phenomenon created in relation to the rock surface and other human and nonhuman elements in the surrounding environment. Kaul’s position is doubtful when we know that carved ships on rock are mainly found in different landscapes.
than those depicted on bronzes, and which he and other archaeologists have made a premise for a general ship typology of South Scandinavia. To develop an alternative chronology, rock carvings have to be regarded as integrating and producing factors in the landscape. Such a position means that carved images should be considered as carriers of a complex temporality that is spatially related as well as typologically based.

Ideas about the composite temporality of rock art were sketched in the previous section where I referred to sequences of ships that were fragmented and dissolved (see 6.6.). Such spatial processes of transformation challenge the idea of a typological seriation where each step of alteration ought to be connected through an evolutionistic or organic structure. The idea of “the vanishing ships” will undermine the meaning of such a theory by visualising how change is driven forward through a process of fragmentation where the images loses forms rather than gaining distinct definitions. Even if an established typology is seen as the result of an interaction between reduction and production of forms, it presupposes clearly defined units as the basis for further development. With “the vanishing ships” as a starting point, however, the unfinished and dissolved forms will get a position that is just as leading and dynamic as clearly defined ships. To reach an understanding of composition and chronology it will therefore be necessary to emphasize fragmented as well as complete images. This does not mean a total rejection of the existing ship typologies, but that the temporal and spatial patterns of the three mentioned models have to be considered when trying to date rock art.

6.8. SCHEMES OF SHIP TYPOLOGY

The existing chronologies of rock art ships in South Scandinavia are based on typological principles (Fett and Fett 1941, Marstrander 1963, Glob 1969, Rostholm 1972, Malmer 1981, Almgren 1987, Østmo 1990, Mandt 1991, Sognnes 1995; 2002, Kaul 1998) developed by Montelius (1885; 1900; 1986. See Gräslund 1986). The main components in these systems are pictures carved on grave slabs from dated contexts, and images engraved on bronze objects that are considered to be representative types for a common South Scandinavian iconography. It is, however, a paradox that these typological anchors are themselves often dated by typological methods. Dates of first and second instance will then not only legitimate each other, but also confirm typology as a general system.

Typological studies are usually based on a regional selection of elements, which are compared with variables on an interregional level. As a result of a common basis in similar criteria, these works have to a certain degree supported the existence of each other, and thereby the system they are founded on. Thus rock art has expanded beyond its actual geographical sphere. A common anchoring in the same temporal schemes has in this way de-contextualized rock art and its different spatial references.

Typological variables have often been composed of a random sample of style elements. In some analyses were these features systemized through complex cumulative diagrams with the intention to find general tendencies and types (e.g. Malmer 1981). This is expressed through a number of unmanageable groups and subgroups, which are typologically connected rather than geographically related (e.g. Malmer 1981). Such treatments are often based on the aesthetic character of ships rather than their form and function in relation to the local landscape. Kaul, on the other hand, emphasizes details of the prows and keel extensions (1998:87). He claims that such features should be considered as structural elements of real ships, just as well as stylistic expressions. Kaul’s typology is mainly based on the systems of P. V. Glob (1969) and Rostholm (1972), but when he discusses the different ship types, he includes both real and metaphoric aspects.

An accepted point of departure has been to take the ship figure on the Rorby-sword as a chronological “zero point” or a “prototype” for the Bronze Age ship chronology in Scandi-
The sword is typologically dated to period 1, and with a reference to the current absolute chronology Kaul has dated the ship figure to 1700-1400 BC (1998:88, Fig. 53). The Rørby-ship is double-lined with inward curved prows and an upward-turned keel extension. In accordance with the general typological principle single-lined ships ought to be older than the double-lined Rørby-type. Fett and Fett emphasize this possibility in their typological scheme for Rogaland (1941, Pl. 82).

The typology of ships is also anchored in the images from the Kivik grave, which have inward curved stems and a slightly upturned keel extension. Analyses of grave goods and carvings on the cist slabs have led to a typological dating to period 2 or the transition to period 3 (Randsborg 1993a; 1995:50 pp.). The complex iconography of the Kivik grave with its contextual relation to horses and ships has also been a major criterion for the dating of the Sagaholm grave (Burenhult 1980, Wihlborg 1978, Randsborg 1993a, Goldhahn 1999a).

The Sagaholm barrow was badly damaged when excavated in 1971, and neither a grave nor any datable objects were found (Wihlborg 1978). However, 45 slabs were still standing
in a half circle around the centre of the barrow, and 15 of them had rock carvings on one side. Seven of the slabs are decorated with ship images, mostly in combination with depicted horses (Randsborg 1993a:93, Goldhahn 1999a). They are similar to the ones on the Kivik slabs, and resemble the horse figures of bronze from a hoard at Tågaborg in Helsingborg, which according to its context can be dated to period 2 (Wihlborg 1978:142, Randsborg 1993a:90, Goldhahn 1999a:146-147). The horses from Kivik, Sagaholm and Tågaborg have also been compared with “The sun chariot from Trundholm” at Zealand, which is dated to the same period (Randsborg 1993a:105).

During the excavation of the Sagaholm barrow a bottom layer below the grave construction was C-14 dated to 3265±130 BP.1 This layer is probably older than the barrow, and a recent analysis of the iconography of the rock art has dated the construction to period 2-3, contemporary with the Kivik grave (Randsborg 1993a:133, Goldhahn 1999a:144). Closely related to the ships from Kivik and Sagaholm are two images from a grave chamber at Järrestad i Skåne (Althin 1945:71, Pl. 78). No datable objects were found in this barrow, but its form and location indicate that it was built in the Early Bronze Age.

Mats P. Malmer classified the ships at Sagaholm as type C (1981:37). They seldom occur in Rogaland, but similar ships are carved on a boulder registered underneath a barrow at Sør Sunde (Fett and Fett 1941:71) and on localities at Olberg and Vigdel. All of them are situated in a milieu that is rich in finds from period 2. Otherwise such ship pictures have been found in Trøndelag and at some localities at the coast of Møre and Romsdal (Sognnes 2002). But in general the type has its main distribution in East Scandinavia with a concentration in Uppland, Östergotland and Scania, and even in Finland and Karelia (Malmer 1981:18-19, Fig. 7-8, 24-25, Fig. 9). Therefore the ships from Kivik and Sagaholm are not representative for Rogaland, but the horse images may indirectly be an important reference.

Horses are common motifs on open rock art localities in Scandinavia, especially in Bohuslän (Högberg 1995:8 pp.), Østfold (Marstrander 1963, Pl. XV) and Trøndelag (Sognnes 1983, Pl. XIX; 1990:46 pp.). At Klinta on Öland two horse pictures have been found on a boulder close to a barrow from the Early Bronze Age. Depicted horse images have not been found in Rogaland, neither on open localities nor on grave slabs. Horses are, however, represented on a large number of ships where the prows are decorated with stylised horse heads. Such a combination of ship and horse is otherwise widely distributed in South Scandinavia, but in Rogaland this is a common expression since horse heads on prows seem to be representative for the finishing stage in the transformation of ships. It is most obvious where ships are transformed from fragmentary to more complete forms, as for instance at Revheim.

Bronze razors with a handle formed like a stylised horse head are common within the Nordic area. Because of their shape they have been seen as miniature representations of ships (Müller 1921:32-33, Glob 1969:55, Kaul 1996; 1998:93). This resemblance is strengthened by the ship figures that are engraved on many razor blades (Kaul 1998). Thereby the ship is represented both in form, picture and texture. The earliest razors of this type occur in period 2-3. Two razors with a stylised horse head have been found in Rogaland (B.908, B.5952), and both are dated to an early phase of period 3 (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:105).

An analysis of a settlement excavation in Appalla in Uppland, Sweden has shown that the treatment of horse bones changed at the end of period 4 (Ullén 1995; 1996; 1997). During the earliest phase (period 3-4) horse bones were found in cairns of burnt and cracked stones, and they were interpreted as ritual deposits (Ullén 1996:179). They were never deposited together with bones from domestic animals, and their treatment was similar to bones from games (ibid.:180). Horse bones from the earliest phase have cut-marks from the slitting, while later bones show traces of wear and tear. Ullén’s interpretation of these findings is that the status of the horse changed from a metaphorical and ritual position to a more metonymic animal that was often used for domestic activities (1996:182). Accordingly the
The introduction of ships with prows formed like horse heads has been taken as a typological criterion that marks the transition phase between period 2 and 3. This date is primarily based on the ship representation on the Wismar horn that was found in a bog in northwest Mecklenburg in 1836. Its date has been discussed with similar arguments as used for the Rørby sword. When Ernst Sprockhoff dated the Wismar horn to period 5, his idea was that the ship iconography reached South Scandinavia as a result of an influence from the so-called Vogel-Sonnenbark culture, and in his opinion it should have been a temporal delay before the Nordic horse motif was connected to a ship type that had its origin in Germany (1956). Sprockhoff’s view has later been modified because of a general critique of diffusionism and a better foundation for the date of the references he used. A wider compilation of datable objects with ship pictures has shown that both ship and horse images had a Scandinavian origin. Especially the date of the Rørby ship to period 1 has been the leading indication for such a theory [Glob 1969:49-55, Malmer 1981:33, Randsborg 1993a:98-99, Kaul 1998:92]. As a result of this discussion the ship images on the Wismar horn have been dated to period 3.

According to the Scandinavian typology ships from period 3 have a high keel line with a forward curved prow that sometimes has the form of a stylised horse head. Kaul claims that this simply means that ships both with and without horse heads were used simultaneously from period 3 onwards. But instead of seeing this difference as a stylistic criterion, it may just as well be interpreted as a spatial expression of different types of ships, which during a linear presentation are transformed from simple forms towards ships with a horse head. The decoration on the Wismar horn itself can be taken as an example of such a process. Here four ships in a linear sequence are gradually getting larger, simultaneously as their prows are becoming more erected and decorated with horse heads. Similar to many rock art panels, the ships on the Wismar horn are orientated towards multi-lined circles, images that above have been interpreted as entrances to another world (see 6.6.). The vertical space of linear horse representations from period 2 and 3 might have had a ritual and religious motivation.
decorations may in a similar way be associated with clefts and crevices, which on rock art panels are referring to an invisible, inner room. Seen in this way decorated metal objects have, just like rock art panels, included both human and nonhuman elements. Even natural features of the rock itself were copied and given an aesthetic form.

From period 4 and onwards the Scandinavian ship typology is based on an analogy with images on bronze objects (Kaul 1998). A general change of grave costumes is probably the reason why ships no longer are carved on grave slabs, but it is of interest to note that the relation between ships on open rock art locations, death and closed rooms was altered at the same time (see 6.9.). This is of special importance when we know that a growing number of bronze objects are decorated with ship figures, and they are still deposited in graves. It is too early to interpret this as a result of a “domestication” of ships and sea faring, but it seems that the carving of rock art ships now became a more public event than before. Without drawing a too close parallel with Ullén’s analysis of the changing praxis of depositing horse bones in period 4 (1996), it is possible that the new role of ship images indicates a change from a personal ritual sphere to a more collective space (see 6.10.).

Ships dated to period 4 are still characterised by prows decorated with heads, but the S-form is now more distinct, and they are interpreted as aquatic birds (Kaul 1998:93-94). This alteration is seen as an influence from the Urnfield-culture and has been called a "Sonnen-Vogelbark phenomenon". In spite of such a southern impulse the Nordic “bird-boat” has never been considered as an acceptance of a complete foreign ship-form. Such ships are found nearly all over South Scandinavia, but the core area is the eastern regions, especially Bornholm, Bohuslän and Østfold (Marstrander 1963, Pl. 17,1 and 22,1). This type was never fully accepted in Rogaland. Instead the horse heads got a more S-like shape. This means that the new form was partly taken up, but it was articulated through an alteration of an already established motif.

At the beginning of period 5 the bird head was replaced by a spiral-shaped prow (Kaul 1998:95). Simultaneously the keel extension became higher, and sometimes even higher than the prow itself. Such a detail is particularly distinct on a brick-wood bowl and a wooden head-stool from Høstad in Trøndelag, which is C-14 dated to the transition between period 5 and 6 (Johansen 1993:55-56). Even if ships with a high keel line are documented on several localities in Rogaland, they seldom have a complete spiral-shaped prow. Like the aquatic bird in period 4, the spiral element was included, transformed and articulated in ships with horse heads. This implied that the prows got an almost baroque composition as they were curved both backwards and forwards.

The tradition of depicting ships on bronzes seems to have ended during period 6, but this does not mean that the praxis of carving ships on rocks stopped at that time. In Trondelag and West Norway, as well as in other regions of Scandinavia, there are indications of such an activity also in the Early Iron Age (Sognnes 1995, Kaul 1998:107). It is possible that stylistic features from period 5 continued to be used through the last part of the Bronze Age. The Hjortspring boat from about 350 BC may nevertheless be seen as the end of a long Bronze Age shipbuilding tradition. It was found in a bog at Als in South Jutland in 1921-22 (Rosenberg 1937, Randsborg 1995), and it had been about 19 m long and was designed for 22 paddlers (Rieck and Crumlin-Pedersen 1988:72). Ships of the Hjortspring type is seldom found as a motif on rock art, but similar images that appear on a locality at Kårstad in Innvik in Sogn and Fjordane, have been compared with this boat (Mandt Larsen 1973). Two possible parallels are also known from Litsleby and Tengsby in Tanum, West Sweden. Ships from Nag II, Åmøy IV-2 and X might belong to the same tradition.
6.9. DATING OF DECORATED GRAVE SLABS

Most rock art in Rogaland is found on open localities, but a number of images are also documented on slabs, boulders and stone circles in barrows and cairns (de Lange 1912a, Fett and Fett 1941, Pl. 40 and 83, Nordenborg Myhre 1998a:146-151, Syvertsen 2002). Until now 62 slabs or stones with rock art have been found in 35 grave mounds. In addition 40 decorated slabs are recorded at locations close to monuments (Syvertsen 2002:158). This is a relative large number compared with the rest of Norway where rock art is found in only 25 barrows. It is not surprising that they come from the counties of Sogn and Fjordane (6) (Mandt 1990), Møre and Romsdal (2) (Mandt 1983), Trøndelag (7) (Rygh 1879:95, Petersen 1940:13) and Østfold (7) (Johansen 1971), which together with Rogaland have produced the largest number of imported flint daggers, open rock art localities, metal objects and grave monuments from the Bronze Age (see 6.3.).

The motifs on these slabs and stones can be divided in two groups: one with similar images as on open localities, while the other has more abstract decorations. Bow- and wave-patterns with circle motifs, parallel lines and geometric figures are typical for the abstract decoration. The first group is dominated by cup-marks, but also footprints, circles and ship figures have been recorded. Cup-marks in datable contexts show that they appear in relation to graves from the whole Bronze Age. They are found in connection with footprints in graves from both Early and Late Bronze Age, like Steinhaug at Særheim (see 5.3.) and Myklebust in Sola (see 5.9.). In the period 2-grave at Rege cup-marks appear together with a circle motif and a ship (see 5.8.).

Ship images, however, seldom occur in graves, and only four slabs and one boulder decorated with ships can be related to barrows and cairns from the Early Bronze Age. A single-lined ship and several fragmented ships appear on a grave slab at Rege. These ships have inward curved prows, and according to traditional criteria they should be from the Early Bronze Age (Fett and Fett 1941, Pl. 82). A date to period 2 is in agreement with the metal objects found in the grave. Four ships on a boulder from a barrow at Sør Sunde have a more uncertain context. They are single-lined with inward curved prows and a short keel, features similar to those on the ships at Sagaholm and Kivik, and they should therefore be from period 2 (Kaul 1998:88, Fig. 53). Such ships are seldom found in Rogaland, but can be seen at Vigdel and Ølberg I and II, which is situated in the neighborhood of the rich period 2-milieu at Rege.

A circular construction made of six slabs was found in Stavhaug at Borsheim in Klepp (see 5.5.). Three of the preserved slabs are decorated with cup-marks, while an up-turned ship with an inward curved prow was engraved on the fourth slab. The shape of the slab indicates that this was the original position of the ship. Up-turned ships on open rock art localities have been seen as symbolic expressions of death as they appear in compositions interpreted as travels between life and death (see 6.6.). In Stavhaug such a connection is articulated in a more direct way since the up-turned ship was integrated in a grave construction. Another kind of relation between ship and circle was also unveiled at Stavhaug as the ship was part of a circular arrangement, while the ship images on open localities often are orientated towards carved circles. This may illustrate another stage of the travel between life and death, but it might also be a cosmological expression or an idea about a circular cycle of the journey.
No datable objects were found in Stavhaug, but cremated bones appeared between the slabs. The central grave cist contained, however, traces of an inhumation and fragments of rusted bronze. The location, size and construction of the mound indicate a date to the Early Bronze Age. According to traditional typological criteria ships with inward curved prows are known from period 1-2, while a similar ship with a single-lined keel appears in a grave from period 2 at Rege.

Some of the features observed in Stavhaug are similar to those found in the Sagaholm mound. In a new analysis of the Sagaholm grave Joachim Goldhahn sees the circle of decorated slabs as an expression of the sun on its journey across the sky, and the horses and ships as dynamic elements and metaphors for movement (1999:169). Such an interpretation is an extension of Kaul’s theory about the “Chariot of the Sun” from the Trundholm bog, that the horse pulls a sun disc with a day-side of gold and night-side of bronze across the sky (1998:30). A broken loop underneath the horse’s muzzle may indicate that the image was meant to be pulled and could be used for staging such a metaphor. Kaul enlarges this reasoning and argues that ships on bronze razors articulated a corresponding idea. Ships and circles appear also as motifs on rock art in Rogaland, but the sun images is often carried on a stick, for instance at Aubeberget (see 5.10).

A similar, but a more complex motif is carved on the slab from Harvaland. It was found near a barrow that cannot otherwise be dated (see 5.7). The size and form of the slab indicate that it once belonged to a grave cist, but there is no information about the find context. The depicted scene consists of three ships, and each of them carries a circular image. One of the ships is turned like the one from Stavhaug, but identical local compositions have not been found. The keel and prows of the ships are connected, and Fett and Fett classify them as H-ships and describe them as local boats (1941:116). The same type is known from Bru II and Revheim VIII.

A fifth possible grave slab with ship motifs has been found at Haga near the shore of Hafrsfjord. The find circumstances are not documented, but an undated barrow was situated near by, and both the form and size of the slab indicate that it may have come from a cist. Three ships are depicted between two groups of cup-marks. They are double-lined with inward curved prows, and the aft end of the short keel lines is formed like a loop. All of them are similar to the Rørby-ship and can possibly be dated to period 1-2. A comparable ship is registered on a slab from Amøy XV, which according to local information was originally found in a barrow as a cover-stone over a cist (Fett and Fett 1941:65).
Few of the ship images found in barrows and cairns in Rogaland belong to typical South Scandinavian types, which are representative for special periods. Even if some general typological elements can be identified on the ship images from Stavhaug, Rege and Harvaland, they appear as local constructions. One exception is the ships on a boulder from Sør Sunde, which are similar to the ones from Sagaholm and Kivik, and the ships of a local variation of the Rorby-type on slabs from Haga and Ámoy. The other grave slabs are decorated with ships images of a more hybrid character. They have, however, typological features that are characteristic for the Early Bronze Age, mainly period 2, but possibly also for period 1.

In contrast to the grave slabs decorated with ships, those with abstract motifs seem to be from the Late Bronze Age. The validity of such an assertion must, however, be evaluated in light of the weak documentation of the find context of these slabs. Their size is, however, a variable that may indicate if they come from large cists made for Early Bronze Age inhumations, or from small cists with cremated graves that may be from the Late Bronze Age.

Among the six slabs with an abstract pattern only one can with certainty be related to a grave context. It was found as a cover over a ceramic pot with burnt bones at the edge of a barrow from the Early Bronze Age at Skjølingstad on Karmøy. The character, location and size of the grave indicate a date to the Late Bronze Age. The other slabs come from barrows, but their find context is not well documented. The size and proportions of most of them indicate that they originally were part of small cists, most probably from the Late Bronze Age. Among them are the slabs from Auglend in Time, Søyland in Há, Hodne I in Klepp, and Austreim on Karmøy. All of them have proportions that would fit small cists. One exception is the slab Hodne II, which may have belonged to a large cist, and which is decorated with a four-ringed circle that otherwise is a common image on the open rock art localities.

These observations show that engraved ship images on grave slabs were mainly a phenomenon of the Early Bronze Age, and the motif was later replaced by abstract patterns. Even if ship images were carved on open localities during the whole Early Bronze Age, the use of such pictures on grave slabs seems to have come to an end after period 2. This may indicate a change of the cosmological status of ships, but in praxis ships were transferred from an invisible and private room to a more exposed and public space. The proportions of such a change are difficult to estimate since a representative sample of grave slabs is lacking, but also because the abstract decoration seems to have been a local phenomenon, mainly connected to Rogaland.

It is a precarious project to interpret the meaning of abstract patterns on grave slabs. Some of the motifs give associations to sun, sea and waves, as for instance the slab from Austreim where a four-ringed circle with lines indicating sun-beams rests above a line that could be an image of the water surface. If such an idea is accepted, the decoration on grave slabs changed during the Bronze Age from figurative ships to an abstract representation of seascape.

6.10. CHRONOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF CARVED SHIPS

On open rock art localities ships are presented in layers and levels of types and time, which often are included in centrifugal or linear compositions. These seem to have had a reproducing position where patterns are created and recreated through time (see 6.6.). Thereby forms
and ideas are accumulated and transformed, narratives are documented, and places produced. When carved in stone the temporal quality of the motifs was strengthened. Their repeating repertoire has the same effect. Reiteration seems to be a dynamic element that brings the creation of time and place together. Any chronological scheme should therefore be locally based as well as regionally related.

When ships are organized according to the centrifugal model, those placed in the centre of the composition appear as the most complete figures. From that point the ships get more fragmented towards the edges of the panel, where they lose form and definition. Thereby they are also reduced from difference to similarity. Such compositions may represent a horizontal stratigraphy, which completely or partly integrates new ship types. Within the linear composition the ships go through a similar transformation when they are orientated away from the “archetypical starting point”. In contrast to “the plastering” that can be observed in the centrifugal composition, new and different ship types are included along the linear axis. Besides the ships that fit into these two models, there are a large number of individual ship images that cannot be defined within a specific pattern.

On these conditions I shall analyse how different compositions and ship images in Rogaland are related to the established typological schemes, but also try to develop a local concept of time from which an alternative chronology can be outlined. Like Flemming Kaul, I shall use the design of the prow and the shape of the keel extension as leading criteria for the classification (1998:88). They can be seen as structural elements of real ships, as well as pure stylistic features, and this combination of aesthetic and functional properties will create a broader basis for the analysis, especially when the carved ships refer to travels in life as well as in death.

Even if the shape of prows and keels on the ships from Rogaland follows a general typology for Scandinavia, there is a large number of local variations. They are represented by a comprehensive selection of variables, which are not typologically based, but spatially related. Thereby general style elements are included and transformed into local contexts and compositions. This should be seen as a strategy for chronological expansion and a wider production of spatial patterns. Such ships combine typological elements from different periods, and form the basis for a local innovation of new types. They can be considered as hybrids, which often have a liminal position at the transition between different compositions.

Very few of the ships from Rogaland can unreservedly be identified with the types that Kaul sees as representative for a South Scandinavian typology. A reason for this is that he has not included elements and images from the northern areas of Scandinavia in his scheme; neither the early ships of a Neolithic tradition, which are documented at Nag I and Bru II, nor the late group of ships which Malmer has defined as D and E types (1981:40-41). These are mainly found in Trøndelag and Rogaland, and in general they have a northern and western distribution.

Malmer dates the D-ships to period 4 and 5 because of their similarity with images on bronze razors from Kallehave and Fælledskoven on Zealand (Malmer 1981:40, see also Broholm 1946:33-34, Glob 1969:53). In Malmer’s opinion these contoured ship images were created in an innovative centre in West Denmark as a design on bronze objects, and was later distributed northwards and copied as a rock art motif. It is within the same centralistic and diffusionistic framework that Malmer explains the distribution of E-ships. He suggests that this type evolved in period 4 at the same time as the D-ships, and he regards the rock art variant “as coarse and misunderstood versions of multiple line ship design found on metal” (1981:40).

The basis for dating the D-ships is weak, but it seems that they appear on rock art localities in Rogaland together with other ship types that are from period 4, but not from period 5. This observation supports Malmer’s dating, but it is also an argument against his idea of an innovation from the south. The quantitative distribution of D-ships points in the same direc-
tion, since 58 of the known 81 images are registered in Rogaland and Trøndelag, in contrast to the few designs on bronzes found in Denmark. Even with Malmer’s quantitative method it is difficult to accept a diffusionistic centre in South Scandinavia for this ship type. Gro Mandt has come to the same conclusion, and she mentions Malmer’s type E II and E III among the earliest ship images and date them to period 1, but this result is not fully published.

There are also a number of ship images that cannot be classified and dated according to established types. They appear as individual motifs, but may also be characteristic for whole panels, for instance at Åmøy II and VII, Rudlo, Buøy, Dusavika I and II and Friheim. Unidentified figures like those at Dusavika may express a consequent, but uninterpretable code. Other fragmented images may be the result of erosion or wear and tear, for instance at Rudlo. Sometimes it is difficult to decide if the fragmentation of images at the edges of a locality is due to a special composition or a wanted presentation, like the eastern part of Åmøy I.

**The shore displacement, the local Rørby-ships and other early ship images**

Besides the typological evaluation, the dating of the earliest and lowest situated motifs will depend on the sea level. It will therefore be necessary to make a critical assessment of the shore displacement curve for Jæren and the Boknafjord. A comparison of typological and natural variables will especially be decisive for a local dating of ships of the Rørby-type and for other early ship types, like those at Nag I and Åmøy I.

Ships of the Rørby-type are mainly found at Nag and Åmøy, but also at the slab from Haga in Sola. These ships can best be studied as a group at Nag I where they form a part of a linear composition. Higher up on the same panel there is a separate group, which includes two ship types that belong to an early northern tradition of “hunters’ carvings”. They are different in form and composition, and besides a loop at the end of the keel line there are no common typological features to be seen. Only the ships of Rørby-type illustrate sequences of fragmentation. They are also included in compositions with different types of motifs and have a distinct reference to the structures in the rock surface and the surrounding landscape. Thereby they represent a more complex and comprehensive narrative than the group of northern ships. But it is important to note that both groups are lineal organized, and both are addressing the sea and the inlet to the Boknafjord. The younger ships seem therefore to have been adapted to an old pattern.

A sequence of ships that seem to be a local variant of the Rørby-type can also be seen at the northwest corner of group I-8 at Åmøy. They are gradually being fragmented along their linear axis and are loosing direction along the fjord. A more comprehensive group of younger ships have been added to the same linear composition. A third sequence of ships that are sailing in the opposite direction, represent a similar typological time-depth. Within all three groups there are exceptions to the rule, so the suggested compositions must be seen as tendencies more than a consistent pattern. A more homogeneous typological representation of Rørby-ships can be seen at panel VI-7 at Åmøy. They are organized after the same linear principle, but the sequence has not been encreased by adding new generations of ships.

In general it can be claimed that when Rørby-ships are directly copied, the linear composition which they were part of, was not extended by adding later ships. This was, however, common when a local variant was the starting point of the sequence, like for instance panel I-8 and III-3. A difference can therefore be observed between panels of copied Rørby-ships and those, which include more local and transformed versions. Even if this is an expression of typological variations, it is the local examples of the Rørby-ship that was the basis for a further chronological development, often within the same linear composition.

If the Rørby-type was introduced already in period 1 (1700-1500 BC), as suggested by Flemming Kaul, some principle questions have to be asked concerning the date of this image on rock art localities in Rogaland. First, it will have consequences for the shore displace-
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ment curve for Jæren and the islands in the Boknafjord in the Bronze Age. According to Lisbeth Prøsch-Danielsen the sea level at 1700 BC was about 7 m higher than today (pers. com.). But the Rørby-ships at Nag I and Åmøy I are located 4,81 m and 4,00 m respectively above the present sea level, which is well below her calculated hight of the sea in period 1. The early northern ship-types at Nag are situated at a similar level. If the Prøsch-Danielsen’s interpretation were correct, it would have undermined the present ship chronology.

But this calculation of the sea level in the Bronze Age is based on only two C-14 samples and the general shore displacement curve for the region. The dates refer to the time when two lakes, Hålandsvannet and Breiavannet, were isolated from the sea (see p. 70 and p. 163, note 2 and 3). Hålandsvannet has a threshold of 7 m and was isolated 3440±290 BP, with a calibrated mean level of 1700 BC. But as the C-14 date is calibrated to 2200-1400 BC (one sigma), the time span between SN I (Late Neolithic I) and period 2 of the Bronze Age. Breiavannet has a threshold of 4,2 m and was isolated 3090±160 BP. The calibrated mean level is about 1300, at the transition between period 2 and 3. But the sample is calibrated to 1530-1130 BC (one sigma), so the time span covers both period 2 and 3.

According to these calibrated dates it is therefore possible to suggest at least three alternative shore displacement curves for the Early Bronze Age, with the consequences they will have for the date of the early ship images:

1. Based on a calculated middle value the sea level was 7 m higher than today about 1700 BC and 4,2 m higher about 1300 BC, at the transition between period 2 and 3.

2. Based on the maximum calibrated value for the isolation of Hålandsvannet, the sea level was 7 m higher than today about 2200 BC, while a minimum value for the isolation of Breiavannet means that the level was 4,2 m higher about 1130 BC, that is late period 3.

3. Based on maxium calibrated values for the isolation of both Hålandsvannet and Breiavannet, the sea level was 7 m higher about 2200 BC and 4,2 m higher about 1530, that is late period 1.

Alternativ 1 means that the lowest ships at Nag I must have been carved in period 2 or later (4,8 m a.s.l.), Åmøy I in period 3 or later (4 m a.s.l.). With alternativ 2 the ships at Nag I must have been carved in period 3 or later, Åmøy I in the transition between period 3 and 4 or later. With alternativ 3 the ships at Nag I must have been carved in period 1 or later, Åmøy I at the transition between period 1 and 2 or later.

According to the C-14 dates all three alternatives are possible conclusions. It would, however, be surprising if the date of the early ship-types in Rogaland deviates from both the South Scandinavian and North Scandinavian chronology with several hundred years, as would be the case if alternatives 1 and 2 were chosen. Alternative 1 opens up for the conclusion that the Rørby-ship appeared in the Rogaland rock art repertoire already in period 1. It would also indicate that there might be a span of time between the northern and southern ship tradition. But presently the shore displacement curve for Jæren and the Boknafjord area during the Bronze Age is not sufficiently investigated, and so far it cannot be used as a reliable source for a rock art chronology. We also have to take into consideration the possibility that the images were carved at some height above the sea level of that time. The examples indicate, however, that the relation between rock art and sea level is a promising method that might give the rock art chronology a safer basis in the future (Bakka 1979, see also Austad and Erichsen 1987).

Åmøy

A linear sequence of local Rørby-ships can be seen in the northwestern corner of locality I-8. They are orientated and fragmented along the fjord. This linear composition is extended at its rear end with younger ship types that pursue some early forms in combinations with
new typological elements. Thereby some ships appear as hybrids that unite elements from
different periods. They are formed through spatial integration rather than typological evolu-
tion. This kind of production creates temporality through repetition and spatial extension;
based on a continuous recurrence.

The main elements of the Rørby-ship are maintained during this transformation, while
the shape of keel lines and prows seems to follow the general typological development.
There are, however, several compromises to be seen, for instance at ship no. 64. This image
has a prow that is curved both inwards and outwards, and the form of the animal heads are
characteristic for different typological periods, while the hull has the original structural lines
of the Rørby-type. Thereby ship no. 64 unites typological elements from period 1-2 and 3-4.
In such a way some ships appear as attending and preserving images. They can be seen as
hybrids and compromises, but also as historical documents and sources of memory. Periods
1-4 might be the time span for the whole sequence, which began with local Rørby-ships in
period 1 and was expanded with new ships during periods 2, 3 and 4.

Similar linear compositions can be observed at other levels of the panel. The lowest
sequence consists mainly of northern D-ships from period 4, but during the expansion of
the sequence into group I-4, I-5 and I-6, they get more fragmented. They are finally replaced by
another group of ships, which have a southern character and are from the same period. Most
of them are sailing in the opposite direction and are thereby marking the limit for the distri-
bution of D-ships. This sequence indicates that a composition should not only be seen as a
temporal meeting point, but geographical references are also included.

The ships of the upper sequence are orientated away from a multi-ringed circle. Ship no.
68 seems to be the starting point for the linear composition, and its form indicates a date to
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period 3. Few ships are added to this sequence, but ship no. 61 can be interpreted as a possible extension of the line. It has a prow with a S-shaped animal head and may therefore be from period 4. This ship is fragmented and is integrated into the lowest sequence.

All three linear sequences have a distinct and clear-cut ship as a starting point. These ships stand out among the others because of their deeper and broader lines as if they were created and recreated over a long span of time. Such an idea is supported by the fact that several of them include typological elements from different periods. The youngest features can be dated to period 4, which coincide with the time when the original linear sequences were included in a centrifugal composition. The centrifugal pattern seems then to have dominated locality I both on a micro and macro level.

Locality III can be separated in five smaller groups, which all are dominated by ship images. Each group includes ships from periods 1-4, but only III-2 have a distinct composition. Here a centrifugal pattern can be observed. A double-lined ship with a triangular formed rear end of the keel is situated in the middle of the composition. This is a feature that reminds of the loop that characterizes ships from period 1 (see I-5, no. 22). Both prows are outward curved and decorated with a stilised horse head. The rear end of the ship has a second prow that does not seem to have a structural connection with the ship. Even if the double-lined hull has features that indicate a date to period 1-2, both the shape and height of the prows point towards period 3-4.

Locality IV consists of two groups, and both of them demonstrate a chronological continuity from period 2 until period 4. Both panels are dominated by ship images, but there are also a number of axe-motifs, which seldom occurs on rock art in Rogaland. The ships on panel 1 have a fragmented and dispersed form, but two linear compositions can be seen. The upper sequence has double-lined ships with slightly inward-curved prows as a starting point, probably from period 2-3. They are gradually fragmented and dispersed near the shore. A linear sequence of E-ships from period 4 demonstrates a similar process of fragmentation. Chronological continuity is thereby presented in two stratigraphical layers. A vertical organization of ships can also be seen in

Fig. 6.10.3, Locality III, group 2 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941)
the northwest corner of the locality, where chronological layers cover periods 2, 3 and 4.

The ship images at panel 2 are organized in one linear and one centrifugal composition. The early ships in the linear sequence are double-lined, they have prows decorated with horse heads, and can probably be dated to period 3. They are followed by a number of ships from period 4, and the two groups are separated by a human figure with outstretched arms. The younger ships are orientated towards a multi-ringed circle, which seems to be located at the centre of a centrifugal composition of fragmented ships from period 4.

Locality V consists of three groups. Panel 1 presents a linear composition of two different types of ships, which are partly integrated and fragmented as they sail along the fjord. Most distinct is a sequence of single-lined ships, some of which are up-turned. The prows are inward curved and have a form that indicates a date to periods 2-3. The second sequence is composed of a line of scattered D-ships from period 4. Panel 3 is dominated by similar D-ships, but some of them have high keel lines and S-shaped prows, which are characteristic for period 5. The prow of one of the D-ships is formed in a similar way. Panel 2 includes also two ships with higher keel-lines and spiral-shaped prows, and they may therefore be from period 5-6.

Locality VI is separated in eight small groups, among which group 1, 3, 4 and 7 cannot be typologically dated, while group 7 and 8 includes ships of the Rørby-type which have been discussed above. Panel VI-2 consists of only three ships. They go beyond the chronological scheme of the Bronze Age and have some similarities with the Hjortspring-boat from about 350 BC. This is a ship type that seldom occurs in Rogaland, but it is otherwise found at Nag II and Åmøy XI (see below).

Panel VI-5 depicts the most comprehensive group of ships at this locality. The images are distributed over both the north and the south side of a rock surface. Its flat upper part is dominated by a 5.55 m long D-ship. The earliest ships are found on the north side of the rock. Some of them are local variants of the Rørby-type (see no. 24), while others belong to an early group with references to a neolithic building tradition (see no. 27). They belong to a linear organization of ships with a typological time span that covers period 2 and 3. The ships on the south side are distributed in three horizontal levels. The earliest ships, primarily from period 2 and 3, are found along the middle line, while those at the upper and lower level consist of period 3 ships. A common reference for most ships at this locality is the local variant of the Rørby-type, which is transforming and adabting new typological elements, while the main principles of the hull are preserved through periods 2 and 3. An exception is, however, the large D-ship from period 4, which represents the latest ship image on the locality.

Among the 8 groups at locality IX, nos. 2, 4 and 5 cannot be typologically dated, and it is also difficult to classify the ships of group 6, 7 and 8. The ships at panel IX-1 are fragmented and dissolved, but some of them are related to the local Rørby-type and indicate a typological transformation through periods 1, 2 and 3. The two ships at panel IX-6 belong to the same type and can probably be dated to period 3. Panel IX-3 prolongs this chronological perspective, since it mostly consists of ships with a straight prow that is decorated with a horse-shaped head. They have local characteristics, but can probably be dated to period 4. The same can probably be said about most ships at panel IX-6 and 7.

Locality X is situated at the western end of the continuous row of rock art sites along the southern shores of Åmøy. Some of the ships at panel 1 are different from those otherwise found on the island, especially because of their high V-shaped prows (see no. 10). They are similar to a ship image carved on a raised stone on a barrow at Austreim in Gloppen, Sogn and Fjordane, which has been dated about AD 400 because of a grave find from the monument (Skjelsvik and Straume 1957:13). Similar ship figures are documented on a rock at Kårstad in Innvik, Sogn and Fjordane. A runic inscription that is carved across these images, has been dated to 4-5th centuries, which therefore is a *terminus ante quem* for the ships (Mandt
Fig. 6.10.4. Locality IV, group 2 at Åmøy (From Fett and Fett 1941)
1990). The same ship type has otherwise been found at Bjørnård in Trøndelag (Sognnes 1993:165-166), and at a grave slab from Smiss at Gotland in Sweden, which has been dated to 4th century AD (Kaul 1998:108). Ships from an earlier phase at Kårstad have been compared with the Hjortspring-boat and are therefore dated to the period between 300 BC and 400 AD (Skjelsvik and Straume 1957:19, Mandt 1990, Randsborg 1995). Since ships similar to the Hjortspring-boat have been documented at panel X-1, it might also have been used during this time span (see nos. 36, 37, 45, 50 and 53. Compare also Åmøy VI-2 and Nag II). The ships at panel X-2-4 can, however, be dated to the Bronze Age, mainly period 1-4.

Localities XI-XIII are situated on higher grounds above the shore, and consist mainly of small panels with few ships. The ship at panel XI cannot be classified to a specific type, but the other ones seem to be from periods 3 and 4.

To conclude, the typological classification of the Åmøy ship images shows that they mainly were carved during periods 1-4. This chronological perspective is common for the whole area, as well as for most of the individual localities. This continuous use of rock art at Åmøy is probably anchored in a Neolithic tradition of carvings, which included boats with both local and northern characteristics. There is no direct typological connection to be seen between these early boats and the Bronze Age ships, but the Neolithic tradition may have been one of the reasons why Åmøy became such an important rock art centre.

A local and transformed variant of the Rørby-ship dominated the ship iconography during periods 1 and 2. In period 3 the keel-lines became longer, and the prows were decorated with horse-shaped heads. These structural features continued to be
used in period 4, but now the keels were made even longer and the prows became S-shaped. During the earliest periods this transformation of ship types took place within linear compositions, but they were later included in centrifugal patterns, mainly in period 4.

Period 4 was also a time when ships of the northern D-type was used side by side with ships of a more South Scandinavian character. There is no mutual influence to be seen between these images, and they appear as two distinct types during the whole period. They were often even carved on separate panels. The D-ships were, however, included in compositions together with early local types, and they were often adapted to already established linear sequences. The local E-ships, on the other hand, seem to integrate a large number of form elements, but this ship type has also a tendency to appear separately, both as individual motifs and in compositions.

Other sites in the Boknafjord basin
The rock art at Bru is distributed among three localities, which all are dominated by ships. Bru I consists of a group of boats with a closed construction. Several of them have a prow
decorated with a horse-shaped head that has no structural connection with the construction of the boat. It seems to have been a decorative feature that was added for aesthetic reasons, not as a functional element. The ships have no obvious parallels, but some of them are similar to the D-type at Åmøy. Compare also ships found at Åmøy I-4 (no. 8), I-7 (no. 4), I-8 (no. 28), I-10 (no. 12), IV-3 (nos. 2 and 4) and Revheim 8 (nos. 10 and 20). The form of the prows indicates a date to period 3, and the shape of the horse heads represents a typological time span that covers period 3 and 4.

Other boat types appear at the same panel. Image no. 7 has been classified by Malmer as AIII type, but this categorisation is not considered to be precise enough (1981:12, Fig. 2). The type appears also at Åmøy I-12 (no. 1 and 9), I-13 (nos. 2, 4 and 10), III-5 (no. 2), VI-6 (no. 16) and Revheim 8 (no. 51). Fett and Fett compare them with the more local K-ships, which they have documented at Bru II and V. They can probably be dated to the first part of the Bronze Age and belong to the Neolithic ship tradition. A third type is represented by a single-lined keel with a straight prow that is decorated with a horse shaped head, and is therefore possibly from period 4.

Bru II can be separated in five groups. Ships carved in a South Scandinavian style are represented at panel 1. They have a single-lined keel with an inward curved prow that is characteristic for period 2 ships. In addition a ship with a prow that is decorated with horse-shaped head, is partly carved into a K-like vessel (no. 16). Bru II-2-5 represent local boat images which Fett and Fett have named the Bru-type. Only a ship at Helleseto (no. 22) has a similar form. The ships at panel II2 and II5 have been divided into two typological groups, but it is difficult to see a distinct difference between them (Fett and Fett 1941:121). These ships have some similarities with the early ones at Nag, which may be dated to the transition between the Neolithic Period and the Early Bronze Age (see below).

Only ships are represented at the Hodnefjell locality. They are organised in a linear sequence from west to east, and are gradually being fragmented and integrated into a centrifugal composition. The ships are double-lined, with an inward curved prow and a rounded keel-line, which are features commonly dated to period 3. The central ship in the centrifugal composition has, however, an angled prow that is characteristic for period 4. Like at Åmøy I and IV-2 the original linear composition is later expanded and organised into a centrifugal pattern.

The locality Løland at the island of Ombo is also dominated of ships, but these cannot be related to a defined composition. Most of them are fragmented, but the central ship seems to be double-lined with a high keel line and an outward curved prow formed like a horsehead. These are characteristic features for period 3. The V-shaped pattern between keel and rail has not been found on other sites in Rogaland, but it is otherwise common in South Scandinavia.

**Sites at the Stavanger peninsula**

The locality at Harestad consists of a comprehensive group of ships, but is primarily dominated by a local type. They have a closed construction similar to the ones at Bru I, but the length and the angled shape of the prow is different, and this may indicate a date to period 4. One hybrid ship, with a construction that is partly open and partly closed, has a prow shaped like a stylized animal head and can probably be from period 3. Even if these ships do not have any obvious parallels, some details give associations to the period 4 D-ships at Åmøy. Based on this uncertain comparison, these ships at Harestad may probably be dated to periods 3-4.

This special ship type appears together with other vessels, which also are difficult to date. Most of them are single-lined with gently curved keels and prows. In three sequences they overlap with ships of the local type, but it is not possible to se a clear stratigraphy. They general shape of the single-lined ships indicates, however, a date to period 2. The third ship
type is drawn with straight keel lines and prows, which are characteristic for period 4. The Harestad locality may therefore represent continuity from period 2 to period 4.

The rock art at Aubeberget is also dominated of ships, but a small number of circles, cupmarks and footprints can be seen. The motifs are registered on an unbroken rock surface, but can be separated in three groups. The ships of group 1 are mostly single-lined with gently inward-curved prows and can possibly be dated to period 2. The prows on some ships are, however, straight or angled, which is characteristic for periods 3-4. There are also a few K3-ships (Fett and Fett 1941), which represent the earliest phase of the Bronze Age boats, which also are found at Revheim, Bru I-2 and II-5. The ships of group 3 belong to the D-type from period 4. These dates indicate that Aubeberget was used as a rock art site from the early Bronze Age until period 4.

The locality at Revheim can be separated in 12 panels. The distribution of the images is clearly related to the topography and form of the outcrop, and the ships on its south side are mainly concentrated to the concave polished chutes, which constitute many of the panels (see 5.10.). The largest group of ships are found in the most distinct chute (Fett and Fett 1941, Pl. 35). They are included in different compositions together with other types of images. The panel is parted in two halves by a distinct cleft that leads water from the inside of the rock to a number of basins at the foot of the outcrop. At the deepest point there is a number of fragmented ships and a multi-ringed circle that has been interpreted as an entrance to the inner landscape of the rock (see 5.2.9.). A group of local ships are situated on the west side of the cleft, and some of them have a closed construction and an inward curved prow like those at Bru I (see no. 3 and 10). Similar ships are also situated on the east side of the cleft, but they have got prows shaped like horse heads and a complete number of crew lines. The form of these features indicates that this transformation took place in period 3, and it is illustrated as a linear and spatial process.

The first part of this linear composition consists of an early group of double lined ships with curved keels and prows, which might be dated to period 2 (nos. 11-13). The second part is extended by an addition of single-lined ships with outward curved prows and distinct horseheads. They may be dated to period 4 and are fragmented along a linear axis that follows the foot of the outcrop from west to east. Near the end of this line there are weak traces of a centrifugal composition that mainly includes ships from period 3 and 4 (Fett and Fett 1941, Pl. 34B).

This linear sequence includes also some other ship types. They are not integrated in specific compositions, but they underline the chronological continuity from period 2 to period 4. This time-depth is prolonged by one Rørby-ship, which probably can be dated to period 1 (Fett and Fett 1941, Pl. 34D). One K3-ship on panel 8 also belongs to the same introductory phase.

The ships on the north side of the outcrop are much fragmented, and some of them are orientated towards a spiral-formed image. It has been interpreted as an entrance to the interior of the rock, through which the ships travelled to be transformed and later recreated in a more complete form at the south side. The water running through clefs and fissures can be seen as a dynamic and transformative element in this process (see 5.10.). In spite of the dissolved form of these ships, most of them appear as single-lined constructions with high and straight prows decorated with horseheads, similar to the ones at the south side of the outcrop. This similarity makes it relevant to consider the two groups as part of a common tradition in period 4.

At last a small group of ships related to the comprehensive composition of model 3 should be mentioned. It consists of two parallel rows of ships, one of them is made up of complete images, while the others are much fragmented and sometimes only crew lines can be seen. The ships that can be identified are single-lined, and they are probably from period 4 (for a discussion on the preservation of these images see 5.10.).
Ølberg, Vigdel, Hellestø og Hedland

The ships in this southern area of rock art are mainly from period 2 and 3. For the localities at Ølberg and Vigdel such a date is of special interest since they are situated near the harbours of Rege, which represents the richest find milieu from period 2 in Rogaland. Ølberg and Vigdel are also the localities where the ships most consequently can be dated to period 2. A local Rørby-ship at Vigdel show that this locality may have a history that goes back to period 1. The ships at Hellestø, however, seem to be of a much later character. This panel is dominated by single-lined ships with straight prows and distinct horse heads, and can therefore be dated to period 4. There are also some undefined ships, but they might not change this general chronological profile.

Hedland represents one of the few localities where human and animal figures are depicted, but they are not directly integrated in the organization of the ships. The locality can be devided in three groups. The western panel consists of three ships placed above each other. The lowest ship has both a keel and a rail-line, as well as double prows in both ends. These elements are fragmented as we move upwards on the panel, and the upper ship has lost both the crew and its structural forms. The complete ship ought to be from period 3, and if the images are contemporary, that should be the date of the whole group. The middle panel depicts only one ship, which is single-lined and has gently curved prows, probably from period 2. At the eastern panel there is a comprehensive group of ships that can mainly be dated to period 4.

Conclusion

Considering the many uncertainties connected to such a typological analysis, most rock art ships on Jæren and the Boknafjord islands seem to be from the time between period 1 and 4. This chronological perspective is common for the whole area, but also for most of the individual localities. Within this time span the majority of ships can be dated to period 3 and 4, which seems to have been when the carving of ships on open localities were at its height in Rogaland. This chronological framework can be extended at Ámøy V-2 and 3, where a small group of ships are from periods 5-6. It is also possible that some of the D- and E-ships were carved during these late periods. It is also obvious that the praxis of carving ships on rock continued into the Early Iron Age, for instance at Nag II, Ámøy VI-2 and X where images similar to the Hjortspring-boat can be seen. A younger ship type, which probably is from the Roman Iron Age, has also been found at Ámøy X-1.

Even with this chronological conformity most localities demonstrate that local forms were developed and transformed from general South Scandinavian ship types. This is most obvious at Ámøy where a local variant of the Rørby-ship dominates during periods 1 and 2. Several of these ships got prows with horse heads in period 3, simultaneously as the length of the keel line was extended. These construction features were continued into period 4, but now the prows were S-shaped, and the keels took a more angled form. In the early phase this transformation took place within a linear pattern, and younger ships were gradually added to the composition. In period 4 this pattern expanded in a centrifugal pattern where some elements were pursued and repeated within the frames of a recurrent recognition. Thereby a local innovation began, which was spatially related more than evolutionistically founded.

Ámøy is the place where the chronological time span is longest and the typological variation is largest. This situation mirrors Ámøy’s role as a meeting place between a northern rock art tradition and ships of a South Scandinavian character. Nag can be said to have a similar position, only on a smaller scale. In a geographical perspective both of these places are strategically situated in the Boknafjord, near passages between the open sea and the highlands: Ámøy at the inlet from the sea, while Nag marks the inner part of the fjord basin where a larger system of fjords begins. Small sites like Hundvåg, Mosterøy and Dusavika are situated at less prominent places along the fjords. The rock art at Bru, however, has an
exposed position and represents a similar time-depth, from the transition phase between the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age until period 4.

Four core areas of rock art have been defined between the Boknafjord and the southern part of Jæren. All of them are situated near protected harbours where central passages and waterways meet. The Harestad locality represents the northern area of the Stavanger peninsula. The rock art is placed at the south side of the height called Varden, and is facing the now drained Bøvannet, which in the Early Bronze Age was a lagoon from where a narrow passage led to the sea. From Varden it was possible to see all the major rock art sites on North Jæren and in the Boknafjord basin. Several of the ships at Harestad have a closed construction. The nearest parallels are found at Bru I and Revheim, and like other ships on this locality they can be dated to periods 3 and 4.

Besides the Boknafjord islands the area around Hafrsfjord has the largest concentration of rock art sites in Rogaland. Among these Fluberget at Revheim stands out as the most prominent. Its central position is partly due to the large number of carved images, but mostly because of the ship-shaped form of the outcrop and its outstanding location. Like at Åmøy it is possible to trace a continuous use of the locality from the transition phase between the Late Neolithic Period and Early Bronze Age until period 4. Most ship images seem, however, to be from period 3 and 4. The same chronological perspective has been suggested for the neighbouring locality at Aubeberget.

The third core area around Vigdel and Ølberg has, however, a more limited chronological framework. Most ships at Ølberg have a form that is common for South Scandinavia, expressed through their similarity with the ship images from Kivik and Sagaholm from period 2. The ships at Vigdel can also be dated to this period, but most of them have a local form. Some of the localities are situated at protected harbours near the open sea, but they are just as well addressing inner passages and natural lines of movement between the sea and the Rege height, which represents the richest grave milieu from period 2 in Norway. These localities are therefore different from the pattern that has been suggested for the other core areas.

Both Hellesto and Hedland are situated close to the former area, but they are mostly addressing the inlet to the now drained lakes and rivers between Harvaland, Byberg and Skasvannet. These waterways made a passage between the outer coast in the west and Gandsfjorden in the east, and from there it was easy access to the Ryfylke fjords and the mountains. These localities in this fourth core area seem to have been used continuously between periods 2 and 4.

Within this chronological and geographical distribution pattern Åmøy and Revheim may be characterized as the most prominent localities. They are outstanding both quantitatively and chronologically, because of the large number of images and the long time span they represent. Their unbroken continuity is characterised by integrated systems of compositions where form elements are integrated and transformed in relation to established patterns. On this basis an aesthetic continuity was created, which made these areas into innovative centres of rock art where new and local ship types were formed, and where northern and southern rock art traditions met.

NOTES
1 St-4007, calibrated to 1900-1200 BC (2 sigma) or 1700-1420 BC (1 sigma). For a further discussion see Malmer 1981:36, Goldhahn 1999a:144.
2 T.5893, T.5898.
4 Its size is 1.33 x 0.94 m, S. M. Aarsh. 1901, p. 65, no. 23, see also p. 66, Fig. 5.
5 B.6129, B. M. Aarb. 1908, No. 3, p. 31-32, no. 57.
The size of the slab is 74 cm x 38 cm.

S.2405, 80 cm x 66 cm, S. M. Aarsh. 1901, p. 118, no. 71, see also p. 119, Fig. 8.

S.4452, 82 cm x 45-60 cm, S. M. Aarsh. 1924-25, p. 40-41, no. 182.

S.3506, 95 cm x 58 cm, S. M. Arsh. 1905, p. 72-73.

S.9120, 64 cm x 42 cm, S. M. Årb. 1966, p. 7.

S.4158, 1,15 x 0,35 m, S. M. Aarsh. 1905, p. 71-72.
CHAPTER 7.
Barrows beyond belonging

Time won’t sit still
If a million Fausts
Were to cry: “Stay
Moment of happiness, linger a while!”
Not one moment would stay.

From *Selected Poems* by Ojars Vacietis (1979:35)

7.1. UNFINISHED THINGS

Rogaland represents the northern border of earthen grave monuments and is thereby marking a difference from areas further to the north and east, where cairns were the dominating grave constructions. This contrast has been seen as an expression of a cultural dualism between a South and a North Scandinavian Bronze Age. Southwest Norway in general, and Lista and Rogaland in particular, is often considered as a northern border zone for an agrarian culture with a centre in Denmark, especially in Jutland (see 3.3.). Thereby an opposition was created between the South Scandinavian culture complex and the northern regions where the Neolithic way of life to a certain degree is supposed to have continued. Cairns and barrows have in this way been connected to different economic systems, and the agrarian societies in the south was placed at a higher social and technological level then the northern cultures with a mixed economy. When contact between these regions was emphasized, it was explained within the framework of diffusion, and innovations and ideas were spread from the southern centre to a northern periphery.

Instead of emphasizing the marginal role of Rogaland within a South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture, it will be of interest to focus on the liminal position of the region between two different monumental traditions. Even if every place might be seen as a potential border, Southwest Norway is a meeting point between two types of grave monuments. Both barrows and cairns are represented in the region, and construction elements from north and south are included and transformed within the local landscape context in a way that goes beyond the material conditions given by centre-periphery relation. Such a co-localization might be seen as a specific phenomenon, but it can also be explained as the result of a general process where material expressions were created in a meeting between marginal differences, rather then through an evolutionistic process that was perfected in a centre. Thereby, borders are not marking oppositions, but a creative room for exchange.

Different from Denmark, where grave monuments were mainly built of turf or earth, the barrows in Rogaland has a more comprehensive composition. Usually there are two stratigraphical layers, which consist of a central cairn covered by earth, sand or gravel. The exterior of such a construction can be associated with the southern grave custom; the interior with the northern monuments. Seen in this way the monuments in Rogaland have the appearance of hybrids, where elements from both north and south are included and arranged in relation to their specific geographical positions. It is therefore doubtful if the concept *barrow* should be used for such monuments, but after all it is meaningful as a contrast to the cairns found within the same landscape.

However, the distinction between barrows and cairns is not always clear. In archives and reports monuments are sometimes mentioned as barrows, even if they in reality are cairns covered only by a thin secondary layer of accumulated earth and vegetation. Such confusion is understandable since both barrows and cairns may have the same size and shape. A third
factor that make it difficult to separate between the two concepts, is that most monuments were excavated according to the antiquarian tradition, which has left only minimal information about stratigraphy and inner constructions (see 3.2.). Therefore, it is sometimes difficult to understand the real representation of these monuments. The difference between cairns and barrows can, however, be determined because of their location in the landscape. The former were mostly built on rock and outcrops, while the latter are usually located on moraines.

A third type of grave monuments was constructed of stones and earth without a structured stratigraphy. They are referred to as cairns mixed with earth, but might also be seen as hybrid monuments. Even if such composite monuments lack the barrow’s distinct order of stones and earth, their construction might be considered as a result of the liminal position of the region. Assuming that this is an intentional composition, a third room is opened up between the concept of barrows and cairns. Such an idea emphasizes their geographical positions, but is also rejecting the traditional opposition between barrows and cairns.

Thereby the production of grave monuments in Rogaland expresses hybridity on at least two levels: First by virtue of a spatial organization that unites barrows and cairns within the same landscape. Second through a composition that combines stones and earth, either in stratigraphical layers or as a mixed substance. The different levels of hybridity are connected through the circulation of the same elements, but with different forms of integration. This is expressed on a macro-level that is exposed and visible, as well as on a micro-level that is secluded and hidden. Therefore, earth and stone should not be considered as neutral materials, but as something that can actively be used to articulate both a geographical position and a cultural situation.

The barrows in Rogaland have, to a higher degree than cairns, been related to an agrarian population. Besides the general comparison with similar grave monuments in Denmark, this interpretation is based on their location in areas well suited for agriculture. It is possible to document a certain difference in the location of barrows and cairns, but it is doubtful if this is sufficient to connect the two types of monuments to different economic systems. Even if analyses of pollen and plant macrofossils and settlement sites have documented a considerable agrarian activity on Jæren and Karmøy in the Early Bronze Age, it has not been possible to demonstrate a direct connection between these indicators and the distribution of barrows (see 4.2.). On the other hand both barrows and cairns are addressing the sea and lines of movement, and they are often interrelated through a visual contact between each other.

Within such an integrated system of references barrows and cairns can often be found at different locations. There is a tendency of a linear organization of barrows, while cairns are mainly built separately at prominent localities in the landscape. Such distinct places are often marking the outer limit of the mortal landscape or the transition between different geographical zones. Steinhaug at Særheim in Klepp and Kongshaug at Karmsundet are representative for such places. Steinhaug is situated at one of the highest points at Jæren, which visually includes the coast, the lowland, and the highlands (see 5.3.). From this location it is thereby a wide view over the three main landscape formations of the region, and at the same time the place marks the transition between the flat, open landscape in the west and the hilly terrain in the east.

The prominent location of cairns is, however, most evident when seen from a maritime perspective, as they often are situated at distinct points, marking a liminal position between sea and land. Such a situation is typical for Kongshaug, which is built on a low outcrop close to the shore, where Karmsundet is at its narrowest. Other cairns have a similar location at Nedrebo and Aksdal at the sailing route northwards from Boknasundet (Høgestøl 1996:23). The same pattern is found at other maritime passages like the inlet to Byfjorden or the straits between the islands of Bru, Åmøy, Mosterøy and Hundvåg. Rock art sites have got similar positions (see 5.12. and 5.13.). Such a location is also obvious at Hebnes in Ryfylke where a group of cairns mark the inlet from the northern part of the Boknafjord to five other fjords.¹
Even if cairns are distributed over the whole investigated area, most of them are registered in the northern part of Rogaland, especially in Ryfylke and on the islands of Boknafjord. Karmøy is an exception since a large number of barrows, in addition to cairns and composite monuments, are recorded there. Some individual barrows are also situated on the moraines and terraces of Hebes, Sandeid, Ølen and Etne. The general distribution of grave monuments demonstrates that there was not a gradual transition from barrows at Jæren in the south to cairns in the north. Instead the two types of grave monuments are related to different and overlapping landscape formations with different qualities of exposure and visibility.

Most of the barrows, which are included in this study, have been dated to the Bronze Age because of their grave goods. Since objects seldom are preserved in cairns, other dating indications have to be emphasized, for instance their size, form and location, or their inner constructions like grave cists, ring walls and different types of stone-built structures. The dating of such variables to the Bronze Age is supported by C-14 analyses, for instance at Steinhaug and Kongshaug (see 5.3. and 5.15.). There is also a general tendency for the Bronze Age cairns to be located in the shore-zone or at the edge of open moraine landscapes in Rogaland, as well as at the coast of West Norway. A similar double-sided location of cairns is found in Trøndelag and East Norway (Sollund 1996, Grønnesby 2002).

One distinction between cairns from the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age is that the latter ones are often organized in cemeteries. Such groups of cairns are common along the shores of Jæren (Lillehammer 1996), but they are also found in relation to farms and agrarian settlements (Myhre 1980). The Iron Age cairns are often rather low, and thereby they differ from the more cone-shaped Bronze Age monuments. The similarity with cairns from the Late Iron Age and the Viking Age is, however, more obvious since they are also individually placed or in lines along the coast, addressing the sea and maritime connections. In general it can be claimed that monuments in Rogaland are to a high degree maritime related, and the Bronze Age barrows and cairns in this way set a spatial agenda that was later enlarged, continued and integrated.

Despite these dating problems a number of cairns have been selected as possible Bronze Age monuments, when they are included in a set of references with other monuments from the same time. Such a situation is obvious when barrows and cairns together frame in maritime passages or mark meeting points and lines of movement in a common spatial strategy. Within such a system of references several cairns have been mentioned as seamounts and beacons in historical times, for instance Tormodvarden (5.7.), Vigdelveden (5.8.) and Odderoysa (5.11.) at Jæren, Ullnesrosysa at Hundvåg (5.13.), and Kongshaug at Karmsundet (5.15.). Tangerhaug at Sele, which is a composite barrow with a wide view over the coast of Jæren, has a similar status, and is still the foundation for a seamount (5.7.). However, the criteria used for the selection of cairns, do not rule out the possibility that some Iron Age monuments might have been connected to spatial systems from the Bronze Age with the intention of reproducing historical places and identities.

On the background of this discussion and the distribution of the grave monuments I shall analyse how barrows and cairns were organized and located in relation to lines of movements, passages and meeting points. The aim is to see if the maritime localization of monuments illustrates the importance of mobility, but also how ideas of transgression and transformation fit in with their role as burial places. In this way the organizing of the material landscape should be connected to the structuring of the mental space. This does not mean that the ordering of the physical world can be directly transferred to a mental reality, but that the study of factors like localization and construction might bring about some interpretable metaphors and help to deduce ideas about mental aspects of space. The monuments can in this way be seen as meeting points of daily life and cosmology – connecting elements between real and imagined travels. They become material manifestations of a spatial organization, but also coordinators of cosmological order. The meaning of such a double position
will be sought through a parallel investigation of the monuments’ exposed qualities and their inner composition. This may also elucidate how similar elements circulate between integrated contexts, opened and closed rooms, and from being functional factors they take up the role of metaphors.

7.2. ARRANGEMENT OF MONUMENTS

Monuments seem to have been organized in relation to lines of movements and passages. Their locations are mainly maritime related, but they are also marking paths across land. Jæren is situated at the entrance to the main sailing route northwards along the coast of West Norway, and is thereby connecting Jutland and Skagerrak with the northern regions. This is a major communication route, but it is also a coordinating axis in a system of meeting fjords and rivers, which together make an integrated network of waterways. Natural harbours can be found at these meeting points, from where there are inlets to adjoining sailing routes. They are crossing points for the traffic along the coast and links of communication between the sea and the inland.

Grave monuments are often concentrated near such meeting points where they contribute to the constitution of a superior organization of space, and are emphasizing the qualities of the local landscape. Such spatial patterns can take different forms, which sometimes include compromises with the characteristics of the landscape. Therefore they are seldom identical, but some common features can be seen. A phenomenon, which is often repeated, is the monuments’ internal alternation between distance and nearness when they overlook or mark passages or lines of movement. This form of organization is often expressed through a double-sided stratigraphy. Some monuments are for instance located on high grounds with an exposed monumentality that reach beyond the local landscape milieu, while others have been placed in lower terrain and are accentuating passages or lines of movement.

Both barrows and cairns are represented among the group of monuments that are situated on the top of hills and heights. Different from the scattered distribution of cairns, the barrows are often organized in linear groups. Thereby they emphasize the outstretched shape of the moraine ridges where they are situated, and which at the same time are strengthening the impression of their monumentality. This means that the barrows do not appear as limited units, but they act within a network of relations between human and non-human elements. In general it can be claimed that there is an interplay between the organization of the monuments and the linear formations they addresses. The repeating character of such parallel associations surpasses the ideal of a rounded classical locality for the advantage of a spatiality that is characterized by topological continuity and horizontal distribution.

The visual relation between lines of barrows can be difficult to observe from the inland, but when seen from a certain distance off the coast they will appear as a more continuous whole. This might support the idea that the upper spatial stratum of monuments primarily was meant to be seen from the sea. If such an assumption is accepted, this nautical position marks an invisible passage; an imagined representation that indicates the real place from where the linear organization of barrows should be observed in a macro-perspective. Such a passage has not a constant physical form, but it is created and recreated for travellers as they sail along the coast. It is coming into existence through movement, but it is only meaningful for those who can perceive the essence of this spatial organization. The situation illustrates how imaginary structures can be deduced from the material, and how the visible bring about the meaning of invisible rooms.

Barrows with such a linear arrangement are found within the whole investigated area, but they are especially concentrated at the main meeting points along the coast, for instance Orrevannet, the waterway of Sele/Byberg/Skasvannet, the harbour at Rege-Olberg, around Hafrsfjord, and the northern part of Karmsundet. The milieu around Orrevannet is limited
by the Braut/Kleppe ridge to the east and the narrow strip of land between Bore and Orre to the north and west (see 5.4. and 5.5.). Rows of Bronze Age barrows are found along the rim of these elevations, but there are also grave monuments from later periods, which demonstrate how the monumental organization of the Bronze Age was copied, but without integrating all elements of the original spatial concept. This example illustrates the intention of a historical identity, but it also reveal a material complexity that is both backward-looking and reviving, and thereby goes beyond the framework of the dynamics of evolution.

Seen from the sea the barrows on the rim of land between Bore and Orre have not the same monumental exposure as those on the Kleppe ridge, but they are clearly visible from Orrevannet. Thereby they contribute to the constituting of a local milieu rather than the regional geography. The same can be said about the rows of barrows that are placed on terraces along the River Orre, and which are marking the connection between the sea and the lakes further inland (see 5.5.). A system of waterways leads from Orrevannet to Froylandsvannet and the highlands, and at prominent locations there are linear arrangements of monuments from the Early Bronze Age. They accentuate the passage and mark the crossing lines of movement over land. This is most obvious at Re and Tjøtta where rows of barrows can be seen at both sides of the river valley, near the crossing point of an ancient pathway along the middle part of Jæren (see 5.2.).

Above the harbour of Ølberg the barrows at Rege are placed in line along the rim of the hill, addressing the sailing route along the coast (see 5.8.). Like the row of monuments at the Braut-Kleppe ridge they can be related to a superior organization of space. While the barrows around Orrevannet were situated at two different levels of the landscape, most rock art sites are found at the lower spatial level in the Rege-Ølberg area. The same tendency can be seen in the area around Hafsfjord where the barrows are placed in rows along the higher terraces and moraine ridges, but the rock art is mainly recorded near the shore. Both monuments and rock art sites are marking the passages into Hafsfjord, between Sunde and Jåsund and between Sola and Tjora (see 5.9. and 5.10.). A more complex form of linear organization appears along the waterways of Sele/Byberg/Skasvannet, where the barrows either are marking the inlet to the River Figgjo or are situated along the northern side of Skasvannet (see 5.6. and 5.7.).

Cairns may also appear with a certain form of linearity, but the lines are determined by the shape of the landscape, rather than by the internal organization of the monuments. In general they are individually placed on distinct points along passages and lines of movements, some on top of hills and outcrops, but mostly on headlands and promontories where fjords meet. The linear representation is most obvious in the Boknafjord area where cairns overlook the main entrance to Byfjorden (see 5.12.), or are marking the narrow straits and passages between the outer islands (see 5.13.). Like at Ølberg-Rege and around Hafsfjord monuments and rock art sites are often distributed at two different topographical levels, especially at Bru and Åmøy, but also to a certain degree at Mosterøy, Hundvåg and Buøy.

The cairns along the coast of Jæren seem to have a similar position, but because of the character of the landscape, they are more scattered and not included in an integrated composition. This impression is strengthened by their locations at high points near the sea, where they appear as natural sailing marks. Among these cairns Odderøysa in Randaberg is special because it is situated at a prominent hilltop from where most of the rock art sites at North Jæren can be seen (see 5.11.). In general cairns have a more liminal position than barrows, since they either are placed at the transition between topographical zones or near the border between land and sea. Thereby the marginal role of cairns in South Scandinavia is recreated on the local and regional level.

Independent of their internal location and organization both cairns and barrows are mainly situated at the central meeting points, like the area around Orrevannet, along the lower part of River Figgjo and Skasvannet, at Vigdel-Ølberg-Rege, around Hafsfjord and
Bøvannet, at Byfjorden-outer Boknafjord, and at Karmsundet. Aside from Orrevannet and Karmsundet, this distribution pattern coincides with the densest concentrations of rock art. It is therefore a quantitative corresponding of two groups of sources that both are addressing water and lines of movement. One reason why the sub-area around Orrevannet differs from the others is that open rock surfaces are seldom exposed here. On the other hand a large number of decorated grave slabs are coming from this area.

In the similar way as topological horizontality dominated the organization of monuments in relation to sailing routes and maritime passages, linearity is also the structuring element for those found at the upper rims of terraces and ridges at mid-Jæren. These landscape formations were bordered by waterways, lakes and fjords, which connected the sea with the inland. The southern sub-areas are divided in parallel moraine ridges where linear sequences of barrows have been recorded. Even if monuments from the Iron Age are present, the Bronze Age barrows dominate these elevations. Most of them are orientated in a N-S direction and are therefore repeating the linearity of the coast. Some have an E-W orientation and is running parallel with rivers or lakes, like the terrace at Holen in Time where four barrows are situated (see 5.2.). From this point they overlook the narrow passage at the outlet from Frøylandsvannet of the river that runs towards Orrevannet and the sea, and are marking a central line of communication eastwards to the highlands of Njåfjellet and Gjesdal. Thereby a visual interplay is exchanged between a natural and cultural monumentality.

All grave monuments from the Bronze Age at inner Jæren are situated on the moraine ridges that run along the middle part of the flatland. One line of barrows stretches from Line in the south, via Braut and Klepp to Bore in the north, while another parallel row can be followed from Hauge, via Særheim and Anda to Grude. Between these two ridges there is a valley that ends in a narrow passage between Bore and Grude, before the landscape opens up at the waterway of River Figgjo. Barrows from the Bronze Age have been recorded on both side of the passage that has a similar visual position as the one at Holen in Time. These situations demonstrate how the similar spatial grammar was used in relation to a monumentality that was created by nature as well as by culture.

Such a monumental production is not only revealing functional aspects of communication. Different levels of mobility are also expressed, especially the linear aspect that animates movement. This dynamic element is constituted by an alteration between real and visual repetitions. Such a movable illusion is strengthened by the combination of a recurrence in time, expressed by the monuments, and a movement forward in space, experienced by travellers. A journey is therefore not only a movement towards future but also a process of memory. In this way the spatial organization of monuments gives the premises for the perception of time. This spatial rhetoric can be seen as a material testament for the general organization of the relation between time and space. It is, however, an important notion that such a time-space conception is not primarily created through stationarity, but by virtue of mobility.

7.3. FROM FEMININE SPACE TO MASCULINE ROOMS

According to the typological dating of graves goods the burial monuments in Rogaland seem mainly to have been built from period 2 and onwards. Exceptions are Steinhaug at Særheim and Kongshaug at Karmsundet, where C-14 dates indicate that these cairns may have a history that goes back to the transition between the Late Neolithic and the Early Bronze Age. Artefacts of flint point in the same direction, although it has not been determined if this material was deposited contemporary with the building of the cairns or belonged to an earlier settlement layer. If the building of cairns like Steinhaug and Kongshaug began as early as this, they represent the earliest type of grave monument in Rogaland, and accordingly the monumental tradition was not introduced as a copy of the South Scandinavian barrows. The architecture of cairns should in stead be considered as a compromise, where
the size and shape was included from the barrows, while the creolization is represented by the building material that can be associated with the maritime landscape.

The earliest graves with preserved objects of metal can be dated to period 2. The grave goods consist mainly of different kinds of jewellery, like gorgets, belt-plates, tutuli, arm-rings, and brooches. Such objects are primarily found in women’s graves, while knives and daggers can be related to both sexes. There is a tendency that graves with jewellery from period 2 are located to the moraine ridges and hills of mid-Jæren. Many of them express a double communication as they are addressing both sea and land, but their internal connection is more land-based than sea-related. The few graves from period 2 with weapons are situated closer to the coastal zone, and their distribution anticipates a pattern that becomes more common in period 3.

Weapons like swords and spearheads are the dominating objects in the richly equipped graves from period 3. In addition the grave goods might consist of buttons and pins that belonged to the men’s dress, as well as personal outfits like razors and tweezers. Such objects mark a change from the feminine equipment of period 2 to a masculine expression in period 3. At the same time the location of the monuments is altered from the open moraines of the middle and southern parts of Jæren to the hilly coastal landscape in the north. The Tananger peninsula and the outer parts of Sola and Madla represent areas where this change is clearly materialized and monumentalized.

A more distinct expression of these alterations can be seen in the northern parts of Karmsundet, where the largest concentration of monuments from the Early Bronze Age is registered. Karmøy represents the northernmost area of earthen barrows, but until now grave goods with jewellery from period 2 and 3 have not been found. Even if older metal objects are recorded, it seems that the monumental milieu was established in period 3 as the result of new material conditions (Nordenborg Myhre 1998a). Therefore, the barrows at Karmsundet appear without the historical continuity that is so characteristic for the monumental landscape of Jæren. This impression is underlined by the fact that no rock art sites have until now been found at Karmsundet. In general this indicates that a rapid expansion was followed by a sudden collapse at the end of period 3. It is reasonable to assume that the background for the raising of these large monuments was mainly externally related rather than locally founded.

The material accumulation that is documented at Karmsundet, might be considered in the light of its geographical position as a protected passage on the main sailing route between south and north. Through history Karmsundet has been a maritime centre, and the monumental continuity from the Bronze Age until the Viking Period indicates a similar status in prehistoric times (Hernæs 1997, Opedal 1998). Its maritime importance is mainly due to the shelter Karmøy gave against the dangerous waters and currents west and north of Boknafjorden, but also because of the natural harbours to be found in the sound.

The monumental development at Karmsundet seems to have occurred contemporary with a stronger focussing on the outer sailing route in general. Cairns and barrows where built in the coastal zone, while the inner waterways and the local traffic were no longer marked with monuments to the same degree. This indicates that longer travels by sea became more important in relation to the daily maritime contact. Even if there are tendencies of such a change in spatial structure even earlier, the monumental expression becomes more obvious in period 3. At the same time as the maritime aspect was strengthened, the use of weapons as part of the grave goods was introduced as a new element.

The use of rock art was also intensified during period 3, especially at the coast of North Jæren and on the outer islands of Boknafjorden. The number of sites increased, and the panels became more complex. Even if several of the localities have a history that goes back to the transition between the Late Neolithic and the Bronze Age, the great expansion was in period 3 and it continued into period 4. Ships were carved as elements in comprehensive compositions that included processes of fragmentation and sailing into natural cracks and
clefts in the rock. In this way travels between visible and invisible rooms are underlined, and the sequences of vanishing ships have been interpreted as journeys between life and death (see Chapter 6).

The maritime monumentalization of death, and the visualization of travels towards the world beyond, is thereby brought together. The landscape is staging different sequences of the relation between life and death, where real and imagined expressions are communicated through similar forms and as a common set of references. In this way imaginary travels, founded on identified forms and a recognizable topography, are constituted. A contrasting point is, however, the difference between the identical, sex-neutral human representations on the rock art and the individual masculinity that is characteristic for some of the graves. This divergence might be connected to different stages of a travel between life and death, where it is expressed that sex and material status could not be transferred from one sphere to the next. Accordingly the individual grave should be considered as a monumental manifestation of lived life, while the rock art to a higher degree illustrates the transformation from life to death, where the de-personification of sex and the individual was an element of the process. Besides the expression of a potential alteration during the travel, the idea is mediated that sex, individuality, and social status could not be brought to the world beyond.

Even if both real and imagined travels had intentional aims, it is the process itself that was in focus. It should be seen as a consolidating stage, not only between the old and the new, but also for the making of a third identity that is pointing towards an open uncertainty. Such a point will represent an undefined space that is present in any cosmology, but it is also a source of un-clarified mysteriousness and energy. Travels activate such rooms. They become real as well as ritual actions. The carving of rock art ships can be seen as an activity that unites a similar duality. Like travels, both graves and rock art illustrate a transgression between two worlds that unite the present action with a continuous accumulation of memory.

7.4. THE CROSSING PLACE

Both rock art and graves emphasize the connection between outer and inner rooms – between the interior, the exterior and the outer landscape. These levels are united through a circulation of symbols, but also by playing different roles in a common narrative where travels are the connecting element. In rock art this is expressed by sequences of ships that are orientated towards crevices and clefts in the rock. When such natural formations did not exist, multi-ringed circles or spirals were used to compensate for the three-dimensional effect. An animating element in such processes is the gradual fragmentation of ship images as they sail towards the inner landscape of the rock. At some panels such compositions are overrun by water, and thereby creating a dynamic effect with water as a transforming factor.

Similar articulation elements can to a certain degree be observed in relation to hoard sites. Like the dissolved lines of rock art ships, some of the deposited objects were fragmented before they were hidden in water or bogs. They can be found in fractions, or as completely dismantled objects like the lurs from Revhemsmyra. Such a form of fragmentation is not common for all hoards, but it is a widespread practice that is connected to deposited objects of metal, flint and pottery. Sometimes it is, however, uncertain if the partition was intentional or the result of an accidental destruction. Such a source-critical grey zone must also be considered when interpreting the fragmentation of rock art ships.

The archaeological documentation of excavated grave monuments is often too inaccurate to be used in an analysis of their inner construction, but still it is possible to study the role of barrows and cairns as meeting places between a visible and invisible world, where the travel may be seen as a connecting and transforming element. With such an approach their inner structures might be seen as components in a cosmological layout that also regulates the relation between a real and an imagined framework. The former lack of interest for
the inner construction has left us with a documentation that is standardized, and therefore
gives the impression of a uniform way of building monuments. This apprehension is strength-
ened by the quantitative focus that is common for most excavation reports. Even if such
information is of value, we are missing explanatory observations that make it possible to
compare data beyond the ordering of them in tables and lists. The same can be said about
the associating and interpreting standard that seldom gives priority to observations that can-
not be measured, or goes beyond defined categories. Qualitative information are therefore
often left out.

Only few investigations that have tried to obtain a more comprehensive knowledge about
the interior of monuments. These excavations have revealed complex constructions and
interesting information that goes beyond the distribution of status objects of gold and bronze,
for instance about the depositing of shells, beach-sand and lithic material like flint and quartz.
Some reports also focus on how the grave goods were treated, especially about the fragmen-
tation of objects both inside and outside the grave context. But no comparative analyses
have been made on the relation between this practice and other source categories. Neither
has there been a discussion of the meaning of the sea-related ecofacts in relation to the
maritime location of the monuments. In general, a comparison between this type of finds
and the connection between sea and monuments in the Early Bronze Age is missing.

A source-critical question is to what degree this form of complexity is representative for
a large number of graves. A discussion of this problem has to be hypothetic, but according to
the given information, it cannot be ruled out that most excavators did not emphasize atypi-
cal finds and structures. A major reason for this might be that the main focus of the discipline
was on find-circumstances and objects within the framework of traditional definitions. This
led to a tendency to de-contextualize the objects, and to reject the meaning of associated
relations. It would be too simple to claim that such a practice only exists within the antiquar-
ian tradition. Both through the cultural-historical epoch, and later within the more scientific
orientated New Archaeology, there was a tendency to focus on objects that were related to
an established repertoire of types. On the basis of these considerations there is reason to
assume that essential information about the construction of monuments have not only been
overlooked, but also excluded, because it was not an epistemological foundation for creating
such meaningful relations.

Despite the weakness of the existing documentation most barrows seem to have con-
structed with an inner core of stones that was covered by a thick layer of earth or sand. With
such a design the interior of the monuments refer to the northern cairns, while their exterior
mediates a contact to the southern barrows. The hybrid structure ought then to be seen as a
result of the liminal position of the investigated area between two monumental traditions.
The core cairn represents the local element of the architecture. It varies in size, from small
heaps of stones that only enclose the grave cist, to constitute a major part of the monument
so it is only covered by a thin layer of earth. The cairn is usually built of rounded stones that
were collected from the local moraine or were brought up from the shore. The character of
these stones is, however, seldom described, and the lack of information makes it difficult to
elaborate on the form and colour of the chosen material. The stones seem to vary in size
between that of a fist and a head, but they can also be larger.

Even if the chosen stones were available in different types of landscapes, their rounded
forms can be associated with the shore-zone where stones are washed and shaped by sea and
waves, in a continuous process that is expressing a state of alteration. Beaches of pebbles and
stones are a distinct feature of the Jæren coastline, but they can also be found on the islands
of Boknafjord. As the beaches are representing a mid-zone between sea and land, the core
cairns might be said to be an expression of a similar liminal position within the barrows.
Thereby the inner construction of the monument reproduces a structural grammar that is
visible in the surrounding landscape, and properties of the outer room appear as a metaphor
for the meaning of the core cairn in the interior of the monument. This means that both positions might be considered as levels of breakthrough and transformation. Such an idea can also be illustrated of the fragmented form of the material.

Pebbled beaches and cairns can be seen as symbols of solid rock that has been completely fragmented. Such a metaphoric process brings new aspects to the idea of the rock surface as a membrane between a visible and invisible world, through which rock art ships are supposed to travel via crevices and clefts. Compositions of ship images have been interpreted as a presentation of travels between life and death, but they might also be considered as a part of a larger system of narratives, where the fragmented form of the cairns illustrates a distinct and specific breakthrough to the world beyond. With such a point of departure the core cairns make the barrows of Rogaland to something more than marginal copies of southern monuments. Neither can they be treated as a substitute, which original meaning was constituted in a distant centre and later transmitted to the periphery in a bleached out and context-free state. On the contrary the construction, character and context of the barrows ought to be interpreted as a part of an integrated interplay with other source categories, within the circulating set of symbols they share with each other, as well as with the surrounding landscape.

Such an interpretation does not exclude that some constructive elements were copied and integrated, but these seem to have been of secondary character. Primarily it is the crossing references of local articulation elements that constitute meaningful connections and create a specific identity of place. The outer layer of earth that covers the core cairn, might be considered as an external, integrated compromise. In Denmark the earth was probably more easily associated with an agrarian landscape, than within a spatial organization of monuments that was addressing maritime meeting points and lines of movement in a coast-related topography. When the exterior of the Rogaland barrows nevertheless articulates a connection with cultivated soil, the meaning could have been to express agrarian relations with southern areas, at the same time as the growing importance of agriculture and husbandry in this region during the Early Bronze Age was emphasized. This process did not have an evolutionistic structure where old features successively were replaced by new. Instead a maritime intensification and a stronger underlining of external waterways were indicated, and a thereby a culture that was founded on long-distance contacts.

It has been documented that some barrows were built on newly plowed soil, where ard-furrows are still visible. This phenomenon has been interpreted as a ritual tilling of the ground before the monument was raised. The characteristic diamond shaped pattern of the furrows is probably copied on some rock art localities in South Scandinavia, and pictures of plowing and sowing are also known. Such a form of activity is mainly connected to male figures. These associative elements have strengthened the relation between barrows and rock art and supported the idea of a common background in an agrarian cosmology where functional actions like plowing and sowing also had a ritual meaning. In Rogaland such a connection between cosmology and agrarian activities has not been demonstrated. Neither are ard-furrows and cultivated soils found underneath grave monuments from the Early Bronze Age, as in Etne in Hordaland (Myhre 1972; 1977).

Hearth, cooking pits and layers of charcoal are, however, documented underneath barrows, and they have been taken as indicators of offerings and ritual meals. Potsherds found in such contexts support the idea that food and drinks were consumed as a part of the performed burial rites. Because of the agrarian framework of the interpretation of these barrows, it has been assumed that the meals consisted of cultivated or pastoral food. Thereby the idea was strengthened that such products did not only had a real value, but they were also meaningful for an agrarian founded cosmology. Since fields and cultivated land were cleared by fire, layers of charcoal underneath barrows have been given a similar transforming value. Regular burning of vegetation adds nutriment to the soil, and charcoal could be considered as a source for new life.
Even if the moraines of Jæren and Karmøy were well suited for an agrarian economy, and such a way of life has been documented, these aspects have not been materialized on a cosmological level in the burial monuments. Neither are agrarian and pastoral motifs depicted on rock art, except the herding scene on a panel at Dysjaland in Sola, near the inlet to Skasvannet (see 5.7). The carving illustrates a human figure together with a number of animals that has been interpreted as a dog and a group of cattle or sheep, but which might just as well be horses. Dog-like figures have also been documented at the nearby Hedland locality. The few animal motifs on Åmøy, which possibly were meant to be dogs, are marginally located on the panels. Different from the un-communicated position of the animals, the fishes are depicted in exaggerated dimensions that make them an obvious focus.

Until now there are no reports about microfossils of cereals found in charcoal layers or other structures from burial mounds in Rogaland. Evidence of fires have, however, been documented underneath both barrows and cairns. Such features might be connected to real and imagined aspects of an agrarian culture, but it is also possible that these fires should be seen in relation to navigation and travels at sea. The strategic location of Bronze Age barrows and cairns along the coast of Southwest Norway made them useful as sea marks in historical times, and some of them functioned as beacons or as places where permanent light houses were built.

Maritime exposed rock art sites may have had a similar function, since indications of intensive burning has been found, and the rock surface is cracked and eroded after long time use of fires. It is also striking that very few pictures are documented at the highest point of these rocks, at places where it would have been reasonable to lit bonfires. This might indicate that this part of the rock functioned as a beacon or was used for burning during prehistoric times. The main point is not to transfer such a practice back to the Bronze Age, but to emphasize the general meaning of fire for the navigation, especially in a Nordic seascape where darkness dominated large parts of the days during the wintertime. The fire also imitates the colour and light of the sun, the moon and the stars, which were basic for all kind of navigation.

The circular form of barrows and cairns can be interpreted as a representation of the sun that was activated through an intensive form of burning. Besides the animation of a three-dimensional sun image, the intention could also have been to lead the sun from the open space to the closed room of the grave, or from a physical to a metaphoric sphere. In this way the general characteristics of the sun were incorporated, as well as its qualities as a navigator for travels between life and death. Since the sun symbol appears as a motif on open rock art localities as well as on grave slabs, it might be seen as an expression of the sun’s ability to transgress the world between the living and the dead. The sun also follows a circulating cycle between a visible and invisible identity that to a certain degree illustrates the relation between life and death. This repeating aspect makes the sun a metaphor of immortality. In outer parts of Rogaland the sun always sets in the sea. This vision seems to have been presented in an abstract form on some of the decorated grave slabs, but it can also be seen in a more figurative form when ships carrying the sun disc sail from east towards west. In such a way water revives the characteristics of the sun and becomes a transforming element for the travel between life and death.

The burnt layer underneath barrows varies in size from small separate patches to large areas. Few objects are found among the charcoal. Potsherds often occur, but also fragments of flint or quartz, which both have the quality of producing fire. Such objects are seldom recorded in connection with clear structures, but sometimes their context is well-defined, as for instance in Molkhaug at Bore in Klepp (see 5.6.). At the bottom of the barrow two burnt slabs had been placed as a cover over a circular pit that was filled with charcoal. The lower slab was decorated with 28 cupmarks. A pebble of white quartz had been placed in the centre of the pit. Fragments of quartz were also found in connection with ship-settings of
stone in Kongshaug at Karmsundet and in Steinhaug at Særheim in Klepp. The ship in Steinhaug had a moraine stone of quartz at its bow. It might be interpreted as a representation of a source of light for the travel from life to death.

The connection between quartz and ship can also be seen on some rock art localities. On panels with distinct veins of quartz there is a tendency that ships are carved parallel with these structures, which because of their wavy form, might illustrate the surface of the sea. The carving of ships along these lines of quartz might have been associated with the making of fire. The stroking of quartz triggered sparks, and thereby the characteristics of the mineral and the carving of ships would get an extended meaning.

This row of associations demonstrates how similar symbols circulated between different, but integrated, contexts. Repetition and circulation animate movement and accentuate the real and imagined meaning of the travel. Such relations give premises for a spatial agenda that is different from what was found in Denmark, and they undermine the traditional view that barrows and rock art always should be taken as evidence for a finally established agrarian culture. Instead the contours of a reality that combines maritime and agrarian references can be seen, where sea and travels are the constituting elements of a physical world, as well as of an imaginary universe. Such a form of hybridity is expressed by one of the preserved grave cists in Molkhaug at Bore, where a human cranium had been placed on a circular bed of marine shells (*Littorina littorea* and *Patella vulgata*). The shells were also scattered in the grave cist, but with a specific concentration around some deposited horse teeth. Fragments of bones of sheep, cattle, dog and birds were also found in the cist, and together with the marine shells they underline the combination of maritime and agrarian aspects of this grave context.

7.5. EN-CLOSING THE DEATH

Cairns and earthen barrows in Rogaland are mainly built over graves from the Early Bronze Age. The primary grave is usually placed in the middle part of the monument, but seldom at the exact centre. Three different types of cists have been defined. Most of them have dry-walled sides built of small horizontal slabs, while each end is made of one standing slab. More unusual are cists where both sides and ends are constructed of raised slabs. This cist type is common for the monuments at Karmsundet. Among the 46 registered primary graves from the Early Bronze Age at Jæren it has only been documented at Re, Hognestad and Holen in Time, which like Karmsundet, represent the border zone of the monumental milieu in Rogaland. All of them have been found in barrows. One exception is the main cist in Steinhaug at Særheim, which has a similar marginal location as the other monuments with this grave construction. The third cist type is made of rounded stones, but it is only represented in a small number of barrows, all of them situated at Jæren.

All three cist types were used in period 2 and 3, but the source material is not sufficient to identify a more detailed chronological difference between them. The primary graves vary in length between 1,70 and 2,82 m, and in height between 0,30 and 1,30 m. The average breadth is 0,50 m. There is no correspondence between the size of the cists and the way they are constructed, and their gradual variation does not make it possible to connect the different types to specific periods or places.

The cists found in Denmark are in general differently constructed. The wooden cists made of hollowed oak trunks, which were common in Jutland, have not been documented in Norway (Glob 1971; Jensen 1998). The well-preserved textiles and other organic materials, due to the favourable circumstances for conservation in these trunks, are therefore seldom found. The other main cist type in Denmark is constructed of standing slabs at both ends and sides (Kayser 1998, Fig.1), and is in principle similar to the few of this type found in Rogaland. They are mainly situated in Thy and the northwest area of Limfjorden, the
region that was exposed towards the North Sea and therefore had a maritime relation with Southwest Norway (ibid., Fig. 2).

Grave cists with dry-walled sides and raised slabs at the ends are common in cairns along the whole coast of West Norway and Trøndelag, but like in Rogaland a few examples of cists with only standing slabs are also recorded. The grave construction, therefore, underline that Rogaland should be compared with these northern areas when it comes to the inner structure of the monuments, while their exterior refers to both north and south. It has been claimed that the absence of oak cists in West Norway is due to lack of suitable trees, but the study of the vegetation history has demonstrated that oak was common along the coast, and the forests had only been cleared in the most densely settled areas. Even in Rogaland with its moderate agriculture open woodlands prevailed over large areas until the Late Bronze Age (Prosch-Danielsen and Simonsen 2000). The absence of oak cists must therefore be due to a deliberate choice.

When the orientation of cists is documented, there is a tendency of an east-west direction. Traditionally it has been claimed that the deceased was supposed to look towards the sunrise (Broholm 1943:56, Brøndsted 1958:45). Since skeletons seldom are preserved in West Norway, and most excavations in Rogaland are not well documented, it is difficult to decide the orientation of the buried. Most of the rock art ships are, however, sailing from west to east. Danish investigations have demonstrated that 75% of the Bronze Age cists also have an east-west orientation, but while the dead in East Zealand and Scania were buried with their head in the east, they were placed in the opposite direction in West Zealand and West Jutland (Hansen 1984:66). This might indicate that the dead in West Scandinavia were addressing the rising sun. Since most rock art ships have a similar orientation it is possible that the intension of their journey was transformation and regeneration.

The floor of the cists is constructed in different ways, but usually it is covered of slabs or pebbles. In some occasions it is documented that beach-sand or small rounded stones from the shore were scattered on the bottom of the cist, for instance at Nese in Klepp and at Storeisund and Reheia on Karmoy. In Krosshaug at Viste a similar layer of sand was mixed with marine shells (Littorina littorea and Patella vulgata). The same features have been found in cists at Lista; at Sverreshaug, Svarthaug and Mebergshaug, as well as in Nordhaugen at Stord in Hordaland, and at Todnes in Trøndelag. The use of beach-sand and marine shells as a bottom layer in grave cists was common along the coast from Lista to Trøndelag in period 2 and 3.

Like the stones in the core cairn, pebbles, beach-sand and marine shells give associations to the sea. Together with the earth and sand in the outer layer of the barrows, these features illustrate a stratigraphy of elements that could be observed in the landscape as well as in the inner construction of the monuments. While the earth takes up the characteristics of the arable soil, the core cairns refer to the shore zone and the transition between land and sea. As a third layer in this stratigraphy the sand and shells remind of the bottom of the sea. On a metaphoric level the dead was therefore brought through the three major elements of the landscape with the water and the sea as a final aim. In this imaginary travel the dead followed the cycle of the sun that also included transformation and regeneration through water.

There is no obvious foundation for the interpretation of the grave cist as a vessel that carried the dead on such an imaginary travel. Even if the slabs that covered a cist at Kubbhaug at Karmsundet had the shape of a boat, this example cannot be taken as a proof for the idea that cists in general represented ships. Instead we should focus on the stone-built ship-settings that have been revealed near graves in some monuments, and which might be interpreted as material representations of transforming processes that marked a movement between inner and outer rooms. In Rogaland three such constructions have been recorded in grave monuments from the Early Bronze Age: In Kongshaug and Knagshaug at Karmsundet and in Steinhaug on Jæren (Nordenborg Myhre 1998b). In addition seven similar ship-set-
tings from the Early Bronze Age are known from monuments in the Nordic area, respectively in Sweden (5), Denmark (1) and North Germany (2) (Capelle 1986; 1995, Artelius 1996).

The ship-settings in Kongshaug and Steinhaug are placed between two circular ring-walls, in a position that mark a breakthrough, but also a movement from one sphere to another. A similar layout is registered in a stone construction in Hunden in Västergötland and in a cairn in Södermanland in Sverige (Hyenstrand 1966, Hedengran 1991, Artelius 1994b). A ship-setting in a barrow at Nyaigard near Skivefjord at Jutland (Nilsen 1977), and in Guckelsby in Schleswig-Flensburg (Aner and Kersten 1978:210-211), was also orientated outwards from the monument. If they were meant to carry the dead away from the grave, the ship at Steinhaug may express how difficult the exit was, since the opening was closed of a boulder and two outer ring-walls. This blockage seems to have been renegotiated, as indicated by a secondary placed boulder with footprints, which like the ship-setting is orientated outwards from the monument. This transforming effect is strengthened by the fact that the central cist has the same east-west direction as the ship.

Such a construction might illustrate how the dead was carried by ship from the central grave to the world beyond, but at the same time a negotiation is revealed, which might be seen as an expression of the complexity of the travel. This is articulated through the opening and closing of borders that were created by nature as well as culture, but also by combining two-dimensional expressions with three-dimensional constructions that can be associated with barriers, transformation and mobility. Independent of the chronological connection between these sequences both the central grave, the ship-setting and the footprints underline that the east was addressed. This is an orientation they have in common with the sailing direction of most rock art ships.

In contrast to the ship-settings in barrows and cairns, which are orientated outwards from the monuments, the rock art ships are heading for an inner landscape. This is expressed by sequences of ships that are dissolved and fragmented as they sail towards crevices and clefts in the rock. During this process the number of crew lines are reduced so that the human aspect finally disappears. This form of composition has earlier been interpreted as an illustration of travels between life and death. When natural entrances into the rock do not exist, the depth-effect was compensated of carved multi-ringed circles and spirals. They can be seen as symbols of tunnels that led ships between the visible and invisible world, and as two-dimensional references to the three-dimensional stone-built circles in grave monuments.

The corresponding arrangement of circles and ships that is mediated on rock art, and articulated through the inner construction of the monuments, can be understood as different stages of a cyclic composition of a travel between life, death and regeneration. Within such a three-parted narrative the rock art ships that sail towards the inner room, represent the first stage of this travel. It is possible to draw a parallel between this phase and the setting of the sun in the sea, with water as a transforming element. The same feature is incorporated in rock art compositions where central sequences of fragmented ships are overrun by surface water. Besides an intermediate stage in the grave, the final travel out of the monument, and towards the reviving the sun in the east, was emphasized.

The circulating and repeating aspect that characterizes this form of material production opens up for other questions of representation. One consequence must be that quantitative variables with unambiguous relations do not have to be present. Just as important is the opportunity that is given to identify different forms of interaction between referring and associating elements. It means that individual parts do not necessarily represent separate units of a totality. Such a transgressing, and to some extent relative material structure, is not limitless, but it creates a foundation for an epistemological position where a corresponding system of human and non-human elements might be deduced from physical forms.
Anyway it ought to be said that three ship-settings are not a sufficient material to constitute a complete cosmological concept. But compared with the seven ship-settings in grave monuments in the Nordic region, the number of Norwegian representations is proportionally high. Because of the hidden position of the ship-settings it must be presupposed that there is a "dark number" of not detected structures in other monuments. The un-clarified research status of these ships is also underlining the uncertainty of the situation. Despite these source-critical limitations Kongshaug and Steinhaug must be considered as two of the best investigated Bronze Age monuments in Rogaland. They are among the most prominent cairns in this part of the country, with a diameter of nearly 40 m, and excavations has demonstrated that they were used as grave monuments during the whole Bronze Age. Even if they are separately located at the outskirt of the mortal landscape, they have both been given an exposed position that made them to landmarks within their respective milieu.

The spatial position of Knaghaug is more uncertain. After the barrow was removed in 1907, its original location can only be approximately identified, but like Kongshaug and Steinhaug it was built in the outskirt of a major monumental milieu. Kongshaug and Knaghaug mark respectively the western and eastern limit of the grave mounds at Karmundet. Such a marginal situation gives them a special spatial position that they have in common with other large monuments in South Scandinavia. Their exposed, but secluded, locations also underline their specific status. These conditions may indicate that ship-settings in monuments are special, and that they at the same time mediate something that is both superior and general.

No artefacts have been recorded in the Rogaland ship-settings. Human remains are only registered in Kongshaug where 23 grams of cremated bones of unspecified sex were found together with tooth-enamel from an animal. In addition to the ship-setting four other burials were identified in Kongshaug. Three of them were cremations with burnt bones, while the central cist made for an inhumation is C-14 dated to period 3. Haakon Schetelig described the ship-setting in Knaghaug as a simple inhumation grave, even if no human remains were found, while the ship-setting in Steinhaug was not identified by the excavator as a specific structure.

The ship-settings in Kongshaug and Steinhaug belonged to the same stratigraphic level as the central grave cists, which have been C-14 dated to period 3. The ship construction in Knaghaug seems to have been built close to a destroyed primary grave without grave goods in situ, but a sword of bronze from period 3, which came from the central area of the barrow, may have belonged to this grave. Even if the stone-settings are only indirectly dated, all of them appear in period 3 contexts. They seem to have been built at a time when the carving of rock art ships was intensified, and when they were included in complex compositions.

The poor find conditions of the Rogaland ship-settings differ from the excavated material from the other ship constructions in the Nordic area where the artefacts are of a similar character as found in ordinary graves, and consist of objects that are typical for male graves from period 3 (Artelius 1996:105). One exception is a possible double grave from Oeversee in Schleswig-Flensburg (Aner and Kersten 1978:70-72). Their masculine profile corresponds with the general grave goods from period 3 in Rogaland, especially from Karmøy where two of the three ship-settings are located. A series of C-14 dates from the ship-setting in Trustorp in Halland strengthen the impression of a general chronological concentration to period 3 (Hernek 1994).

All monuments with ship-settings from period 3 are situated in maritime contexts in southwest Scandinavia. They are registered in landscapes characterized by a large number of Bronze Age monuments within limited areas, like for instance Karmøy and Jøren. But despite similarities in localization, construction and chronology, the Rogaland ship-settings seem to have had a somewhat different position, since they are part of a more complex geographical layout with other references and forms of integration, both on a micro- and macro-level. The lack of grave goods makes it problematic to identify these ship-settings as
graves, and the sex and identity of the buried persons cannot be decided. In this way they
can be associated with the homogeneous and sex-neutral crew-lines that are characteristic
for the rock art ships.

Therefore it seems that individual characteristics were not articulated by the Rogaland
ships, neither in rock art compositions where vessels are sailing towards the inner room, nor
as ship-settings that through a similar cyclic composition address an outer room. The former
situation has been interpreted as an imagined travel between life and death, while the latter
is seen as a travel between death and regeneration. This means that neither sex nor individu-
ality was related to these transforming phases. Besides the high degree of flexibility that is
expressed in relation to these changes, the grave monument becomes a place where altera-
tions were constituted. In this way grave goods need not to be an expression of the sex and
status of the deceased person, but as objects that contributed to the forming of a new per-
sonal profile. The negotiations, which seem to have been carried out during the construction
of the monument’s interior, should therefore be considered in relation to the making of such
a subject. It is, however, uncertain if this process represented the formation of a personal or
a collective identity.

Stone circles without ship-settings were common in grave monuments from the Early
Bronze Age in Rogaland. In general they are more regular constructions and appear with a
lesser degree of complexity than the ships. Both singular and multi-ringed circles have been
found. Some of them are made of simple boulders, while others are built like walls of several
layers of slabs. When multi-ringed circles occur, it is uncertain if all of them were built
simultaneously, or if they represent successive enlargements of the monument when sec-
ondary burials were added. It is, however, important to note that similar circle motifs appear
both as three-dimensional constructions in grave monuments as well as two-dimensional
expressions carved on rock. When stone circles are not broken by ship-settings the interior
of the monument represents a closed room. This means that alterations and transformations
must then have been articulated in other ways.

Stone circles with ship-settings might have been a phenomenon that was connected to
specific persons with a special position in society, but such an interpretation would not be
compatible with the notion of a continuous reproduction. It is therefore just as likely that this
construction represented a general and collective idea with a distinct status that was strength-
ened by the location and monumentality of the grave mound. Such an understanding would
also create a distinction between a monumental production that had an official status, and
other monuments that took only some elements, like the stone circle, from a common
architectonic idea. Stone circles, with or without a ship-setting might otherwise be associated
with the three-dimensional symbol that took its form from the superior transforming ele-
ment: the sun.
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CHAPTER 8.
The last voyage

Time present and time past
Are both perhaps present in time future,
And time future contained in the time past.

T. H. Elliot

8.1. OPENINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Three integrated aims have formed this thesis. First I wanted to discuss the epistemological foundation for the theory that Southwest Norway was a periphery of centres in Denmark in the Bronze Age and because of this position should have taken up a design and a monumental production that was similar, but not corresponding in quantity and quality with what existed further to the south. Secondly to work out an alternative basis for an interpretation that seeks understanding beyond the closed centre-periphery relation. Without completely rejecting this binary opposition, it has been possible to develop an “Other” set of choices by means of cumulative trialectic. They are not related to a centre, but are based on the idea that elements from both north and south were incorporated and transformed in a hybrid material representation. The third aim has been to investigate this unexplored room between conventional oppositions, not to propose an additional compromise, but to form a third space where differences come together and contribute to the creation of an alternative material genealogy. With this point of departure I have wanted to challenge the role of Rogaland as a secondary “Other” in a social and technological hierarchy, and to constitute another form of temporality than the evolutionistic lag that the centre-periphery model offers the marginal areas.

Within the frames of what is defined as the South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture, Rogaland has been seen as an agrarian periphery and a northern front against a wild and unmanageable nature. The definition of this culture complex is founded on the idea of a common agrarian form of life, with a corresponding agriculture-based cosmology, which has constituted identical norms of aesthetics and monumental production. A common praxis for depositing metal objects in graves and hoards has also been indicated. A third interrelating element is the rock art, which because of the motifs and their geographical position has been classified as “agrarian images”.

Rogaland’s marginal role has partly been created because it is a northern border area for the distribution of earthen barrows, while the common grave monuments further north are stone-built cairns. Stratigraphical analyses of barrows show, however, that they usually consist of two different layers: a core cairn and cover of earth or turf. Such a construction exposes an exterior that could be associated with the earthen mounds further the south, while the interior refers to the northern cairns. There is also a third type of monuments where earth and stones are mixed without clearly defined layers, the so-called composite barrows. Seen in this way the monuments in Rogaland have the appearance of hybrids that include elements from both north and south, which are arranged in accordance to the specific geographical position of the area. The hybrid aspect is strengthened since barrows and cairns in Rogaland are situated side by side within the same landscape. Rather than marking a dualistic border between two monumental traditions, Rogaland is a place for exchange and transformation. This is obvious from the construction of the monuments, but also from their localization and internal geographical organization.
A dense concentration of rock art with so-called agrarian motifs has been recorded in Rogaland. In general they have been interpreted as a marginal substitute for the more rich and composite metal culture in Denmark. Such a view is deduced from the idea that the rock art images were primarily created as motifs meant for metal objects, only later to be transferred to stone. This mainly concerns the ship images, which are not only considered as imitations, but also as misunderstood versions of the original examples that have been found on southern metal objects. Seen from this sovereign position, ships on bronzes have been made chronological anchors of a general South Scandinavian ship typology.

The introductory analysis demonstrates how this form of argumentation has been presented in a dualistic rhetoric that dominates the ruling centre-periphery logic. This is obvious when a number of premises first is attributed to the innovative centres in the south, for afterwards to be used in a reversed burden of proof to illustrate that the same variables are not found in the periphery. Seen in this way there is no connection between premises and proofs when the periphery is defined. One consequence is that the material culture in the marginal areas is not constituted from what they have, but from what they don’t have. They become an antithesis without a real foundation for an identity. Within such a closed dualism the peripheries will only get their meaning according to what is identified in the centre, not by value of their own characteristics. It is a paradox that this way of thinking has placed itself in a scientific research tradition where observable proofs are demanded to confirm a theory. Instead I have tried to show that the actual argumentation mirrors an idealism that lacks a consequent attitude to quantitative representation.

This illustrates how differences are excluded and chronological schemes dictated, but also how the meaning of rock art as a landscape phenomenon is reduced. Instead they are de-contextualized and classified according to universal typological systems that operate within a diffusionistic dynamics where the centre innovates and the periphery imitates. In this way difference is reduced to something that is evolutionistic unfinished, at the same time as social and technological primitivity is indicated. This is serious, especially since we know that only in a limited number of rock art sites have been found in Denmark, compared with parts of Norway and Sweden. The spectre of information that could have been obtained from the geographical localization of rock art is thereby reduced. When rock art is analysed and dated on the same conditions as portable objects, its spatial meaning is underestimated. At the same time the possibility to discuss crossing references between rock art, grave monuments and landscape is also reduced.

Rogaland can be seen as a material meeting point, but it is also a region where southern and northern landscape forms come together. Besides the open agrarian room, there are fjords, highlands, and mountains. A connecting element between these morphological zones is a system of waterways and rivers that seem to have been the primary reference for the localization of rock art and grave monuments. It is problematic to incorporate such conditions in a theory that claims that these sites are material manifestations of an agrarian territoriality. The observations, which have been presented in this thesis, demonstrate that both grave monuments and rock art are addressing outer sailing routes as well as inner waterways, and they also mark inlets to passages and natural harbours.

To claim that maritime lines of movement, passages and meeting points are variables that structure the localization of monuments, imply an uncertainty since water is always near at hand in Rogaland, especially at Jæren, Karmøy and the outer islands of Ryfylke, which are the main investigation areas of the project. When this view nevertheless is proposed as a plausible idea, it is not only because of the real localization of the monuments, but also according to a superior pattern where water and maritime travels are in focus on several spatial levels. Within this spatial framework rock art and grave monuments get a new and integrated explanation. At the same time the concept localization is enlarged to something more than the actual position of the monuments. This phenomenon must be expected to
have interpretative references that include a continuous system of associations where both human and nonhuman elements are represented.

According to a Firstspace epistemology such relations will be of little value since they are not empirically provable, and can only be articulated through associations and visual communication. Firstspace spatiality has de-contextualized objects and sought spatial connections through statistic and measurable systems that operate within the framework of a causal-effect relation. A problem connected to the relationistic landscape concept is, however, that all combinations might appear as acceptable. But to overcome such a relativism has been common to analyse regularity and frequency of distinct material combinations and to claim that they must appear with a temporal continuity and a spatial representivity. At the same time it has been important to clarify the intensity and the extent of the symbols that circulate through such an associative line of communication. An exception has been made for monuments that seem to have had a special position. For this group it has been demanded that the main articulation elements are represented so they appear as monuments that are rich in symbols and with a continuity that go through the whole Bronze Age.

The mapping and observations that have been carried out do not indicate that rock art sites and grave monuments should be connected to the organization of an agrarian territoriality. Even if the identified variables can be related to a broad spectre of life forms and activities there is no clear evidence that these were primarily founded on agriculture. Instead both rock art and grave monuments seem to have been orientated towards the maritime milieu. Even if these sites were established by an agrarian based society, it is travels and mobility that first of all is articulated. This is expressed through their maritime localization, the motifs and compositions of the rock art, the construction of graves, and the common system of references where both real and imagined aspects of travels are mediated.

Most rock art sites in Rogaland are recorded within a coastal zone less than 0,5 km from the present shoreline. A small group of localities are situated near bogs and lakes from where it was easy access to major waterways that lead to the sea. The maritime relation of rock art is strengthened by the fact that most pictures are carved on striated rocks that face water and are observable from the shore or from boats. Since these images hardly are visible from higher grounds, it is most likely that they were meant to be seen from a maritime position. Besides the shore-near rock art there is a smaller group of localities with a more exposed visibility. They have a rather retracted position in the transition zone between the coast and the cultivated land. Some of them demonstrate a double communication as they address the main sailing route as well as the entrance to inland waterways. Their prominent localization makes it reasonable to connect them to a superior organization of the space, while the shore-near localities mark similar places on a micro-level. Boulders with cup-marks seem to be situated at different spatial levels, but they are mainly related to the inner waterways.

The maritime aspect is underlined since the ship is the dominating rock art motif at nearly all localities with figurative carvings. Beside the many ship images on open rock surfaces, they are also represented in grave monuments where they appear on boulders and grave slabs. Different from other South Scandinavian regions there are few pictures of humans and animals, and no illustrations of sowing or ploughing. Completely absent are also motifs that traditionally have been connected to an agrarian cult, such as copulation scenes and phallic figures. With the exception of one possible herding scene and some isolated dog motifs, no domestic animals have been recorded. Neither the localization, nor the motifs, makes it reasonable to maintain the term “agrarian rock art”. “Maritime rock art” is not a covering concept either, but at least it describes the milieu where they are situated. It has also connotations to travels at sea, which seem to be characteristic for their compositions.

In this analysis it has been demonstrated that the ships articulate travels by including at least three spatial levels: a) the inner room of the rock, b) the rock surface, and c) the surrounding landscape. Within this three-parted spatiality the rock surface might be seen as a
meeting point between the visible and invisible space, where the ships address everyday travels as well as journeys to the world beyond. In this way the ship appears as a transgressing and connecting element between a real and an imagined reality. Therefore it becomes irrelevant to separate between a ritual and a sacral meaning of rock art. Instead of analysing these phenomena through a closed dialectic, they are interpreted in relation to a trialectic where the real realizes the imaginative, and the visible generates the invisible space.

The historiographical analysis describes how the images have dominated the rock art discussion in Scandinavia, while the form and character of the rock itself have been given little attention. Thereby the illusion has been created that prehistoric pictures were carved on an even and neutral surface. By going beyond such a two-dimensional documentation, it has been possible to unveil narratives where travels are exposed on several levels.

Three models have been developed to emphasize the importance of the composition of rock art. Even if they appear with different degrees of clarity, they express tendencies that can be observed on a number of representative localities. A prominent characteristic is the progressive loss of lines and details as ships are sailing towards cracks and crevices in the rock, or they appear in patterns that illustrate a similar form of disappearance. A gradual reduction of crew lines is also a common feature of this process. Some ships are turned upside-down, while others are carved out of course. These compositions are interpreted as illustrations of ships that are sailing between a visible and invisible space, but just as important it has been to focus on their disappearance into the rock, which might be seen as a metaphor for another world. The loss of human elements in such a context is seen as a metaphor of human mortality, and the progressing disappearance of both humans and vessels is interpreted as a narrative of travels from life to death.

The most common composition is described as centrifugal. It is referring to a superior organization of images where the most clearly carved ships are placed in the middle, while more un-distinct vessels appear at the edges. Such compositions might include whole panels or major parts of them. As they are enlarged by adding new ships there is a tendency that the crew lines disappear and the ships are losing their definition. This form of fragmentation cannot unreservedly be related to recent destructions, because other images with the same location appear with a distinct character. The centrifugal model is most illustrative when the central focus is a natural crevice that leads the ships from the outer to an inner room. When there are no such natural depressions, multi-ringed circles or spirals are interpreted as tunnels that compensate for the missing depth-effect. There are several compositions where a ship has been depicted halfway into such a circle, but most commonly they mark a central point from where the process of fragmentation begins.

Another pattern that is closely related to this scheme has been defined as the linear model. This composition is characterized by a number of ships that follow a common course. On such occasions the contour of the ships is gradually reduced as they sail away from an original starting point towards a complete disintegration, or with a course that leads to the inner room of the rock. Such sequences of fragmentation are also characterized by a loss of crew lines. While the multi-ringed circle was the main focus of the centrifugal model, there is a tendency that ships in linear compositions carry simple circles. A similar motif is also documented on a grave slab where each of three ships is depicted with a circle. The position of the circle therefore varies in different compositions, but it is reasonable to interpret the simple circles as sun symbols that are carried by ships between different spheres. There is, however, no reason to claim that all circle motifs were incorporated in such compositions.

The third model appears more seldom, and it is therefore not a representative pattern for a common trend. In this composition a number of contrasting ship images are placed together, for instance when complete ships are surrounded of fragmented and empty vessels. Different from the two other models the ships in these compositions appear side by side without a progressing loss of details.
If would be an exaggeration to claim that these compositions can be observed at all localities, so the models cannot be applied everywhere. A more complete understanding of the connection between rock art compositions and the structure of the rock might be obtained if the geological formations were systematically investigated. Such a detailed study could not, however, be carried out within the framework of this project. It has, however, been possible to deduce some tendencies that open up for new interpretative relations between rock art, grave monuments and landscape, especially concerning their common articulation of real and imaginative travels.

As a part of this analysis it has been realized that some of the depicted rocks have the form of an upturned ship. The ship-formed profile of Fluberget at Revheim is for instance orientated towards Sothaug, which is the largest grave monument from the Bronze Age in Rogaland. The rock at Nag has a similar ship-shaped form with a straight keel and a prow that is orientated towards an islet with the form of a barrow. The depicted ships follow the same course. The linear organization of the images is underlined of veins of quartz with a distinct wave-like character. This is a feature that appears at other localities too, probably to give associations to the surface of the sea. The delineation of ships and the linear structure of the quartz animate the entire composition at Nag, first with a reference to a prominent cleft that is marked by two spirals, and then to the island beyond. The first ship in the sequence is clearly depicted with its crew, whilst those towards the cleft are only loosely defined. They appear as irregular and shallow, and the human element is lost. In these terms the drawings of ships, the rock on which they were made, and the surrounding barrows might be interpreted as “the ships of death”.

Islets formed like grave monuments are also recorded in relation to other rock art localities in Rogaland. Their distinct forms give associations to real barrows similar those built on islands along the coast of South Norway. Such examples show how synchronized narratives appear in relation to both real and imagined manifestations. For this reason the division between natural and culture-made monuments becomes diffuse, and they demonstrate a determination to compromise in relation to the demands of a superior organizing of space. It is also important to note how the crossing of water appears as a transforming passage between life and death. The same phenomenon is articulated on a micro-level when surface water overflows compositions of depicted ships. Such features demonstrate how a circulating set of similar symbols are repeated and articulated on several spatial levels where both human and nonhuman properties are included. These factors make it possible to interpret how rock art articulate travels between life and death, but they also reveal the conditions that might have determined the choice of locality.

One conclusion of the analysis is that linear compositions of ships were enlarged through an incorporation of already existing features at the same time as new ones were added. Thereby some ships appear as hybrids that are different from the traditionally defined typological identities, especially when elements from different periods are united to form distinct ships. Thereby the process of hybridisation becomes a chronological incentive. It is obvious that this dynamic was created through spatial integration rather than internal typological evolution. Such a spatial process challenges the idea that typological series can be constructed from a general development of types. The change of figural forms should instead be understood on the background of their spatial position. In this way rock art become carriers of a complex temporality that is spatially based as well as typologically related. The idea of “the vanishing ship” will also undermine the evolutionistic principle that change is driven forward because of an intended perfection. Instead of clearly defined types it is the hybrids that create interrelations in the material genealogy.

Different from the linear composition that includes ships along one axis, the centrifugal pattern is characterized by a form of plastering of ship features. Within both the linear and centrifugal model the images might consist of typological elements from different periods.
In this way ships appear as sources of memory, where forms are transformed, narratives are documented and re-negotiated, and places are made. Even when external style elements are included, like the features of the Rørby-ship, the local variants were the basis for the addition of new elements. These ships demonstrate that when style elements were included, they were transformed into local compositions that followed other norms of change and expansion. These conditions do not make a foundation for a total rejection of the existing typology, but its superior and general importance should be moderated.

Considering the uncertainties of the typological method, most rock art ships seem to belong to period 1-4, both in Rogaland in general and at most localities. But it has been shown that the praxis of carving ships continued into the Early Iron Age. This chronological status is developed through a comparison of regional typological schemes with local compositions, where also selected decorated grave slabs from Rogaland and other South Scandinavian regions have played a role. It has not been possible to use the existing shore displacement curves from Jæren and the Boknafjord area for a decisive chronology, but the method is promising and is depending on a large number of detailed C-14 dates of shorelines. In expectation of a more secure basis for the dating of Bronze Age sea levels, the existing results have only been used to indicate certain chronological tendencies. It was not a primary aim of this thesis to work out a detailed chronology, but to study how temporality is produced within spatial structures rather than through evolutionistic schemes. Even if essential work remains to make an alternative chronology, the principles and concepts that have been discussed and developed might be a starting point for such a project.

Within the chronological framework that has been suggested, most ship images can be dated to periods 3 and 4. This seems to have been the zenith period for the making of rock art in Rogaland. But it is important to note that ships were carved on rock in Southwest Norway long before they became a motif on bronzes in Denmark. Even if there was not a typological continuation from these early vessels to the Bronze Age ships – within the traditional evolutionistic framework – they were carved on the same panels, and they represented the introduction of a long ship tradition to come.

Five core areas of rock art have been defined. They are all situated close to natural harbours where inner waterways meet the outer sailing route. These areas are also the main centres of the monumental milieu that expanded during period 3, from Karmsundet in the north to the waterway of Sele/Byberg/Skasvannet in the south (see Chapter 7). One exception is the harbours of Ølberg and Vigdel with their natural connection to the Rege hill, which represents a rich grave milieu as early as period 2.

The grave monuments from period 2 are otherwise mainly situated at the moraine ridges of mid-Jæren where they are linearly organized, either parallel with the coast or along natural lines of movement over land. Their internal localization is nevertheless more land-based than sea-related. The grave goods from period 2 consist mainly of jewellery. The few graves with weapons from this period are found near the coast, a position that becomes more common in period 3. One conclusion of the investigation is therefore that in general there was a shift from feminine grave goods in period 2 to masculine related objects in period 3. At this time the localization of grave monuments changed from the open moraine landscape of Jæren to the maritime passages further north. A greater variation of monuments is also recorded, and barrows as well as cairns and composite mounds were built. In general the monuments then became larger, and they got more complex inner constructions that also includes ship-formed stone-settings.

Karmsundet is an exception from this pattern as it represents a monumental milieu that did not emerge before period 3. Neither are there any rock art sites that can indicate a long Bronze Age tradition. Despite these differences the grave monuments at Karmsundet are also addressing the main sailing route instead of inner passages. The downgrading of local waterways indicates a common increasing focus on long-distance travels. Even if this spatial
organization was introduced already in period 2 at Jæren, it became more eminent in period 3, as indicated by both graves and rock art sites. Also at Karmsundet weapons were now a common feature among the grave goods. The changing maritime praxis that is indicated by these factors, imply an intensive domestication of ships and sea, and in general it seems that the cosmological importance of travels was strengthened through a geographical and symbolic unity of rock art and grave monuments.

There is, however, a contrast between the sex neutral and equal crew lines of the rock art ships, and the individual masculinity that is expressed by the grave goods. This divergence is interpreted as an expression of different stages of a travel between life and death, and it is suggested that sex and social status were positions that could not be transferred to the world beyond. In this way the grave becomes a monumental marking of lived life, while rock art to a higher degree illustrates the transformation from life to death where de-personification of sex and individual status is a central feature. Even if both real and imagined travels had intended aims, it is the process in itself that was in focus. This link of the travel might be seen as a consolidating stage, not only between old and new individuality, but also for the making of a third identity, where the travel was the creating and dynamic element both in the real and imagined world.

Both rock art and grave monuments emphasize connections between the outer and inner room – between the exterior, the interior and the surrounding landscape. There seems to have been a circulation of similar symbols that had different roles in a common narrative where the travel is a connecting element. However, the archaeological documentation is not sufficient to make a representative analysis of the inner construction of the grave monuments, partly because the discipline primarily has focussed on the objects and on so much on the context they appeared in. It is also a question how representative the observed constructions are, as they were recorded and interpreted under another archaeological regime.

This investigation has nevertheless made it clear that most barrows have a central cairn that is covered by earth. The cairn mainly consists of rounded stones that either were collected from the surrounding moraine, or were brought from one of the many pebbled beaches that can be found in Rogaland. Rounded stones are primarily associated with the shore where their continuous washing by waves expresses a state of change. In the same way as pebbled beaches constitute a middle zone between sea and land the core cairn marks a similar liminal position within the barrow. Therefore, it might be claimed that the inner construction of the barrow takes up a structural geographical grammar that is recognizable in the surrounding landscape. The position of both the pebbled beach and the cairn might also be considered as a stage of transformation. This is illustrated through the character of the material, since both stones and cairns can be seen as pieces of fragmented rock. Such an interpretation also brings new aspects to the idea that the rock surface represents a membrane between the visible and invisible world, during which the rock art ships passed during their metaphoric travel between life and death. The core cairn has a similar liminal position between death and the life-giving earth.

The investigated barrows and cairns are mainly built over graves from the Early Bronze Age. The primary grave is usually placed in the middle part, but seldom at the exact centre of the mound. When the orientation of the grave cist is documented it is usually East-West. Most rock art ships seem to travel in the same direction and are thereby following the cycle of the sun. The floor of the cists is often made of slabs or pebbles, but some of them have a layer of sand mixed with seashells. This is a phenomenon that has been recorded along the whole coast from Lista to Trøndelag. Like the cairns, which are associated with the sea shore, the beach-sand and the shells also articulate a maritime connection. The material used in the grave monuments therefore illustrates the elements that could be observed in the surrounding landscape. The cover of earth took up characteristics of the cultivated soil, the cairns could be connected with the shore zone and the transition between land and water, while
sand and shells referred to the bottom of the sea. During a metaphoric travel the dead was therefore transported through the main elements of the landscape. This imagined travel followed the cycle of the sun towards regeneration via water.

No evidence has been found for interpreting the grave cist as a vessel that was used during this imaginative travel. The ship-formed construction that appears inside some grave monuments might, however, be related to such a transgressing process. They are placed between openings in inner stone circles, and are thereby marking a breakthrough or a movement from one sphere to another. Since only few ship-settings have been recorded it is difficult to use them as a decisive argument for such a cosmological concept. But despite this limitation the monuments with ship-settings are among the largest cairns and barrows, and their distinct positions make them appear as landmarks. They seem to have had a specific status as mediators of a superior and collective idea (see Chapter 7).

This project has shown that the material production in Rogaland in the Bronze Age was of a more hybrid character than the existing explanation models open up for. For that reason it is difficult to maintain the categorization and hierarchical classification of monuments and rock art that is the foundation for the idea that Southwest Norway was a periphery within the South Scandinavian Bronze Age culture. It will be a challenge for a future archaeology to study how material interaction and spatial production can take place within the process of hybridization. Such a development would challenge established forms of dichotomization, and ideas about complete and specific types and irreducible categories would lose its importance. To treat monuments and rock art as open, unfinished and hybrid categories does not mean that they should be considered as undefined components of relativism, but as material manifestations that include the world and at the same time contribute to its understanding. It means that the thinking about monuments and rock art would strengthen its position by being included in a landscape archaeology that has the ability to coordinate the understanding of both time and space. When Lefebvre claimed that there is no conclusion without an opening, he meant to focus on the ambiguous system of references and associations that give meaning to material culture. It is, however, of importance that they are included in a testable system of theory and methods. This has also been the aim that I have aspired to in my work on trialectic archaeology.
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