History and archaeology: the state of play in early medieval Europe

Catherine Hills*

How useful is archaeology to historians? Do they use it in their work? If so how? Catherine Hills considers a number of mighty histories of early medieval Europe that have recently appeared and examines how far the extremely productive archaeology of the last two decades has affected them – or failed to.

Keywords: Europe, Roman empire, Migration period, history, archaeology

This paper takes as its starting point three recent books, *Framing the Early Middle Ages* by Chris Wickham, *Europe After Rome* by Julia Smith and *The Fall of Rome*, by Bryan Ward-Perkins. It also makes reference to four other major works published or revised within the last five years: *The Fall of the Roman Empire*, by Peter Heather (2005), *The Origins of the European Economy*, by Michael McCormick (2001), *The Rise of Western Christendom*, by Peter Brown (2003) and *Barbarian Tides*: *The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire*, by Walter Goffart (2006). All seven deal with a period that it might be best to call 'the middle centuries of the first millennium AD in Europe and the Mediterranean' since all other terms reflect specific perspectives. Most define the period as an end, of the Roman empire, or a beginning, of the Early Middle Ages, while others define it in terms of what the author sees as the most important process: *The Rise of Western Christendom* (Brown) or *The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire*, (Goffart) although the last argues against the concept embodied in its title. All these works start from a primarily western European/Mediterranean perspective, and vary in the extent to which they take account of the eastern Mediterranean and northern Europe. All the authors are historians, but (except Goffart) they do engage with and use archaeological evidence, or at least written summaries of that evidence. This is the main reason for discussing them in *Antiquity*, because it is important for archaeologists to be aware of the ways their material is (or is not) being used by historians.

Most of these books, despite considerable size (400-800 pages of text) are not difficult to follow, as they are driven by an argument which carries the reader along. It is not necessary to absorb the details of every saint's life or battle to appreciate the account by Brown of the spread of Christianity, or Heather's story of the successive invasions, coups and campaigns which destroyed the western empire, and their arguments about those processes and events. McCormick argues his case for the existence of significant commercial activity in and around the Mediterranean between AD 300-900 on the basis of specific types of evidence which he lists in appendices - historical accounts of journeys, the sources of Christian relics, and the distribution of coins. Goffart revisits his earlier arguments about accommodation between

---

* *Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, UK (Email: ch35@cam.ac.uk)*

ANTIQUITY 81 (2007): 191–200

Romans and barbarians in order to counter his critics, as well as arguing for '*a history of the Migration Age detached from German nationalism*'.

Wickham, however, is attempting something more difficult, inevitably fraught with more pitfalls – as he recognises – which makes his book much more difficult to read and assess. He tries to let the detailed evidence speak for itself within the 'frameworks' of regional variation and social and economic structures. This inevitably risks losing the wood for the trees and demands rather close reading. In an introductory review Wickham identifies problems which he sets out to overcome, especially the lack of interpretative paradigms and real international scholarship in this field of research. He locates himself in the middle of the continuity/discontinuity debate, claiming to argue for elements of both. This is intrinsically persuasive, but less easy to present than clear adherence to one view or another. His focus is primarily social and economic history - cultural history is left for another book because this one is already '*pretty large*' (p. 7), and religion hardly features as a factor in Wickham's world. While stressing regional variation he tries to overcome national bias in scholarship by comparative thematic discussion: not Italy followed by Spain, but taxation surveyed in all regions, exchange likewise. This is interesting, and convincing: he does show that the disintegration or transformation of the Roman infrastructures of government and economy took different paths in the various parts of Europe he examines. At the end he presents a set of conclusions which do arise logically from the arguments and evidence he has previously set out. In the early middle ages, by comparison with the later empire, fiscal structures were weaker, aristocracies were mostly poorer and had a more strongly military character; regions showed more diversity and possibly more social fluidity.

INNOMINI
XPI VINCAS
SEMPER
PROBVS FAMVLVS V C CONS ORD

In some parts of the book Wickham is speaking with authority, especially in relation to Italy, and perhaps France and Spain. In others he has dared to '*tread on other peoples territories*' and introduced himself and the general reader to fresh and unexpected material – sixth-century buildings still standing two storeys high in Syria, detailed written accounts of eighth-century bureaucracy in Egypt. As it happens, the areas I know better are less successful. In Britain, Wickham admits he has not dug further in the muddy fields of the Anglo-Saxon migrations, but accepts the conclusions of several current syntheses. Since he concludes that Britain had a different history from most of the empire it does not have much impact on the rest of his arguments. He employs one puzzling device, a fictional Anglo-Saxon village, which I suspect acted as a substitute for a feature of historical writing which I find both appealing and frustrating: the use of anecdote. Everyone appreciates stories about individuals, and there are plenty of good ones in the many pages of the books discussed here: Willibald as a youthful smuggler in McCormick, the happily married couple fighting to preserve their marriage against hostile churchmen in Smith. There are also vivid stories about Anglo-Saxon England, but not perhaps relating to the history of landholding, maybe a gap which Wickham felt he had to fill.

An important section of the book, especially for archaeologists, is its treatment of Denmark. It is very welcome to see the rich archaeological material from southern Scandinavia taken into account by an historian brave enough to explore a land almost without written records. None of the other books takes this region seriously on board, even when it appears on their maps. Wickham has read widely in the relevant archaeological literature, he mentions many of the major sites and topics, and his account of rural settlements in Denmark (p. 498-9) is a fair introduction to the subject. But when he moves away from peasant farmers problems emerge, mainly due to misunderstandings of the dating and contexts of the burials and the ceremonial centres. A focus on the end of the Roman empire has led to a foreshortening of chronology and a mis-dating of some of the sites and artefacts he discusses. Contact between Scandinavia and the Roman empire was not, as he supposes, concentrated at the end of the Roman period, but flourished throughout, as evidenced by finds dating from the first century onwards. Wickham does not appreciate this. For example, '*in the fourth (century) one part of the island of Sjaelland was the focus for a set of very rich burials full of Roman imported goods*' (p. 367). This must refer to the rich burials, especially from the cemetery at Himlingoje, which have been dated to the first half of the third century AD. Likewise, in the same paragraph '*in the fourth and fifth centuries we find large sets of bog deposits of weapons*'. These deposits were made throughout the Roman period, with major concentrations in the third and fourth centuries and again in the fifth. On the next page, Gudme was '*at its height in c. 400-550*'. There is support for that statement, but while certainly important at that time, this complex of sites on Fyn came into use earlier, *c*. AD 200; the major part of the imports found there are attributed to the third and fourth centuries and the largest hall so far excavated is dated to the third century. Gudme cannot be interpreted as a '*sign of Roman crisis*' as it flourished throughout the late Roman period, nor can imports arriving in Scandinavia during the third century be described as the result of Germanic armies helping themselves after the fall of the empire (p. 369). Some Scandinavian archaeologists favour the Marcomannic wars, of the late second century, as the trigger for social and political change, not the fifth century, and certainly AD 200 seems to show greater changes in the archaeological evidence than AD 400 or 500.

Not only does Wickham give a misleading impression of the long term dynamic relationship between southern Scandinavia and the Roman empire at its peak, he also plays down the extent and stability of any political structures in southern Scandinavia: '*aristocratic economic dominance over peasant neighbours was not established in Denmark*' (p. 375). Yet the wealth deposited in graves, house foundations and lakes, and the construction of large long-lived buildings in sites producing and accumulating quantities of metalwork, like Gudme, Tisso and Uppåkra, suggests strongly the existence of inequality, and of elites, some of whom seem to have been able to maintain their positions, or at least rebuild the same house, for generations. Wickham gives an account of eighth/ninth century recorded Danish kings, notably King Godfred, which recognises their large scale investments, including major works like the Danevirke, a host of coastal fortifications and the wholesale relocation of trading centres – but nonetheless he compares the political situation in Denmark unfavourably to '*the unbroken political accumulation we found in England*'. This seems to ignore the disruption caused in England by the Vikings – whose activities were spurred at least in part by 'political accumulation' back home. Somehow Denmark is not permitted to have an aristocracy or kings. This leaves the suspicion that his framework was constructed before the details had been assimilated; he had already decided that Danish peasants were not '*entirely subjected in Denmark for a long time*', so he can only accept '*small-scale tribal leadership*' (p. 373). I do not mean to undermine what Wickham has tried to do, because I certainly admire his achievement. I simply want to point out that, where I know the material, I can see Wickham has sometimes taken shortcuts which have led to misleading conclusions. Many of my criticisms derive from weaknesses in communication between historians and archaeologists, for which both sides are responsible, a matter to which I shall return.

Julia Smith provides the cultural history Wickham did not have space for in his book. She eschews detailed narrative accounts in favour of discussion – resting nonetheless on assimilated knowledge of the details – of what life was like for the people of western Europe in the early Middle Ages. Her book has a smaller geographical range than Wickham's, as it does not deal with the eastern Mediterranean, and an overlapping time span – AD 500-1000 as opposed to Wickham's AD 400-800. Although Scandinavia is included it puts in only fleeting appearances, mostly when there is written evidence. The result is very readable, and gives insights into fundamentals of early medieval life: birth, marriage and death, and how people thought about their world. Smith devotes a whole chapter to 'Men and Women' and points out that '*generations of historians found it easy to see the early Middle Ages as a man's world*' (p. 147). It seems they still do. She is the only female author, and the only author to devote more than a couple of pages to women, amongst all those discussed here. Women are discussed by Wickham, mostly in the context of inheritance, but they have fewer entries in his index than wine production – or even wood. In Heather's book there is a list of 'dramatis personae', which includes 92 men and just 3 women, all from one imperial family: Galla Placidia, sister of the emperor Honorius, her daughter Honoria, and granddaughter Eudocia. McCormick does identify and discuss women as a minority, 9 per cent, of his recorded travellers, and there are a fair number of abbesses, saints and other holy women in Brown.

Smith paraphrases the evidence underpinning her discussion and so it is sometimes difficult to assess the factual basis for her statements, although the text is well-referenced. Smith does not use archaeological evidence very much, except in relation to burial, to which there are references in several chapters, especially in relation to demography. Here her discussion is supported by several different case studies, and it is true that reviews on the basis of more comprehensive surveys have come to similar conclusions: life expectancy was low, infant mortality high – although this is more often assumed than demonstrated. The relationship between age, gender and grave-goods, however, varies regionally and chronologically: the conclusions drawn for burials around Metz cannot stand for all of early medieval Europe.

Brian Ward-Perkins' contribution is written by someone who, although employed as a lecturer in modern history, has dealt with Roman potsherds since his childhood, as he tells us, so he is perhaps one of the rare interdisciplinary scholars who manages to be both historian and archaeologist. His book is certainly written from extensive first hand knowledge of the material culture of the Roman world. It is relatively brief and well illustrated, essentially restating the traditional argument that the western Roman empire ended in violence at the hands of barbarian invaders, *contra* the more peaceful transition, transformation or accommodation which other recent authors, such as Brown or Goffart, have presented. It is written with authority and wit and has already won deserved praise and the accolade of appearing in paperback. It is on my, and other peoples', student reading lists, with the hope it will actually be read from cover to cover. Reading it was, however, the stimulus to writing this article, because although I agree with a great deal of what he says and admire the clarity with which he has set it out, there are some points where I find myself in strong disagreement.

In contrast with the other syntheses, that of Ward-Perkins is slim because it is not a detailed history or survey, but a polemic, and his argument is supported by illustrations as well as words. These illustrations have clearly been chosen by the author himself who has written the captions so that they form an integral part of the argument. Certainly one picture can replace 1000 words: compare Ward-Perkins' graph A1 on p. 185 showing the changing origin of wine amphorae arriving at Ostia with the many words in which the same information is embedded in Wickham's chapter on exchange. It seems self-evident that many kinds of information are better conveyed visually than verbally, yet most of the history books have maps as their main, or only, illustrations. Heather includes photographs: but, surprisingly for an author whose earlier works had plenty of illustrations, these seem to have been assembled by a picture researcher, as many of the captions are either inaccurate or misleading (e.g. pl. 20 shows Dougga not Carthage, pl. 21 Carthage, not Bulla Regia, pl. 9 shows a fresco from Pompeii three centuries before Symmachus).

The subjective character of verbal descriptions of material culture is well illustrated by Ward-Perkins' attempt to convey what Roman pottery is like: '*light and smooth to the touch . . . the vessels are solid, pleasant and easy to handle*' (p. 88-9). This description bears little relationship to my own experience of Roman pottery as the heaps of hard grey muddy lumps of fired clay, with rarer pieces of once shiny red samian ware, which constitute the average Romano-British pottery assemblage. But I do relate to his other comment: '*predictable to the point of being dull*'. We are both right in our own perceptions: what this shows is the necessity for direct engagement with the material evidence. The criticism I would make of Ward-Perkins is that he represents non-Roman material culture unfairly, portraying it inaccurately as much less competent than it was, and he actually says very little about the material culture of regions which lay outside the empire. It is possible to read his book as arguing that the inadequacy of 'barbarian' material culture constitutes evidence for the destruction of the Roman empire. He does not actually say this – and is clear that a decline in technological and economic complexity in the empire was related to collapse of the infrastructure and loss of specialised production. But the examples he chooses, of buildings and pottery from post-Roman Britain, could easily be taken as standing for 'barbarian' culture as a whole – which they do not. He recognises the possibility that timber buildings might be more appropriate to northern climates – and grudgingly allows that they can be complex and substantial buildings. But the presumption that stone and brick are the only materials in which elaborate structures can be created, and that pottery is a measure of civilisation, is the result of a narrow Mediterranean, classical, focus.

It is in relation to pottery that I really take issue with Ward-Perkins. He claims that '*in Britain, most pottery was . . . lamentably friable and impractical*' (p. 104) and illustrates this on the facing page with some admittedly lamentable pottery from Yeavering, with the rhetorical question '*pottery fit for a king?*' Even more bizarre is the choice of the pottery bottle from Sutton Hoo to illustrate that site. This is obviously partly a provocative ploy – never mind the impressive buildings at Yeavering or the exquisite gold and garnet fittings from Sutton Hoo, these people could not make a decent pot and so must be judged as incompetent barbarians. However, these specific pots are hardly representative: the sherds from Yeavering belong to a long-lived native tradition and were found in association with other sherds described as 'prehistoric' (Hope-Taylor 1977: 104). The small wheel thrown bottle from Sutton Hoo is unlike contemporary Anglo-Saxon pottery and might be an import from the continent. Pottery has preoccupied many archaeologists – including myself and Ward-Perkins – because it is durable and, in the Mediterranean, plentiful. But that does not mean it had any great value at the time it was made. Elites, in the classical and medieval world, may have used pottery, their servants certainly did, but what was needed for social display was glass and metal. It should not be forgotten that the durable nature of potsherds privileges them as evidence over (equally serviceable) wood and leather. Where the occasional accident of preservation allows, we can see what a wide range of containers could be made from wood, for example at Fallward in north Germany (Schön 1999). The reason we have no mountains of amphorae near London or any other northern city is that beer and wine were carried in wooden barrels, which have decayed or been burnt long since. A barrel can still contain good wine.

Pottery from northern Europe which might in fact be attributed to 'barbarians' is very different from the examples from Yeavering and Sutton Hoo that Ward-Perkins recruits to his argument. While he was cutting his teeth on Roman potsherds, I spent many years excavating, drawing and describing Anglo-Saxon pottery and studying comparable pots from the other side of the North Sea. Although hand-made, these are often well-formed and in many cases carry elaborate decoration, rich in symbolic meaning. Like the Sutton Hoo ornamental metalwork, the decorated pottery of the north is the product of skilled craftsmen and to imply that it fails a test of prestige against mass-produced Roman crockery is a wholly misleading comparison.

In his latest book Walter Goffart expresses a view of archaeology which has often been implicit in historians' writings: he first explains that he has made a deliberate choice not to use archaeological evidence because he does not feel competent to do so, but goes on to say: '*archaeology . . . is very dependent on texts both in posing questions to be investigated and in interpreting unearthed results*' and that archaeologists are often guilty of '*mixed argumentation*' leading to '*muddled and circular arguments*' (Goffart 2006: 12). While the latter two comments may be true of both some archaeologists and some historians, the first point needs attention, since it is indeed what has caused the second. There is little purpose in engaging in archaeological research if it is simply to be used as support for an historical argument. Setting out to prove through excavation that King Arthur existed or that the Black Death caused the desertion of Wharram Percy is always doomed to failure precisely because those are questions posed in historical terms. The archaeological studies will show that in fifth-century Britain there were British chieftains who controlled territories from refortified hillforts, one or other of whom might have been the source for later Arthurian stories, and that the decline of Wharram Percy took many centuries and was the result of various social and economic processes. Such conclusions may seem perfectly satisfactory to archaeologists:

but the initial failure to give a simple answer to a simple historical question is what may stay in the mind of historians and lead them to see archaeology as a waste of time and money. This is less true of economic and social historians who deal in longer term processes, rather than events or politics, which is why Wickham and Smith are more willing to engage with archaeological evidence. But Wickham has clearly absorbed his archaeological information indirectly, through the writings of archaeologists, rather than by any first hand engagement with material culture, and Smith takes a limited role for archaeology for granted: '*in the absence of any documentary records . . . mentalities and social identities that informed life beyond the frontier remain effectively unknown*' (p. 254). Whether or not you agree that archaeology can and does throw light on mentalities this comment betrays a lack of awareness that this is even a topic of debate. In British, and more particularly in Scandinavian thinking, artefacts, buildings, burial mounds, standing stones and landscapes of the early medieval period have for some time been routinely claimed as revealing and mapping local ideologies, identities and mind sets. Far from being 'unknown', the way people thought at a particular place and time is very much part of the territory being staked out by the modern archaeologist, even where there are documents (see for example papers in Dickinson & Griffiths 1999; Hamerow & MacGregor 2001; Carver 2003).

Why is there still a problem of communication between historians and archaeologists? Some commentators see the problem as political, each discipline having to defend its intellectual citadel in a university system that is increasingly competitive rather than co-operative (Andrén 1998: 84; Carver 2002: 490).

I offer four deeper reasons here, which, while deriving from early medieval Europe, may have a more general relevance. Firstly, archaeologists are less willing than they once were to interpret their evidence in the simple ethnic terms which supported historical and political agendas so well: a brooch in a grave is no longer understood as a clear sign of ethnic identity, so distribution maps no longer show where different peoples were, and offer less immediate help to historians plotting migration or invasion.

Secondly, detailed evidence of all kinds undoubtedly suffers when summarised, especially at second or third hand, and in some cases it is syntheses by archaeologists that have led historians in the wrong direction. When Smith says that '*in Denmark settlements continued to wander around until the eleventh or twelfth century*' (p. 57) she is drawing on discussion of Vorbasse in Jutland. Incautious readers might think this indicated a mobile pastoral society and would be surprised to read an account by the excavator of Vorbasse, describing the site as '*evidence of continuity for centuries*', the moves all being made within the same agricultural territory, usually less than 400m at a time (Hvass 1989). When Wickham discusses the channelling of trade through Kent in the early Saxon period he is following Huggett, whose analysis was based largely on finds from inhumation cemeteries (Huggett 1988). But the large cremation cemeteries of eastern England have also produced plenty of evidence for imported goods. At Spong Hill in Norfolk at least 100 burials contained the remains of glass vessels, more than 200 fragments of ivory rings and remains of bronze bowls. Bronze and glass vessels had their origin in the Rhineland or northern France, while the ivory, ultimately African, probably also came via the Rhine (Hills 2001). The two trade zones mapped by Hodges (1977) for later pottery, one south of the Thames with links to France, the other the Rhineland to East Anglia, could well have existed already in the sixth century or earlier: there seems no good reason to suggest all this material could only have reached East Anglia via Kent. While summaries and interim reports helpfully offer current interpretations, they are sometimes contradicted or modified by later fieldwork or research. But it is the summaries which get into the wider literature, causing confusion. For example, a house at Gudme III (Phase 3) was '*the largest house excavated so far in the Gudme area*' in Sorensen 1994a but was soon dethroned by a larger newly excavated house in Sorensen 1994b. This example is not too problematic but there are others, for example successive excavations at Ribe, which have caused revisions to its chronology and confusion in wider discussions of the implications of that chronology (Feveile & Jensen 2000). Just as understanding the complexity of written texts is fundamental to historical scholarship (and often ignored by archaeologists), so understanding the nature of archaeological evidence and its continual refinement through new discovery is essential to our interpretations. We have not always been successful in explaining this to historians.

Thirdly, comparisons cannot be securely made unless it is clear that the evidence is comparable. Settlement sites which have been excavated after most occupation levels have been ploughed away – like Vorbasse or Yeavering – are not immediately comparable to those which have been buried under sand, like Flixborough or West Stow, or built up in layers, like Feddersen Wierde. The subsoil foundations of Yeavering are what remains of what were once large buildings, plastered, painted and furnished with hangings and carved wooden furniture. Where inhumed bone has survived in graves and been subjected to modern scientific analysis it tells us more than discarded or decayed bones. This kind of 'source criticism' is as fundamental to archaeology as it is to history.

My last point concerns the basis, the proper 'framework', for the interpretation of the period as a whole. There are of course many areas of consensus, for example, the varied regional fates of different parts of the former Roman empire. The eastern empire lasted for centuries after the west, different regions took different courses to their later medieval political and economic forms. In the west there was an overall decline in technology, commerce and living standards. The aristocracy became militarised, learning and scholarship became the province of the church. Disagreement remains as to exactly when, how and above all why this happened. There is plenty of evidence, as can be seen from Wickham, as to what happened and to some extent how: it is the reasons which still demand attention. Ward-Perkins reproduces a list of 210 suggested causes of the fall of the Roman empire (fig. 3.1) (anarchy, apathy, bathing . . .). The role played by external barbarian invaders is still surprisingly contested – compare Ward-Perkins' '*violent seizure of power . . . by the barbarian invaders*' (p. 183) with Goffart, who argues that the '*barbarization of the Roman world came from within*' (2006: 229).

But all these, like most accounts of this period, remain firmly embedded within the Roman viewpoint and the written record. Classical civilisation still sits at the roots of western scholarship, and the Roman empire and its destruction retains a fascination for authors, broadcasters and politicians of all hues. The barbarians are still portrayed as wild men from across the Rhine, their motivation explained simply in terms of the obvious attraction of the glory that was Rome to those unlucky enough to live beyond its frontiers. What has been lacking is incorporation of accounts of the home lives of those barbarians, to give the outsiders' perspective. Tacitus is still taken as a better guide than archaeological evidence – perhaps because he wrote his information down, in elegant Latin. Tacitus is a valuable source, but he cannot be an infallible witness even to the peoples beyond the empire of his own day, let alone 300 years later. It has not impinged on historical scholarship that there is now a wealth of information where Tacitus had little. German, Scandinavian and eastern European archaeologists have been active for decades in fieldwork and research, and there is now an enormous literature, much of it in languages which even English scholars can read. McCormick makes the point that '*a rich harvest is still to be gathered in the Arabic and Hebrew sources*' and for archaeologists Polish and Russian might be even more important (p. 124). But what of the archaeological harvest already gathered into the barns?

Even Heather, who knows south-eastern Europe better than most, writes with reference to a region he defines as *Jastorf Europe* (which on his map includes northern Germany and Denmark): '*its population . . . by the birth of Christ had produced no substantial settlements, not even villages*' and had '*a greater emphasis on pastoral agriculture*' (p. 57). Yet substantial settlements can be seen around the North Sea during the pre-Roman Iron Age, for example Hodde, near Ribe in Jutland (Hvass 1985). Some of the best known settlement sites, such as Feddersen Wierde, began in the first century BC, and stayed in the same place for centuries. Not all their inhabitants were engaged in subsistence agriculture: the wealth deposited in graves, lakes and houses suggests that surplus existed and was used to create and maintain inequality. Society appears to have been organised for warfare, to judge from weapon sacrifices and coastal fortifications. Although many of the weapons, and gold, silver and glass arrived in the north as imports, there were also native craftsmen capable of making artefacts as good as or better than those made within the empire. The peoples of northern Europe were settled agriculturalists with skilled craftsmen, a competitive and warlike elite and considerable knowledge of, and contact with, the Roman empire. This complex society, of which archaeological scholars are well aware, has somehow contrived to keep itself hidden from the writers of historical syntheses. At the least, understanding of the process by which the Roman Empire became the medieval kingdoms of Europe would be advanced by treating the peoples outside the empire as equal human players, rather than forces of nature or acts of God.

References

Andrén, A. 1998. *Between artifacts and texts. Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. New York.

Brown, P. 2003. *The Rise of Western Christendom. Triumph and Diversity AD 200-1000* (Second Edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Carver, M. 2002. Marriages of true minds: Archaeology with texts, in B. Cunliffe, W. Davies & C. Renfrew (ed.) *Archaeology. The Widening Debate*: 465-496. Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press.

–(ed.) 2003. *The Cross goes North. Processes of conversion in northern Europe AD 300-1300*. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Dickinson, T. & D. Griffiths (ed.) 1999. *The Making of Kingdoms* (Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 10). Oxford.

Feveile, C. & S. Jensen. 2000. Ribe in the 8th and 9th Century. A contribution to the Archaeological Chronology of North Western Europe. *Acta Archaeologica* 71: 9-24.

Hamerow, H. & A. MacGregor (ed.) 2001. *Image and Power in the Archaeology of Early Medieval Britain. Essays in honour of Rosemary Cramp*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Hills, C. 2001. From Isidore to Isotopes: ivory rings in early medieval graves, in H. Hamerow & A. MacGregor (ed.) *Image and Power in the Archaeology of Early Medieval Britain. Essays in honour of Rosemary Cramp*: 131-146.

Hodges, R. 1977. Some Early Medieval French Wares in the British Isles, in D. Peacock (ed.) *Pottery and Early Commerce*: 239-255. New York: Academic Press.

Hope-Taylor, B. 1977. *Yeavering*. London: HMSO.

Huggett, J. 1988. Imported Grave Goods and the Early Anglo-Saxon Economy. *Medieval Archaeology* XXXII: 63-96.

Hvass, S. 1985. *Hodde Et vestjysk landsbysamfund fra aeldre jernalder*. Copenhagen.

–1989. Rural settlements in Denmark in First Millennium AD, in K. Randsborg (ed.) *The Birth of Europe: Archaeology and social development in the first millennium AD (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum XVI)*: 91-99.

Goffart, W. 2006. *Barbarian Tides: The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire.* Philadelphia (PA):University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heather, P. 2005. *The Fall of the Roman Empire*. London: Macmillan.

McCormick, M. 2001. *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce AD 300-900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, M.D. 1999. *Feddersen Wierde, Fallward, Flögeln: Archäologie im Museum Burg Bederkesa, Landkreis Cuxhaven*. Bad Bederkesa: Museum Burg Bederkesa.

Smith, J. 2005. *Europe after Rome. A new cultural history 500-1000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sørensen, P.O. 1994a. Houses, Farmsteads and settlement pattern in the Gudme area, in P.O. Nielsen, K. Randsborg & H. Thrane (ed.) *The Archaeology of Gudme and Lundborg* (Arkælogiske Studier 10). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen Institute for Archaeology & Ethnology: 41-7.

–1994b. Gudmehallerne. Kongeligt byggeri fra jernalderen. *Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark* 1994: 25-39. Copenhagen: Danish National Museum.

Ward-Perkins, B. 2005. *The Fall of Rome and the end of civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wickham, C. 2005. *Framing the Early Middle Ages. Europe and the Mediterranean 400-800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.