

## II. Institutions

### Norwegian archaeology – past and present

**SVEIN INDRELID**

Although the distance between Lithuania and Norway is not really large – less than 650 km at the shortest – the two countries are in several ways very different. Lithuania is a low country, a land of flat plains and rolling hills, while Norway is a mountainous country. About 80% of Norway is taken up by mountains and forests. Less than 3% is agricultural land, while – according to the statistics I have consulted – 49% of Lithuania is cultivated fields, and another 22% meadows and pasture land. The land area of Norway is about 5 times larger than that of Lithuania, but the population is about the same, 4.3 million in Norway, and 3.7 million in Lithuania. This gives an average of 57 persons pr km<sup>2</sup> in Lithuania, while Norway has the lowest population density in Europe, with only 13 persons pr km<sup>2</sup>.

The physical factors of nature strongly influence man's adaptation to his environment. Human response to the environment varies over distance and with changes in the environment. Different adaptive patterns can be expected to occur within diverse environments. Topographic and climatic factors may limit human settlement and exploitation and serve to define the area used by a specific band of hunter-gatherers (Price 1980:223). Information from Australia indicates that tribal boundaries are based on visible and rational physiographic features such as river systems, watersheds, shifts in topography, and changes in floral complexes' (Birdsell 1971:334). Information from other ethnographically-known areas of the world indicates that the same pattern is consistent (Price 1980:223).

How man adapts to diverse and changing environment will to some extent also influence the technological, social, economic and political factors – in short human culture. Therefore I find it pertinent to give a short presentation of the country of Norway, with special emphasis on natural conditions and geographic setting.

\* \* \*

The mainland of Norway is long and narrow, stretching across 14 degrees of latitude, from less than 58° in the south, to more than 71° in the north. About

a quarter of the country is above the Arctic circle. The straight coast line is 2650 km long, facing the Skagerrak in the south-east, the North Sea in the south-west, the Atlantic Ocean in the west, and the Barents Sea in the north. But if all the fjords, bays, inlets and islands are included, the real coast line is 55,000 km long.

Within Norway there are large climatic variations, and temperature, precipitation and snow-cover may change dramatically even over short distances. A series of geographic factors, including the temperate waters of the Gulf Stream, strongly influence the climatic conditions along the coast, and cause relatively mild winters in the coastal districts, even far north. Along the coast the temperature changes very little with a mid January temperature above 0°C, even north of the Arctic Circle. In fact the coast of northern Norway is 15°C warmer than the world-wide average temperature at this latitude. The harbours are ice-free throughout the winter.

The east-west gradient of temperature, from coast to inland, shows a totally different pattern. Here we see large changes over short distances, from a mid January temperature of +2° on the south-west coast to -10° in the nearby mountain region. We see a similar pattern for the annual precipitation, with a lot of rain at the coast with gradually dryer conditions towards the east. Land-forms also change dramatically from west towards the east – from a low coast with an abundance of islands, through a fjord landscape with gradually higher mountains, until we reach the barren ground central mountain region with elevations from 1000 and up to more than 2000 meters above sea level.

To sum up: Norway exhibits an extreme variation even over short distances with regards to landscape types, climate and vegetation. The differences between east and west, between lowland and highland, between coast, fjord-lands, valleys and mountains, strongly influence the settlements and ways of living of the present-day population. This influence was even larger in former times, as far back as written sources can tell, and was by all probability not less during prehistoric times.

Bearing in mind then the length of the country – turn it around, and you will reach to Moscow or Rome – we should expect large cultural and adaptation differences and changes also during the prehistoric periods. We should expect different ways of life, different ethnic groups, different languages, and different cultures. This is easy to forget, not least by us Norwegians, since we for several centuries have enjoyed a strong feeling of national unity, even during the periods when we were politically united with other countries – with Denmark 1380-1814 and with Sweden 1814-1905. But why should the cultural differences be less in a country like this, with so varied landscape and ecological conditions, than they are in other areas of similar size, but with considerably more uniform natural environments? Nobody would even think of regarding the prehistoric population from South Norway to Moscow to be one and the same. This may be useful to keep in mind during the lectures and reports to be presented during the next few days.

\* \* \*

Like in many other countries the foundation of archaeology in Norway was collections of antiquities, brought together in learned societies by historically interested men. The oldest of these societies was established in 1760 in Trondheim – *Det Kgl. norske Videnskabers Selskab* (the Royal Norwegian Society of Science and Letters). This society still exists, and is the oldest scientific institution in Norway. The society built up a collection of antiquities, including archaeological objects,

and the founders undertook expeditions, carried out antiquarian and archaeological surveys, collected antiquities and wrote reports. But after the first enthusiastic flowering, the Trondheim society faded away and was rather inactive for almost a century, until the museum was reorganized around 1870 (Hougen 1954:30).

The next large collection was organized in Oslo, or *Christiania*, as the name of the town was at that time. An Antiquity Commission was established in 1810. A year later king Frederik VI approved the founding of Norway's first university, which also got his name – *Det Kgl. Frederiks Universitet* (The Royal Frederik's University), from 1939 *Universitetet i Oslo* (the University of Oslo) (Hougen 1954:32). Seven years later the Antiquity Commission presented the whole collection to the university. The university historian, Rudolf Keyser (1803-1864), was in 1828 appointed director of the antiquity collection, today *Universitetets Oldsaksamling* (The University's Collection of Antiquities). The following year he organized the collections as a museum, and *Universitetets Oldsaksamling* regards 1829 as its founding year. Under the leadership of professor Keyser the institution during the next 30 years changed from a purely antiquity collection to an academic research institute. Professor Keyser gave lectures for students and published articles on archaeological subjects.

The third collection was established in Bergen, where *Bergens Museum* was founded in 1825 and got the first museum building for that sole purpose in 1831. This was the very first museum building in Norway. It included not only antiquities, but ethnological, ethnographic, botanical, geological and zoological collections. In 1946 the University of Bergen was established – formally opened in 1948 – as the second university in Norway. The University of Bergen was a direct continuation of the activities of the Bergens Museum, which by then for more than a hundred years had been active in scientific research and for several decades also had offered academic teaching in different fields.

These three institutions, in Trondheim, Oslo and Bergen, remained for 50 years the main antiquarian and archaeological museums in Norway, with those in Oslo and Bergen being the active ones. They were all results of the trend of national romanticism, spreading from Germany during the second half of the 18th and the first decades of the 19th century. At this time it became fashionable for educated upper class people to show interest for the glorious past and for the protection and preservation of ancient monuments.

Later came the Tromsø Museum, established in 1872 and the Stavanger Museum, established in 1877, both with natural science collections as well as archaeological, ethnological and folk art collections. In 1975 the archaeological department of Stavanger Museum was established as a separate state museum, *Arkeologisk museum i Stavanger* (The archaeological museum of Stavanger).

Norway has no central *national museum* like those in the other Nordic countries or in Lithuania. The five regional state museums function in fact as national museums for a certain part of the country. As to archaeology, the five museums concentrate on collections from their specific regions, and since 1906 with the legal responsibility to perform excavations in their part of the country.

In addition to the museums an important and influential private antiquarian institution was founded in 1844 – *Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkens Bevaring* (the Society for the protection of Norwegian Antiquities). Among those who took the initiative to establish this organisation were, typically enough, several of

our most outstanding pictorial artists of the time, representatives of the national romanticism movement, who were educated in Germany. After the Napoleonic wars a wave of nationalism swept over Central Europe, not least over the split Germany, where a strong desire to preserve and promote national traditions and the memory of bygone days of glory needed visual symbols, such as impressive monuments of the past.

The Norwegian painter, professor J.C. Dahl (1788-1857), was the initiator of the Society. Since 1818 he had spent most of his time in Dresden, and was influenced by the cultural trends among painters, architects, authors and historians in his circle of acquaintances. On his frequent journeys 'home' to Norway his attention was attracted to the *stave churches*, wooden buildings of a characteristic and unique shape, dating from the 12th to the 14th centuries. Several of the stave churches were torn down in the first half of the 19th century and replaced by new churches. One of the first tasks for the Antiquity Society was not only to document as many as possible of these special Norwegian contributions to European medieval architecture, but also to convince local authorities of the importance of taking care of the old monuments (Shetelig 1944).

The Antiquity Society has now during more than 150 years contributed strongly to the preservation of old Norwegian architecture. Several of the stave churches and a long range of other buildings from medieval and post-medieval times have been saved and restored thanks to this organisation.

During its first 60 years the Antiquity Society also undertook archaeological excavations, especially under the direction of Nicolay Nicolaysen (1817-1911), the president of the society from 1852 to 1899. It has been said that he was responsible for the excavation of 800 burial mounds – some say a thousand – when he excavated his last one, in 1902, 85 years old (Bøe 1960:11). Both Nicolaysen and some of his contemporary fellow antiquarians have often been described as "treasure-hunters", which they to some extent also were. The Norwegian field archaeology of the entire 19th century had a strong element of *collecting objects*. The accuracy of documentation was in several cases less satisfactory. The Antiquity Society had no collections of its own, everything was given to the respective museum. In this way there was a close co-operation between the museums and the Antiquity Society.

It has been said, that the Norwegian archaeological museums of the 19th century were run as parallels to the central archives for written documents. The museums were *source collections* for Norwegian *prehistory* as the archives were source collections for Norwegian *history*. Among the many important finds from these early years, the *viking ship burials* may be specially mentioned. They were all found in the south-east corner of the country, near the Oslo fjord. The ship of Tune was excavated in 1867, the ship of Gokstad in 1880. The most spectacular of them all, the ship of Oseberg was excavated in 1904 by Gabriel Gustafson (1853-1915), professor of archaeology at the University's Collection of Antiquities, Oslo. These more than 1000 years old vessels are still regarded as the highlights of Norwegian archaeological discovery.

\* \* \*

By the time of the excavation of the viking ships, Norway had no law or legal act protecting such finds. In principle they belonged to the land-owner. If an archaeological museum wanted to excavate a burial mound, some kind of

agreement would normally be reached with the land-owner, who for a small compensation – or most often for nothing – would let the antiquarian dig as he wanted.

In the case of the Oseberg find this proved to be more difficult. It was obvious to all, not least for the land-owner, that this was a find of great value, also economically. At a certain stage of the excavation there was a real danger, that the whole find could have been sold out of the country – to wealthy foreigners. This was eventually prevented by a government grant. But there is little doubt, that the circumstances around the discovery and excavation of the Oseberg find was one of the major reasons why the first Norwegian law protecting ancient monument was passed, less than a year later.

There was another reason too. These years Norway was struggling to get out of the political union with Sweden, a union that had been enforced upon us 90 years earlier. The Oseberg find, which in the atmosphere of liberation easily could be turned into a national symbol – which in fact also happened – came up at exactly the right time. The young, free nation to be, was in need of such national symbols. Proper steps had to be taken to prevent this one from being lost.

The union with Sweden broke, luckily without blood-shed, the 7th of June 1905. Five weeks later, the 13th of July, *the Ancient Monument Act* was a fact – the very first law to be passed by a free and independent Norwegian parliament. Later this law was changed twice. The current *Cultural Heritage Act* dates from 1979. This Act states that all prehistoric and medieval monuments or other traces of man of that age are protected, irrespective of who that owns the land where such structures are found. If anybody should damage or destroy such a monument, he will be punished according to law. All ancient finds from medieval or prehistoric times belong to the State and should be kept in the archaeological museums.

The Act has rules for the procedures to be followed if a person or institution desires to initiate measures which may affect an ancient monument. In certain cases the proper authority can provide dispensation from the law protecting the monuments, but normally only after a detailed archaeological investigation has been done. In such cases the person or company who initiates a project that will affect protected monuments will normally have to pay the total cost of the archaeological excavations. In the case of smaller private projects, the State may cover the costs.

The five archaeological museums were given the responsibility to enforce the law in their region. The museum in Oslo was responsible for the 10 East Norwegian counties, the museum in Stavanger for the county of Rogaland, the Bergen Museum for the west Norwegian counties, the museum in Trondheim for the mid Norwegian counties, and the Tromsø Museum for the North Norwegian counties and the Arctic islands of Spitsbergen and Jan Mayen. A sixth institution, *Riksantikvaren* (The Central Office of Historical Monuments and Sites), in Oslo, was given the authority to protect medieval archaeological remains and standing buildings.

Recent reorganisation of cultural heritage management in Norway has resulted in a situation where since 1990 the Law enforcement responsibility has been divided between several institutions, the archaeological museums, the cultural administration of each of the 19 counties, the Central Office of Historical Monuments and Sites and the Ministry of Environment. In principle the main

tasks for the archaeological museums today – in connection with the Cultural Heritage Act – are to conduct excavations and to take care of all finds of medieval and prehistoric age.

\* \* \*

We may ask how the law, and especially the role of the archaeological museums in the enforcement of the law, has affected Norwegian archaeology. This question may be difficult to answer, because at approximately the same time as the law came into function, a generation change took place in Norwegian archaeology. The old generation, including Keyser, Rygh and Nicolaysen, did not create much of theoretical archaeological thinking, neither did they manage to establish an archaeological school, at least not any further than to the collecting and museum procedure level. Almost all archaeological research concentrated on the study of objects, systematization, typology and chronological studies. There was a pronounced tendency to interpret changes in the archaeological material as the result of migrations and of the mingling of different peoples.

The turn of the century saw a young generation of academically educated, enthusiastic scholars replace the antiquarians. In 1901 Haakon Shetelig (1877-1955) took over as curator of the Historic-Antiquarian section of Bergens Museum, from 1914 with the title of professor. A.W. Brøgger (1884-1951) became professor in Oslo in 1915. These two giants of archaeology strongly and directly influenced the development of Norwegian archaeology at least up to the time of World War II.

The *Shetelig school* represents a stringent methodological approach, especially with regards to artefact analyses. In his works he emphasized the necessity to study the Norwegian archaeological material against a Nordic background, and setting the Nordic cultural development into a European context. Brøgger's approach was less concerned with strict chronology and typology. His objective was to study Norwegian prehistory based on the land itself, the resources it offered and the possibilities and barriers of nature that people had to face (Straume 1986, Komber 1987). The *Brøgger school* is characterized by *interdisciplinarity*, with a strong emphasis on the connection between society and natural environment.

Haakon Shetelig took up the study of the Norwegian Iron Age and managed to make use of and vitalize the large amounts of grave materials that the antiquarian generations of the 19th century had collected. His comprehensive work on Iron Age graves from West Norway (1912) is a thorough description and classification, to some degree also an interpretation in a wider cultural context, of grave finds and burial customs. Together with his later publications on the subject, his conclusions have, with slight modifications, been valid up to our time, not only for West Norway, but for most of the country (Næss 1972, 23-24).

In his research Haakon Shetelig showed a profound interest in a variety of humanistic disciplines. He frequently discussed subjects from history, art history and general culture history and runology with the same elegance as he did in his main subject – prehistoric archaeology. His studies of Iron Age style history (1920, 1949) reveal an international perspective, which is further demonstrated in his publishing of *Viking Antiquities I-VI*.

A.W. Brøgger concentrated the first years on Stone Age studies. In his first scientific publication, 21 years old, he proved by means of archaeological evidence that the so-called *Nøstvet culture* represented a pre-Neolithic Norwegian culture,

simultaneous with, but still different from, the Danish *Ertebølle culture* (Brøgger 1905). During the next few years he published a series of important Stone Age articles, culminating with his dissertation on the *Arctic Stone Age* (1909).

In less than 15 years Shetelig and Brøgger established a completely new foundation for Norwegian archaeology and for our understanding of Norwegian prehistory. They also managed to develop their museums – in Bergen and Oslo – into research institutions of a high level, they managed to enlarge their scientific staffs, and they encouraged their younger staff members to excavate, write and publish. A wide range of important archaeological studies were published in the 1920's, 30's and 40's by prominent scholars including Anders Nummedal (1867-1944), Jan Petersen (1887-1967), Johannes Bøe (1891-1971), Sigurd Grieg (1894-1973), Bjørn Hougén (1898-1976) and Guttorm Gjessing (1906-1979), in addition to A.W. Brøgger and Haakon Shetelig. The topics ranged from viking age typology, history of styles, rock-carvings, studies of deserted iron age farms, agricultural settlement in the inland valleys, and stone age settlement in the mountains and at the coast.

\* \* \*

It is probably not correct to give the first Ancient Monument Act the main credit for the extensive archaeological activities of the 1920's, 30's and 40's. But the second law, of 1951, came to influence Norwegian archaeology to a large extent. In this act the responsibilities of the building enterprises in cases of conflicts with ancient monuments were stressed, including economic responsibilities for necessary archaeological investigations. According to the act of 1951 these responsibilities were not limited to *known* sites, but included even those which were not known. The enterprise would have to pay for archaeological *surveys* in addition to excavation of the sites that might be discovered during the surveys.

The consequences of this resolution in the act of 1951 were tested in the late 1950's and 1960's, when large-scale regulation projects at mountain lakes and inland rivers took place in connection with the development of hydro-electric power. Anders Hagen (1921-), at that time senior curator at Universitetets Oldsaksamling Oslo, from 1961 professor of archaeology at the University of Bergen, was the first archaeologist to demand surveys and excavations in those inland mountain areas and river valleys that were being exploited for watercourse regulations, and to make the electricity company finance the investigations (Hagen 1959). During the following years all five archaeological museums took up survey work in the archaeologically little known inland and mountain areas and achieved surprising results: almost everywhere in these distant regions, along the mountain lakes were found traces of stone age settlements.

These investigations were followed up by large research projects, of which the *Hardangervidda Project for Interdisciplinary Cultural Research* (1970-74) was the first (Johansen 1973). Scholars from 7 different disciplines (quaternary geology, paleobotany, paleozoology [osteology], modern zoology, archaeology, ethno-history, and place-name research) worked closely together towards a common goal: to show how man has exploited and adapted to the changing natural environment of the Hardangervidda mountain plateau from the early post glacial to the present.

The Hardangervidda project was a model for many important archaeological rescue projects to come, both in East, West and North Norway during the 1970's

and 80's, several of them with budgets totalling the equivalent of 1 mill. US dollars, or more. The interdisciplinary profile of such projects was first developed in Bergen, where traditions of interdisciplinary co-operation reached back in time to the beginning of our century and the small, but highly skilled group of scholars at the former *Bergens Museum*.

For the last 20 years the three other universities have also regularly included the assistance of natural sciences in their archaeological projects. Few of the projects, however, had such a broad interdisciplinary expertise as the first one, but in most of the larger rescue projects there has at least been a co-operation with paleozoology and paleobotany. The Archaeological Museum of Stavanger, while not being affiliated to a university, has built up interdisciplinary expertise of its own in addition to the archaeological staff.

The enormous amount of archaeological data, generated by cultural heritage management as a consequence of the Ancient Monument Act of 1951, has added immensely to our knowledge of Norwegian prehistory. Based on material and reports from rescue excavation projects, several dozen important publications have appeared, ranging from Stone Age studies in the mountains, inland valleys and at the coast to investigations of deserted medieval farms, Bronze Age and Early Iron Age habitation sites in the Central South Norwegian mountain region and sosio-ethnic processes in the Iron Age of North Norway. A large number of master theses and doctoral dissertations from the last 30 years are based on data from rescue excavations, generated by the resolutions of the Ancient Monument Act. Thanks to the Act, the universities have been in the fortunate position that the costs have been paid, not by the university budgets, but by electricity companies, road commissions and different kinds of private and government concerns.

The advantages are however to some extent overshadowed by the fact that, due to the general high level of prices and labour cost, it is extremely difficult to finance independent, purely research oriented projects. Almost all archaeological excavations of some dimension in Norway today are rescue excavations within limited and clearly defined topographical borders. The archaeologist will therefore rarely be in the position to define the scientific approach within his sphere of interest on a free choice and a totally independent basis. The scientific profile of his work will normally be limited by the opportunities given in each case within the area affected by the developer's plans.

It has been said, not without a core of truth, that Norwegian archaeologists today dig where the engineers want them to, while the inter-war period scholars of the Brøgger/Shetelig generation dug where their predefined research assignments made it necessary. There may also be an element of truth in the statement that many Norwegian archaeologists today, after the completion of their master theses or doctoral dissertation, mainly produce excavation reports and administrative reports, while their predecessors produced intelligible and substantial books on Norwegian archaeology and culture history.

\* \* \*

The historical approach of Norwegian archaeology during the inter-war period continued in the 1940's and 50's. A reaction appeared in the middle of the 60's. The fast increasing amounts of material from rescue excavation projects required effective methods for handling large quantities of data. Such methods created a demand for



accurate definitions, unambiguous classifications and a precise terminology. The Swedish archaeologist Mats P. Malmer was one of the first to attack what he called the 'impressionism' and lack of rigour and precision of traditional archaeology and to demand clearly defined concepts, quantified terminology, hypotheses and inferences based on strict logic, and articulated with the help of mathematics and statistics (Malmer 1962). Malmer's ideas were enthusiastically applauded in several of the leading Scandinavian archaeological institutions, and had also a strong influence on Norwegian scholars, especially the younger ones.

At about the same time new ideas from Anglo-American anthropology, known as the *New Archaeology* entered into Scandinavian archaeology and found an atmosphere ready for new ideas and theoretical discussions. An international journal with basis in Bergen, "*Norwegian Archaeological Review*", was founded in 1968 and has since then been the main arena for the debate of theoretical archaeology in Norway. The New Archaeology was a reaction to the traditional archaeology, which was characterized as inductive, empirical and particularistic. The supporters of the New Archaeology criticized the 'old' or 'traditional' archaeology for being interested mainly in collecting objects and to arrange them by elaborated typologies into different 'cultures', mainly for chronological purposes. According to the 'new' archaeologists the 'old' ones had been too reserved or too modest in applying archaeological data to interpret and understand prehistoric social structures and economic and religious relations. While 'traditional' archaeology focused on questions of *what*, *when*, and *where*, the advocates of the New Archaeology would find questions like *how* and *why* more relevant.

Some of the "new" approaches were quite familiar and not at all new for those acquainted with A.W. Brøgger's (1925) and B. Hougen's (1947) synthesis publications on Norwegian prehistory. Brøgger's studies of prehistoric adaptations to the natural environment, and his studies of prehistoric subsistence and settlement patterns, were published – in Norwegian – several decades before such words appeared in archaeological terminology. Bridge builder between the "old" and the "new" traditions was Anders Hagen, former a Brøgger student, from 1961 archaeology professor in Bergen, author of several synthesis works on Norwegian prehistory, including one in English language (1967b). His main focus has been what Grahame Clark (1953) called the 'economic approach', and influenced by an ecosystemic view of culture (1972), based on co-operation with natural sciences, ethnology and cultural anthropology, he was the founder of the interdisciplinary 'Bergen school' of archaeology. The more recent development and trends in Norwegian archaeology will be dealt with by other speakers during this symposium, so I will not discuss here the variety of trends and 'isms' that during the last 20 years have emerged, flourished and faded away, or developed into other trends or 'isms'.

\* \* \*

From the middle of the 1960's a large scale increase in the number of university students took place. In 1960 there were 10,000 students at Norwegian universities. Five years later there were 20,000, and the increase continued by 10,000 for each of the two following five year periods. In 1995 the four universities of Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim and Tromsø had 77,000 students. The 1960's and early 70's were also an economically expansive period for the universities, and a large number of new teacher positions were offered by the government. These

trends were also reflected in the field of archaeology, which experienced an influx of students and several new lecturers during that period. As a result, for the first time there was a group of archaeologists that were not primarily 'museum people', but archaeology teachers. The Shetelig/Brøgger generation and their immediate successors had been both. The study of archaeology had changed from a rather informal tutor based education to a formalized lecture based education.

The study of archaeology at the universities of Oslo and Bergen was reorganized, and the new university of Tromsø got an archaeological department that was completely separate from the archaeological museum. Theoretical and methodological issues became more important in the study of archaeology, and there is no doubt that the new generation of archaeology students can benefit from a considerably better theoretical training than those of their colleagues who got their university training before 1970.

Even though much of the development of the archaeology study in recent years undoubtedly will have a favourable effect on archaeological research as well as cultural heritage management, we also see tendencies that may have undesirable effects. The large increase in student numbers, especially since the late 1980's, has led the universities to put a great deal of effort into getting students more rapidly through the system and improving the quality of the teaching programmes in a more theoretical direction. The archaeology students of the 1960's and 70's spent 7-8 years or more on their Master of Arts degree and participated for several months each year in excavations, often as site leaders. The students of today, being rushed through the study in shortest possible time, acquire too little practical training and too little knowledge of the empirical foundation of archaeology for their future profession. After all more than 90% of Norwegian candidates of archaeology today are employed in cultural heritage management or museum work.

\* \* \*

All four universities offer *undergraduate*, *graduate* and *post graduate* degrees in archaeology, after study programmes of 4, 2 and 3 years respectively. The principle modules are almost identical, but the programmes of study differ from university to university. In Oslo, Bergen and Trondheim the archaeology departments are affiliated with the faculties of arts, while archaeology at the University of Tromsø is a part of the faculty of social sciences. The 'old' *Master degree*, which was earlier the highest level of university study for archaeologists, is now only retained at the University of Oslo, as an alternative to the 'new' *cand.philol.* or *cand.polit.* graduate degrees. The 'old' *dr.philos.* degree which was completely based on the candidate's own research, without the support of special tuition or formalized education, still exists as an alternative to the 'new' *dr.art.* or *dr.polit.* post graduate degrees. These are now the highest academic degrees offered within an ordinary study programme and normally this top level education in archaeology today involves a study period of minimum 9 years.

The doctoral degree is now a minimum requirement for permanent appointment with scientific university positions, including scientific positions at the four university museums of Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim and Tromsø. For scientific positions at other museums and ordinary positions within cultural management administration a graduate degree is normally requested as a minimum.

## References

- Birdsell, J.B. 1971. Ecology, spacing mechanisms and adaptive behavior in Aboriginal land tenure. In: *Land Tenure in the Pacific* (Ed.: R. Crocombe), 334-361. Oxford.
- Brøgger, A.W. 1905. *Øxer af Nøstvettypen. Bidrag til kundskaben om ældre norsk stenalder.* Norges Geologiske Undersøgelse. No. 42. Kristiania.
- Brøgger, A.W. 1909. *Den arktiske stenalder i Norge.* Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania Skrifter II, No.1.
- Brøgger, A.W. 1925. *Det norske folk i oldtiden.* Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Oslo.
- Bøe, Johs. 1960. Vestnorsk fornforskning gjennom fire generasjoner. *Universitetet i Bergen. Småskrifter.* Universitetsforlaget.
- Hagen, A. 1959. Vassdragsreguleringer og høyfjellsarkeologi. *Universitetets Oldsaksamlings Årbok 1956-57*, 98-150.
- Hagen, A. 1962. Forhistorisk tid og vikingetid. *Vårt Folks Historie.* Bd 1. Aschehoug, Oslo.
- Hagen A. 1967a, 1977, 1983. *Norges Oldtid.* Cappelen, Oslo.
- Hagen, A. 1967b. *Norway. Ancient peoples and places.* Thames & Hudson, London.
- Hagen, A. 1972. Man and Nature. Reflections on Culture and Ecology. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, vol. 5, 1-22.
- Hougen, B. 1954. Fra norsk arkeologisk historie. En skisse. *Viking.* Bind XVIII, 29-49. Norsk Arkeologisk Selskap. Oslo.
- Komber, J. 1987. Det arkeologiske grunnsynet til Anton Wilhelm Brøgger og Håkon Shetelig. *Viking.* Bind L, 23-35. Norsk Arkeologisk Selskap. Oslo.
- Malmer, M.P. 1962. *Jungneolithische Studien.* Acta Archaeologica Lundensia, Series in 8°, 2.
- Næss, J.-R. 1972. Some Reflections on the Study of Iron Age Burial Customs in Norway. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, vol. 5, 23-27. Universitetsforlaget.
- Price, T. Douglas 1980. Regional Approaches to Human Adaption in the Mesolithic of the North European Plain. *Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Ur- und Frühgeschichte Potsdam.* Band 14/15, 217-234.
- Shetelig, H. 1920. Vestfoldskolen i den nordiske stilhistorie. *Osebergfundet.* Bd. III. Kristiania.
- Shetelig, H. 1944. Foreningen til Norske Fortidsminnesmerkers Bevaring 1844-1944. *Viking.* Bind VIII, 7-14. Norsk Arkeologisk Selskap, Oslo.
- Shetelig, H. 1949. *Classical Impulses in Scandinavian Art from the Migration Period to the Viking Age.* Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, serie A. XIX. Oslo.
- Straume, E. 1986. Norsk arkeologi de siste 20 år. Forholdet mellom hjemlig tradisjon og internasjonale strømninger i forskningen. *Viking.* Band XLIX, 257-267. Norsk Arkeologisk Selskap, Oslo.

# Archeologija Norvegijoje – praeitis ir dabartis

**SVEIN INDRELID**

## Santrauka

Supažindinama su pagrindinėmis Norvegijos archeologijos mokslo kryptimis nuo XIX a. vidurio iki šių dienų. Jau 90 metų Kultūrinio palikimo įstatymas yra privalomas senovės paminklų atžvilgiu. Jis taip pat deklaruoja archeologinius radinius bei radimvietes, kurios yra šalies priešistorijos ir seniausios istorijos žinių šaltinis. Šis įstatymas – tai juridinis saugotino kasinėjimo projektų pagrindas. Jame numatytos tiek ekonominės priemonės, tiek mokslinis bei administracinis organizavimas. Kultūrinio palikimo įstatymas iki šiol stipriai veikia archeologinių problemų ir temų svarstymą Norvegijoje.

Pateikiama bendra informacija apie administracinę senovės paminklų priklausomybę. Išvardijamos pagrindinės archeologijos įstaigos, muziejai bei universitetų institutai, suteikiantys archeologinį išsilavinimą ir archeologijos mokslo laipsnius. Taip pat apžvelgiama Norvegijos universitetų archeologinių studijų bei mokslinių laipsnių sistema šiandien.

*Svein Indrelid  
Department of Archaeology,  
Bergen Museum, University of Bergen  
Harald Harfagresgt. 1  
5007 Bergen, Norway*