DANISH JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY, 2017
VOL. 6, NO. 2, 109–117
https://doi.org/10.1080/21662282.2017.1338640

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Check for updates

The Norwegian bureaucratic aristocracy and their manor houses in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries

Jørn Øyrehagen Sunde[a] and Guttorm Rogdaberg[b]

[a]Faculty of Law, University in Bergen, Norway; [b]Government scholar, Norway

ABSTRACT

Except royal castles in major Norwegian towns, only two stone castles were built by Norwegian aristocrats in the High Middle Ages. All other aristocrats lived in wooden buildings. Of these only Lagmannsstova at Aga in Hardanger remains. It has been attributed to the appeal court judge Sigurd Brynjulffson, though to have been constructed at the end of the thirteenth century as one unique building. However, investigations show that the remaining hall made up less than one-third of a building complex containing two halls, a chapel, kitchen and living quarters, all built at the first half of the thirteenth century. Investigations also show that the powers of the appeal court judge were drastically expanded at the same time, not at least by the Norwegian Code of the realm of 1274. By relating judicial powers and manor house, we get a quite different image of the Norwegian aristocracy and bureaucracy in the High Middle Ages than the popular one of an egalitarian peasant society.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 27 April 2017
Accepted 1 June 2017

KEYWORDS
Manor house; aristocracy; bureaucracy; judicial powers; legislation

The Norwegian poet Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, author of Norway's national anthem, published a poem in 1890 where he makes the claim: '*Norge, Norge, hytter og hus og ingen borge*' ('Norway, Norway, cottages and houses and no castles') (Bjørnson 1890, p. 232–233). In this poem, Bjørnson expressed a view of Norway which had played a vital role in the making of a Norwegian identity since the second half of the eighteenth century. A major source of this identity was the ancient Norwegian laws, as they were found in the Gulating and Frostating Compilations.

Gulating and Frostating were two popular assemblies for the western and middle parts of Norway respectively – the areas north and south of the later towns of Bergen and Trondheim. For instance, Christian Magnus Falsen, lawyer, historian and prominent member of the constitutional assembly making the Norwegian constitution of 1814, viewed these popular assemblies as the body where all free men themselves produced the norms regulating everyday life.[1] Or in other words – in Falsen's eyes, Gulating and Frostating were the Norwegians' Agora and Forum Romanum.

For Falsen, and later nineteenth century historians like P.A. Munch, a free man in the Norwegian Middle Ages was a man with *odel* (allodium) to the land (Munch 1856, especially pp. 239–242), which means a family priority concerning succession. Hence *odel* was the Norwegian equivalent to nobility, but much more widely distributed and not the right of a closed social class, since *odel* could be obtained by personal effort and not only by grant. In such a society, there would logically be only cottages and houses and no castles, as Bjørnson put it in 1890.

This image of Norway had a number of different political consequences. One was the prohibition by law of a Norwegian nobility in 1821, taking away what was viewed as a social irritation in Norwegian society, thought to be imported from Denmark. Another consequence would be a long-lasting neglect of the manor houses of the Norwegian aristocracy of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Because despite the fact that we have written sources proving the existence of large wooden houses built on stone cellars, like Kvåle by the Sognefjord, and physical evidence, like Sponheim by the Hardangerfjord, these sites have not been excavated (Ekroll, p. 198–201). Hence, we lack knowledge on how the aristocracy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries made visible their power

CONTACT Jørn Øyrehagen Sunde Jorn.Sunde@uib.no Faculty of Law, University in Bergen, Norway
© 2017 The Partnership of the Danish Journal of Archaeology

in the Norwegian landscape. But this is not all. We also lack a source when interpreting the written sources of these centuries. Because with no physical traces of an aristocracy, their importance in the sources has also been overlooked by many. Had Falsen or Bjørnson actually seen manor houses from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it would have been more difficult for them to hail Norway as a nation of political and social equality.

Aga by the Hardangerfjord is a site that provides strong evidence of how the manor houses of the Norwegian aristocracy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries might have looked. Here Lagmannsstova still provides evidence of the complex of houses that stood here during the life of the appeal court judge, knight and member of the king's council, Sigurd Brynjulfsson, from approx. 1240 to 1303. And with an important part of the original building complex still preserved, with written sources on the parts demolished, and with the preliminary research done by government scholarship awardee Guttorm Rogdaberg, Aga is the best source of knowledge on this partly lost aspect of Norwegian history. By reading the Norwegian Code of the Realm of 1274, replacing the Gulating and Frostating Compilations, in light of Aga and its appearance in the High Middle Ages, we will discover that the aristocracy had much the same prominent role in the administration of the realm as their manor houses had in the visual landscape.

Aga by the Hardangerfjord

The short, descriptive name Aga indicates that the place has been inhabited for several thousand years. It is situated in the fjord landscape in the western part of Norway. More precisely, it is on the Sørfjord, an arm of the Hardangerfjord, south of Bergen. In the short distance between the fjord and the mountains, we find steep fields being farmed. The reflection of the sunlight from the fjord, the stored heat in the hillsides warming the fields at night, and the abundance of rain and natural drainage makes this area rather fertile, despite the small amount of agricultural land. Still, agriculture was not the reason for the – by Norwegian standards – large concentration of gentry in this region. Rather this is due to the fact that the Hardangerfjord is situated on the edge of the Hardanger plain, the geographical divide between the western and eastern parts of Norway. This vast plain served as the main travel route for trade between east and west. Hardanger was thus a transfer station for goods from the interior of eastern Norway on their way to the west coast and the North Sea Basin.

At Aga today we find a cluster of a total of 50 houses, about half the number of the houses you would have found there a hundred years ago. Small hamlets like this, in different sizes, were common in the Norwegian fjords up until the twentieth century. As with Aga, these hamlets originated from a single homestead that was divided between the heirs into more and more farming units. Aga was probably split into two parts on Sigurd Brynjulfsson's death in 1303, and by 1938, it was split into nine parts and had thus turned into a hamlet rather than family farm land.

Even though the farm land was divided, the houses were not necessarily so. In the Norwegian Code of the Realm of 1274, it is explicitly stated (VII-15) that if more than one man lives in a house, they all have the same right to use the entrance, and a second entrance should not be made. This tradition was the good fortune of the appeal court judge's hall, since instead of demolishing the house as the farm land was divided, more and more families shared the house, and in the end five families had a share in it. The last inhabitants did not move into a modern house until 1942.

The name Lagmannsstova, or 'the appeal court judge's hall', is a rather recent name not dating back further than the preservation by law of the house and surrounding hamlet in 1926. Originally the house was called Storstova, meaning 'the large house', or Torgillsstova, meaning 'the house of Torgill'. It was built at some point during the second half of the thirteenth century using logs, the same way most houses were built in Norway until the 1930s. What is different with Lagmannsstova at Aga is the size of the house, the size of the logs it is built with, and that it has a stone cellar, see Figure 1.

The hall itself was about 8 × 7 m, in total a little short of 60 square metres. It was joined on the northern edge by Mosstova, which served as the kitchen. On the southern side, we first find a church and then Fruekammeret, 'the ladies' chamber'. Altogether the house was about 27 m long.

Figure 1. The Manor house (Lagmannsstova) at Aga made as a 3D-rendition, based on the mentioned written evidence (graphics by Arkikon).

Lagmannsstova was built of logs that at the bottom are close to 80 cm thick, while the thickness of the logs at the top is about 30 cm. The edges of the logs are decorated with profiles. The doors are decorated with wooden lilies and ornamental door mountings, and the roof beams were also decorated. Lilies featured in the coat of arms of Sigurd Brynjulfsson and also appear on the tables that are still in the hall.

Lagmannsstova stands on a three-room stone cellar. The size of both the building itself and the logs it was built with are unusual. But a stone cellar is by far the most unusual feature of the building, and this more than anything indicates that it was the home of an aristocrat. Except for royal castles and churches, wood was the preferred building material, with the exception of the stone cellars of the aristocrats and higher clergy.

A document written at Aga in 1293 mentions the appeal court judge Sigurd Brynjulfsson, with the sheriff and knight Peter to Sponheim, the aristocrat Torolv to Jåstad, and Jon the vicar (*Diplomatarium Norvegicum* 1858 no. 6). Jon might have been Sigurd Brynjulfsson's own vicar, serving in the chapel next to the hall. This part of the building was described in 1680 as still in good condition, made with an artistic hand and great skill.[2] It was 7 × 5 m, with a ceiling height of 5 m (Rogdaberg 2010). The church was taken down in 1811 and replaced with a room for one of the families who had shares in the building after division of the farm land (unpublished diaries of Johannes. P. Aga (1767–1838) and Johannes. J. Aga (1814–98), in family possession).

Another part of the building that was taken down in 1811 was Fruekammeret. This part also served as home to one of the families, and stood above the last of the three rooms in the stone cellar. Indeed, it was probably the cellar that made the inhabitants decide to dismantle the room and reuse the logs in a new house. The potato had been introduced in Hardanger during the last decades of the eighteenth century and had to be stored in frost-free cellars below, not above the ground. This part of the stone cellar was therefore demolished, and the old Fruekammeret was rebuilt on ground level, almost attached to the old building.

The last part of Lagmannsstova to be demolished was Mosstova in 1894. The old kitchen was replaced with a modern house, built flush with the old building. The medieval well of Mosstova is still in the basement of the new house.

Hence Lagmannsstova, in its current form, is just above half of its original size and appears more like a building than a complex of buildings, as it originally was. Moreover, there was a similarly sized and shaped building parallel to Lagmannsstova in the east from the thirteenth century until 1811. When this eastern part of the building complex was demolished in 1811, it was probably because the six families inhabiting it wanted to use their share of the logs to build their own houses with satisfactory storage for potatoes.

Like Lagmannsstova, the parallel building also stood on a three-room cellar. It was built with large logs, larger than those in Lagmannsstova according to an unpublished diary note from 1811 made by Johannes P. Aga:

> En fortelling eller beskrivelse vil jeg her innføre angaaende 2de ældgamle husbygninge her på Aga, og som i dette aar er nedrevne. De var stående i øvre tun. 1/en stue, tømret, i denne stue var stokkene omtrent 12 alen lange stokkene var en alen og derover brede, den var meget skjøn og sirlig bygget, og paa forskjellige steder ziret med bildhuggeri. 2Det et loft (kaldet) med rommelige omgange, stående på 3de ovenpaa jorden murede kjeldere som var oppbygget med megen konst og styrke, så at de endnu efter så langs tids forløb stod som kirkemure, saa at disse bygninger, som saa eldgamle viste tydeleig at bygningskonsten paa de tider har været i flor. I ovennævnte loft var en af stokkene en og en fjerdedels alen brede.

The building consisted of a hall, a loft and a chamber. The loft would probably be twisted against the length of the house like the chapel, and with a similar high lofted roof. This made the two buildings twins, with the exception of the kitchen that was attached to Lagmannsstova, separated by a court yard.

The building complex at Aga must have made quite an impression on those who came sailing along the fjord. Not only because of the number and the size of the buildings at Aga, but also because anyone who had been to Bergen would see the resemblance between Aga and the royal castle at Holmen by the entrance to the Norwegian capital. Here two parallel halls also made up the heart of the complex, with the difference that the castle was all built in stone. And anyone who had been to rural administrative buildings would recognize the constellation of rooms devoted to different functions: (kitchen,) hall, church and private chamber. This is the same model as Professor Egon Wamers describes in his article on 'Carolingan Pfalzen and Rights': aula, chapella and camera. All in all, Aga

drew its authority not only from the number and size of the buildings, but also from the continental tradition that also shaped the castle in Bergen.

Aga was not unique in the Norwegian realm in the High Middle Ages. As already stated, similar halls and building complexes could be found at the nearby Sponheim and at Kvåle in Sogn. At Talgje in Rogaland, the Stofa at the Biggins on the island of Papa Stour, Shetland, and Kirkjubøur in the Faroe Islands we also find a similar building tradition connected to royal or ecclesial administration. What makes Aga unique is the degree of preservation and the amount of sources that enable us to reconstruct its appearance in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. However, through excavations Aga's uniqueness may be reduced through the acquisition of more knowledge on the building of royal administrative centres in the hands of aristocrats.

The position of the appeal court judge in Norwegian law post 1274

In 1293, Sigurd Brynjulfsson headed a panel to negotiate a truce in a conflict at the neighbouring farm Bleie. When the parties in the case, the witnesses and the general public came to Aga, it was, as we have seen, an impressive complex of buildings they walked towards, after landing their boats in a sheltered bay about 350 m to the north and following a road that passed between two ancient burial mounds, each probably with a stone monument on top. The authority of the building complex mirrored the authority of the appeal court judge.

What they would see would be both the home of an aristocrat and a public space. Aga was built as the home of an aristocrat who also became an appeal court judge. Hence his home also had a public function. For instance, in another civil suit in 1293, the parties met at Aga to have the appeal court judge decide their dispute in the capacity of judge, just as they could have taken the dispute to the local court at the assembly site (*Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, 1848 no. 99 and 100, 1852 no. 32 and 33, Diplomatarium Norvegicum). The hall of the appeal court judge was therefore a public room as well as part of his home. It could also be the other way around – at Papa Stour at the Biggins in Shetland duke Håkon Magnusson built the Stofa complex, much smaller than Aga, for public purposes, but it was later given to the sheriff Torvald Toreson as his property. It is still very likely that the Stofa had a cross private–public function right from the beginning (Crawford and Smith 1999, p. 30).

Sigurd Brynjulfsson was a *lagmaðr*, which literary means a lawman. There is good reason to believe that it is the title of an ancient function at the public assemblies, since we find persons whose task was to cite the law and advise the judges at assemblies in many parts of Europe at different periods of time, like the *brithemain* in Celtic law (Forte 2010, p. 139–142). The first time we find the term *lagmaðr* used is actually in a Celtic source from the second half of the tenth century (O'Donovan 1856, pp. 698–699, Wolf 2007, p. 212). In Norway, there might have been persons with such legal tasks in different public assemblies, but a firm and continuous tradition of lawmen can only be documented in the provincial assemblies, the *lagting*. From the end of the twelfth century the lawmen became royal officials, and their power increased during the thirteenth century until their judgement was made an alternative to the local courts at the local assemblies by King Håkon VI Håkonsson's New Law of 1260 (Sunde 2005, pp. 119–121 and 163–166).

The lawmen were legally skilled advisors and could by 1260 act as judges if one of the parties in a conflict so desired. We can see that this arrangement was not accepted by all from the fact that this law states that the King has been made aware that some people do not appear before the lawman when summoned (Keyser and Munch 1846, p. 124). In other words, the arrangement had been in force without being an unconditional success. Still, a leap in the power and status of the lawmen was made with King Magnus IV Håkonsson the Lawmender's Code of the Norwegian Realm of 1274, and they became more like appeal court judges than lawmen.

The arrangement of the New Law of 1260 was repeated in I-11 of the Code of 1274. This means that the appeal court judge would judge at the first level in the hierarchy of courts. The code was based on an idea of appeal bringing cases decided by the appeal court judge or the local courts to *lagtinget*, now more an appeal court than a public assembly. Here the lawman was no longer a mere advisor, but an equal to the judges, and thus turned into an appeal court judge with the Code of 1274. The task of the appeal court judge was to make a legal

statement that defined the case according to the law, hence he made a legal framework within which the ruling had to be. If the statement was found unlawful by the court, the co-judges could not rule against it; they could only write down their reasoning and send it to the king. Indeed, even the king could only replace the legal statement of the appeal court judge with his own if it was unlawful:

> No skytr maðr male sinu vndan logmanni oc til logðingis. þa ranzsake logretto men invirðiliga þat mal, oc þo at þeim synizt allum sa orskurðr eigi logligr er logmaðr hefir sagt þa skolu þeir eigi þo riufa logmanz orskurð, en rita skulo þeir til konungs huat þeim þickir sannare i þui male, oc slikt ranzsak sem þeir hafa frammast at profat. þui at þann orskurð sem logmaðr ueitir ma engi maðr riufa nema konungr se at logbok uar uatte mote. (Keyser and Munch 1848, I-11, p. 21)

'When a man takes his case to the appeal court judge and the appeal court, the appeal court jury shall investigate the case. Even if they all find that the appeal court judge's legal statement is unlawful, they shall not disregard it, but write down their opinion and reasoning based on the evidence, and send it to the king. Because no man shall judge against the legal statement made by the appeal court judge except the king, if he finds it unlawful.'

But this was not all. In IV-18, the power of the appeal court judge was greatly expanded: Not only could the appeal court judge serve as an alternative to the local courts, he would also have the power to censor their decisions in all major cases:

> En þui er domren til nefndr at þa skal sakir mæta oc misgerningar oc tempra sua dominn eptir malauoftum sem þingmenn oc rettare sea sannazt firir guði eptir sinni samuitzku. En eigi eptir þui sua sem margr snapr hefir suara her til at þeir doma ecki annat en log. (Keyser and Munch 1848, p. 62)

'And the judges are appointed to measure cases and misdeeds, and temper the sentence according to the circumstances in the same manner as the men at the *þing* and the official providing justice find most truthful in the face of God and conscience. And not, as has been stated by the fool, that they judge only according to law.'

IV-18 does not give details on the procedure when making the kind of decision the provision deals with, but this was done in an additional law of 1280, which reads:

> Goymi oc varezt vmboðs menn inuirðiliga at hueruitna þar sem menn er at doma vm stor mal om lif manna eða lima lat eða aðrar storar refsingar at þeir nefni xij menn til doms huarke sakaða eða siuiaða uiðr þa er vm skal doma en þeir xij gange einsamnir og staðfesti sua dom sinn. Siðan ganga þeir aptr til annara þingmanna og samðycki þeir þa allir iamsaman domin með lofa take. (Keyser and Munch 1848, p. 9–10)

'Those providing justice should take care, and especially beware, that whenever men are judging major cases involving human life or limb-loss or other major punishments, they should name twelve men for a jury (*dómr*), neither foe nor friend to he who shall be judged. And the twelve should go alone, and so establish their judgement. Later, they go back to the other men of the assembly, and they should together consent to the judgement.'

The same procedure is outlined in an amendment to IV-18 in a mid-fourteenth century manuscript of the Code of 1274, where it is stated that:

> En þæn tima er men doma a þinghi eðr a stemfno um lif eðr lima laat eðr adrar efsinghar eðr þiofnad, þa skall loghmaðr ef han er ner, ok j hia staddær næmfna tolf eðr sex til doms, sysslu maðr ef loghmaðr er æighi til, ok dome þætt maall, ok ganghe allar saman, ok þa er þæir værda samdoma þa ganghe æftr till þinghmanna ok biði þa samþykkya þenna dom. (Keyser and Munch 1848, p. 63 note 30)

'But when man shall judge at the *ting* or at summons in cases concerning life, limb-loss or other punishments or theft, the appeal court judge shall, if he is near by, appoint twelve or six men as jurors to decide the case. The sheriff does this if the appeal court judge is not near by. They shall decide the case by sitting together, and when they have reached agreement, they shall return to the other men at the *ting* and ask them to approve of the decision.'

Now, if we read these provisions together, we see that the appeal court judge was to appoint the jurors who propose a verdict to the local court 'in major cases involving human life or limb-loss or other major punishments', as it is stated in the additional law of 1280. After hearing the evidence, the jurors were to withdraw from the court to discuss and reach a decision. When returning they proposed a verdict to the court, which then approved or rejected it. But the appeal court judge also had to approve. Hence, he was given the same power in major cases in local courts as at the appeal court – through his legal statements he could define the character of the

case, and hence make the framework for the discussion of the jury and the decision of the court.

It is important to notice that IV-18 does not speak of the appeal court judge, but of the 'rettare', meaning the official providing justice. The term 'rettare' appears for the first time in an additional law from 1271 (The Norwegian Code of the Realm X-2), and was most likely a translation of the roman term *judex*, just like the legal statement of the appeal court judge, *orskurðr*, was a translation of the Latin *decisio* (Robberstad 1976, p. 147). Still, 'rettare' and the appeal court judge do not have to be one and the same office, since it could also be the sheriff, who acted as public persecutor and was responsible for administrating justice (Storm and Hertzberg 1895, p. 516, Taranger 1979, p. 58 (note made in the text of IV-18)). But, as we saw from the amendment to IV-18 in the mid-fourteenth-century manuscript of the Code of 1274, the role of the 'rettare' was supposed to be performed by the appeal court judge:

'Đa skall loghmaðr ef han er ner, ok j hia staddær næmfna tolf eðr sex til doms, sysslu maðr ef loghmaðr er æighi til.'

'The appeal court judge shall, if he is nearby, appoint twelve or six men as jurors to decide the case. The sheriff does this if the appeal court judge is not nearby.'

Nevertheless, the Code of 1274 ensures both offices a major increase in legal status and power. The most important change in the competence of the sheriff was made in the additional law of 1280. Firstly, a sheriff could propose a fine to a suspect in a criminal case before charges were brought to court. Secondly, the sheriff could summon the parties in a civil dispute and propose a settlement. If these proposals were not accepted, the matter could only be settled by a legal statement from the appeal court judge (Keyser and Munch 1849, pp. 8–9, law of 1280 art. 24). And this was the usual order of things – the two royal servants would work together, but with the appeal court judge as the superior in judicial matters. According to the *Administrative Code* of 1277 the sheriff should give advice, but the appeal court judge decided in cases involving harm done to commoners by the king's men (Imsen 2000, chapter 29/34, pp. 126 and 127). According to the additional law of 1280, the sheriff and appeal court judge were to decide cases concerning debt, and property claims involving both clergy and laymen (Keyser and Munch 1849, p. 8, law of 1280 art. 23). And in an additional law of 1314, the sheriffs and the appeal court judges were to redefine a punishment when someone had failed to pay fines for breaking the clothing code (Keyser and Munch 1849, p. 110, law of 21.10.1314, Seip 1934, p. 68).

Against this backdrop it is no surprise that we find evidence of building complexes like the one at Aga as the home for aristocrats holding the sheriff's office. An example would be the previously mentioned knight and sheriff Peter at Sponheim, the brother in law of the appeal court judge Sigurd Brynjulfsson, who also had a hall built on a stone cellar like the one at Aga (Ekroll 2006, p. 201).

The legal powers and status of the appeal court judge were even greater than controlling all but minor cases in local courts – he also had the last word when filling the lacunas in law. In I-4 in the Code of 1274, it is stated that lacunas are to be filled by the court. But if the court cannot unanimously agree on one norm, the appeal court judge will have the last word, unless the king and his advisors find another norm more legal.

In minor cases that were not to be brought before the appeal court judge, the sheriff could summon the suspect or the parties to him and propose a settlement. If not accepted, the appeal court judge would decide the matter. In other words, there were no cases that could not be decided by the appeal court judge as long as he and the sheriff cooperated (Sunde 2014, p. 143–153).

Again we see that the appeal court judge is positioned far above all the other participants in the legal system. Nevertheless, his powers were partly dependent on cooperation with the other royal servant within the legal sphere, the sheriff. And he was subordinate to the King. But even the King had to argue if he finds the legal statements of the appeal court judge, in cases or in the lacunas of law, unlawful or less legal than his own. Still, the entire arrangement was made by the King to ensure the realisation of his politics through application of the laws he made. The legal status and powers entrusted to the appeal court judge, but also the sheriff, were thus a transfer from the political status and powers of the King. This, just like the building complex at Aga, appeared in the landscape as a smaller version of the King's castle in Bergen.

Building legal status and power

When the legal historian Fredrik Brandt wrote the first article on the development of the Norwegian judiciary in the early 1850s (Brandt 1851–52, p. 108), he noted the importance of both I-11 and I-4 in the Norwegian Code of the Realm of 1274, and concluded that these were legal powers and status that the appeal court judges developed almost organically, and in the interest of both court and judge. Downplaying on the importance of IV-18, and stressing the organic development and mutual interest, Brandt manages to depict the changes in the Norwegian judiciary in 1274 as a lot less radical than they actually were. Hence it was possible to uphold the image of a non-aristocratic, free peasant society.

There is no direct relationship between the thirteenth century building complex at Aga by the Hardangerfjord and the article by Brandt from 1852. Nevertheless the question must be asked: Would Brandt have looked more closely at the Code of 1274 for more traces of transfer of legal status and power to the appeal court judge, and would he have been less inclined to see this transfer as organic development, if his image of Norway as an egalitarian society – a nation with cottages and houses and no castles – had been challenged by knowledge of the appearance of Aga in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? The question is relevant not only for how we perceive the legal status and power of the Norwegian appeal court judge, but also for the relationship between archaeological and written sources. The real matter on the agenda here is: Would we read the written sources, in this case the Code of 1274, differently against an archaeological backdrop proving that next to the houses and cottages were impressive building complexes that served as the home of aristocrats that exercised royal power in the provinces?

Notes

1. Christian Magnus Falsen, *Norges Odelsret, med Hensyn paa Rigets Constitution* (Bergen) 1815: especially pp. 61–63. See as well Gustav Ludvig Baden, *Det Norske Riges Historie* (Copenhagen, Schubothe) 1804: 45–54, and Tyge Rothe, *Nordens Staetsforfatning før Lehnstiden, og da Odelskab med Folkefrihed – I Lehnstiden og da Birkerettighed, Hoverie, Livegenskab med Aristokratie, Første Deel* (Copenhagen, Gyldendal) 1781: 121–135 and 234 (speaking of the Nordic constitutions, and then including Sweden, Denmark and Norway).
2. Gjert Hendriksen Miltzow, 'Voss og Hardangers Prestehistorie – Oversat og forsynet med Anmerkninger samt en Skildring af Forfatteren', in *Voss Sogelag* 1911: 55: 'Staar ogsaa endnu i god Stand, bygget med stor Konstferdighet og Dygtighed og af middels Størrelse'.

References

Baden, G.L., 1804. *Det Norske Riges Historie*. Copenhagen: Schubothe.

Bjørnson, B., 1890. *Digte og Sange*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Brandt, F., 1851–52. Fremstilling af den Forandring, som Norges dømmende Institutiones i ældre Tid have undergaaet. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Videnskab Og Litteratur*, Vol. 5.

Crawford, B.E. and Smith, B.B., 1999. *The Biggings, Papa Stour, Shetland – the history and excavation of a royal Norwegian farm*. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

Diplomatarium Norvegicum, 1st volume no. 99 and 100, 1848. Christiania: P. T. Mallings Forlagshandel.

Diplomatarium Norvegicum, 2nd volume no. 32 and 33, 1852. Christiania: P. T. Mallings Forlagshandel.

Diplomatarium Norvegicum, 4th volume no. 6, 1858. Christiania: P. T. Mallings Forlagshandel.

Ekroll, Ø., 2006. *Ei anna historie – Norsk mellomalder i arkeologisk lys*. Trondheim: Tapir akademisk forlag.

Falsen, C.M., 1815. *Norges Odelsret, med Hensyn paa Rigets Constitution*. Bergen: R. Dahls Enke & Søn.

Forte, A., 2010. Mixing and remixing Scots law – an historical perspective of scots law. In: J.Ø. Sunde and K.E. Skodvin, eds. *Rendezvous of European legal cultures*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 133–148.

Imsen, S., 2000. *Hirdskråen – hirdloven til Norges konge og hans håndgangne menn, etter AM 322 fol*. Oslo: Riksarkivet.

Keyser, R. and Munch, P.A., eds., 1846. *Norges Gamle Love, 1st volume: norges Love ældre end Kong Magnus Haakonssøns Regjerings-Tiltrædelse i 1263*. Christiania: Chr. Gröndahl.

Keyser, R. and Munch, P.A., eds., 1848. *Norges Gamle Love, 2nd volume: lovgivningen under Kong Magnus Haakonssøns Regjeringstid fra 1263 til 1280*. Christiania: Chr. Gröndahl.

Keyser, R. and Munch, P.A., eds., 1849. *Norges gamle Love, 3rd volume: lovgivningen efter Kong Magnus Haakonssøns Død 1280 indtil 1387*. Christiania: Chr. Gröndahl.

Miltzow, G.H., 1911. *Voss og Hardangers Prestehistorie - Oversat og forsynet med Anmerkninger samt en Skildring af Forfatteren*. Voss Sogelag.

Munch, P.A., 1856. Om Adelens Oprindelse i de nordiske Riger og Noregs nuværende forhold til denne Institution. *Norsk Maanedsskrift*, 1, 176–242.

O'Donovan, J., ed., 1856. *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616*. Vol. 1st. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co.

Robberstad, K., 1976. *Rettssoga*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1. bind.

Rogdaberg, G., 2010. *Rapport vedkomande Lagmannsstova og andre mellomalderbygningar på Aga*. Unpublished.

Rothe, T., 1781. *Nordens Staetsforfatning før Lehnstiden, og da Odelskab med Folkefrihed – I Lehnstiden og da Birkerettighed, Hoverie, Livegenskab med Aristokratie, Første Deel*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Seip, J.A., 1934. *Lagmann og lagting i senmiddelalderen og det 16de århundre*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad.

Storm, G. and Hertzberg, E., 1895. *Norges Gamle Love, 5th volume: Indeholdende Supplement til foregaaende Bind og Facsimiler samt Glossarium med Registre*. Kristiania: Grøndahl & Søn.

Sunde, J.Ø., 2005. *Speculum legale – Rettsspegelen: ein introduksjon til den norske rettskulturen si historie*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Sunde, J.Ø., 2014. Daughters of God and counsellors of the judges of men – a study in changes in the legal culture in the Norwegian realm in the High Middle Ages. In: S. Brink and L. Collins, eds. *New approaches to early law in Scandinavia*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Taranger, A., ed., 1979. *Magnus Lagabøtes Landslov*. Oslo/Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.

Wolf, A., 2007. *From Pictland to Alba 789-1070*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.