

Háskóli Íslands
Hugvísindasvið
Viking and Medieval Norse Studies

Systems of Settlement Hierarchy

*A study of Husby, Central Places, and Settlement in the Mälaren
Region from an Archaeological Perspective.*

Ritgerð til MA-prófs í Viking and Medieval Norse Studies

Karl Troxell
Kt.: 050994-4229

Leiðbeinandi: Orri Vésteinsson
June 2019

Abstract

The study of the settlement landscape of Late Iron Age, Viking Age, and Medieval Scandinavia has often focused on questions concerning the development of socio-political organization and its effect on the regional organization of settlement. In the Mälaren region in central Sweden scholars have relied on theoretical models of social and settlement hierarchy developed over nearly a century of discourse. The framework for these models was initially built on sparse literary, historical, and linguistic evidence, with archaeological material only being considered more systematically in recent decades, and then only in a secondary capacity. These considerations only being made to shed light on the existing theoretical framework. No general examination of the archaeological material has taken place to corroborate these models of settlement hierarchy based purely on an archaeological perspective. This thesis reviews the models of settlement hierarchy and social organization proposed for the Mälaren region in the Late Iron Age through Medieval Period and examines how they hold up in the face of the available archaeological evidence. It finds that while much more systematic archaeological research is necessary, the available evidence calls for a serious restructuring of these theoretical frameworks.

Ágrip

Rannsóknir á landsháttum síðari hluta jánaldar, víkingaaldar og miðalda á Norðurlöndum hafa að stórum hluta miðað að því að varpa ljósi á álitamál um þróun valdakerfa og um áhrif þeirra á skipulag byggðar. Í kringum Löginn í miðhluta Svíðþjóðar hafa fræðimenn þróað hugmyndir um samfélags- og byggðaskipan fornaldar sem byggja á meir en aldarlöngum rannsóknum. Upphaflega byggðu þessar hugmyndir fyrst og fremst á örnefnum og fátæklegum ritheimildum, en á síðustu áratugum hafa fornleifar í vaxandi mæli verið teknar með í reikninginn. Þær hafa þó nær eingöngu verið notaðar til að varpa ljósi á þau líkön sem þróuð hafa verið, ekki til að þróa ný sem leggja til grundvallar heildstætt mat á hinum fornleifafræðilega vitnisburði. Í þessari ritgerð eru líkön um skipulag byggðar og samfélags í Lagardalnum á seinni hluta jánaldar til miðalda tekin til skoðunar og athugað hvernig þeim reiðir af í ljósi þeirra fornleifafræðilegu vísbendinga sem fyrir liggja. Niðurstaðan er sú að þó að mikið vanti enn upp á að fornleifarnar gefi skýra mynd af þróun mála þá sýni þær að fyrirbyggjandi líkön eru alls ófullnægjandi

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend a sincere thanks to my advisor, Orri Vésteinsson, for his continued academic support. This project would have not have made it this far if not for his guidance and infinite patience. I would also like to thank my friends and peers in the Viking and Medieval Norse Studies program. I would not be where I am today without their continued friendship and support. Thank you Jake, Zach, Mads, Lynn, Adam, and Sarah for helping me through the rigor of these last few months. Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their continued financial and emotional support throughout my time in the Viking and Medieval Norse Studies Program.

Foreword

The following project is one that has seen many alterations, revisions, and changes in direction since its inception. The product that follows is one built within the standards of the necessary limitations in material and scope imposed upon me. The majority of the source material for this project comes from what is available to me through direct access within the library system of this university. The material I have chosen is, in my opinion, enough to demonstrate the patterns in the material and the scholarship I see as visible. However, this material is limited to what is accessible and what is understandable to me. Amongst my limitations language has played a great part in the limiting in scope of this product, and there may be some material that has been overlooked due to my lack of comprehension. The material I have worked with represents a smaller fraction of what is available on the topics of Husby studies, and settlement hierarchy in central Sweden. Although this fraction is smaller it is still my belief that it represents enough of a sampling of the matter to address the core of the issues presented in this thesis. Additionally, due to my own comprehension there are doubtless countless linguistic nuances that have been lost in translation, and the data which I interact with is subject to my own comprehension. This comprehension has shaped some of my interpretations of the archaeological material, which is in this case unavoidable. Additionally, the archaeological material with which I have chosen to interact with comes from either secondary summary interpretation, or summary reports rather than field catalogues. This is simply the material that is accessible to me, and as such has had an impact on my interpretation of that material. However, the material I examine in my opinion is a clear enough sampling of the matter to provide insight into the issues I believe visible through my examinations. It is my hope that the presentation of these examinations is displayed in enough of a clear and visible manner to address the issues I see present.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Research History	1
Husby Studies	2
Settlement Archaeology	8
Central Place Theory in Scandinavia	11
Theories of Social and Settlement Hierarchy in the Mälaren region	13
Central Place Theory and Social-Settlement Hierarchy	19
State Formation and Medieval Period Social-Settlement Hierarchy	27
Archaeological Material	30
Archaeological Settlement Hierarchy	32
Archaeological Material and the Husby System	36
Husby in Glanshammar	37
Mälby	42
Husby and Tuna in Vendel	45
Other Husby in the Mälaren Region	47
Archaeological Material and Central Places	49
Helgö	50
Gamla Uppsala	53
Urban Settlement in Viking Age Mälardalen	56
The Material at a Glance	59
Conclusion	61
References	63

Introduction and Research History

There exists a long chain of scholarship that represents the development of Scandinavian Archaeology (Stjernquist 1978). However, as this chain develops it often branches into isolated subfields which see either independent development, or minimal development based on the field of Scandinavia Archaeology as a whole. In this way a considerable amount of subfields, research aims, regions, and time periods within Scandinavian Archaeology can be seen to be somewhat disjointed. There is however always the aim to link developments within a particular research interest with greater theoretical questions concerning Scandinavian Archaeology as a whole. The interplay, or lack thereof, between these disjointed elements is one of, if not the most critical factor to the development of these theories surrounding the development of settlement and social landscape within Scandinavia during the Iron Age. Three major subfields of study within the vein of Scandinavian Archaeology concerning the settlement landscape define this interplay when concerning the study of the Scandinavian Archaeology and its approach to the settlement landscape in the Mälaren region. .

Husby Studies

The first of these subfields is a longstanding phenomenon in the study of the development of political expression and social complexity within Scandinavian, and within central Sweden during the Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval Period. This subfield, which I have elected to define here as “Husby Studies” is the culmination of several avenues of inter-disciplinary research (Brink 1996, 235-237). Primary among these is literary-historical analysis, although archaeology is often tangentially involved. This field of study springs off a chain of scholarship studying a model of social and settlement hierarchy within central Sweden that centers around the functionality of royally controlled elite farms known as Husby, within a hierarchical network under royal power centered in Uppsala (Christensen and Lemm 2016, 7-9). These studies draw from a great deal of previous inter-disciplinary research. This research has had a tendency to examine this theoretical model from similar perspectives, often using similar methodologies or reaching similar interpretations, even when they do not directly examine the phenomenon of the Husby themselves (Brink 1996, 237-243, 248-249).

The name I have chosen to refer to this particular research interest within the study of specific elements of settlement landscape and socio-political organization within Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval Scandinavia refers to the named locations which are the subject of study. Found in the settlement landscape of Scandinavia, and in modern Scandinavian geography are more than a hundred locations bearing a name that is a derivative of the Old Norse place name Húsabýr/Húsabær. The linguistic elements are Hús, meaning house, and Býr/Bær which is often used to refer farmsteads. However, the meaning and usage can vary to extend to any settlement complex of a degree of size larger than a small scale farm (Carstens 2016, 11). These locations have the highest number and density within Sweden, numbering some 70 locations bearing Húsabýr derivative names (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41). In particular the region of Svealand in central Sweden, specifically Uppland, bears the highest density of Husby sites within Sweden. Uppland alone has 25 of these sites within a relatively dense configuration (Lindkvist 2016, 141). Study of these particular places within the cultural landscape of Viking Age Scandinavia has been extensive and

spans the last several decades. These locations are notably a pan-Scandinavia phenomena, although particular interest has been placed on the study of Husby locations within Sweden and Norway, as both contain the majority of Husby locations within Scandinavia (Christensen and Lemm 2106, 7-9). Study of these locations has for the most part has focused on an interdisciplinary approach, often using elements of place name studies, literary and historical studies, and occasionally archaeology (Christensen and Lemm 2016). The focus of research into Husby locations has shaped the understanding of the settlement landscape of central Sweden around these Husby locations, which have come to be understood as a particular type of named settlement comprised of a royally controlled central farmstead (Christensen and Lemm 2016). In particular while some Husby locations share name and location with known settlement archaeological sites within Scandinavia the use of archaeology within the study of these locations is often supplementary (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41). The usage of the material present, or lack thereof in some cases is limited to support assertions only derived from linguistic and geographic study (Brink 1996, 235-273). As the focus of research into Husby locations has been driven first and foremost by literary and historical analysis, these analyses provide the bulk of the understanding of the shape and functionality of the socio-political system in which these locations perform their function (Christensen and Lemm 2016). The socio-political system in review is the proposed Husby System, a system of political organization within Late Viking Age and Early Medieval Sweden which has been argued to form the basis of political and social hierarchy within central Sweden, in particular the proposed historical state that compromised Svealand. This system is envisioned as a network of these Husby settlements that form either a political organization or early tax system which feed into a center at Gamla Uppsala. The basis for the understanding of this system is built upon literary-historical study of Medieval Swedish legal texts, as well as referential evidence within Saga Literature (Lindkvist 2016, 141-148). The legal texts which in this system, the Husby locations, and their functionality are described date to after the collapse of the proposed Husby System by at least a century (Runer 2016, 168). The literary material containing potential reference to the system, the associated state, and the associated functionality post-date the proposed period of activity by centuries as well (Carstens 2016, 12-14). The use of archaeological material within these studies is

limited, although not completely absent. The main focus of this use is on associating archaeological remains with Husby name locations. The study of these locations from a purely archaeological perspective, or at least a perspective lead by archaeological data has been severely limited. This previous study was mostly limited to the examination of Husby name locations in conjunction with nearby elite burials to bring about the association with a royally centered elite network (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41-53). There has yet to be a wider study of Husby locations within the wider context of the settlement and cultural landscape of prehistoric Scandinavia, and it seems that no plans for wide scale survey projects to identify and denote settlements that share a character which can be positively identified as what is assumed to be a Husby exist (Lemm 2016, 86). This may be in part due to the ambiguous settlement character of archaeological settlements sharing the location of these Husby named geographic locations. There is a particular character associated with a Husby archaeologically. That of a larger farmstead, or magnate farm. The size and character of this farm, as well as the association of this farm to elite activity using material data present would naturally be expected to share some similarity. However, the settlement character of these archaeological sites found on Husby name locations is not uniform, as is often asserted by the common models of the Husby system itself. This is the case in particular in Norway concerning the size of these settlements (Stylegar 2016, 27-38). There are also considerable cases within Uppland of archaeological settlements at Husby name locations that show a distinct settlement character asynchronous from what would be expected of a Husby settlement, including lacking a settlement or manifesting as a large village (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 42-50). Survey of these locations has also been somewhat limited archaeologically. This is due to either the relative freshness of these sites in the field of study as well as the character of settlement survey within the study of Husby name locations. The survey of these locations by nature is based in historical, linguistic, and geographic survey and beyond the identification of potential named locations geographically there is little effort made towards excavation (Lemm 2016, 71-89). There exists no wide scale archaeological prospection to collaborate these named locations with known archaeological settlement sites surrounding these Husby name locations (Lemm 2016, 86).

To understand the preference and research foci within “Husby Studies” it may help to understand the chain of scholarship within these studies, as well as the current atmosphere of material and analysis concerning these Husby locations, the proposed Husby System in which they function, and the theoretical models for the development of social hierarchy within the time period in which these locations and this system are proposed to function. From a literary and linguistic perspective the study of Husby extends back to elements of study in the 19th century within early linguistic studies of place names in Scandinavia from Olof Rygh (Carstens 2016, 12). The emergence of the culture-historical study of Husby locations arguably develops from early 20th century analysis of the proposed Husby System within the study of the development of political organization in Viking Age Scandinavia, predominately from material generated by early scholars such as Henrik Schüek, with his work *Upssala Öd*, and Asgaut Steinnes with the titular monograph, *Husebyar* (Lindkvist 2016, 168; Pettersen 2010, 52). The focus of early scholarship was primarily to identify and associate the proposed Husby System with reference to political organization and states within literary and historical sources (Carstens 2016, 12). This early work can be summed up within an early state of the art examination by Jerker Rosén in a 1962 publication which examines “Husby Studies”, and built a considerable amount of the standard model of research questions, aims, and methods concerning the study of Husby name locations (Lindkvist 2016, 141; Pettersson 2000, 49-59). In particular the focus during this stage of scholarship was the identification and examination of potential Husby sites, as well as the examination of the Husby System in a culture-historical context. The status quo arriving from this early half century places the Husby system as a form of political organization under royal control that operated from a network of these Husby settlements centered on the king in Uppland. During the next three decades more attention to the use of archaeological data in the corroboration of previous assertions concerning this system became more common, as well as the application of settlement-historical approaches (Pettersson 2000, 59-61). This addition of connecting archaeology with the previously studied geographic named locations occurred under Åke Hyenstrand during the 1970s, although the focus was far more on connecting monumental burials with Husby name locations (Pettersson 2000, 60). During a new wave of influence from archaeological theory during the 1980s Stefan Brink laid the groundwork for the common understanding of

the sociopolitical model of the Husby System within Viking Age Svealand, focusing on these named locations as specific settlements within the settlement landscape defined and understood using more modern archaeological theory (Brink 1996, and Brink 1997). This research in particular has driven the focus towards a broader interdisciplinary study of the Husby System, and the theoretical models of social, political, and settlement organization on which it is built (Brink 1996, 235-248). However, this study leads with linguistic survey of place names at its head, with minimal corroboration from archaeology (Brink 1996). More recent state of the art examinations have been made, specifically two more recent publications that examine the state of “Husby Studies” in the past two decades; *En Bok om Husbyar*, in which Jonatan Pettersson outlines a more recent state of “Husby Studies” and *Husebyer – status quo, open questions and perspectives* a 2014 collaboration by the National Museum of Denmark to examine the current field of research into Husby name locations (Pettersson 2000; Christensen and Lemm 2016). Both examine newer developments in “Husby Studies”, in particular the increased usage of archaeological case studies concerning the Husby System and its functionality (Pettersson 2000, 59-61; Lemm 2016). However, it is clear from these examinations the majority of research focuses on predominately literary-historical data driven research over material data driven research (Pettersson 2000). Archaeology is not entirely absent from the study of Husby sites. There has been some survey concerning understanding Husby sites from a landscape perspective, notably by Gerhard Larsson in the 1980s (Pettersson 2000, 59). The use of archaeological material within the majority of Husby studies appears to focus on associating Husby name sites within specific topographic landscape arrangement, known monumental architecture near the name site, or known archaeological settlements dating to the Viking Age and Medieval Period near the name site (Pettersson 2000, 59-60). However, there is very little connection between Husby name sites and known archaeological settlements dating to the relevant period (Pettersson 2000, 60). There have been a few projects undertaken to excavate isolated settlement sites associated with potential Husby name sites, the results of these projects often yielding highly variable results in the organization, dating, and functionality of the settlement itself (Lemm 2016 71-82). There is still no systematic survey of archaeological settlement sites near Husby name sites, or of the settlement landscape

and structure within these sites (Pettersson 2000, 59-60). The central research questions of the shape of the Husby System, and its prevalence in the settlement and cultural landscape of Viking Age and Medieval Scandinavia remain much the same (Christensen and Lemm 2016, 7). The standards of the field of Husby studies can be seen to have remained the same over the last several decades. Focus of the research is placed on the understanding and development of political power and state formation within specific regions in Viking Age Scandinavia. The region most studied, and primary for this study, is Uppland in central Sweden (Pettersson 2000, 49-63; Lemm 2016, 71). Second, the named Husby locations can be seen to correspond with historical settlements that functioned within a political system theorized through study of Saga Literature, and later Medieval Legal Texts (Runer 2016, 165-170). This system can be seen to correlate with a proposed system of social organization present within archaeological theory which has been applied to the settlement landscape and cultural landscape of Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval central Sweden (Brink 1996; Brink 1997).

In summary, the study of the Husby within the regional context of the Mälaren region extends throughout most of the 20th century A.D. and can be seen to develop from and maintain elements of Schück's original conception of the Husby as a phenomenon.

Settlement Archaeology

A component of the issue surrounding the lack of widespread directed survey, at least in terms of archaeological prospection in this particular field of interest is due in part to the disjointed nature of settlement archaeology in Sweden as a whole (Stjernquist 1978, 261). Settlement archaeology as a subfield of archaeology itself is by no means a monolithic entity. While there are wider projects undertaken to examine the cultural landscape of Sweden in broader inter-regional and chronological focus, each is limited by its own regional or focal scope. There have been studies conducted to examine broader inter-regional and longstanding focal issues within the context of settlement in prehistoric Sweden, however these center on either a single focal issue, or a small set of issues pertaining to a particular subfield of archaeological theory, such as wider study of landscape and environmental usage, urbanization, central place theory, and regional studies (Stjernquist 1978). There has been an increased focus on examining the settlement and cultural landscape of particular regions in Scandinavia, central Sweden among them, in the wider context of sewing together these disjointed research foci in the study of settlement and social theory. However, publications in settlement archaeology often focus on singular regional issues, or the field of settlement archaeology as a whole from the perspective of several disparate research topics rather than any form of conjoined monograph (Fabech and Ringtved 1999). From the perspective of methodology and large scale prospection settlement archaeology has a long a flourishing history within Sweden, and in central Sweden, Svealand, and the Uppland region in particular. The archaeology of settlement has developed extensively over the last century in Sweden, however the basis for most of the research focus of settlement archaeology in central Sweden has only consolidated over the course of the past few decades (Stjernquist 1978, 261; Martens 2010, 231-235). Early forays into the archaeological study and prospection of settlement in Sweden have had varied geographical and temporal foci, among the more impactful were the work of Knut Stjerna and Oskar Almgren on the study of Neolithic settlement (Stjernquist 1978, 251-252). Various major known prehistoric settlement sites also saw the majority of their first excavations in the late 19th and early 20th century (Ambrosiani and Clarke 1995, 23-40). The first major shift in the study of settlement archaeology in Sweden came

with the establishment of the Central Office of National Antiquities in 1938. This institution would lay the foundation for most of mid twentieth century settlement archaeology in Sweden as focus would shift towards the recording, cataloging, and study of large scale prehistoric monuments in Sweden (Stjernquist 1978, 235). It is under the domination of this focus in Settlement archaeology that the majority of studied settlements within the region of Svealand such as Birka, Gamla Uppsala, Valsgårde, and Vendel see a renewed period of interest. These large scale settlement sites would drive focus towards a larger study of the development of urban settlement in prehistoric Sweden, which to this day has remained considerable in the study of the Viking Age and Medieval settlement landscape in Sweden. This period of central monumental focused study of settlement would reach its height during the 1970s and 1980s with major undertakings such as Hans Andersson's Medetidsstaden Project (Stjernquist 1978, 261). The results of these large scale surveys of individual sites would later serve as the foundation for most of the study of large scale settlement in Sweden during the Viking Age and Medieval Period (Ambrosiani and Clarke 1995, 41-42; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 46-50). It is also under this focus that the tradition of singular intensive publication and study of individual Iron Age, Viking Age, and Medieval monumental or large scale settlement sites sees a considerable reinvigoration. This tradition still carries as the major running publication series concerning these settlement sites are either still running, or have just recently come to a close (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 45). A considerable amount of these studies are based in major excavation series publications, however volumes of these publications have often tried to provide a place for these specific dense settlements within the context of wider settlement archaeology (Clarke and Lamm 2017). The current state of settlement archaeology from the perspective of survey and settlement landscape is one quite similar to other national archaeological climates. Although, it is somewhat dissimilar from its Scandinavian neighbors (Martens 2010, 231-238). A handful of larger institutions handle most wide scale prospection and publication concerning settlement archaeology, most significant among which is Riksantikvarieambetet, the Swedish National Heritage Board, as it maintains study and preservation of all national heritage sites within Sweden (Martens 2010, 238). In the region of Svealand, Uppland in particular Riksantikvarieambetet is responsible for most publication and regional studies in settlement archaeology, as a

considerable amount of these large scale monumental sites are found in this region, and have been the responsibility of this institution for a considerable time (Göthberg 2007). This is somewhat of a boon for larger studies within settlement archaeology as the RAÄ funds, publishes, and often directs larger survey projects in this region. Beyond the RAÄ prospection and publication are limited to a handful of universities, and archaeological institutions. Most of which cannot conduct work at the scale comparable to the resources of the RAÄ. The majority of prospection of settlement is undertaken in major cultural resource management salvage projects in Sweden, which like other archaeological climates outside of Scandinavia have seen a massive expansion of privatization (Martens 2010, 238). This coupled with mechanical topsoil stripping, and major legislation refinancing the costs of salvage archaeology during the 1990s has seen a massive increase in the quality and quantity of archaeological prospection and study of settlement in Sweden. However, as the direction of most of this boom has been towards cultural resource management and salvage archaeology the direction of this settlement focus is more or less determined by the randomness of modern landscape restructuring (Martens 2010, 234-238). This has often brought in newer settlement sites to examine, particularly in the context of Viking Age settlement in Uppland in some cases, but it still lacks a wider context around which to direct itself. This trend in recent prospection marks a considerable amount of the current climate of settlement archaeology in general (Martens 2010). The amount of material, as well as the milieu of advanced methodology lead to a greater quantity and quality of archaeological data concerning the settlement landscape of prehistoric Sweden, however beyond specifically directed wide scale regional surveys and publications it lacks synthesis. Arguably this synthesis may not be possible, and is certainly beyond the scope of this study. However, a more directed synthesis of the core elements of these fields of study through the lens of some of the archaeological data present on the current cultural and settlement landscape of Svealand may yet be attainable.

In Summary, what can be seen from the development of Settlement Archaeology is that focus within the Mälaren region has remained on specific monumental settlement sites, and is seen to have limitations based on the direction and system of funding of archaeological prospection within the region.

Central Place Theory in Scandinavia

The last of these subfields is comprised of the developments in archaeological theory related to the development of the archaeology of settlement within Scandinavia. As settlement archaeology develops both in the focus of material studied and methodology by which data based on that material is generated so too does the theoretical framework with which to interpret said data develop. Often this development is entirely parallel to major material developments, however elements of this theory can develop off of each other in a more isolated context. A single theoretical model is critical to the overview of this project, and will be discussed in length soon, however before that discussion can be made there must first be laid out the developmental groundwork of this theory from the perspective of previous study and publication based on this theoretical model. The model in question is Central Place Theory, which has had an integral place in settlement archaeology from the theoretical and interpretative end, particularly in Scandinavia during the past few decades (Brink 1996, 237).

Central Place Theory itself is a fairly longstanding concept within archaeology, having bridged into the vein of archaeological theory in the 1970s, drawing from earlier city-hinterlands models in geography and economics. It has become heavily intertwined with mainstream archaeological theory when it comes to settlement archaeology and the study of prehistoric settlement landscapes (Brink 1996, 237). In particular the use of Central Place Theory in Scandinavia has taken root in the mainstream of archaeological theory in Scandinavian archaeology since the 1990s, to describe settlements that display a certain character associated with urban centers without outright manifesting as urban settlements. The character of these Central Places displays a certain economic production and control over the outlying region which defines its interaction with the hinterlands (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 53-56; Fabech 1999). Arguably, elements of this theoretical approach can be seen in the analysis of individual settlement sites in Scandinavia during the boom in settlement archaeology of individual large scale settlement during the 1970s and 1980s (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 46-50). The name, attribution, and solidification of Central Place Theory within Scandinavian archaeology is far more recent. This is due in part to the introduction of Central Place Theory as a methodology to interpret individual large Iron Age and Viking Age settlement sites in

Scandinavia that do not conform to traditional notions of urban character (Brink 1996, 237; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 54-56). This approach in particular has taken root concurrently with the boom of archaeological prospection at well-known large scale settlement sites from the Scandinavian Iron Age and Viking Age such as Gudme/Lundeborg, Sortre Muld, Helgö, Gamla Uppsala, and Birka (Brink 1996, 237). Most of the popularization both of the shape and definition of Central Place Theory has come from early publications by Charlotte Fabech and Jytte Ringtved during the mid-1990s in analysis of Gudme/Lundeborg, as well as one of the more common criteria for understanding and defining central place settlements within Scandinavian archaeology (Fabech and Ringtved 1995). This triangular model, based on the regional interaction of central place settlements has taken a foundational place within the canon of Central Place Theory in Scandinavia and in particular Southern Scandinavia. In some ways the development of Central Place Theory has kept itself close to the material on which it is based, but there has been some independent development of Central Place Theory in Scandinavian archaeology since its introduction to the mainstream during the 1990s (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 54-56). The most common usage the theoretical model has developed to be used in isolated cases of individual major settlements in prehistoric Scandinavia in an effort to interpret the nature of the expression of power and hierarchy over each individual settlement and the surrounding landscape (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 54-56). Occasionally it has been applied to more inter and intra-regional studies of communication, trade, and power networks within Scandinavia, however this usage is considerably less common (Brink 1996, 237-239).

In summary, it is clear that Central Place Theory has seen a unique turn within Scandinavia, focusing on examining the social aspects of the settlement landscape. The Central Place in this context is seen to be a unique Scandinavian adaptation to urban settlement functionality while maintaining a settlement organization expected of Scandinavia during the Iron Age.

Theories of Social and Settlement Hierarchy in the Mälaren region

Scandinavian archaeology has had a clear and standard development when it comes to regional analysis (Stjernquist 1978). The influence of this development present has set forth particular models of social and settlement hierarchy argued to be present during the Late Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval Period within the region of central Sweden above others. These models, built in the early 20th century upon scholarship based on certain linguistic and historical studies have come to define the status quo and modern interpretations of the process of state formation within central Sweden as well as the interpretations of the power systems and political entities present within this process. Although there has been significant development in these models, both in the material they become sourced with, and the theoretical toolset which seeks to explain them, they remain much the same in terms of their unifying elements. The general system in place which is molded within this phase of scholarship is one that envisions the development of a central unified state within the region of Uppland that expresses power through the control and coopting of smaller units of settlement, often large farmsteads. These royally controlled farmsteads are assumed given to local elite, and form the basis of both the political, and economic power within the “Uppsala Öd”. This model of settlement hierarchy is seemingly built more so to explain a system of taxation or political hierarchy than settlement landscape, however providing considerable basis for how settlement landscape has been understood within the Viking Age in central Sweden (Runer 2016, 165-168). Although the exact nature of this model of socio-political expression is not replicated into the modern status quo after a century of development and interaction with archaeological material, elements of it still survive. These elements mostly focus on the acceptance of the nature and functionality of the “Uppsala Öd” based on this network of elite settlements under royal ownership and control as the economic basis for the early state or prestate assumed present within central Sweden, centered in Uppland during the Vendel Period and Viking Age (Brink 1996; Runer 2016).

There are three main elements of this model which seem to be present within modern interpretation. The first is that this model is defined around a hierarchical

network built on certain elite settlements (Runer 2016, 168-169; Brink 1996, 248-250). For most of the lifespan of this model they have been referred to and understood as “Husby”. This is due to the inception of this model by Henrick Schück, what he referred to as “Uppsala Öd”, a system of political hierarchy controlled by elite royal farms which he associated with the Husby place name (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41; Petterson 2000). This system is envisioned based on the distribution of royal farms from a foundational center at Gamla Uppsala, which comprise the basis of royal power within a confederated system over individual regions in Sweden. The Husby unit within this system is assumed to be composed of a royal controlled farmstead controlled and given to local elite as means of political and economic control (Runer 2016, 165-168). Later models have redefined both the expression of these settlements through archaeological theory and taken an approach to this network focused on several types of settlements within this network rather than just the Husby (Brink 1996, 237-239). The second element is the assertion of a royally controlled hierarchy centered on Gamla Uppsala. Schück built his assertions based on the notion of a hierarchical confederacy based in the various regions, lands, of Sweden. Gamla Uppsala is envisioned as the foundation estate within this, at the top of a hierarchy in which control of larger royal farms in each land, as well as the smaller elite Husby settlements provides a network of economic and political control over these lands (Runer 2016, 165-169). The last core element is the notion that this network is asserted to be the early political entity based in Uppsala asserted to be present within the Viking Age and Medieval Period by later legal, literary, and historical texts (Runer 2016). These elements have more or less pervaded through the general interpretations present within the study of the development of social complexity within prehistoric Scandinavia, in multiple disciplines (Brink 1996; Runer 2016). These elements may not solely be based on the model Schück presents in his “Uppsala Öd” as other contemporary archaeologists and historians have made similar assertions. Namely, the assertion of a correlation between archaeological sites near Husby place names and the existence of a system of royal elite expression within the settlement landscape which these Husby were a part of. Notably these assertions are made by Sune Lindqvist during early excavations at Vendel, where there is postulated a connection between the Husby name and royal political power (Arrhenius 2000, 93).

Over the next century this model changes in shape and material, however the core elements remain the same. These elements being centralized hierarchy, a central settlement unit exerting power over an area within a network, and association with various proposed political and legal systems (Lindkvist 2016, 141-143). After its inception this model sees a period of homeostasis as most examinations take both the model of “Uppsala Öd”, and the Husby phenomena with little criticism (Lindkvist 2016; Petterson 2000, Runer 2016). Settlement archaeology itself can be seen to flourish during the mid-20th century and when it touches on similar concepts to this model of social hierarchy it seems to gravitate towards the same core elements (Petterson 2000, 59-61). In fact this phase can be seen to occur contemporaneously with the development of the archaeology of settlement and regional analysis of the region surrounding Lake Mälaren (Stjernquist 1978). This would make sense as much of the drive for the archaeology of settlement from this period is seen to derive from the study of large scale settlements and monumental architecture, coming from archaeological sites like Valsgärde, Vendel, Helgö, and Birka (Stjernquist 1978, 253). The culmination of this period would most likely be embodied by Jerker Rosén’s 1962 article “Husby” which provides the first state of the art on the study of the Husby within a culture-historical context. The work very much contributing to a status quo of acceptance as it barely questions the structure of the proposed “Uppsala Öd” and its connection with these Husby settlements (Lindkvist 2016, 141, and Runer 2016, 168).

It is shortly after this that the first changes in this model occur, and it begins to derive reinterpretation through the lens of archaeological theory. Additionally, it is during this phase when archaeology as a source of data on which to build this model comes into play, albeit seemingly superficially. The model itself and its core elements remain much the same during this phase of development save for a few notable additions. The focus on the original conception of a system of networked settlements under a clear royal hierarchy, associated with referenced literary and historical polities is clear. However, elements of archaeological material and theory at a more basic level permeate into the support for this model. Namely, the use of correlation between archaeological material and Husby locations as evidence in support of the Husby model (Petterson 2000, 59-61; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41-42). It can be seen that during the 1970s the trend in settlement archaeology in terms of prospection and research shifts

into a continued study of monumental architecture and large scale settlement sites (Stjernquist 1978, 253). Within central Sweden in particular major archaeological sites such as Helgö, Birka, Gamla Uppsala, Vendel, and Valsgärde are focused on considerably (Ambrosiani 1985). It is interesting that the interpretations for the functionality and character of these locations within their culture historical context share a great deal with the core elements of this earlier model (Ambrosiani 1987, 247, 253). Many of these even focus on reinterpreting this proposed model through the means of archeological data and theory (Ambrosiani 1987). The model itself in a static form also gains traction within archaeology, as it is during this period that archaeologists begin to address the phenomenon of Husby named locations using archaeological material. Most of this effort comes from Åke Hyenstrand who began to reevaluate this older model and link it with archaeological theory and material (Pettersson 2000, 59-61). At the theoretical level the model draws little from archaeological theory, mostly drawing a base sourcing of quantitative methods drawn from the introduction of processualism into the mainstream of Scandinavian archeology (Pettersson 2000, 59-61). The evolution made upon this model focused more in terms of the material used to support it rather than the changes within aspects of the model itself. Hyenstrand was the major contributor to the integration of this model of settlement hierarchy within regional analysis in Scandinavia. Although, most of the focus of Hyenstrand and his peers within this analysis still derived from the linguistic place name studies of the previous phase of scholarship, they made both the assertion that this model functioned within the region in an archaeological context, and that it could be sourced using the material record. Their focus laid on associating these name sties with various archaeological sites, particularly monumental burials and some settlement sites. Additionally, there was a restructuring of this model around the concept of a Husby as a definable settlement within the archaeological record (Ambrosiani 1985; Pettersson 2000, 59-61, Hedenstierna-Jonson, 41). The reshaping of the model during the 1970s and 1980s also occurs under other archaeologists focusing on regional analysis of the Mälär Valley region. While Ambrosiani only lightly touches on the concept of the Husby as the fundamental political system by which a Vendel and Viking Age early state spanning the regions surrounding lake Mälär functioned, his analysis of the region still centers around much of the fundamental elements present within the older model began by Schück,

particularly the idea of a state like entity in Uppland using control over royal settlements within the outlying regions to express power over the local elite (Ambrosiani 1985; Ambrosiani 1987). The analysis of the archaeology of settlement undertaken at Birka, Helgö, as well as other major settlement sites dating to the Iron Age through early Medieval Period within its region by Ambrosiani focus much on the same conception of the development of a centralized early Swedish state in the Mälaren region (Ambrosiani 1985). This conception of the development of a networked political system in which a royal authority, based in Uppland, established and controlled power through settlement during late Iron Age and Viking Age, before transitioning into a more recognizable feudal European kingdom heavily features within Ambrosiani's examination of the regional settlement landscape during these few decades (Ambrosiani 1985; Ambrosiani 1987). The fundamental units of settlement may be somewhat different from the older model, which had a directed focus on using the named location and concept of a Husby as the main unit of royally controlled elite settlement. However, Ambrosiani briefly does hint upon the use of Husby as royal farms within his understanding of Viking Age Mälardalen (Ambrosiani 1987, 247). During this period although the use of archaeology as a discipline to explore this older conception of a model of social development centered around these Husby settlements begins, the focus on the Husby as the central elements stays much the same (Pettersson 2000, 59-61). The general acceptance within the regional analysis during time period of this model of the development of hierarchy, the central Husby concept on which it is based, and the primacy given to place name studies and literary-historical allusions to the system on which this model is based remains almost entirely unquestioned (Lemm 2016, 71). It seems that not only does regional analysis independently draw upon this model of social complexity within the Mälaren region to frame its own analysis of the material record, but the model itself changes and validates its core based on basic methods and theory taken from the development of archaeology within Scandinavia at the time. What debate occurs within the model only occurs surrounding a few elements. Prime among which is dating, although the presence of separate phases within the model and their relation to periods of state formation within the region do occur briefly (Lindkvist 2016, 143; Runer 2016, 168).

Towards the end of the 1980s within Scandinavia the next wave of archaeological theory makes its way into mainstream and it can be seen to shift the use of archaeological material towards a more socially based approach rather than pure quantification. Interestingly enough this can be seen to already occur within the adaption of elements of the older Husby focused model into regional analysis, under Ambrosiani. Parts of the rigid focus on the Husby concept are dropped to explore more of the social aspects of this model, mostly focusing on how royal control is expressed within settlement rather than expression of power based on a singular type of settlement (Ambrosiani 1985). These forays are still bound by a focus on supporting elements of this model using economic quantifications (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 50-53). Once postprocessualism bleeds into the mainstream of Scandinavian archaeology the focus of regional analysis within the Mälaren region shifts wholly towards a more social theory driven approach. Not surprisingly, this is where a great deal of the integration of the idea present within the older Husby based model of settlement and political hierarchy within this region fades somewhat. The dedicated Husby based studies still draw a great deal from archaeological theory and material during this period, however regional analysis dedicated to early social complexity and state formation within Uppland and Mälardalen begin to draw less from a rigid focus on the Husby concept as the base unit of this system (Brink 1996; Lindkvist 1991). There is still a notion within regional analysis in this region during the late 80s and 90s of a system similar to the early model conceived by Schück, however the fracturing of the expression of this model in the landscape as well as the dating begin to create varied interpretations of this model (Runer 2016; Brink 1996, Brink 1997, Brink 1999, Lindkvist 1991).

In summary, although it has seen consistent development, the concept of the Husby within a Husby System is one repeatedly discussed when examining the development of social and political hierarchy in the Mälaren Region. The concept of the Husby System itself is seen to persist throughout its usage, and maintain to this day.

Central Place Theory and Social-Settlement Hierarchy

The most notable, and likely current shaping of this model of state formation within central Sweden evolves with the work of Stefan Brink during the 90s. Brink is most notable for drawing the core elements of this model into the regional analysis and social theory entirely, drawing focus away from a concept purely based within the study of the Husby (Brink 1996, 237-238, 264). The concept is addressed, and much of the same material is used to support it, however Brink's assertions represent an integration of these elements into archaeological theory. During the close of the 20th century and the turn of the millennium the breadth of theoretical toolsets available for use in regional analysis within archaeology expand greatly, and Brink is among the first to heavily integrate these frameworks to reshape a new model of social settlement based on the core elements of the early 20th century conception of an early state or prestate settlement hierarchy within central Sweden (Brink 1996; Brink 1997). This model draws upon the older place name based material and reshapes it using these newer theoretical toolsets. The use of archaeological material within it is notably sparse, however it is still present at some level (Brink 1996, 244-247, 268-273). Brink seemingly draws upon 3 separate analytical frameworks within archaeological theory that are introduced into the mainstream in Scandinavian archaeology during this time period, ties in the core elements of this older model of settlement organization and hierarchy, and then ties in the study of named locations within the Swedish landscape into this model (Brink 1996; Brink 1997).

Earliest among these analytical frameworks is the concept of Central Place Theory. Central Place Theory is a difficult concept to work with in modern archaeological theory. This is mostly due to the fact that its conception varies widely from region to region, and the only unifying aspect of Central Place Theory between regions concerning Central Place Theory is the name itself. The emergence of the concept occurred fairly early within the development of archaeological theory as a whole, however these early manifestations of Central Place Theory were mostly derived from elements of spatial analysis found within economics (Brink 1996, 237; Kantner 2008, 40). The conception of Central Place Theory common to Scandinavian archaeology develops much after this time, and manifests in a far more unique

interpretation. Although, elements of the interpretation of Central Place Theory within Scandinavian archaeology can be found as early as the 1970s with focus on singular large settlements like Helgö, particularly under Holmqvist. His conception of Helgö as a royal subsidiary estate that expresses power over a landscape through economic and social control matches well with the current conception of Central Place Theory (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 54; Holmqvist 1979, 64-67). Central Place theory within Scandinavia tends to focus far more on the social aspects of a Central Place (Fabech 1999). This may be in part due to the adaption of this model in particular to understand the relationship between large non-urban settlements and hinterland settlement within Scandinavia during the Iron Age. This understanding is built to interpret urban functionality of larger single or multi-site complexes, spread out across the landscape to a greater degree than a traditional urban settlement (Fabech 1999, 469-471; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 54-56). It seems that the adaption of this theoretical framework came during an increased time of focus on social theory and its influence in archaeological theory within Scandinavia. It is no shock then that the reshaping of an older quantitative theoretical framework to fit within what is in all reality an entirely new theoretical framework built from the climate within archaeological theory at the time occurs (Fabech 1999; Kantner 2008, 40). Central Place Theory in Scandinavia represents a unique toolset for examining the spread out settlement landscape of Iron Age and Viking Age Scandinavia, and it is no surprise that this is the base unit on which Brink builds his adapted model of settlement hierarchy and state formation (Fabech 1999; Brink 1996 237-238). The use of this theoretical framework to provide a new base unit for this older system is crucial to Brink's restructuring of the system. Brink may touch on the older Husby concept, but replaces it as the core unit of his model. The abandonment of a rigid single unit allows for the assertion of hierarchy at more general level among a varied set of archaeological settlements. As the restriction of relying on solely on the concept of Husby is lost it allows for the core framework of this model to be applied to archaeological material at a far more general level. Some study of the Husby concept continues within Brink's usage and concept of his model of settlement complexity in central Sweden, but the general model now focuses on social expression of power over landscape backed by archaeological theory and material (Brink 1999 424, 433-436). However, oddly enough it seems the core backing of this model is based within the study of named locations,

with a minimal focus on their relation to archaeological material. Other elements of archaeological and social theory are drawn in to this model during expansion in later writings (Brink 1997).

During the second iteration of this model Brink integrates elements of popularized cognitive theory within archaeology to map this model into cognitive theory concerning the expression of power over landscape (Brink 1997, 390-395). This is mainly to tie more recent developments in the use of cognitive archaeology within Scandinavian archaeology during the last twenty or so years into Brink's developing model of settlement landscape. However, Brink does make use of this vein of cognitive theory to map the relation between cognitive archaeology, spatial relationships, and his proposition for a model of settlement landscape hierarchy. Specifically arguing that the use of named locations to denote certain types of settlement is a means asserting territory over landscape, both in the physical world and in the mind (Brink 1997, 402-404). The integration of these cognitive elements are mostly to give a place for the use of place name studies as an expression of territorial bounding (Brink 1997). This integration is underdeveloped, and arguably does not change the core of the model. However, it does continue the trend in scholarship concerning this vein of regional analysis, as it provides yet another example of the reintegration of modern developments in archaeological theory into this older model of understanding social and settlement hierarchy within central Sweden. After this period the shape of this model changes little, and remains much the same to this day. Later iterations in both regional analysis concerning state formation in the region surrounding Lake Mälaren, draw from this newly adapted model heavily as well as a great deal of newer studies on the Husby concept (Runer 2016). The only other major aspect of archaeological theory this model seems to draw from are loose elements of network theory within the social sciences, which is drawn upon loosely within the first iteration of Brink's model of social settlement (Brink 1996, 237-238; Brink 1999, 433-434). It seems this is more to provide a new framework for the understanding of the hierarchical system or networks asserted to be present within this region of central Sweden during the period of early state formation within Sweden. Whereas the older conception is a network in a sense it draws mostly from direct assertions of a system present within Uppland mentioned within the historical and literary sources (Runer 2016, 165-169). The use of elements of network

theory to reframe the earlier concept of a hierarchical settlement system around it by Brink seems to mostly function to reframe it around archaeological theory rather than historical attestations and proposed historical polities (Brink 1996; Brink 1999). There is still the element of direct reference and association of this system with mentioned historically attested polities within the region in question during the time in which Brink asserts the system develops, however these associations are not the central theoretical framework on which the model is built. The association with specific named political and social systems within the later legal, literary, and historical texts is not heavily challenged within the model presented by Brink. The model of social and settlement hierarchy is still asserted to constitute the Svear state mentioned in *Heimskringla* (Runer 2016, 165). However, the association is no longer the sole source material on which the model is built (Brink 1996; Brink 1997, Brink 1999). In a way this is where a major split occurs within this model of settlement hierarchy within the Lake Mälars Region. Brink's model, while drawn from the older model developed off Schück and Hyenstrand, has enough of a separated focus to be considered its own model. In reality there are two models present. The older model of a Husby focused settlement hierarchy, closely associated with the proposed historical political entity present in Uppland, and the newer model of a Central Place focused settlement hierarchy, interacting with the Husby concept while not entirely relying on it or the association with that political entity within Uppland. The second model, Brink's model, drawn more from archaeological theory seems to permeate more within the standard of regional analysis within central Sweden since its inception. It also has permeated greatly within studies solely focused on the Husby concept (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41-42).

The creation of this second model marks a brief split in the interaction of the Husby concept and regional studies within central Sweden, however most recent studies have been conducted with the mind for a reintegration of archaeological material into the study of the Husby concept (Lemm 2016, 84-86). Most of this recent focus has been on the study of recent archaeological excavations of settlement sites found near Husby name locations. It seems that the recent wave of scholarship concerned with the study of the Husby in the settlement landscape has become concerned with the use of archaeological material to provide a foundation for the previous assertions made in the construction of the Husby model (Lemm 2016; Stylegar 2016, Hedenstierna-Jonson

2016). The results of these recent studies seem to indicate a growing concern surrounding the material used to construct the older model of settlement hierarchy, as well as whether or not this system is as pervasive and applicable within the region as previously asserted (Lemm 2016; Stylegar 2016, Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016). Although, much of this new material is recent, and only subject to cursory study. Growing interest in these recent studies has spread increasing concern aimed at clarifying the pervasiveness of these models of settlement hierarchy, their relevance to the expression of power, and the regional and temporal presence of these models (Runer 2016; Lindkvist 1999, Lindkvist 2016). Many of the core elements present with the oldest model are present in most analyses of these concepts, but there is a growing dissatisfaction towards this model with the level of centralization and hierarchy present, the time period of functionality, the region of functionality, and the particular historical polities on which they are based (Runer 2016 166-170; Lindkvist 2016, 145-148). However, even with these criticisms the alternatives presented still draw heavily on a need to connect settlement hierarchy with the expression of royal power (Lindkvist 1991; Lindkvist 2016). Arguably this is due to this element being central to most understandings of the process of state formation within anthropological theory (Claessen 2006, 223-225). However, the seeming acceptance of the presence of this element within every proposed alternative would indicate that the influence of the older model built within the period of the 20th century was and is still somewhat pervasive.

Through all of this debate there do seem to be a few prevailing models of settlement hierarchy and social complexity present which have developed through the study of the Husby concept and regional analysis within central Sweden. The first would be that of the Husby System. This is the original model conceived by Schück with *Uppsala Öd*. In this model during either the Late Iron Age, the Viking Age, or the early Medieval Period a systematic restructuring of settlement hierarchy occurs centered on a network of royally controlled magnate farms laid along communication and trade routes that connect with a royal center of power. This network of settlement is centered on Uppsala and the king in Uppland, and asserted to compromise the political entity of that historical kingdom. The Husby are those royal controlled magnate farms that are controlled by royal appointed elite, and are used in a form of early tax system. Their functionality asserted as a means of storage and administration for the naval military tax

mentioned in later medieval legal texts, the *Ledung*. As is the case due to the system proposed having been asserted to function as the economic and political system described in the Law of Dalarna and the Law of Södermanland during the Medieval Period. The dating of this model has shifted recently towards a Late Viking Age or Early Medieval dating, however the place of the Husby within the model remains much the same. This model has a particular conception of the formation of state level society within central Sweden during this time, which focuses on the emergence of either a very late pre-state society in this region before the emergence of the traditional European Kingdom-State, or the qualification of this system as representative of an early state which the Medieval European Kingdom-State transitions from during the end of the 12th century (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 50, Lindkvist 2016; Runer 2016, 168-169). This model is the focus of the Husby concept, as the Husby concept represents the fundamental imposition of this system over the settlement landscape of Viking Age and Medieval Mälardalen. However, more social theory based research seems to shift towards a second model, which Brink forwarded.

The second model is based around Brink's model of settlement hierarchy. This model as discussed previously is built on much of the same elements as the Husby model, however it draws from archaeological and social theory to shape itself. Additionally, it removes the use of the Husby concept as the core settlement element on which it is based. This model proposes a more evolutionary approach towards regional analysis and state formation within Uppland and the surrounding regions. By removing the Husby as the fundamental unit and replacing it with the concept of the Central Place it allows for the assertion of a naturally coalescing settlement hierarchy that occurs within the region during the period preceding early state formation. The development of local elite settlements in this model is seen to precede the emergence of royal hierarchy as it provides an already existing network of local power expression through landscape that royal power can take over. In many ways this model still shares most of the core elements of the Husby System, and indeed the outlining of the model by Brink would seem to indicate a willingness to push towards its use as a sort of precursor to the Husby System (Brink 1999, 434). Within this model there is a natural development of settlement hierarchy around central place complexes, later associated with the settlement district or *Bygd*. These central place complexes are seen to form the nodes of

a networked system of settlement hierarchy. This system is marked by the flow of resources upwards into these centers, which in turn use those resources to exert social power (Brink 1999, 424-425, 433-434). As this model is argued to develop without direct imposition it is argued to develop naturally from the changes that occur in the settlement landscape within Scandinavia during the Iron Age from the lowest level upwards (Brink 1999, 423). Lastly, this network of settlement hierarchy is argued to constitute some form of political entity, either a late pre-state or an early state which is associated with noted political entities identified within the literary and historical corpus to have existed within the region of central Sweden during the period of this model's functionality (Brink 1996; Brink 1997, Brink 1999). As can be seen this model shares much of the old Husby System, however it has been adapted to serve a particular niche in the theoretical analysis of the development of state level society within the region. By the removal of the Husby as the core node, as well as the transition to a more evolutionary development this model provides an earlier system that can be imposed onto the settlement landscape. The dating for this system is often proposed to develop during the Late Iron Age (Brink 1999, 423). It draws from the elements on which state level society is argued to develop and gives an earlier progression on which the Husby system can develop using a wider base of archaeological material. This model seems to feed on the popular conceptions of the development of state level society within central Sweden as it provides a naturally occurring evolution of state level society within the region, which feeds well into continuity models built during the late 20th century by Ambrosiani and his peers. As these conceptions seem to focus on the emergence of the historically argued Svear kingdom centered on Gamla Uppsala (Runer 2016, 165). Furthermore, this model can be seen to provide a middle ground between the Husby system and the last common model of the development of state level society within central Sweden. As the last model argues for the creation of state level settlement hierarchy under the emergence of the Medieval European State-Kingdom in the 12th century, the central place based model allows for the attribution of many state like elements of settlement hierarchy without the attribution of statehood to the system itself.

In summary, it can be seen that use of the Central Place model has seen the attribution of certain elements of the Husby system to the settlement landscape without fully attributing the system to a single type of settlement. As well as providing a flexible

intermediary system to explain certain elements of settlement hierarchy in the cultural landscape of Late Iron Age central Sweden.

State Formation and Medieval Period Social-Settlement Hierarchy

The last model is a more common one in other regions within Scandinavia, although it is still explored within regional analysis within central Sweden. This model is the traditional model of European state formation. This model of state formation marks that the development of state level society in central Sweden occurs with the transition from earlier systems whether it be Husby or Central Place to a Medieval European kingdom. Within the regional studies in question the most active proponent of this theory would be Thomas Lindkvist (Lindkvist 1991; Lindkvist 2016). While most of the previous models do acknowledge that this transition marks the transition into a more definite level of hierarchy which can be identified as a European feudal kingdom and state, this last model diminishes the importance of any system less complex than a traditional feudal organization. In this last model the imposition of settlement hierarchy only comes with the emergence of the landed aristocracy and a feudal manor based system of settlement hierarchy, evidenced by the spread of aristocratic manors and urban centers (Lindkvist 1991, 137). The imposition of class based hierarchy as well as a tax based economic system which feeds resources upwards towards a centralized kingship is argued to be the main indicator of a state in this model (Lindkvist 1991). There can be seen some development of this model in terms of settlement organization from elements of both the Central Place and Husby models, however neither is regarded to bear enough of the levels of hierarchy and centralization which a state is argued to comprise (Lindkvist 2016, 145-148). While neither of the previous two models would directly argue towards a system that comprises the political and settlement hierarchy of a state there have still been attempts to associate these models, the time periods, and the systems they represent as the beginning of the state formation process within central Sweden or even Sweden as a whole. This last model provides a firmly identifiable formation of state within the context of regional studies in central Sweden, which draws on elements of these earlier systems argued to represent pre-state social hierarchy.

Arguably the preference towards each model is mostly based on the conception of the formation of the Swedish state within the academic climate at the time. It is also fundamentally based on how state formation is perceived to occur. In modern

anthropological theory the concept of the state, and the process by which it forms is highly contested. However, enough generalities occur to give a rough outline of the conditions present within a culture to onset the transition to a level of social complexity identified by modern anthropologists as a state. Several general conditions are identified to correlate with a state formation period, however the nature of the presence and organization of these conditions is highly variable. These can occur within multiple regional levels, to varying degrees, as well as in various forms. This makes it incredibly difficult to draw a line between what is and is not a state. There are many elements that comprise the conditions of a culture in the process of state formation. Population growth, an ideologically centered leadership, economic control, complex socio-political organization, and military organization and control all factor into the qualification of a developing state (Claessen 2006, 223-224). The emergence of state level social complexity stemming from a mixture of the development of these various elements, along with some form of catalyst which drive that development (Claessen 2006, 223). Already can be seen a problem with the imposition of these elements within regional analysis of central Sweden during the Iron Age, Viking Age, and Medieval Period. Aside from the idea that a catalyzing element is necessary most of these conditions lack a definable binary. Most can be argued to present themselves along a gradient, and all can be seen to be present within all three models of settlement hierarchy in central Sweden. Each model seeks to provide a basis for the understanding of these conditions, and each either conceives the system present as a state or very nearly one. The last model, that of the Medieval State-Kingdom is the only model to offer a definable binary along this system as it provides a binary in the presence of a catalyzing element on which a transition of these conditions occurs (Lindkvist 1991). This catalyst in the case of Lindkvist's model is the use of warfare and external appropriation to drive emergent elite social expression. This then feeding into an increase in complexity and organization based around this warfare which leads to systems of tax and hierarchy like the Husby system and the Ledung (Lindkvist 1991, 140-145, and Lindkvist 2016, 145-148). This would seem to follow along the lines a great deal of anthropological theory on the matter as warfare and organized conflict are sometimes seen as the catalyzing element necessary for the formation of state level society (Claessen 223-226). However, the evidence present for this catalyst is never presented in any solid manner using

archaeological material in Lindkvist's conception of this model of settlement hierarchy and state formation (Lindkvist 1991; Lindkvist 2016).

In Summary, during the Medieval Period there is a clear transition to a model of hierarchy identifiable with feudal landscape organization seen in Medieval Europe. This is often argued as the most distinctly evident model of settlement equated with state level society observable.

As can be seen these models of settlement hierarchy and socio-political organization share a great deal of similar elements, in part due to the interconnected nature of their development. Most are also shown to share a distinct preference towards literary and historical material over archeological material, and have seen a great deal of their conception and form develop from said preference.

Archaeological Material

Archaeological material has seen little use in the construction of these models of social and settlement hierarchy during their inception. Material is not absent however, it is merely sparse. For a considerable time the focus of material within the study of these models, and in particular the Husby phenomenon has focused little on studying archaeological settlement. Rather the focus when using material within the context of this model has been to merely associate Husby locations with monumental burial, or some form of archaeological remains with the name site (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016; Lemm 2016). Before archaeological material can be examined, it is best to examine what can be understood in terms of settlement hierarchy within the Mälaren region from a purely archaeological perspective.

Over the first millennium A.D. there can be traced a gradual intensification of agricultural activity, expansion of population, and centralization of settlement within Scandinavia (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 52). There is variation depending on region, but during the first millennium there can be seen a distinct shift in the settlement landscape (Widgren and Pedersen 2011). The Mälaren region is no exception to this expansion and can be seen to follow these general trends in the change in settlement landscape (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 56). The Roman Iron Age in particular sees increased agricultural intensification, development of technological adaptation, and particular methods of landscape organization that lay the foundation for the development of settlement hierarchy within the settlement landscape (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 52-57). This rapid growth is somewhat halted during the environmental crisis of the 6th century, however the break in growth is seen to allow for the centralization of major settlements that comes to define settlement hierarchy during the Late Iron Age and beyond (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 60-61). During this period, particularly in Uppland there can be seen an abandonment of minor settlement, as well as an expansion of central settlement within central places such as Gamla Uppsala (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 60-61, 65; Ljungkvisst et al 2011, 576). This trend towards depopulation and centralization has in part formed some of the framework for the operation of some of these models such as Central Place or Husby. This is in part due to the emergence of regional centers such as Gamla Uppsala during this period, but also

due in part to another shift in the settlement landscape that occurs during the later Iron Age. There can also be seen a change in field boundaries within the agricultural landscape in the Late Iron Age. There is a change in enclosures systems from connected walled enclosures shared between several settlements to a system of singular enclosure for each settlement. This is argued to mark a change in use and ownership over landscape, and form the basis of sustained field and territory boundaries regionally through the Viking Age and Medieval Period (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 63-65). However, this model of settlement change concerning the transition of enclosure systems is based on a case study within Östergötland specifically, and its applicability within the Mälaren region is stated rather than argued using material (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 65-66). Still, these trends in the development of the settlement landscape during the Iron Age within Sweden can be seen to develop a certain hierarchy of settlement which can be generally seen within the archaeological material (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59).

In summary, it appears that the trend of an increase in settlement density and population density within Iron Age Scandinavia influences the development of a clearly observable hierarchy of settlement present within the settlement landscape of Scandinavia during the first millennium A.D.

Archaeological Settlement Hierarchy

Pedersen and Widgren have defined a discernable settlement hierarchy within the settlement landscape of Iron Age Sweden, based on size and production. At the bottom are “Small Households” and “Medium Sized” farms which are dependent on the wider organization of landscape into enclosure systems (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59-60). These units sometimes cluster into larger settlement clusters which could be interpreted as villages or hamlets, however these clusters are internally homogenous in terms of lack of stratification of buildings and lack of elite craft production (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59-60). Above these in the hierarchy are settlements which can be qualified as farmsteads, which can be seen as a slightly larger local center of organization. The defining factor of these settlements is the presence of larger longhouse structures, halls, and in rare cases occasional fortification (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59-60). Above these in the hierarchy are settlements that could be identified as more regional centers. These are defined by large scale craft production which can be traceable within the region in which it operates. Additionally, one of the defining factors of this type of hierarchical settlement is the agricultural consumption rather than production, making these types of hierarchical settlement reliant upon lower tier settlements within the hierarchy within the hinterlands for mainline resource production (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59-60). In terms of dissonance with the Late Iron Age material the only changes necessary in the understanding of this settlement hierarchy are the population, size, and or production necessary to characterize which tier a site correlates with. As there remains a general expansion of population size throughout the Viking Age and Medieval Period (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 59-60). It seems that the key differentiating factor between these higher settlements, and baseline farms is the presence of some form of elite association. Namely, the presence of a hall building as well as other material finds indicating higher status residence. Additionally, there can be seen a core separation between the two highest positions of settlement hierarchy based on the continual rebuilding of the hall structures along with the presence of metalwork and craft production related to the production of prestige goods in the region (Carlie 2008, 110; Brink 2015, 326-327).

This hierarchy is based on the abundant settlement material available within the Early Iron Age, but can be seen to persist throughout most of the Iron Age, the regional centers in the highest tier even showing continuity through into the Late Iron Age (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 60). There are indeed some concerns with using a settlement hierarchy based on earlier Iron Age material in relation to Late Iron Age and Viking Age settlement landscape, however this hierarchy is the only settlement hierarchy within this region based on archaeological material rather than those older models of settlement and social hierarchy based on mostly place name studies, runology, and later Medieval textual sources (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 70-71). However, this structure remains stable through the Late Iron Age and Viking Age within the archaeological context in central Sweden (Price 2015, 258, 326-327). The size applicable for these units of settlement may change depending on the period of the Iron Age, but the general hierarchical subdivision between farms and larger elite residences is reflected in the archaeological material (Price 2015, 258, 326-327).

Taking this settlement hierarchy into consideration it becomes clear that the definition of the core elements of each of these earlier models of settlement, the Husby System, and the Central Place model can be examined in terms of identifiable archaeological settlement hierarchy. Each model requires that the main type of settlement on which it is built must conform to a certain character archaeologically to support the model itself. Arguably within all models each of these settlements within the regional network, whether it be a Husby, a Central Place, or Medieval Manor must represent a type of regional center. This is arguably represented by the fourth tier of the archaeological settlement hierarchy, “Chieftain Farms” although arguably simply defining this type of settlement as a “Regional Center” would avoid certain connotations associated with that terminology. If each of these settlements is identified as some form of regional center within the context of their own model of settlement, then it would follow that they would show similar functionality and organization to a “Regional Center” within the archaeological context

The first of these models, the oldest, the Husby model is built upon the assertion of a certain type of settlements forming the regional centers in a network in which Gamla Uppsala is at the top. These regional centers, the Husby, have seen a great deal of reinterpretation over the past century. However, the basic assumptions concerning

their organizational character, place within the settlement hierarchy, and functionality remain much the same. These Husby are envisioned as some form or royally associated regional center (Runer 2016, 165-170). The use of archaeological material in conjunction with the study of the Husby phenomenon has focused less on identifying the characteristics of the settlement hierarchy within an archaeological context, and identifying potential archaeological evidence for the Husby. Primarily these associations are made between the Husby name location and any monumental burials within the region, with almost no focus on any actual settlement sites (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41). In fact, the primary focus of the study of these Husby regional centers within the archaeological context has been towards the study of monumental burial as indicators of possible elite or royal associated settlement, regardless of whether there is an identifiable settlement site within the area (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41, 47). There has however, been recent study of recently excavated settlement sites found near Husby name locations (Lemm 2016; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016). Within this context a Husby as a hierarchical settlement is asserted to have a number of identifiable elements within the landscape and archaeological material. A Husby is argued within the archaeological context to comprise some form of hierarchical settlement the size of a larger farmstead or magnate farm, the distinction made within the context of the Husby model is somewhat unclear. This settlement bears has form of elite or royal association, either in the form of relation to elite monumental burials, or some form of elite expression within identifiable burials. Lastly, there is some association of the settlement within a landscape context with known waterways, roads, and other forms of travel or communication along known networks of trade and communication (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 41-42). In comparison with the expected archaeological settlement hierarchy identifying the proposed Husby unit is somewhat difficult as while their functionality within the Husby system is often discussed, their archaeological character lacks a clear definition. Within the settlement hierarchy it would seem that a Husby should appear as either a regional center or a farmstead. The main difference between the two forms of settlement is mostly based on two factors, production of craft goods, specifically fine metalwork and production of prestige goods, and the consumption of agricultural material rather than production. It would follow then that a settlement identifiable within the archaeological record as a Husby should be definable based on

clear elite association, connection to waterways or trade routes, and craft production of metalwork or prestige goods.

In summary, the archaeological settlement hierarchy of Late Iron Age Scandinavia is clearly observable. This hierarchy is based on settlements with distinct association with elite residence, and production of elite goods, mainly metalwork.

Archaeological Material and the Husby System

In terms of material potential settlement sites with association to Husby name locations are somewhat sparse. Out of the hundred and thirty some Husby locations only a handful have been found to bear spatial relation to archaeological settlement sites, and out of those only a handful have been investigated archaeologically (Lemm 2016, 71). Very few of these are found within central Sweden, however there has been a growing interest in the study of archaeological settlements near Husby name locations within central Sweden (Lemm 2016, 71; Ekman 2000, 9). Five sites within this region are most frequently mentioned when discussing the Husby in an archaeological context, four directly within the Mälaren region, the fifth somewhat farther west (Lemm 2016, 71-72). This choice of settlement sites is based on a combination of three factors. The first is the amount of material available in terms of publication and past examination. The second is the prevalence of the site in the recent discussion of the Husby phenomenon. The third is their position within the Mälaren region, in which the system is proposed to have originated in Schück's original model.

Husby in Glanshammar

The first of these sites, Husby in Glanshammar, is a short distance west of the Mälaren region, however it is one of the most well studied archaeological settlement sites within relation to the Husby phenomenon (Lemm 2016, 71-72). Although it lies off the shore of Lake Hjälmaren, in Närke, it is connected with the Mälaren region as there has been a close spatial relation between the location of the Husby in Glanshammar and known Iron Age trade and communication routes to the Mälaren region (Lemm 2016, 71-72; Ekman 2000). In terms of material Husby in Glanshammar is perhaps the most intensively studied archaeological settlement found on a Husby name location. The site was one of the first Husby locations in Sweden to be excavated (Ekman 2000, 9). Additionally, it has also seen a larger amount of direct publication and study of the material in comparison with more recent excavations at Husby locations within Sweden. The material from the excavations at Husby in Glanshammar is fairly sizeable, and a decently clear interpretation of the occupation at Husby in Glanshammar has been made. The Glanshammar excavation was conducted roughly 700 meters from the modern settlement of Husby, the excavation area divided over 5 fields. The location areas, running west to east, Västra Gärdet, Västra Lyckan, Södra Lyckan, Östra Lyckan, and Kofallet yielded an uneven amount of material (Lemm 2016, 72-73; Ekman 2000, 19). It seems that the occupation itself based on the dating of features is likely from the Vendel Period and the Viking Age (Lemm 2016, 72-73; Ekman 2000, 19-20). In terms of features there have been found 11 houses, most concentrated within the eastern portion of the site. In addition within Västra Lyckan, Södra Lyckan, Östra Lyckan, and Kofallet have been found a number of craft production spaces and smithies (Lemm 2016, 72-73; Ekman 21-29). Kofallet has been interpreted as some form of elite residence from the presence of a palisade foundation, as well as two potential hall buildings. Both houses 2 and 3, found on Kofallet have been interpreted as halls due to their structure and size, which gives them an estimated length of around 30 meters. Additionally, it is argued that House 1, slightly to the west, can be interpreted as a hall building due to its construction and length, another 30 meter construction (Ekman 2000, 21, 23-25). House 5 may also share some interpretation as a hall, due to the assumption that the structure, which is identified as 17 meters in length, and may have been roughly

30 meters in length during initial construction or in an earlier phase of use. Additionally, it is identified as the oldest structure within the site, with radiocarbon dating placing the structure's occupancy between 340 and 650 A.D. (Ekman 2000, 28). The other structures houses number, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are far smaller, the largest of which does not even exceed 12 meters in length. The general interpretation of these smaller structures places them in conjunction with some form of craft, workshop, or smithing activity (Ekman 2000, 21-29). None of these latter structures seem to indicate any form of dwelling activity (Ekman 2000, 21-29). Additionally, there are a limited number of Christian burials found within the Kofallet excavation area, dated the Late Viking Age through Medieval Period (Ekman 2000, 21-29; Lemm 2016, 73).

Dating of the material is somewhat varied, but most dates for each structure whether based on carbon samples or relative typology fall within the Vendel Period and Viking Age. There are some samples that would indicate a potential later dating, Late Viking Age or Early Medieval. However, these dates come from the burials on Kofallet which have been interpreted as later Christian burials (Ekman 2000, 21; Lemm 2016, 73). The potential hall structures, houses 1, 2, and 3 have dates from the early Vendel period, house 1 dating roughly between 440 and 600 A.D. while houses 2 and 3 roughly between 540 and 635 A.D. (Ekman 2000 25-28; Lemm 2016, 72). Additionally the stratigraphy of houses 2 and 3 indicate some relation between these two structures, and each other as well as the palisade (Ekman 2000, 25-28; Lemm 2016, 72). Dates from the production areas place them in the Vendel Period based on the typology of the material found within Västra Lyckan's cultural layer, most likely 550-650 A.D. (Lemm 2016, 72; Ekman 2000, 21). The building structures are dated mostly by radiocarbon sampling. House 5 dates roughly between 640 and 800 A.D. House 6 dates between roughly 680 and 880 A.D. House 7, which is considered the oldest structure, dates roughly between 980 and 1170 A.D. House 8 dates roughly between 650 and 860 A.D. House 9 dates roughly between 960 and 1160 A.D. Lastly, House 11 dates roughly between 620 and 870 A.D, with a nearby furnace dating roughly between 680 and 960 A.D. (Ekman 2000, 28-30). Generally there can be seen from the dating a Vendel Period through Viking Age or early Medieval occupation at Husby in Glanshammar (Lemm 2016, 72-73). Artefact finds from the site have the highest concentration in the workshop areas of Västra, Östra, and Södra Lyckan as well as Kofallet. The material in

these workshops indicates a great deal of craft production, both iron production and bronze casting. The function of these workshops seems to have been devoted to metalwork, due to the large number of metalwork debris in the workshop buildings and production areas (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 40). The majority of the workshops seem to have been devoted to metalwork, specifically iron production. The material in these workshops has demonstrated that metalwork related to iron production has occurred along every stage of the lifespan of the material. Not only is there evidence of reduction, but there is evidence of both primary and secondary forging (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 40). Additionally, the composition of the iron material within the workshop areas would indicate a high variety of iron and steel composition, including high quality carbon steel (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 43). There is evidence of casting molds and crucibles for bronze production, this scrap material would indicate bronze casting within the workshop areas. The dating of the casting material is somewhat difficult, due to the disturbed nature of the casting molds, however it is associated with the Vendel period through typological comparison (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 43-44). The material from the workshop and production areas at Husby in Glanshammar has been argued to evidence some form of high quality iron production. Additionally, there is a lack of iron ore even though there is clear evidence of reduction and purification. The initial interpretation assuming the ore source to be local, rather than long distance import. This has yet to be clearly substantiated, however future trace element analysis of the slag may yield a plausible location for the source of the iron ore necessary to fuel the workshop activity (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 42).

Husby in Glanshammar as a settlement is difficult to interpret. Not only because of the somewhat sparse material, but because of the seeming incongruity in the settlement itself. There can be seen clearly some form of elite settlement during the Early Vendel Period. However, this occupation ceases by the Late Vendel Period. Additionally, the dating of each of these structures is seemingly split. It would seem from the dates that there is genuine discontinuity between the hall site at Kofallet and the workshop site spread across Västra, Östra, and Södra Lyckan. The dating of the structures indicates very little chance for overlap between the potential hall structures and the workshop structures. Additionally, the association of the Västra and Östra

Lyckan production areas comes from a small sampling based only on two typological dates placing material roughly within the Vendel Period (Lemm 2016, 72). Furthermore the structures within the site seem to indicate very little in the way of evidence of high population dwelling. This may be due to the function of most of the site as some form of workshop, however there is still lacking any dwelling in conjunction with this workshop, or outbuildings in conjunction with the potential halls. The general interpretation forwarded for Husby in Glanshammar places it as a Vendel Period Central Place turned Husby during the early Medieval Period. The central place function is seen to be evidenced by the production of high carbon steel weaponry indicating elite military association. However, the material present is less convincing than the narrative. First and foremost it would seem that the hall settlement and the workshop are not contemporaneous. Given the general dating within these structures the only potential for overlap is in the extreme end of the ranges for houses 1, 2, and 3 and the extreme beginning of houses 4, 8, and 11. Additionally, there is a lack of byres within the halls along with a lack of any outbuildings. There are no dwellings associated with the Viking Age workshop phase. Explanations for this focus on the potential relocation of the settlement to the location of the modern Husby town, however this possibility has yet to be supported by any survey or excavations (Lemm 2016, 71-72; Ekman 2000).

How then does the site in Glanshammar compare with the notion of a Husby settlement or Central Place? The location of the settlement is fairly promising in terms of relation to known Iron Age and Medieval Period trade/communication routes, as demonstrated by its close proximity to a known route to the Mälaren region (Lemm 2016, 71-72). There is a clear elite association as evidenced by the hall structures on Kofallet (Lemm 2016, 71-72). The workshop buildings as well as the production areas indicate clear craft production in both iron and bronze metalwork (Lemm 2016, 71-72). However, the structure beyond the hall structures and the workshop buildings is difficult to interpret as there is a clear lack of dwellings (Ekman 2000, 21-29). In terms of reliance on material from the hinterlands as would be expected of a regional center, without any evidence of dwelling the settlement must clearly be reliant on a hierarchy of settlement resources to sustain itself. However, in terms of the regional drawing of resources it is difficult to tell in terms of workshop production as the lack of ore has seemed to indicate at least some form of off-site sourcing of ore (Hjärthner-Holdar,

Lamm, and Grandin 2000, 42). The Late Vendel and Viking Age workshops clearly share some similarities with the regional center level of settlement that would be expected of a Husby or Central Place, however there is no evidence of settlement or dwelling contemporary to the workshop themselves. Distinguishing between regional center, or isolated workshop is incredibly difficult. Positively identifying the settlement nature of Husby in Glanshammar has proven straining even in the face of the abundance of material in comparison to other settlement sites related to Husby locations. Perhaps later excavation will expand our knowledge of the settlement to a degree that its place within the hierarchy of the settlement landscape can be identified, but for now the material present is not promising in terms of supporting any of these models of settlement hierarchy. Furthermore it is disheartening that this lack of clarity is present within the material even though this is the most abundant Husby location in terms of archaeological settlement data.

In summary, the material at Husby in Glanshammar may both indicate an elite residence, and some form of workshop. However, concerns in the dating of the material raise the question of contemporaneity between these potential settlements.

Mälby

Mälby, located in Tillgine, Uppland, is a settlement site with similarities in character to the conception of the Husby as a settlement within the Husby system (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 48). The main phases of occupation place the settlement within the Vendel Period through the Medieval Period (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 49). However, there is some settlement continuity within the region surrounding Mälby spanning through the Bronze Age and early Iron Age (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 15-16). The earliest identifiable phase of settlement, phase 2, dates roughly within the Vendel period. There are a number of longhouses, post buildings, and unassociated post holes associated with a Vendel Period occupation (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 21-24). Dates from the features indicate a cluster of houses occupying the same phase, potentially subdivided into two sub-phases of direct continuous occupation, one Vendel Period, one Late Vendel/Early Viking Age (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 21-24). Material is incredibly sparse and indicates little about the functionality of most of the structures during this phase beyond their use as dwellings, the only exceptionable material coming from house 50 in the form of a few scattered ring fragments. There has been some interpretation that there is relation between this structure and cultic activity, but this has yet to be expanded upon (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 21). The occupation displays very little in the way of stratification, hierarchy or differentiation between the clustered house structures (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 49). Phase 3 is the major Viking Age occupation of the settlement. The structure of the settlement remains much the same, save for two major changes. The first is an increase in the size and variety of the house structures within the clustered settlement, the second is a massive expansion in the available material found within the settlement (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 24-28; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 49). The general structure of the settlement is unchanged. It is still a cluster of contemporary houses and structures (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 26). However, there is a massive expansion in the amount of trade goods found within the settlement (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 24). Additionally, there is considerable evidence of craft production within the settlement. There is evidence of textile manufacture, iron forging, and bronze casting within the settlement during this phase (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 27).

Evidence for bronze casting is the most prolific as there is strong evidence of complete copper chain production; purification, bronze production, casting, and working (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 27). This is striking in contrast to large scale production sites like Husby in Glanshammar or Helgö as the entire copper chain is identifiable. During this phase there is also little to indicate any elite association or hierarchy in the house structures within the settlement, or in terms of material that would indicate elite presence (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 28). The transition to the next phase does mark some of these indicators. Phase 4 is marked by the transition of the settlement into a complex rather than a clustering of comparable house structures. Phase 4, which is dated to between 1050 and 1250 A.D. sees the restructuring of the settlement around a single multi-story wooden structure surrounded by a complex of outbuildings. Craft production and agricultural activity intensify greatly compared to the previous phase (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011, 28-58).

Making sense of Mälby is somewhat difficult. The location of Mälby would seem to indicate a connection with known trade routes between Uppsala and Västerås (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 48). There is no evidence of elite residence, elite presence, or even stratification within the buildings of the settlement during the Vendel and Viking Age occupation. The redevelopment into a manor complex during the Early Medieval Period, however would at least indicate some form of elite association. Craft production occurs during both the Viking Age and Early Medieval occupation, including bronze casting. Production clearly increases during the transition into a manor complex during the Medieval Period. The size and structure of the settlement is built similar to a village, and the clustering and size of structures increases during the Viking Age. The structure of the site radically changes in structure during the Medieval Period into a complex of outbuildings centered on a large single structure, interpreted as a manor. Trade goods are present during the Viking Age and are seen to increase in number after the Medieval Period restructuring. Comparing the settlement to what would be expected from a characteristic Husby or Central Place it is somewhat difficult. During phase 4, the medieval manor adheres fairly well to the assumed settlement character of a Husby, however as something that is so identifiable with a medieval manor it is more likely to function as such. When phase 2 and 3 are compared to the elements expected of a Husby settlement it is somewhat difficult to determine the

settlement's place within the regional settlement hierarchy. The settlement is located close to known travel/communication routes between Uppland and Västerås. As a settlement it shares similarities with a regional center in terms of large scale craft production, however it lacks any form of identifiable hierarchy or stratification. Additionally, as a clustered agricultural settlement it is not consuming from the top of a chain of settlement hierarchy it is producing. However, it has a size and productive capability similar to a regional center. Any association with the Husby phenomenon is not to be found as the settlement is not located near any Husby place name (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011 16-28; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 48-49).

In summary, Mälby appears to have clear evidence of craft production, however as a settlement it shows no elite character until the transition to a manor complex in the Medieval Period.

Husby and Tuna in Vendel

Following Mälby the only other potential Husby associated archaeological settlements comparable in material are located in the wider area of Vendel. Each is associated with a specific place name, one Husby, and one Tuna (Arrhenius 2000, 93). The settlements within Vendel are somewhat spread out, but the material from these settlements is often examined in relation to each other as well as in relation to nearby grave fields and burial mounds (Arrhenius 2000, 94). From the material there appear to be two settlements within the old Tunagården by the parish church (Arrhenius 2000, 94). Most of the material between these settlements is spread out across multiple sites, and excavated from a motley of excavations spanning most of the 20th century, most of the recent data coming from the 1995 excavations (Arrhenius 2000, 95). The majority of the material of recent studies comes from the grave fields nearby these settlement sites, however there is still a fair amount of material from the settlements themselves (Arrhenius 2000, 95). Within the first settlement site at Husby there appears to be a terrace hall structure dated roughly to the Migration Period, around 540 A.D. In the second settlement location, associated with the Tuna location, there is a small cluster of dwelling structures without any hall structures or terraces (Arrhenius 2000, 95). This is interpreted as a migration period farmstead dating to the migration period, based on radiocarbon samples from the southern buildings which dated to around 420 A.D. (Arrhenius 2000, 95). There is also interpreted a significant stratification between the burial goods of the two cemeteries, interpretations arguing that each belonged to a separate class strata (Arrhenius 2000, 94-95). It is also argued that sometime during the Viking Age the hall is moved outside of the area of Vendel, after which there is a shift to the settlement at Örbyhus during the 11th century (Arrhenius 2000, 98). The material within Vendel is without doubt somewhat confused. Due to the disparate nature of each settlement and their overall spreading across the landscape it is difficult to identify any sort of settlement hierarchy. The general interpretation of these settlements is that there is a Migration Period occupation of the area manifesting in settlement form as some sort of farmstead, the population gradually shifting to another more clustered settlement site during the Vendel Period, which was in turn replaced by a fortified medieval manor or town at Örbyhus (Arrhenius 2000, 100).

The nature of these settlements within relation to the assumed character of a Husby or Central Place within their respective systems is difficult to discern. This is mostly due to the scattered nature of the material itself, and focus on the burial material rather than the settlements. The location of Vendel would suggest close relation to travel/communication/trade routes, due to the position of Vendelsjön in relation to the Vendel and Fyris rivers. There is a clear elite association both in the presence of a terraced hall, as well as monumental burials. However, there appears to be a lack of craft production within the area of Vendel. The structure or size of settlements within the area of Vendel is difficult to determine. Within the monumental burials there is evidence of goods acquired from long distance trade (Arrhenius 2000). It would seem then that beyond the elite association the settlements at Vendel does not show a great deal of similarity with a regional center in the archaeological context, mostly due to lack of craft production. However, as the material is somewhat hazy it is difficult to determine the exact nature of settlements within Vendel.

In summary, the elite association at Vendel is clear, however there is a distinct lack of production. The material is spread out over multiple sites, and difficult to interpret due to previous historical excavation as well as sparseness material within the settlements.

Other Husby in the Mälaren Region

The last two Husby name locations are only worth short mention. However, their use within the canon of archaeological data used within the study of the Husby phenomenon is clear evidence of some of the greater trends within the Husby system when it comes to associating archaeological material with the system itself. The first is Husby on Munsö, which is located next to Hovgården on Adelsö and Birka on Björkö (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 47). I have considerable doubts as to whether or not the archaeological material present indicates any form of Vendel Period or Viking Age settlement at Munsö. The only archaeological material present is a grave field of some 150 graves, including 5 monumental burial mounds. The excavation and dating of which is limited, only taking place during the mid-19th and early 20th centuries A.D. The burial ground dated to the Vendel Period through the Viking Age, has only received a handful of typological dates determined in the middle of the 19th century A.D. which have only received a cursory reexamination during the 1980s, which reaffirmed the dating based on a single Slavonic coin (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 47). There is no evidence of Viking Age or early Medieval Period settlement, or of any settlement beyond the later Medieval Period farm at Husby (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 47). Similar to Husby in Glanshammar this is based on the assumption that the settlement must lie beneath the continuously occupied Medieval and Modern Husby, however no survey or archaeological prospection has been conducted to test these assertions. The available material cannot be compared against the expected structure of a Husby, Central Place, or archaeological settlement hierarchy as there is no settlement. The second location, Husby in Österåker, is similarly lacking in material. Although, the knowledge of this site comes from recent survey work. Within the context of the study of these models of settlement hierarchy Husby in Österåker is only worth mentioning as it has been used within relation to the development of the Husby system previously (Ambrosiani 1987, 250, 253). The archaeological material from Husby in Österåker comes from the archaeological site coded as RAÄ 209:2. The material is sparse, which has previously been interpreted as a small Iron Age settlement, RAÄ 209 (Nordberg 2008, 9). A 2008 survey undertaken due to construction with the goal to examine the extent and dating of the settlement, however yielded few results. Of the 1500 square

meter excavation 600 meters were heavily disturbed (Nordberg 2008, 10). The features found were limited. In total only three positively identified post holes were found along with a potential stone fence setting, and a potentially disturbed grave (Nordberg 2008, 14). None of the features found indicated any form of positively identifiable structure of any kind within the excavated area (Nordberg 2008, 15). Carbon samples from some of the material in the cultural layer, predominately burnt bone indicated a dating between 380 and 440 A.D. (Nordberg 2008, 16). Again, the material present is hardly indicative of any form of positively identifiable settlement so it cannot be compared against the expected structures. It is doubtful that there is any large scale settlement present, let alone associated with the Husby phenomenon.

From the archaeological examination of the material present within the Mälaren region and within central Sweden concerning these Husby name locations it would seem there is a great deal of heterogeneity in the material compared to the assumed structure of the Husby model. In terms of relation to a position within the archaeological settlement hierarchy, and to a settlement character relatable to what is assumed to comprise as Husby as a settlement the archaeological material is far more varied than is often asserted within the Husby system. Furthermore, there is seen at least from an archaeological perspective a potential disconnect between the presence of a Husby name location and the presence of a definite archaeological settlement site. As is the case at both Husby on Münsö and Husby in Österåker. Perhaps further investigation may yield settlement more identifiable with the expected character assumed by the Husby system, however from the current perspective of the available material within the archaeological record the assertions made concerning the character of the Husby settlement within a settlement hierarchy as well as the ubiquity of that settlement hierarchy are highly suspect.

In summary, other Husby locations leave little material indicating any form of settlement, in particular Husby in Österåker has shown little to indicate Late Iron Age, Viking Age, or Early Medieval Period settlement. Additionally, the archaeological material shows a great deal of disconnect with the assertions made concerning the structure of the Husby made within “Husby Studies.”

Archaeological Material and Central Places

Looking at these settlements from the perspective of Brink's later Central Place model also is fairly disconcerting in terms of their applicability as central nodes within that framework. Examining these settlements as compared to the redefinition of hierarchical settlement within Brink's Central Place model is somewhat difficult. This is somewhat due to the expansion of the examined nature of Central Places within Scandinavia as a complex of functional settlement units rather than a single hierarchical settlement (Fabech 1999; Brink 1999, 425). The expansion of this within the context of Brink's Bygd takes this expansion somewhat farther, making it difficult to distinguish from a local or regional center, and the region itself (Brink 1997). This does in part give explanation to the often scattered nature of some of these proposed regional centers, like Vendel, however when compared with a settlement hierarchy based in known regional centers within the Mälaren region which function as Central Places there is a disconnect. There are two known Central Places within the Mälaren region during the Iron Age, both share similarity in their organization and functionality, and both function clearly as regional if not superregional centers from an archaeological perspective. These settlements are Helgö, and Gamla Uppsala.

Helgö

Helgö as a settlement is occupied somewhat unevenly depending on building group, however general dating for the settlement places the earliest occupation in the Late Roman Iron Age through the Viking Age (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 11). The general chronology of the site itself split into two phases, an earlier phase between the 3rd and 6th centuries A.D., and a later phase between the 6th and 11th centuries A.D. (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 13). The site is divided into a number of building groups over a settlement estimated to span 75000 square meters in maximum size, although only around 16000 square meters remains excavated (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 7). The division of the site sees around 6 cemeteries and 8 settlement areas, clustered into four main building groups (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 9). General dating for building group 1 places occupation from the 6th century through the late 9th century A.D., building group 2 from the 3rd through the 8th century A.D., building group 3 from the 5th through the 8th century A.D., and building group 4 from the 5th through the 9th century A.D. (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 11). Building group 2 appears to be the central building group and remains the only building group completely excavated (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 15). Building group 2 is composed of a number of post built structures constructed on a number of artificially constructed terraces. There are confirmed all structures on terraces 1 and 3, however the structures built on terraces 5 and 6 do not share a size or construction that would indicated functionality as halls (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 16; Göthberg 2017, 12-17). Dating is consistent with the occupation of the site in the structures within building group 2, with terrace 5 occupying the Roman Iron Age through the Migration period, terrace 6 occupying the Vendel Period through Viking Age, and terraces 1 and 3 sharing some overlapping dates with both (Göthberg 2017, 18, 21, 22). Most of the buildings within building group 2 either share some multifunctional character including hall structures and metalworking activity, and none indicate agricultural functionality (Göthberg 2017, 19; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 19, 21). Building groups 1 and 4 both share an agricultural and workshop functionality, while building group 3 is the largest workshop complex among the main building groups (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 22-24). In terms of material assemblage it is evident that the workshop capacities within building groups 1 through 4 indicated mass production.

Production related finds indicate bronze casting, most likely along all stages of the bronze production chain, gold and silverwork, glass bead production, as well as considerable iron and steel production during the Viking Age (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 26-35). Additionally, in terms of production of prestige goods Helgö has significant evidence of functionally as a regional center which has traceable distribution of most elite grave goods within the Mälaren region during its height in the 4th through 6th centuries A.D. (Fischer and Victor 2011, 80-90). Lastly, like a considerable amount of Central Places within Scandinavia Helgö has clear evidence of long distance trade in a considerable amount of the material finds within building group 2 (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 11).

When compared at least within the archaeological expectations concerning settlement hierarchy Helgö is a clear regional center, if not superregional center. In fact in that observable settlement hierarchy within central Sweden on which this notion of archaeological settlement hierarchy is based Helgö is in fact the typesite for the 4th tier of hierarchy. Helgö is used by Pedersen and Widgren as the example for the structure of a settlement defined as a “Chieftain” Farm (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 60). The structure clearly indicates a hierarchy of elite goods production within a region, as well as a reliance on the agricultural production of lesser settlements within the hierarchy, which seems to be based on the lack of agricultural functionality of building group 2 (Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 60; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 19). Additionally, there is significant evidence of connection within long distance trade networks, which is arguably another crucial factor in determining a regional center. When comparing Helgö as a settlement to the traditional elements of Scandinavian Central Place it conforms fairly well, including the assumption of a somewhat more spread out character, the site compromised of loosely clustered building groups rather than a single nucleated settlement (Fabech 1999; Clarke and Lamm 2017, 9, 74, 54-56). It continues to fall fairly well into the distinction of a Central Place within Brink’s Central Place model, however unlike the conception of a Central Place complex that spreads across an entire local region, Helgö is a clearly identifiable settlement clustered over a distance of less than a kilometer (Clarke and Lamm 2017, 7). There is some hesitation in making the elite connection with Helgö as it lacks clearly identifiable monumental burials, however from the perspective of the settlement itself it clearly functions as some form of regional

center within some form of settlement hierarchy. In comparing the material available to what is expected of a Central Place within the Central Place model there is some disconnect between the functionality of Helgö archaeologically and a Central Place node within the model, namely in the fact that Helgö has a traceable production that can be seen with a clear regional distribution, and the structure of Helgö as a single settlement, spread out in clusters of building groups, however clearly comprising a single settlement complex.

In summary, Helgö appears to be clearly identifiable as possessing an elevated position within a regional hierarchy of settlements.

Gamla Uppsala

The second clearly identifiable Central Place within the Mälaren region is the well-known site of Gamla Uppsala. However, studying Gamla Uppsala from a purely archaeological perspective is increasingly difficult. This is mostly due to the site's lingering presence within the cultural memory of Sweden since the Medieval Period, and in part since the time in which the site functioned as a regional center (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 571). This lingering cultural memory has seen a great deal of focus on the site over the last several centuries, and has involved a distinct focus on the monumental aspects of the site. The settlement itself is considerably less well understood (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 571). However, there is an emerging picture of Gamla Uppsala as a settlement and regional center that has developed over the course of more recent excavations. This is enough to determine a few specific elements of Gamla Uppsala's functionality as a Central Place and regional or superregional center.

Similar to Helgö, Gamla Uppsala is divided among a cluster of related settlements within a fairly large area. The settlement itself is defined to include Gamla Uppsala as well as the corresponding historical estates and villages of Myrby and Nyby (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 572). The settlement itself is divided into 2 areas, a royal manor complex, and an eastern settlement (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 576-578). The royal manor complex is somewhat difficult to examine due to its continued use within the archdiocese of Uppsala during the Medieval Period, as well as infrequent excavations over the course of the last few centuries. The original structure before its donation to the church in 1160 is difficult to determine. There is a cluster of terraces, only a few of which have been positively identified. Additionally, only a single hall structure has been positively identified, any other potential structures left somewhat undefinable due to the disturbed stratigraphy near the church itself. There are several burial mounds located close to the settlement site, which due to the presence of prestige goods would indicate elite burial (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 576). Within the larger settlement complex at Prästgården and Högåsen there are further monumental burial mounds, only a handful of which have been excavated, these excavations occurring more than a century ago. From the dating available, which is somewhat scattered in source material and location within the settlement complex a Migration Period through Late Vendel is assumed. The

radiocarbon dating from some western hearths within the complex date it to between 400 and 650 A.D., additional dates from the monumental burials indicating a late 6th or early 7th century A.D. burial. The burial mounds excavated within Högåsen all indicate a continuous span of no more than a century. Additionally, north of the terraces is found a potential road or rampart structure with indication of an earlier dating within the Roman Iron Age (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 576).

East of the royal manor complex is a large settlement comprised of a series of clustered farms or farmstead sized settlements. A considerable amount of these clusters show evidence of craft production. Recent survey indicates the presence of considerable amounts of iron slag within several of the clusters. Additionally, within a settlement or settlement cluster in the northern section of the area a large workshop was found, including several furnaces, as well as post built structures dated to the Viking Age. Additionally, there is evidence of precious metal craftwork, glass bead production, and bronze casting within the settlement area east of the royal manor complex. Lastly, some evidence of precious metal craftwork has been found within the manor complex itself on a few of the terraces (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 576-78).

From the material available it would seem that Gamla Uppsala would have functioned as some form of regional or superregional center. There is a clear indication of craft production, although the material is less well studied than Helgö. Additionally, the position within the regional context is uncertain. As a settlement it is clear that the royal manor complex lacked any productive capacity agriculturally and must have relied on lesser settlements within a settlement hierarchy. There is also clear evidence of elite association in the royal manor complex, especially as Gamla Uppsala contains the largest monumental burial complex within all of Sweden (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 576). However, the functionality of Gamla Uppsala as a settlement is somewhat difficult to determine. This is mostly due to the lack of available data on the settlement itself, along with a lengthy research history which has seen the site become the focus of study within premodern periods to a degree which may have compromised the understanding of the site both archaeologically, and within cultural memory itself. In comparison with what is expected of Brink's Central Place it follows fairly well. However, when compared with Helgö a few elements of Gamla Uppsala's functionality as a Central Place become questionable. Namely, those would be the extent of its functionality as a production

center regionally, and the structure of the settlement. Both are difficult to determine due to the inconsistencies present within the material record at Gamla Uppsala, and the general lack of focus on Gamla Uppsala archaeologically beyond the study of the monumental burials. Gamla Uppsala is most likely some form of regional center, although its structure as a Central Place and its potential position as a superregional center are difficult to determine.

In summary, Gamla Uppsala is clearly some form of hierarchical settlement, however the longstanding history of premodern excavation has made examining Gamla Uppsala as a settlement difficult.

Urban Settlement in Viking Age Mälardalen

The focus on the construction of a settlement hierarchy around smaller regional settlements such as Husby or Central Places seems to ignore a considerable amount of the foundation of the third model, the Medieval Feudal system, based around a hierarchy centered on Manors and Towns. A number of these early urban sites are clearly identifiable within the Viking Age. Two major urban sites are found to have functioned within the Mälaren region in the Viking Age and Early Medieval and their functionality indicates a higher position within the settlement hierarchy. The functionality of these proto-towns is clearly identifiable at a level comparable to a regional or a superregional center, and the emergence of these urban centers places them within the functionality of these models of settlement hierarchy.

The first of these early urban sites, Birka, is seen to have its earliest phase within the middle of the 8th century A.D. and potential continuity with earlier hall structures on Björkö dating earlier in the Vendel Period (Ambrosiani 2013, 68-70; Kalmring, Runer, and Viberg 2017). Sigtuna similarly is seen to have a clearly identifiable first phase within the Viking Age, although later. The founding of Sigtuna is clearly identifiable to a period around 980 A.D. (Tesch 2001, 727). Both settlements are seen to be large and clustered settlements, in which craft production, trade, and dwelling all occur within a nucleated settlement (Ambrosiani 2013; Roslund 1995). Evidence of bronze casting, metalwork, glass bead production, as well as other forms of craft production is abundant in the assemblages of both settlements (Ambrosiani 2013; 223-252, Nordin 1990, Pettersson 1990, Ros 1990, Henricson 1990). Additionally, the volume of production within these settlements is considerably larger than any other production site, be it Gamla Uppsala, Helgö, Mälby, or Husby in Glanshammar. The volume of material related to Bronze casting in particular at Birka numbers in the tens of thousands (Ambrosiani 2013, 237-242). The amount of organic and osteological material within Birka and Sigtuna indicates a large consumptive population (Ambrosiani 2013, 242-48; Widgren and Pedersen 2011, 67-68). The population reliant of a settlement hierarchy within the hinterlands to supply the amount of resources needed to maintain both population and production. Both of these sites are clearly urban in character, and both clearly represent an elevated position within a settlement hierarchy. Additionally, within

both locations an elite association is clear, with Sigtuna indicating a potential royal center, and Birka's association with the burial mounds at Hovgården on Adelsö (Tesch 2001; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 45).

In terms of material it is clear that both urban sites are clear regional if not superregional centers. In terms of both consumption and production they are considerably more prolific than any other contemporary settlement. Indeed there is considerable argument that the bronze casting workshop at Birka supplied the entire network of bronze prestige goods found within elite burials in the Mälaren region during its period of functionality (Ambrosiani 2013, 237-242). The network of elite production within Sigtuna is similarly identifiable within the Late Viking Age and Early Medieval Period in the Mälaren region (Roslund 1995). However, their organizational character is considerably different from both the Husby system and the Central Place model. In fact the only model of settlement hierarchy to account for urban sites is the later Medieval feudal settlement organization, in which towns are the central nodes of the network of economic and political organization (Sindbæk 2007). When compared with the Husby System, which in its earliest form sees Gamla Uppsala as the superregional nexus of its network there is considerable dissonance with the archaeological material. Both in terms of the potential of Gamla Uppsala's functionality as a superregional center due to lack of material, but in the presence of these urban superregional centers during the Viking Age. Later iterations of the Husby System which see its inception during the Late Viking Age or Early Medieval Period see considerable overlap with the emergence of urban settlements in central Sweden, yet maintain the Husby settlement as the regional center within the Husby System (Lindkvist 2016, 143).

Due to their clear functionality in the regional context it is not surprising then that some of the later restructuring of models of political organization within the Mälaren region see these urban sites as centers within that political organization (Ambrosiani 1987; Tesch 2001). From the perspective of these settlements the character of a regional center is reliant on economic control through production of elite goods, which can be seen to have a regional distribution traceable to that center. Additionally, these settlements represent a more stereotypical urban settlement rather than a Central Place, as they show both urban functionality and dense clustering. This may be due in

part to the original argued functionality of a Central Place within the Scandinavian context, which is seen as an adoption of the functionality of an urban site while maintaining a more spread out settlement characteristic of Iron Age Scandinavia (Fabech 1999). The position of these settlements within the hierarchy is seen to have been completely reliant on resource production from the hinterlands. If these elements are taken into account as markers of a regional center based on these clear regional centers than smaller regional centers like the proposed Husby settlement sites do not overlap. As a hierarchy marking these urban centers as regional centers requires a considerably more dense settlement, and larger volume of production.

In summary, urban settlements in the Viking Age in the Mälaren Region are difficult to fit into these models of settlement hierarchy, as they demonstrate a hierarchical centrality which is not addressed within these models.

The Material at a Glance

Looking once again at each of the previously studied settlements in association with these models there can be seen a clear difficulty in associating them with a position of regional center from the perspective of an archaeological settlement hierarchy based on the available settlement material. Many of these locations can be seen to share characters similar with clear regional centers, however elements of their organizational character as a settlement make it difficult to conclusively identify within a character expected of a regional center from an archaeological perspective. Husby in Glanshammar has a clear function as a workshop capable of producing in volume, however the regional distribution of its material remains unclear (Hjärthner-Holdar, Lamm and Grandin 2000). Additionally, the lack of contemporaneity between the dwelling and the workshop is disconcerting, as there is no indication of a contemporaneous settlement in association with the workshop (Lemm 2016, 72-73). Mälby as a settlement is much clearer in terms of its association with an organization structure closer to regional centers, additionally it sees a period of increased production during the Viking Age. However, lack of any sign of elite association, along with its position as an actively producing agricultural settlement conflict with what is expected of a regional center. It does however see a distinct restructuring into a medieval manor during the early Medieval period which can at least be seen to function within a later Medieval regional hierarchy comparable to the medieval feudal model of organization (Beronius Jörpelan and Seiler 2011 28-58; Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016, 49). The material at Vendel, although indicative of some form of elite association is vastly unclear in terms of settlement character and organization (Arrhenius 2000). Helgö has features that clearly identify it as some form of regional center and Central Place. Additionally, the distribution of material produced at Helgö would indicate some form of regional centrality within the entire Mälaren region (Clarke and Lamm 2017; Fischer and Victor 2011). Gamla Uppsala, while identifiable as some form of regional center is difficult to interpret due to the nature of the history of scholarship surrounding the site along with the lack of focus archaeologically on the settlement itself (Ljungkvist et al 2011, 571). It seems archaeologically that settlement while displaying some form of distinct hierarchy during the Iron Age, Viking Age, and early Medieval Period functionally from an

archaeological perspective is difficult to place within these models of settlement. This is most likely due to the material responsible for the construction of these not lying within the archaeological record.

In summary, settlement material associated with these models of hierarchy is sparse, and less thoroughly studied. Due to the hazy nature of the data the material can be seen to neither prove nor disprove these models of social and settlement hierarchy. Although, the material can be seen to call into question the homogeneity of how these settlements are perceived within their models as the settlement material seems to indicate great variation where uniformity was predicted.

Conclusion

Working with these models in an archaeological context is difficult, however there is potential for reexamination of these models in light of the available archaeological material. There is also great potential for expansive archaeological survey based on these models and named locations. It seems that the heterogeneity present within the available archaeological material is less ubiquitous than expected. This seems not due to the outright inaccuracy of these models, but rather their original construction without the archaeological material in mind. Perhaps a reexamination of the core elements of these models, whether it be Central Place, or Husby, in light of all known archaeological settlement within Mälaren during the Late Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval Period is the only means of restructuring these models to take the archaeological material into consideration. Additionally, there needs to be conducted some form of wider archaeological survey of these named Husby locations to provide a clearer connection between these Husby and identifiable archaeological settlement sites, rather than just a connection with monumental burials. While burial is a potential indicator of settlement, it is not an identifiable settlement. There are indeed cases, as with Husby in Österåker, where there does not appear to be a settlement in conjunction with the named location. Determining the number of these named locations that correspond with clearly identifiable archaeological settlements, along with the structure and function of these potential settlement sites is a necessity before discussion of the structure or the functionality of these settlements within a regional context.

From this examination it would seem that a number of insights are evident. Firstly, it seems that although these models of settlement hierarchy often use, and are influenced by archaeological material the core conception of their structure and form has developed in some minor isolation from the archaeological material. The use of literary, historical, and linguistic material to form the basis for the conception of how social and settlement hierarchy functioned within the Mälaren Region during the Late Iron Age, Viking Age, and Early Medieval Period has greatly shaped the perceptions of how settlement within these models is thought to be reflected in the landscape. In

examination of the archaeological material it would seem that there is some form of dissonance between what can be seen within the archaeological record and what has developed over the last century of discourse surrounding the concept of the Husby phenomenon. Due to the nature of archaeological material, and indeed archaeology as a field of study it is difficult to lucidly determine the validity of these models using archaeological material. However, there does appear to be enough evidence within this dissonance to question elements of the form and structure of these models when the archaeological material is examined. In particular, there is a clear disconnect between what is interpreted as the clear settlement hierarchy within the region observable archaeologically and the general regional structure of these models of settlement hierarchy, namely the Husby system. The lack of homogeneity in regional centers associated with Husby name locations shows a distinct weakness in the Husby system to examine the Husby from a settlement perspective. Additionally, there does seem to be some disconnect between attributions of the Husby name to a location within the landscape and the presence of an archaeologically identifiable settlement. This may be due in part to the lack of consensus on the meaning of the Husby as a linguistic phenomenon, but it does in some part call into question the rigid reliance on this particular phenomenon to form the basis for a regional model of settlement hierarchy. It would seem that in the end there is observable some form of hierarchical settlement in the archaeological material, however its interpretation in relation to these theoretical models of settlement is difficult to interpret as these models do not seem constructed to particularly examine or address the nuances surrounding archaeological material. Additionally, the lack of clarity and relative sparseness of the material only adds to the malleability of its usage within relation to these models of settlement. There is clearly more work to be done, both in terms of refining these theoretical models to address the archaeological material, and in the examination, expansion, and interpretation of said material. However, what is hopeful is that with this work can come a clearer understanding of the structure and nature of the organization of the settlement landscape of the prehistoric Mälaren region.

References

- Ambrosiani, Björn. 2013. *Stratigraphy: excavations in the Black Earth 1990-1995. 1, The site and the shore, the bronze caster's workshop*. Stockholm: Birka Project.
- Ambrosiani, Björn. 1987. "Royal Manors and Towns in Central Sweden." In *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress; Larkollen, Norway, 1985*, edited by James E. Knirk, 247-254. Oslo: Universitetets Oldsaksamling.
- Andrén, Anders. 1989. "State and towns in the Middle Ages." *Theory and Society* 18, no. 5: 585- 609.
- Arrhenius, Birgit. 2000. "Tuna och Husby i Vendel." In *En Bok Om Husbyar*, edited by Michael Olausson, 49-63. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Bernoius Jörpelan, Lena and Anton Seiler 2011. *Mälbys många ansikten: En tidigmedeltida huvudgård, förhistorisk och historisk gårdsbebyggelse I Uppland; Tillinge socken; Tillinge-Mälby 1:20 och 5:1 RAÄ 327 Dnr 423-1095-2007*.
- Brink, Stefan. 1996. "Political and social structures in early Scandinavia: a settlement-historical pre-study of the central place." *Tidskrif För Arkeologi* 28: 235-281.
- Brink, Stefan. 1997. "Political and social structures in early Scandinavia II: aspects of space and territoriality; the settlement district." *Tidskrif För Arkeologi* 29:389-437.
- Brink, Stefan. 1999. "Social order in the early Scandinavian Landscape." In *Settlement and Landscape: Proceedings of a conference in Århus, Denmark, May 4-7 1998*, edited by Charlotte Fabech and Jytte Ringtved, 423-440. Århus: Jutland Archaeological Society and Aarhus University Press.
- Carlie, Anne. 2008. "Magnate Estates Along the Road: Viking Age Settlements, Communication and Contacts in South-West Scania, Sweden." *Acta Archaeologica* 79, no. 1:110-144.

- Carstens, Lydia. 2016. "Huseby in the Old Norse written sources." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014*, edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen, 11-24. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Christensen, Lisbeth Eilersgaard, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen, eds. 2016. *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014*. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Clarke, Helen, and Kristina Lamm. 2017. *Helgö Revisited a New Look at the Excavated Evidence for Helgö, Central Sweden*. Schleswig: Stiftung Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesmuseen Schloss Gottorf.
- Claessen, Henri M. 2006. "War and State Formation: What is the Connection?" In *Warfare and Society: Archaeological and Social Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Ton Otto, Henrik Thrane, and Helle Vandkilde, 217-226. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Ekman, Tomas. 2000. "Item Husby in Niercia" In *En Bok Om Husbyar*, edited by Michael Olausson, 9-38. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Fabech, Charlotte. 1999. "Centrality in sites and Landscapes." In *Settlement and Landscape: Proceedings of a conference in Århus, Denmark, May 4-7 1998*, edited by Charlotte Fabech and Jytte Ringtved, 455-473. Århus: Jutland Archaeological Society and Aarhus University Press.
- Fabech, Charlotte, and Jytte Ringtved. 1995. "Magtens geografi i Sydsandinavien: Om kulturlandskab, produktion og bebyggelsesmønster." In *Produksjon og Samfunn: Beretning fra 2. nordiske jernaldersymposium på Granavolden Gjestgiveri 7.-10. mai 1992*, edited by Heid Gjøstein Resi, 11-37. Oslo: Universitetets Oldsaksamlin.
- Fabech, Charlotte, and Jytte Ringtved, eds. 1999. *Settlement and landscape: proceedings of a conference in Århus, Denmark, May 4-7 1998*. Aarhus: Jutland Archaeological Society and Aarhus University Press.

- Fischer, Svante, and Helena Victor. 2011. "New horizons for Helgö." In *Excavations at Helgö XVIII*, edited by Birgit Arrhenius and O'Meadhra Uaininn. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhet Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.
- Göthberg, Hans. 2017. "Houses on Helgö: An archaeological analysis of the buildings on Terraces V and VI in Building Group 2 at Helgö." *Upplandsmuseets Rapport* 2017:07. Translated by Helen Clarke. Uppsala: Upplandsmuseet.
- Göthberg, Hans, ed. 2007. *Hus och bebyggelse i Uppland: delar av förhistoriska sammanhang*. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet, UV GAL: Societas archaeological Upsaliensis, and Upplandsmuseet.
- Hedenstierna-Jonson, Charlotte. 2016. "Same, Same but Different – Three case studies reflecting Swedish Husabyar from an archaeological and geographical perspective." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014*, edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen, 41-53. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Henricson, Lars. 1990. "Glas och Glasbägare I Sigtunas Medeltid." In *Makt och Människor I Kungens Sigtuna: Sigtunautgrävningen 1988-90, 28 artiklar om de preliminära resultaten från den arkeologiska undersökningen I kv. Trädgårdsmästaren 9 och 10, Sigtuna*, edited by Sten Tesch, 92-94. Sigtuna: Sigtuna Museer.
- Hjärthner-Holdar, Eva, Kristina Lamm, and Lena Grandin. 2000 "Järn- och metallhantering vid en stormannagård under yngre järnålder och tidig medeltid" In *En Bok Om Husbyar*, edited by Michael Olausson, 39-48. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- Hjärthner-Holdar, Eva, Håkan Ranheden, and Anton Seiler, eds. 2007. *Land och samhälle i förändring : uppländska bygder i ett långtidsperspektiv*. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet, UV GAL: Societas archaeological Upsaliensis, and Upplandsmuseet.

- Kantner, John. 2008. "The Archaeology of Regions: From Discrete Analytical Toolkit to Ubiquitous Spatial Perspective." *Journal of Archaeological Research* 16, no. 1: 37-81.
- Kalmring, Sven, Johan Runer, and Andreas Viberg. 2017. "At Home with Herigar: A Magnate's Residence from the Vendel to Viking Period at Korshamn, Birka (Uppland/s)." *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 47.
- Kowalewski, Stephen A. 2008. "Regional Settlement Pattern Studies." *Journal of Archaeological Research* 16, no. 3: 225-285.
- Lemm, Thorsten. "2016. Excavations and surveys – Husby in Glanshammar, Huseby in Tjølling, Huseby in Varend and Husby in Angla." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014*, edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen, 71-89. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Lindkvist, Thomas. 1991. "Social and Political Power in Sweden 1000-1300: Predatory Incursions, Royal Taxation, and the Formation of a Feudal State." In *Social Approaches to Viking Studies*, edited by Ross Samson, 137-146. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Lindkvist, Thomas. 2016. "Husabyar, administration and taxation in Medieval Sweden." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014*, edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen, 141-149. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Ljungkvist, John, Per Frölund, Hans Göthberg, and Daniel Löwenborg. 2011. "Gamla Uppsala: Structural development of a centre in Middle Sweden." *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 41, no. 4: 571-585.
- Martens, Jes. 2010. "Pre-Roman Iron Age Settlements in Southern Scandinavia." In *Haus - Gehoft - Weiler – Dorf: Siedlungen der Vorromischen Eisenzeit im nordlichen Mitteleuropa: Internationale Tagung an der Freien Universität*

Berlin vom 20.-22. März 2009, edited by Michael Meyer, 229-250.

Rahden/Westf.: Verlage Marie Leidorf.

Nordberg, Andreas. 2008. *Husby I Österåker: Särskild arkeologisk undersökning av del av boplatz RAÄ 209:2 vid Husby, Österåkers socken och kommun, Uppland. Rapport 2008:11.*

Nordin, Ann-Catrin. 1990. "Bronsgjutning." In *Makt och Människor I Kungens Sigtuna: Sigtunautgrävningen 1988-90, 28 artiklar om de preliminära resultaten från den arkeologiska undersökningen I kv. Trädgårdsmästaren 9 och 10, Sigtuna*, edited by Sten Tesch, 73-75. Sigtuna: Sigtuna Museer.

Pettersson, Jonatan. 2000. "Husabyarna – en kritisk forskningsöversikt." In *En Bok Om Husbyar*, edited by Michael Olausson, 49-63. Uppsala: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Pettersson, Mats. 1990. "Järn och Järnsmide." In *Makt och Människor I Kungens Sigtuna: Sigtunautgrävningen 1988-90, 28 artiklar om de preliminära resultaten från den arkeologiska undersökningen I kv. Trädgårdsmästaren 9 och 10, Sigtuna*, edited by Sten Tesch, 76-79. Sigtuna: Sigtuna Museer.

Price, Theron Douglas. 2015 *Ancient Scandinavia: an archaeological history from the first humans to the Vikings*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ros, Jonas. 1990. "Horn – och Benhantverk." In *Makt och Människor I Kungens Sigtuna: Sigtunautgrävningen 1988-90, 28 artiklar om de preliminära resultaten från den arkeologiska undersökningen I kv. Trädgårdsmästaren 9 och 10, Sigtuna*, edited by Sten Tesch, 80-86. Sigtuna: Sigtuna Museer.

Roslund, Mats. 1995. "Tools of trade- spatial interpretations of trade activities in Early Medieval Sigtuna ca. 980-1250." In *Meddelanden från Lunds universitets historiska museum 1993/1994*, vol. 10.

Runer, Johan. 2016. "The Husabyar in the unification process of the Swedish Kingdom." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and perspectives: Papers*

from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen 19-20 March 2014,
edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm, and Anne Pedersen,
165-172. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Sindbæk, Søren M. 2007. "Networks and Nodal Points: The Emergence of Towns in
Early Viking Age Scandinavia." *Antiquity* 81, no. 311: 119-32.

Stjernquist, Berta. 1978. "Approaches to Settlement Archaeology in Sweden." *World
Archaeology* 9, no. 3: 251-264.

Stylegar, Frans-Arne. 2016. "Husebyer in Norway – their archaeological and
topographical context." In *Husebyer – status quo, open question, and
perspectives: Papers from a workshop at the National Museum Copenhagen
19-20 March 2014*, edited by Lisbeth Eilersgaard Christensen, Thorsten Lemm,
and Anne Pedersen, 27-38. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Tesch, Sten. 2001. "Houses town yards and town planning in late viking age and
medieval Sigtuna, Sweden." In *Lübecker Kolloquium zur Stadtarchäologie III,
der Hausbau, 723-741*. Bereich Archäologie der Hansestadt Lübeck von
Manfred Gläser Lübeck.

Widgren, Mats, and Ellen Anne Pedersen. 2011. "Agriculture in Sweden: 800 BC-AD
1000." In *The agrarian history of Sweden: 4000 BC to AD 2000*, edited by
Janken Myrdal and Mats Morell, 46-71. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.