

Abstract

This essay deals with the late 19th and early 20th century excavations of Bronze Age barrows in the small village of Hasslöv. A normal Bronze Age barrow is visible to the untrained eye, but in this case, the barrows of Hasslöv differ from the majority of the mounds located in Skåne and southern Halland. In Hasslöv they are almost impossible to spot for the untrained eye.

In this essay I will try to find the reason for the location of the barrows and if possible, see if there's any evidence of a economic boom in the burial material found in these barrows that can explain why the majority of them were built during the late Bronze Age.

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Problem.....	2
3. Method.....	3
3.1 Maps.....	3
3.2 Field Observations.....	3
3.3 Earlier Writings.....	3
4. Result.....	4
4.1 Travel Route	4
4.2 Statistics as a Support for Economic Wealth.....	6
5. Discussion	8
5.1 An Emergence of Iron Working Theory	8
5.2 A Protection Fee Theory.....	9
5.3 Is There an Answer?	10
5.4 Why did it all End?.....	10
6. Bibliography.....	11

Appendix I – III is excluded of this version of the essay due to copyright issues

Appendix IV – A List of Excavated Barrows

Appendix V – A List of Artefacts Found in Those Barrows

Appendix VI – A List of the Dimensions of the Barrows and the Central-graves

1. Introduction

In the fall of 1868 a Danish archaeologist named Vilhelm Boye came to the small rural village Hasslöv in southern Halland. He had been appointed by the local lord to the manor of Skottorp to excavate a number of barrows in the small community. He started to work in a fast pace, excavating no less than nineteen barrows in less than thirty days, possibly making some mistakes since some of the barrows are noted to contain no central grave. The report from the excavations was published as “Ättehögar I Södra Halland” in the paper “Hallands Fornminnesförenings Tidskrift” the following year.

Almost fifty years later the local priest (and amateur archaeologist), Victor Ewald were saddened by the state of one of the barrows that hadn't been excavated by Boye. The mound, today known as “Lugnarohögen” was damaged and had been used as a garbage dump by the villagers. Being one of the foremost experts in local history, Ewald knew that the barrow wasn't excavated in 1868, even though he admits in his book “Sydhalländska Fornminnen” that he had a hard time locating all the barrows that were excavated that year (Ewald 1926:17). At this time the era of mound excavations were coming to an end and the archaeologists doubted that there was any point in excavating the barrow. This reasoning made it an almost impossible task for Ewald to convince anyone to restore and excavate the mound. Yet, when he finally managed to get the archaeologist Folke Hansen to excavate it, a new type of grave was unearthed beneath the mound. After removing the actual mound, the usual secondary burials and the cairn, a ship setting was unearthed it contained two cremated burials and one unique dagger among other more standardized Bronze Age artefacts. Today, due to Ewald's initiative, the barrow has been fully restored¹ and a museum has been built in the mound, which makes it possible for ordinary people to see the ship setting from a tunnel inside the mound. The artefacts that were unearthed in the mound are also displayed in the museum, though not in their original place. Folke Hansen also excavated another barrow close to Lugnaro, today named Flintarp 3:4 that was also badly damaged and in need of restoration. This makes the total count of excavated barrows in the village twenty, even though eighteen of those were excavated in a great hurry². One barrow has been excavated twice, and that's the one named “Bussehög”, which was first excavated by the school teacher Bruzelius in 1854 and then again by Boye in 1868³. “Bussehög” or mound no 5 is also one of four excavated barrows that can be placed in the early Bronze Age. Of the other barrows, six cannot be dated at all since Boye either missed the central graves or they weren't

¹ It's possible that the restoration made the barrow look too good.

² Mound no 16 on Boyes map were never excavated since it was deemed to be destroyed.

³ Ewald claims that the barrow excavated isn't the actual “Bussehög” (Appendix IV).

present anymore (meaning either plundered or the mound could be natural) and ten can be placed in the late Bronze Age (both of the barrows excavated by Hansen falls into this category). Of course there are several other barrows in the vicinity of the village, but none of them have been excavated, with the exception of “Gullshög” that were excavated after it had been destroyed. This excavation was made by Ewald himself, who later went on to excavate several other barrows in nearby areas until his death in 1930. All the research of Victor Ewald have been published as a series of books called “Sydhalländska Fornminnen” which was published in four volumes.

Today the village seems quite unaware of the distant past and the only thing that might remind the villagers of past times is the museum of “Lugnarohögen” and the tourists that it attracts. Being a local myself (even though not from the actual village, but from another village some twenty kilometres away) I wasn’t even aware of the other mounds located in the area. Still there are at least thirty of them (ten or more that remains unexcavated) and a possible settlement site given that Ewald found somewhere around one thousand four hundred artefacts in the area. A coin treasure has also been unearthed in the area containing two hundred and fifty roman coins ranging from the period of 55 AD to 220 AD. It seems like this is the last major find in the area and that the era of economic wealth for the area was over by then.

The main thing that attracted my attention to this subject was the location of the mounds in the landscape and the fact that they aren’t as grand as the textbook examples of southern Skåne. At first my study consisted only of the most famous barrow, “Lugnarohögen”. When I realised that there were a lot more barrows in the vicinity I decided that it would be good to include the other barrows in the study to have a larger number of barrows for a better statistical result. This applies mainly to the second problem that I present below, in the section called “Problem”.

2. Problem

The statistic mentioned in the introduction raises some confusion and leads to the questions that are the reason for writing this essay,

- Why are the barrows located in a valley and not on the surrounding heights?
- Is there any evidence of sudden economic wealth in the burial material that’ll explain why most of the barrows were raised in a time when the mound building in most parts of Sweden had ended?

3. Method

The methods that has been used during the writing of this essay to gather information could be split into three categories; maps, field observations and studies of earlier writings. There has been some problem with the written material since it's either culture historical, processional or written by enthusiasts as in the case of Victor Ewald. You could say that this essay is an interpretation of these writings, even though that's not entirely correct. I've also had a conversation with Erik Rosengren who is responsible for archaeological research at the county administration of Halland.

3.1 Maps

During the preparations for writing this essay I spent some time studying old maps, mainly the map of Boye (Appendix I) and some recent maps, the modern day settlement map and the area map called "Blåa Kartan". Even though I couldn't find a copy of the paper from 1868 I found a copy of the map that Boye made in an essay by Lennart Carlie (Appendix I).

3.2 Field Observations

I've also done some field observations, that mainly consisted of walking around (and driving) in the areas of Hasslöv, Ränneslöv, Edenberga, Hov and the forests between Hasslöv and Hishult. The observations mostly consisted of taking photos of the mounds and noting other objects or formations in the landscape that might support my theories.

3.3 Earlier Writings

When I started researching the subject I thought that it might be hard to find any written material on the subject. Fortunately this wasn't the case, but most of the material were very old, especially the relevant material (i.e. the material that is referred to in newer essays). I found that the writings of Victor Ewald, dating from the 1920:s, is still the most relevant source of information. This since it's the only written work that focuses on the actual area. More modern writing as those written by Lennart Carlie and Lennart Lundborg has also been studied, but these two authors often leaves out information or doesn't focus on the actual area. A book written by P.V Glob, "Högarnas folk" has been studied to get an impression of the popular, or professional view of barrows and how the barrows in Hasslöv differs from that one. A book about Iron Age settlements by Carlie has also been studied to get an impression of where those were located.

4. Result

During the writing of this essay I found a couple of answers the questions. The first problem is the one that's the easiest one to answer. The second problem is harder to pin down and should be discussed more than the first one.

4.1 Travel Route

Early in the preparations of this essay the reasons for the mounds location down in a valley isn't as strange as it might seem. The village of Hasslöv is a pretty old settlement and has been around since at least middle neolithic or perhaps even earlier. Still there's a lack of known megalithic constructions in the area, something that might point to that the "golden age" of the area was yet to come. I write "known" megalithic constructions since the megalithic constructions in the nearby areas has been uncovered beneath mounds thought to be of Bronze Age date (consisting of two chamber tumulus's in Snöstorp and Eldsberga (one them actually used as a burial mound during early Bronze Age when two oak coffins had been buried close to the chamber tumulus)) (Lundborg 1972:13). Since there's somewhere around ten unexcavated barrows and probably several other mounds that has been destroyed through time, we cannot know for sure that there aren't any megalithic constructions in the area. The multitude of stone axes from middle neolithic that was uncovered by Victor Ewald is the best support for an early neolithic settlement in the area. A possible settlement site might also be found one day thanks to the fact that Ewald wrote on the axes where he found them.

The earliest identified and excavated monumental graves in the area are the burial mounds of the early Bronze Age, that today numbers to four excavated ones. The most impressive one of those are the mound known as "Bussehög" or barrow no 5 where two stone cists containing skeletal burials were found in 1854 and one urn containing a cremated late Bronze Age burial in 1868. The other ones are less impressive and hasn't been given a name in local folklore, but it's still worth noting that the preferred material for building cists in the area have always been stone, not oak. The reason for this might be the lack of any forests in the area with the exception of birch forests. Birch is known to have been used at least at one occasion as cist material, though that burial has been carbon-dated to the late Bronze Age. It is possible that it was easier to build the cists of stone than to travel a long way to get wood that matches the criteria's for cist building in a way the Danish oaks do.

In neolithic the area that today is far from the sea, was actually a bay and during the whole Bronze Age the former areas of sea was still uninhabitable marshland. The farming that usually is pointed out to be the main occupation of the Bronze Age people can also be ruled out by the

location since Hasslöv before the 18th century the area was a sandy heather clad moor (the concentration of sand and stones in the burial mounds are far greater than the textbook examples of southern Skåne). This leaves us with only one possible option for the people of Hasslöv as main occupation, trade or at least something vaguely related to trade. The location of the settlement was ideal for trade in those times since it is located between two major areas of great mound concentration, the peninsula of Bjäre and the area around modern day Halmstad. Possible cultural influences can also be traced to those areas in the construction of the mounds (three ship settings has been located beneath mounds as of today (with the exception of the one in Hasslöv), one in Snöstorp close to Halmstad and two at the peninsula of Bjäre). It's also possible that there has been some influence from the stone cist building people of Småland in the early Bronze Age.

A thing that points to the existence of a trade route during those times is the location of mounds in the whole area of southern Halland. If I were to walk from the area of modern day Snöstorp to the area of modern day Grevie I would be able to see at least one mound at each notable height in the landscape, this is with the exception of Hasslöv. Especially the area of Hov (located near modern day Laholm) has a lot of traces of this practice of building barrows near a travelling route. Hov is located near a fordable place during the Bronze Age are a complex of eight barrows and two raised stones of unknown purpose. When standing by the last one of those barrows you can actually see another barrow outside the modern village of Edenberga. Standing beside the barrow in Edenberga (also the location of two excavated non mound Bronze Age burials (Lundborg 1972:27)) you can see the church of Ränneslöv. Ränneslöv has been built around the church and the name of the village means “the grave monument of Randver” so there's a possibility that the church could be located on the site of an earlier mound. If you're standing besides the church of Ränneslöv you can see a complex of three mounds on the other side of the creek Smedjeån and from those mounds you can spot Hasslöv (Hasslöv is probably named after one of the mounds in the area since the name Hasslöv means “the grave monument of Hader”). If the barrows in a distant past worked as markings for civilised territory, this would be a good way to signal that you can travel this way without problems, thus making the barrows mark a travel route.

In conclusion, all those things, the location of mounds, the marshland and the general location of the area, indicates that people might have travelled this way during the Bronze Age and later on. A location of a travel/trade route that passes the mounds would explain why they're located in valley and not on the surrounding heights. When travellers can spot the monuments as they travel by them on a road there's no reason to build the mounds on a difficult place like the

Hallandsås even though it would be formidable. Though not worth the work effort needed to pull off such an task (the Hallandsås also reaches its greatest height nearby Hasslöv, Högalteknall). It's also possible that the travel route could be extended to a route into Småland or at least into the middle age province "Hisholte leen" known for its richness of bog-ore. This explanation is only valid for the barrows that are concentrated to the main village/settlement, since both before and after today's village the barrows seem to be built high up on the slope of Hallandsåsen, as in the case of Harahöj in Östra Karup (there are a total of four barrows in Östra Karup) and two unnamed barrows located in the Yllevad area. Those barrows seems to confirm the existence of a travel route to the more populated areas of Bjäre since they're located along a road that ends in the village of Grevie on the peninsula of Bjäre. The same goes for the barrows in the Yllevad area as those are located near a fordable place over the creek Stensån. The name Yllevad also means "the fordable place near the wolves". This name is obviously pretty old since there haven't been any wolves in the area in quite some time. As is the case of the mound near Edenberga, the barrows of Yllevad were probably visible a long way from the actual location.

4.2 Statistics as a Support for Economic Wealth

As the argumentation of the previous chapter leads to a possible answer of the first problem in this essay, we will continue to the second problem in this essay. Using statistics we will reason whether the burial materials in the mounds excavated by Boye, Hansen, Ewald and Bruzelius does reflect a rise in economic wealth in the areas during the late Bronze Age. A brief look at the statistics says that the activity in the areas accelerates during the late Bronze Age, this since the number of graves is larger during these times. The later graves are the richest ones if you look at both the statistics over burial material and the effort put into building the monuments, like the eight metre ship setting in "Lugnarohögen" that has been dated to the late Bronze Age. The mound given one of the most grand folklore name is also from the late Bronze Age ("Kungshög"), and besides that the uniqueness of the dagger found in "Lugnarohögen" indicates that the settlement might have had some form of casting expertise or at least the possibility to buy those things.

There's one troubling thing though and that is the fact that the richest grave besides "Lugnarohögen" is from the early Bronze Age, the one named 14 or 2 in the documentation of Boye. This grave has a number of 50 artefacts recovered, albeit 47 of them might be 1 artefact (Appendix IV) since the 47 small bronze-plates that were found might be part of some kind of jewellery. It should also be noted that there is a lack of the traditional "tutulus" artefacts of the early Bronze Age in the graves (one artefact just isn't enough). The preservation possibility of

stone and sand doesn't match the one of the Danish oak cists mentioned by Glob either. Most of the graves have been destroyed by time and many of the metal artefacts are heavily eroded. Only barrow no 15 is anywhere close to the Danish barrows when it comes to preservation, since Boye discovered clothing fibres and preserved wood in this grave (Ewald 1926:78-85).

Is there enough evidence of greater economic wealth in the late Bronze Age than in the early Bronze in the burial material? I would say so. The lack of central graves in some of the mounds poses a problem though, but still there seem to be an expansion of the settlement in the fact that there are a far greater number of possible upper class burials. The burials of the early Bronze Age are few only five. The numbers of mounds raised over cremated burials are far greater, eleven, and the number of secondary burials outnumbers those, sixty-seven. The tweezers, sickles and razors of the late Bronze Age burials also dominates the artefact list in appendix V. This could be related to the great number of secondary burials (I have no way of knowing this since the documentation of Boye doesn't tell me this) I still don't think so since there are just too much that points in the other direction. Even if the lost central graves should all prove to be of the early Bronze Age we would still have a fifty-fifty situation with the richest and most work demanding grave construction in the late Bronze Age. Given the existing excavated material (and totally ignoring the ca 15 barrows that hasn't been excavated) I think that the burial material of the barrows points to an economic boost of the late Bronze Age periods, possibly extending into the Iron Age given the unsure dating of "Gullshög". The existence of "Gullshög" is also problematic in a way, mostly because it was used as a gravel-pit and had been destroyed (Ewald 1926:114) by this use and therefore cannot be dated properly. But if the folklore had given the barrow such a grand name, then there surely must be a reason for this, especially since it almost certainly had been robbed (all that was left of a ca 4 metres high and 30 metres long barrow was a one metre sand-hill, some burned bones and an arrowhead). The arrowhead might have reached the location much later than the other things as in the case of the flint axe of barrow 13 (Ewald 1926:71-72). After all it might have been the robbers who lost it there and then the whole basis for the dating is invalid.

So, if we were looking plain hard at the burial material we find that there is a raise in economic wealth during the last three periods of the Bronze Age. According to Ewald's description of the graves, that are very thorough for being a amateur archaeologist, and certainly is better than many professionals of that era (in fact Lundborg writes that it is thanks to Ewald's thoroughness that the description of Lugnarohögen and Flintarp 3:4 are so detailed) I have to draw one conclusion; most of the burial material in form of grave gifts are located in the secondary graves (if the grave

have been raised in period I-III). This might be blamed on grave-robbing of course but to what extend? It doesn't seem plausible that a whole society would rob graves to that extent. If we add to this that the graves that have taken the most work resources and where they used the scarce topsoil to build graves are located in the late Bronze Age. Lugnárohögen and Flintarp 3:4 are the only barrows in the area that has been built by topsoil; all the others were built by sand or rocks and covered with a small amount of heather-clad soil on top. This weren't common practice elsewhere, but is wise in an area where the surrounding land was made up of heather and sand (Ewald 1926:18-108,114,118-158 and 165-170). So my conclusion is that there is an economic boom that's supported by the burial material in the barrows that has been excavated.

5. Discussion

There are a few things that aren't proved by archaeological findings in the area, but they still could be relevant for the essay and therefore is worth mentioned, even though not in the result chapter of the essay.

5.1 An Emergence of Iron Working Theory

Today we know that the old definitions of prehistory into a Stone Age, a Bronze Age and an Iron Age aren't as definitive as they sound. Tools of stone were widely in use during the Bronze Age and the Iron Age and bronze were still a symbol of social status in the Iron Age and it never really broke through as an every day material since all bronze were imported. The common conclusion seems to be that the common people switched from stone to iron, leaving out the bronze stage since bronze were a rare material even in the period named as the Bronze Age.

What relevance is there for my essay in this you might ask? The location of the settlement between an area rich of bog-ore (which was the major source of iron in the early iron age) and areas who would want iron but didn't have it in the nearby area is something that I think is relevant. Mostly because the areas in which this bog-ore is located were well travelled by man in the Bronze Age and if were moving to a new metal in the late Bronze Age periods of V and VI, to which the most magnificent and monumental graves date, this is something that would open for trade. Possibly by people with great expertise in the area of trading since they been a part of a trade route since ever. In the bog-ore rich areas there are also a number of possible Iron Age graves and the mounds that seem to be placed in a system related to a trade route in the nearby area do continue in the direction of the bog-ore rich lands⁴. Still there's no clear evidence that

⁴ Referring to the last two barrows in Yllevad.

support this theory, with the exception of Lennart Lundborgs dating of the “Gullhög” to the Iron Age (Lundborg 1972:17). This barrow is supposed to have been the most magnificent of all the barrows according to Victor Ewald (Ewald 1926:114) and an Iron Age dating of this barrow might support this theory, yet the evidence for any dating of this barrow is scarce (nothing more than an arrowhead). Ewald and Lundborg don’t agree about the dating as Ewald thinks the arrowhead to be of Bronze Age IV (Lundborg 1972:17). In all this makes the iron working theory nothing more than just an intriguing theory.

5.2 A Protection Fee Theory

Another thing that’s worth mentioning but there’s still no archaeological evidence for is the tradition of highwaymen and/or robberies on the “Hallandsås”. This theory is based on the activities in the area during historical times and has no real connection to the archaeological material, but is still worth mentioning. The traditional view of the Bronze Age is one of a beautiful time with no real problems or conflicts. Or at least this is the case according to Glob in his book “Högarnas folk”. This interpretation rhymes badly with the history of this place and the tradition of defying authorities and making some extra money on beating (sometimes murdering) and robbing travellers who’s about to pass over the “Hallandsås”. This tradition is well supported in written sources and it would fit kind of well within the trade route theory. The theory is that the economic wealth of this settlement close to the trade route and a dangerous part of it would demand a protection fee in goods or other things by the traders. Paying would be guarantee for a safe passage over the “Hallandsås” to Bjäre. Some of those who paid would probably be robbed and left to die up in the hills anyway, just like the mailmen of the 17th and the 18th century AD. Of course this is in conflict with the common view of the Bronze Age as generally peaceful and happy time, but we should also keep in mind that this “happy time”-theory is an after-construct too. There’s nothing that really proves this theory with the exception of the need to explain why a well established trade route was abandoned when another option arouse. Besides that there are a lot of examples throughout history that shows that sometimes a whole village can support a highwaymen tradition or more common a pirate tradition (look at the history of many coastal towns in the UK for an example). A general tradition of grave robbery might also explain the lack of central graves in some mounds and the appearance of period II burial gifts in a period IV-V grave (Ewald 1926:78-85).

5.3 Is There an Answer?

When where talking about economic wealth there's a lot of things that cannot be answered in burial material, which leaves my answer to the second question raised in this essay open. There's the theory that there might have been a founder in the village. This cannot be proven by only looking at the burial material. Yes, there's this unique dagger, but this dagger could just as easily been founded somewhere else. Other questions that cannot be answered by only looking at the burial material are whether the persons buried in the secondary graves in the mounds are the upper class or if they're just everyone in the settlement. There is no final answer to this question since we have no way of knowing the size of the settlement. Maybe the settlement were small like the village is today⁵? There's also the case of that the rich graves might be a suicide construction, meaning that the settlement uses all of its resources to build this magnificent grave for the daughter of a "big man". We have historical parallels today in the crowning of emperor Bokassa in the Republic of Central Africa. This is highly unlikely, but it would explain the lack of any real findings in the area from early Roman Iron Age and later on. This is of course dependent on who's right concerning the barrow "Gullhög", Ewald or Lundborg.

5.4 Why did it all End?

One thing is sure about the prehistoric settlement in Hasslöv. Its golden age came to an end and it never came back. The end is somewhat synchronous with the appearance of the first major artefacts in the modern coastal villages of the area. We know for sure that the trade route had been abandoned by the time of Karl XII given his road markings that's nowhere near Hasslöv but passes by Skottorp and is more in line with the main roads of today.

There could be an answer in the fact that bog-ore produces low quality iron and isn't used widely after a while, but since the theory of bog-ore isn't proved it's hard to use this as an explanation of the demise of the settlement. Demise probably a strong word since the settlement still exists in a way (at least five of the barrows are located inside the modern day village).

Another more plausible theory is that the travel route became obsolete when the marshland dried up. After all, the shortest route between two points is a straight line. Yet this is a construct that requires the existence of maps, otherwise there would be no way of knowing that you were travelling in a straight line.

⁵ Hasslöv has about 500 residents today.

6. Bibliography

- Carlie, Lennart, Arkeologen Vilhelm Boye och undersökningarna vid Hasslöv 1868-69, Utskrift 5 sid. 39-48, Halmstad, 1996
- Carlie, Lennart, Bebyggelsens mångfald, Wallin & Dahlholm Boktryckeri AB, Lund, 1999
- Ewald, Victor, Sydhalländska fornminnen "För Sydhalland", Theo Lundbergs Boktryckeri, Laholm, 1926
- Glob, P.V., Högarnas folk, Det Berglinske Bogtrykkeri, Köpenhamn, 1971
- Lundborg, Lennart, Undersökningar av bronsåldershögar i södra Halland, AB Civilttryckeriet, Halmstad, 1972
- Lundborg, Lennart, Svenska fornminnesplatser 5: Lugnarohögen, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1974

Appendix I – III is excluded of this version of the essay due to copyright issues

Appendix IV
A List of Excavated Barrows

NO (or name)	NCG	CGIC	SGIU	C	Excated by	Year
1(15)			2	Y	V. Boye	1868
2(14) ¹	1		3	N	V. Boye	1868
3(13)		1	3	N	V. Boye	1868
4(7)	1		5	N	V. Boye	1868
5, (Bussehög ²)	2		1	N	N. Bruzelius V. Boye	1852 1868
6(8)			2	N	V. Boye	1868
7(9)	1		3	N	V. Boye	1868
8(10)		1	9	N	V. Boye	1868
9(11)		1	4	Y	V. Boye	1868
10(12)		1	4	Y	V. Boye	1868
11(4)		1	3	Y	V. Boye	1868
12(2)		1		N	V. Boye	1868
13(1)		1	1	N	V. Boye	1868
14(4)			5	N	V. Boye	1868
15(5)		1	2	Y	V. Boye	1868
16(18) destroyed					V. Boye	1868
17(6) Kungshög		1	2	Y	V. Boye	1868
18(16)			2	Y	V. Boye	1868
19 Rankebjärshögen		1	2	N	V. Boye	1868
Flintarp 3:4		1	2	Y	F. Hansen	1926
Lugnarohögen		1	2	Y	F. Hansen	1926
Myrhögen ³			1		cultivation	not
Prästhögen ⁴			1		cultivation	not
Gullhögen ⁵			1		V.Ewald	1926
Burials in total	5	12	60			

NCG = Non Cremated Grave

CGIC = Central Grave Is a Cremated burial

SGIU = Secondary (cremated) Grave In Urn

C = line of curbstones (Y/N)

Year = year of excavation

Excavated by = name or if the findings appeared during cultivation

1) The stone-cist in the barrow was empty and had never been used (Ewald 1926:22)

2) Ewald states that barrow no 5 isn't the barrow know as "Bussehög" (Ewald 1926:36)

3) Destroyed a long time ago but cremated bones from a urn has been found during cultivation.

4) Destroyed a long time ago but cremated bones and ceramics from a urn has been found during cultivation.

5) The barrow "Gullhögen" were once the largest of them all, but by the time it was excavated it had been used as gravel-pit for some time and were almost destroyed (Ewald 1926:114). Lennart Lundborg belives that the barrow is actually an Iron Age barrow (Lundborg 1972:20) and Ewald believes it to be from Bronze Age IV. The state of the barrow makes it hard to tell who's right or wrong in this case.

Still somewhere around 15-20 barrows remains unexcavated or destroyed. The first number in the name or number column is the first number that Boye assigned to the barrows and the one that Ewald uses in his descriptions. The second one is the one that Boye uses on his map.

Appendix V
A List of Artefacts Found in These Barrows

Artefact	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	17	18	19	G	L	F
Daggers					1		1	1							1	1				1	1
Razors		1	1	1			1		1		1			1						1	1
Knives (in general)				1										1						1	
Sickles				1			1														
Tweezers									1						1					1	
Bowls	1	1	1				1		1			1									
Needles				1									1					3		1	
Doublebuttons	1	1		1										1		1				1	2
Fibulas				1																	
Rings									1												
Bracelets					2																
Tutulus		1																			
Bronzeplates														47							
Arrowhead																			1		
Artefacts (by mound)	2	4	2	6	3	-	4	1	4	-	1	1	1	50	2	2	-	3	1	6	4

The 47 bronze-plates in grave 14 are parts of some kind of jewellery. The barrows with no artefacts at all are either destroyed or have been raided. G is short for "Gullhögen", L f or "Lugnarohögen" and F for "Flintarp 3:4". Prästhögen and Myrhögen aren't represented in this table because the table is based on discoveries made by Boye (Carlie 1996:44) with additions from Ewald (Ewald 1926:18-108,114,118-158 and 165-170) and Lennart Lundborg (Lundborg 1972:29-30).

Appendix VI

A List of the Dimensions of the Barrows and the Central-graves

No	Barrow dimensions		Cist dimensions		Material
	Radius	Height	Short side	Long side	
1	17,3	1,2	D	D	D
2	15	1,6	0,39	1,4	Stone
3	13,9	2,7	C	C	Urn
4	9,7	2,3	0,42	2,1	Stone
5	15,4	2,3	0,44	2	Stone
6	9,4	2,3	C	C	Urn
7	18,5	3,1	C	C	Urn
8	22,3	3,6	0,38	1,88	Stone
9	14,5	2,3	0,55	1,3	Stone
10	15,2	2,1	C	C	Urn
11	16,8	3,1	C	C	C
12	12	2,2	C	C	C
13	9,4	2,2	C	C	C
14	14,1	1,7	C	C	Stone
15	17,3	2,8	0,43	1,15	Stone ¹
16	D	D	D	D	D
17	14,8	2,2	0,65	2,25	Stone
18	13,2	1,2	C	C	Stone
19	18	1	C	C	C
L	10	3,75	2	8	Stone ²
F	8	1	0,4	1	Stone
			0,35	0,9	Stone

C = Cairn

D = Destroyed

1) The stone-cist contained another cist made of birch (Ewald 1926:78-85) that resembled the oak-cist found in Danish barrows from the early Bronze Age. It was sealed with resin that has been carbon-dated to 853 BC \pm 75 years (Lundborg 1972:30).

2) The dimension of the ship setting. In the mound there were two smaller stone-cists, one in the ship setting with a dimension of 0,4x0,5 metres and one secondary with the dimensions of 0,25x0,45 metres (Lundborg 1972:17).

The radius and height that is given here is before restoration. Today "Lugnarohögen" (L) is larger than specified here. That is also the case of Flintarp 3:4 (F). Though the largest one according to Ewald; "Gullhögen" were in such terrible state that the original dimensions cannot be estimated in a fair enough sense. Barrow 17 was gravely damaged and the original dimensions were larger than specified here. Based on (Carlie 1996:42) and (Ewald 1926:18-108,114,118-158 and 165-170).