In so doing, it's important to recognize the shared overlap between Marxism and anarchism, who have both acted together and debated each other for well over a century, each sharpening the views of the other. Randall McGuire (2012, 576) has emphasized that we 'should embrace the intersections and the tensions between anarchism and Marxism ... Both lead us to critical understandings of our noncapitalist pasts'. Elsewhere, I have tried to show how both approaches can integrate (Angelbeck 2017), as there are many shared avenues of concern, if different points of departure.

Again, the theory of anarchism primarily concerns methods of power in relationships, which places it at the heart of what constitutes the proper concern of social sciences (Russell 2004; Flyvbjerg 2001). Moreover, anarchism concerns various ways to implement such principles in practice, as appropriate for the cultural or environmental circumstances. Many principles concern resisting the concentration and centralization of power in ways that are seen as not justified.

Other aspects of anarchism concern the harnessing of power collectively, whether for the accomplishment of economic, religious, or recreational projects, or in movements of resistance, as emphasized by Borake here. The theory concerns both types of power expression. Too often, we can limit our use of 'power' to refer to top-down exertions of power, as in those 'with power' or 'in power'; these are 'vertical' forms of power. Yet just as important are forms of power that are exercised in conjunction, through alliance, or what is referred to as the 'horizontal power' of collectivities. It is important to recognize multiple forms if we are to adequately theorize social life. To reserve the use of 'power' for only vertical forms literally disempowers any consciousness of collective capability, and may contribute to a lack of understanding of such horizontal efforts in the past societies we investigate.

Anarchism provides a reminder that state and society are separate phenomena. This is emphasized by Pierre Clastres (1987) in *Society against the state*. Too often, we can lazily slip into equating the two as one and the same, which is not helpful for understanding sociopolitical dynamics in the past. Rather, Clastres stressed that the 'state' is a sociopolitical structure organized often by a subset of the society overall; we should extend such to any structure of political hierarchy, not just states, but chiefdoms, and other formations, especially those of dominance. As Borake emphasizes here, these need to be evaluated for whether they are viewed as justified in their position of hierarchy and how they apply their power.

In this article, Borake shows how an anarchist perspective can provide alternative and useful interpretations for cases in Scandinavian culture history, and by extension how such analyses might be applicable for archaeohistorical analyses of other areas and times. Her cases here have been at a macro scale, given the orientation; however, these cases provide examples of how such analyses could be carried out at smaller or finer scales of analysis, and I look forward to seeing such work expand and reorient our understandings of the past.

Archaeological Dialogues (2019), **26**, 80–86
doi:10.1017/S1380203819000199

Anarchistic actions. Reply by Trine Borake

Trine Louise Borake

I wish to thank the commentators for taking time to carefully, constructively and critically comment on my work. They have provided a range of new and valuable insights, perspectives and ideas, for which I am grateful. Their comments illustrate the potential and value of anarchistic perspectives but likewise point to concerns and limitations. In the article, I have far from exhausted the topic, and, as is pointed out in the comments, like Marxism, anarchism offers multiple embedded approaches that could successfully be investigated in the future.

The comments fall in two groups: on theoretical and empirical aspects. I will address them in turn.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The need for an anarchistic perspective

In this article I did not aim to raise the black flag, a relevant concern raised by Rathbone. I do not agitate for an anarchistic perspective in its own right. Neither would I prefer to see all trouble-makers throughout history as anarchist. I do not even seek a bottom-up approach or a 'people's archaeology', however relevant, that does not recognize inequality and inegalitarianism and does not allow for hierarchies. That would be mistaken, perhaps scientifically manipulative and definitely naive. We do find hierarchies in social organization, past and present, close and far away. We do see accumulations of wealth and resources and individuals who seek dominion over others. The existence of hierarchies can therefore not be ignored. But we cannot ignore either that we also find decentralization, evasion, resistance and collective actions, network organization and mutual aid. Traditional interpretations with a one-sided focus on hierarchies are insufficient to explain these complex actions and dynamics and often do not recognize human agency. Anarchism, however, offers a range of multifaceted perspectives that frame mechanisms of social organization and dynamics – hierarchical as well as communal. Nevertheless, the need for an anarchistic perspective in archaeology can be questioned since anthropology for long has studied societies of these kinds, as Grier points out, and offers both extensive data and ideas. It is irrelevant, though, to separate archaeology and anthropology since they feed on each other and draw on mutual knowledge and ideas. However, the development of an anarchistic perspective has some advantage. First of all, archaeology will benefit from developing its own theories and perspectives with a strong and complex focus on material culture instead of merely adapting ideas from anthropology. Anarchism is a new perspective in archaeological research design and its application may point in other, new and thought-provoking directions instead of reproducing anthropological theories. Only in this way can we expand our capabilities to understand social organization. Second, an anthropological approach is often based on small-scale societies different to those found in, e.g., European proto-historical times and settings. Anarchistic principles can be applied to all societies, not only small-scale ones. Finally, an anarchistic approach is highly operational, often in contrast to anthropological approaches, which are generally braided from complex perspectives and challenging to apply to material culture. The three core principles (extracted from Angelbeck and Grier's (2012) five principles) make anarchism applicable to material-cultural interpretations.

The principles, however, may be constraining, suggesting an undesired universalism, as Grier puts forward. This is a just concern. The principles, however, or the idea of how humans act and dynamics evolve, are not constricting but engage with a number of elements, encounters and tensions. Likewise, there is no blueprint or detailed outline as to how it plays out, as Angelbeck notes. Wealth, access to resources and know-how do not inevitably and solely come from or lead to oppression, exploitation or coercion. The need for network organization, the effectiveness of justified leaders and the use of decentralization are evoked by multiple desires or tensions.

As is illustratively suggested by Rathbone, anarchism offers perhaps more than anything the reflection of the warped glass of a fun-house mirror. But do not all theories and perspectives, applied to a prehistoric or historical context, do just that? Would it not be bold, perhaps even naive, to imagine that we can get a straight, true reflection of the dynamics and mechanisms in any society? I find that an anarchistic perspective offers the most nuanced and comprehensive approach, allowing a wide and hitherto unnoticed range of warped reflections in the fun-house mirror. Clearly it must be combined, tested and supported by empirical data, just like any other theory and perspective.

Strong empirical support

Rathbone notes how the application of anarchistic principles to the archaeological record is an easy task. The difficulties occur when making such strong arguments that the explanations would find wide acceptance at the expense of traditional hierarchic explanations. I acknowledge the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concern. Empirical data can most often be fitted to any preferred theory or perspective; an ever-present scientific pitfall. However, eventually theories will be questioned when the incongruence becomes too obvious; for example, hierarchically based theories are now under siege. Strong and comprehensive arguments clearly must be an aim, but is it an aim to seek acceptance at the expense of traditional hierarchical explanations? From that viewpoint, academic discussions seem more like a theoretical competition rather than a scientific dialectic.

Either way, the strong argument of anarchistic principles from empirical data is admittedly not easily established. It can be argued that making the connection between theory and data in general is problematic, and theory-driven studies are thus traditionally too infrequent, at least in a Scandinavian context. Hierarchically based ideas can be argued to have a protagonist in research history and structurally informed data. This is what Angelbeck see as a fourth way of anarchistic endeavours; history was traditionally conducted and written by white males, to put it sharply.

My argumentation built on three examples: thing sites, Danevirke and migration. I chose examples based on both archaeology and history to illustrate that anarchistic perspectives are independent of methodology and of temporal setting. I did not in this work describe the pig-tusk ceremony from Vanuatu, Polynesia, which put chiefs in power but consequently limited their economic advantages (Earl and Spriggs 2015, 522–25). Neither did I touch upon studies from the prehistoric Southwest, where elites were subsumed to the commune limited by kin and civil obligations (McGuire and Saitta 1996, 202; Saitta 1994). I did not go into the numerous examples of rebellions; in 841–42 Saxon slaves rose against their lords in the Stellinga uprising (Goldberg 1995); in 1086 the Danish king Canut was killed as a result of a peasant riot; the Engelbrekt rebellion in Sweden launched in 1434 led to long-lasting effects of tax reduction and the peasants finally became included in the Swedish parliament alongside the nobility, the clergy and the burghers (Myrdal 2011, 98–99). We find long periods with civil war in early medieval Scandinavia, and looking further we find extensive Chinese peasant rebellions, the French Revolution and the Spanish Civil War. I did not in this study include examples of different social organizations like Old Saxony, where social organization was based not around a king but in districts led by elected chiefs (their ancient laws aimed to prevent the rise of a monarchy) nor upon regulated common farming in early Middle Ages Scandinavia lasting 500 years, reassuring mutual aid and collective action and limiting the economic advantages of individuals. Examples from archaeology, history and ethnography could preferably be offered, strengthening the argument and reassuring us that it is not constricted by research design, methodology or the nature of the empirical data. Likewise, studies on macro and micro scales could be conducted testing the anarchistic arguments on different levels. Truly, an extensive study of data, examples and cases that support the argument would be welcome, leading to more thorough discussions on intentionality and human agency. I hope this article will inspire such work in a European context in the future.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful for wise comments on this paper from Professor MSO Søren Sindbæk, Associate Professor Tim Flohr Sørensen, Professor Lotte Hedeager and Ph.D. Anna Severine Beck. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for relevant and constructive comments. Furthermore, I am grateful for good and productive discussions on the content with colleagues.

References

Andersen, H.H., 1998: *Danevirke og Kovirke. Arkæologiske undersøgelser 1861–1993*, Århus (Moesgård Museums Skrifter).

Andersen, H.H., 2004: *Til hele rigets værn. Danevirkes arkæologi og historie*. Højbjerg.

Andersen, K.H., 2016: Da danerne blev danske. Dansk etnicitet og identitet til ca. år 1000, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Culture and Society, History, Aarhus University.

Anderson, B., 2005: *Under three flags. Anarchism and the anti-colonial imagination*, New York.

Angelbeck, B., 2016: The balance of autonomy and alliance in anarchic societies. The organization of defences in the Coast Salish past, *World archaeology* **48**(1), 51–69.

Angelbeck, B., 2017: Applying modes of production analysis to non-state, or anarchic, societies. Shifting from historical epochs to seasonal microscale, in R.M. Rosenswig and J.J. Cunningham (eds), *Modes of production and archaeology*, Gainesville, FL, 52–74.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Angelbeck, B., in press: Interpreting the dialectic of sociopolitical tensions in the archaeological past. Implications of an anarchist perspective for Iron Age societies, in I. Sastre and B.X. Currás (eds), *Alternative Iron Ages*, London, 29–49.

Angelbeck, B., and C. Grier, 2012: Anarchism and the archaeology of anarchic societies. Resistance to centralization in the Coast Salish region of the Pacific Northwest Coast, *Current anthropology* **53**(5), 547–87.

Arkush, E., 2012: Comment on: Anarchism and the archaeology of anarchic societies. Resistance to centralization in the Coast Salish Region of the Pacific Northwest Coast, by B. Angelbeck and C. Grier, *Current anthropology* **53**(5), 569–70.

Bakunin, M., 1871: *God and the state*, New York.

Baldwin, D., 2010: *Robin Hood. The English outlaw unmasked*, Stroud.

Barclay, H., 1990: *People without government. An anthropology of anarchy*, London.

Barrett, J.H., 2008: What caused the Viking Age?, *Antiquity* **82**, 671–85.

Bettinger, R.L., 2015: *Orderly anarchy. Sociopolitical evolution in aboriginal California*, Oakland, CA.

Black Trowel Collective, 2016: Foundations of an anarchist archaeology. A community manifesto, at https://savageminds.org/2016/10/31/foundations-of-an-anarchist-archaeology-a-community-manifesto, accessed 26 September 2018.

Blanton, R.E., and L. Fargher, 2008: *Collective action in the formation of pre-modern states*, New York.

Borck, L., and M.C. Sanger, 2017: An introduction to anarchism in archaeology, *SAA archaeological record. The magazine of the Society for American Archaeology*, **17**(1), 9–16.

Bourdieu, P., 1977: *Outline of a theory of practice*, Cambridge.

Brink, S., 1998: Land, bygd, distrikt och centralorter i Sydsverige. Några bebyggelseshistoriska nedslag, in B. Hårdh and L. Larsson (eds), *Centrala platser, centrala frågor. Samhällsstrukturen under järnåldern: en vänbok till Berta Stjernquist*, Stockholm, 297–326.

Brink, S., O. Grimm, F. Iversen, H. Hobæk, M. Ødegaard, U. Näsman, A. Sanmark, P. Urbanczyk, O. Vésteinsson and I. Storli, 2011: Court sites of Arctic Norway. Remains of thing sites and representations of political consolidation processes in the northern Germanic world during the first millennium A.D., *Norwegian archaeological review* **44**(1), 89–117.

Brumfiel, E.M., 1995: Heterarchy and the analysis of complex societies. Comments, *Archaeological papers of the American Anthropological Association* **6**(1) 125–31.

Byock, J.L., 2001: *Viking age Iceland*, London.

Callmer, J., and E. Rosengren, 1997: *'– gick Grendel att söka det höga huset –'. Arkeologiska källor till aristokratiska miljöer i Skandinavien under yngre järnålder: rapport från ett seminarium i Falkenberg 16–17 november 1995*, Halmstad (Halland länsmuseer).

Caraher, W., K. Kourelis and A. Reinhard (eds), 2014: *Punk archaeology*, Fargo, ND.

Chapman, R., 2003: Archaeologies of complexity, London.

Christensen, T., 2006: En folkekonges død. Et forslag til tolkningen af jernalderens våbenofferfund, *Fortid og Nutid*, 195–220.

Clark, J.E., and M. Blake, 1994: The power of prestige. Competitive generosity and the emergence of rank societies in lowland Mesoamerica, in E. Brumfiel and J. Fox (eds), *Factional competition and political development in the New World*, Cambridge, 17–30.

Clastres, P., 1989: *Society against the state. Essays in political anthropology*, New York.

Clastres, P., 2010: *Archaeology of violence*, Los Angeles.

Crumley, C.L., 1995: Heterarchy and the analysis of complex societies, *Archaeological papers of the American Anthropological Association* **6**(1), special issue, 1–5.

Dobat, A.S., 2008: Danevirke revisited. An investigation into military and socio-political organisation in south Scandinavia (c A.D. 700 to 1100), *Medieval archaeology* **52**(1), 27–67.

Dolgoff, S., 1972: *Bakunin on anarchy*, New York.

Earle, T., 1997: *How chiefs come to power. The political economy in prehistory*, Stanford.

Earle, T., and M. Spriggs, 2015: Political economy in prehistory. A Marxist approach to Pacific sequences, *Current anthropology* **56**(4) (2015), 515–44.

Ehrenreich, R., C.L. Crumley and J.E. Levy (eds), 1995: *Heterarchy and the analysis of complex societies*, special issue of *Archaeological papers of the American Anthropological Association*, **6**(1).

Fabech, C., and J. Ringtved (eds), 1999: *Settlement and landscape. Proceedings of a conference in Århus, Denmark, May 4–7 1998*, Aarhus.

Feviele, C., 2016: Understanding the hinterland of the Ladby ship grave, in V. Turner, O. Owen and D.J. Waugh (eds), *Shetland and the Viking world. Papers from the proceedings of the Seventeenth Viking Congress*, Lerwick, 229–35.

Flexner, L., 2014: The historical archaeology of states and non-states. Anarchist perspectives from Hawai'i and Vanuatu, *Journal of Pacific archaeology*, **5**(2), 81–97.

Flyvbjerg, B., 2001: *Making social science matter*, Cambridge and New York.

Furholt, M., C. Grier, M. Spriggs and T. Earle, 2019: Political economy in the archaeology of emergent complexity. A synthesis of bottom-up and top-down approaches, *Journal of archaeological method and theory*, DOI 10.1007/s10816-019-09422-0.

Giddens, A., 1979: *Central problems in social theory. Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*, Berkeley.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Goldberg, E.J., 1995: Popular revolt, dynastic politics, and aristocratic factionalism in the early Middle Ages. The Saxon 'Stellinga' reconsidered, *Speculum. A journal of mediaeval studies* **70**(3), 467–501.

Gonzalez, R.A., 2016: Inter-cultural communications and iconography in the western Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg Br., Garmisch-Partenkirchen.

Graeber, D., 2004: *Fragments of an anarchist anthropology*, Chicago.

Graeber, D., 2009: *Direct action. An ethnography*, Edinburgh.

Grier, C., 2017: Expanding notions of hunter-gatherer diversity. Identifying core organizational principles and practices in Coast Salish societies of the Northwest Coast of North America, in G. Warren and B. Finlayson (eds), *The diversity of hunter-gatherer pasts*, Oxford, 16–33.

Grier, C., and B. Angelbeck, 2017: Tradeoffs in Coast Salish social action. Balancing autonomy, inequality, and sustainability, in M. Hegmon (ed.), *The give and take of sustainability. Archaeological and anthropological perspectives on tradeoffs*, Cambridge, 198–221.

Grier, C., B. Angelbeck and E. McLay, 2017: Terraforming and monumentality as long-term social practice in the Salish Sea region of the Northwest Coast of North America, *Hunter gatherer research* **3**(1), 107–32.

Grier, C., and M. Schwadron, 2017: Terraforming and monumentality in hunter-gatherer-fisher societies, *Hunter gatherer research* **3**(1), 3–8.

Hall, M., 2000: *Archaeology and the modern world. Colonial transcripts in South Africa and the Chesapeake*, London.

Hall, T.D., 1991: Civilizational change. The role of nomads, *Comparative civilizations review* **24**(5), 34–57.

Hansson, M., 2006: *Aristocratic landscape. The spatial ideology of the medieval aristocracy*, Lund.

Harrison, J., 2013: Building mounds. Longhouses, coastal mounds and cultural connections. Norway and the Northern Isles, c AD 800–1200, *Medieval archaeology* **57**(1), 35–60.

Hayden, B., and R. Gargett, 1990: Big man, big heart? A Mesoamerican view of the emergence of complex society, *Ancient Mesoamerica* **1**, 3–20.

Hedeager, L., 2007: Scandinavia and the Huns. An interdisciplinary approach to the migration era, *Norwegian archaeological review* **40**(1), 42–58.

Høilund Nielsen, K., 2014: Key issues concerning 'central places', in E. Stidsing, R. Fiedel and K. Høilund Nielsen (eds), *Wealth and complexity. Economically specialised sites in Late Iron Age Denmark*, Randers, 11–51.

Holst, M.K., and Rasmussen, M., 2012. Combined efforts. The cooperation and coordination of barrow-building in the Bronze Age, in N. Johannsen, M.D. Jessen and H. Juel Jensen (eds), *Excavating the mind. Cross-sections through culture, cognition and materiality*, Århus, 255–79.

Ilkjær, J., 2003: Danske krigsbytteofringer, in L. Jørgensen, B. Storgaard and L. Gebauer Thomsen (eds), *Sejrens triumf. Norden i skyggen af det romerske imperium*, Copenhagen, 44–64.

Iversen, T., 2011: Thralls' manumission, land clearing, and state building in medieval Norway, in S.M. Sindbæk and B. Poulsen (eds), *Settlement and lordship in Viking and early medieval Scandinavia*, Turnhout, 264–76.

Jensen, J., 2003: *Danmarks oldtid. Ældre jernalder 400 f. Kr.–500 e. Kr*, Copenhagen.

Jørgensen, L., 2008: Manor, cult and market at lake Tissø, in S. Brink and N. Price (eds), *The Viking world*, London, 77–82.

Jørgensen, P.J., 1974: *Dansk retshistorie*, 6th edn, Copenhagen.

Kintz, L., 2017: An anarchist archaeology for the Anthropocene. *SAA archaeological record. The magazine of the Society for American Archaeology*, **17**(1), 33–38.

Knight, S., 2006: Remembering Robin Hood. Five centuries of outlaw ideology, *European journal of English studies*, **10**(2), 149–61.

Kohring, S., 2011: Social complexity as a multi-scalar concept. Pottery technologies, 'communities of practice' and the Bell Beaker phenomenon, *Norwegian archaeological review* **44**(2), 145–63.

Kohring, S., and S. Wynne-Jones (eds), 2007: *Socialising complexity. Structure, interaction, and power in archaeological discourse*, Oxford.

Kristjánsdóttir, S., 2011: The Vikings as a diaspora. Cultural and religious identities in early medieval Iceland, in Svavar Sigmundsson (ed.), *Viking settlements and Viking society. Papers from the proceedings of the Sixteenth Viking Congress*, Reykjavík, 422–36.

Kropotkin, P.A., 1952 (1902): *Mutual aid. A factor of evolution*, Boston.

Kropotkin, P.A., 1987 (1898): *The state. Its historic role*, London.

Lihammer, A., 2007: *Bortom riksbildningen. Människor, landskap och makt i sydöstra Skandinavien*, Lund (Lund Studies in Historical Archaeology 7).

Lønstrup, J., 1988: Mosefund af hærudstyr fra jernalderen, in P. Mortensen and B.M. Rasmussen (eds), *Fra stamme til stat i Danmark. Jernalderens stammesamfund*, Bd. 1, Århus (Jernalderens stammesamfund), 93–99.

Ludowici, B., H. Jöns, S. Kleingärtner, J. Scheschkewitz, and M. Hardt, 2010: Foreword, in B. Ludowici, H. Jöns, S. Kleingärtner, J. Scheschkewitz and M. Hardt (eds), *Trade and communication networks of the first millennium AD in the northern part of Central Europe. Central places, beach markets, landing places and trading centres*, Stuttgart (Neue Studien zur Sachsenforschung, 1), 6–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

McGuire, R.H., 2012: Raise the red flag and the black (comment on Angelbeck and Grier 2012), *Current anthropology* **53**(5), 575–76.

McGuire, R.H., and D.J. Saitta, 1996: Although they have petty captains, they obey them badly. The dialectics of Prehispanic Western Pueblo social organization, *American antiquity* **61**(2), 197–216.

McIntosh, S.K., 2005: *Beyond chiefdoms. Pathways to complexity in Africa*, Cambridge.

Manco, J., 2013: *Ancestral journeys. The peopling of Europe from the first venturers to the Vikings*, London.

Marshall, P., 2008: *Demanding the impossible. A history of anarchism*, London.

Mauss, M., 1925: *The gift. Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*, Miami.

Morgan, C., 2015: Punk, DIY, and anarchy in archaeological thought and practice, *Journal in public archaeology* **5**, 123–46.

Morris, B., 2005: *Anthropology and anarchism. Their elective affinity*, London.

Mortensen, P., and B.M. Rasmussen, 1988: *Fra stamme til stat i Danmark. Jernalderens stammesamfund*, Aarhus.

Mortensen, P., and B.M. Rasmussen, 1991: *Fra stamme til stat i Danmark. Høvdingesamfund og kongemagt*, Aarhus.

Myhre, B., 1993: The beginning of the Viking Age. Some current archaeological problems, in A. Faulkes and R. Perkins (eds), *Viking revaluations*, London, 182–204.

Myrdal, J., 2007: Källpluralismen och dess inkluderande metodpaket, *Historisk tidskrift* **127**(3), 2–11.

Myrdal, J., 2011: Farming and feudalism. 1000–1700, in J. Myrdal and M. Morell (eds), *The agrarian history of Sweden. 4000 B.C. to A.D. 2000*, Lund, 72–117.

Näsman, U., 2000. Raids, migration and kingdoms. The Danish case, *Acta archaeologica* **71**(1), 1–7.

Näsman, U., 2006: Danerne og det danske kongeriges opkomst. Om forskningsprogrammet 'Fra stamme til stat i Danmark', *Kuml*, **2006**, 205–41.

Ødegaard, M., 2018: Thing sites, cult, churches, games and markets in Viking and medieval southeast Norway, AD *c*.800–1600. *World archaeology* **50**(1), 150–64.

O'Grady, O.J.T., 2018: Accumulating kingship. The archaeology of elite assembly in medieval Scotland, *World archaeology* **50**(1), 137–49.

Olsen, A.B., 2015: Courtyard sites in western Norway. Central assembly places and judicial institutions in the Late Iron Age, in M.H. Eriksen, U. Pedersen, B. Rundberget, I. Axelsen and H.L. Berg (eds), *Viking worlds. Things, spaces and movement*, Oxford, 43–55.

Paynter, R., 1989: The archaeology of equality and inequality, *Annual review of anthropology* **18**(1), 369–99.

Pluciennik, M., 2005: *Social evolution*, London.

Poulsen, B., and S.M. Sindbæk, 2011: *Settlement and lordship in Viking and early medieval Scandinavia*, Turnhout.

Purkis, J., and J. Bowen, 2004: *Changing anarchism. Anarchist theory and practice in a global age*, Manchester.

Randall, A.R., 2015: *Constructing histories. Archaic freshwater shell mounds and social landscapes of the St. Johns River, Florida*, Gainesville, FL.

Randsborg, K., 1980: *The Viking age in Denmark. The formation of a state*, London.

Randsborg, K., 1991: *The first millennium A.D. in Europe and the Mediterranean. An archaeological essay*, Cambridge.

Rathbone, S., 2017: Anarchist literature and the development of anarchist counter-archaeologies, *World archaeology* **49**(3), 291–305.

Roesdahl, E., and D.M. Wilson, 1992: Introduction, in E. Roesdahl (ed.), *From Viking to Crusader. The Scandinavians and Europe 800–1200*, Copenhagen (22nd Council of Europe exhibition), 24–29.

Roslund, M., 2007. Guests in the house. Cultural transmission between Slavs and Scandinavians 900 to 1300 A.D., Leiden (The Northern World 33).

Russell, B., 2004: *Power. A new social analysis*, London.

Saitta, D.J., 1994: Class and community in the prehistoric Southwest, in W.H. Wills (ed.), *The ancient southwestern community. Models and methods for the study of prehistoric social organization*, Albuquerque, 25–43.

Sanmark, A., 2009: Administrative organisation and state formation. A case study of assembly sites in Södermanland, Sweden, *Medieval archaeology* **53**(1), 205–41.

Sanmark, A., 2017: *Viking law and order. Places and rituals of assembly in the medieval north*, Edinburgh.

Sanmark, A., and S. Semple, 2008: Places of assembly. New discoveries in Sweden and England, *Fornvännen* **103**(4), 245–59.

Sawyer, P., 2001: *The Oxford illustrated history of the Vikings*, Oxford.

Schulze, F., 2013: Flirting with anarchism. Class, state, and anthropology, *Focaal*, **2013**(66), 133–38.

Scott, J.C., 1985: *Weapons of the weak. Everyday forms of peasant resistance*, New Haven, CT.

Scott, J.C., 2009: *The art of not being governed. An anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*, New Haven, CT.

Scott, J.C., 2012: *Two cheers for anarchism. Six easy pieces on autonomy, dignity, and meaningful work and play*, Princeton, NJ.

Semple, S., and A. Sanmark, 2013: Assembly in North West Europe. Collective concerns for early societies? *European journal of archaeology*, **16**(3), 518–542.

Sindbæk, S.M., 2005: *Ruter og rutinisering. Vikingetidens fjernhandel i Nordeuropa*, Copenhagen.

Sindbæk, S.M., 2007: Networks and nodal points. The emergence of towns in early Viking age Scandinavia, *Antiquity* **81**(311), 119–32.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smith, M.E., 2016: Anarchism in archaeology. Trivial or insightful?, Publishing archaeology (author blog), at http://publishingarchaeology.blogspot.com/2016/04/anarchism-in-archaeology-trivial-or.html.

Söderberg, B., 2005: *Aristokratiskt rum och gränsöverskridande. Järrestad och sydöstra Skåne mellean region och rike 600–1100*, Stockholm (Riksantikvarieämbetet).

Spriggs, M., 1984: Another way of telling, in M. Spriggs (ed.), *Marxist perspectives in archaeology*, Cambridge, 1–10.

Stidsing, E., R. Fiedel and K. Høilund Nielsen (eds), 2014: *Wealth and complexity. Economically specialised sites in Late Iron Age Denmark*, Randers.

Storli, I., 2010: Court sites of arctic Norway. Remains of thing sites and representations of political consolidation processes in the northern Germanic world during the first millennium A.D., *Norwegian archaeological review* **43**(2), 128–44.

Storm, G., 1900: *Norges kongesagaer, 1914-utgaven*, Kristiania.

Sundqvist, O., 2016: *An arena for higher powers. Ceremonial buildings and religious strategies for rulership in Late Iron Age Scandinavia*, Leiden.

Thomasson, J., and M. Anglert, 2003: *Landskapsarkeologi och tidig medeltid. Några exempel från södra Sverige*, Lund (Acta Archaeologica Lundensia).

Tollefson, K.D., 1987: The Snoqualmie. A Puget Sound chiefdom, *Ethnology* **26**(2), 121–36.

Trigger, B.G., 1990: Monumental architecture. A thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behaviour, *World archaeology* **22**(2), 119–32.

Trigger, B.G., 2006: *A history of archaeological thought*, Cambridge.

Ulsig, E., 2011: *Danmark 900–1300. Kongemagt og samfund*, Aarhus.

Vésteinsson, O., 2007: A divided society. Peasants and the aristocracy in medieval Iceland, *Viking and medieval Scandinavia* **3**, 117–39.

Wallis, N.J., 2008: Networks of history and memory. Creating a nexus of social identities in Woodland period mounds on the lower St Johns River, Florida, *Journal of social archaeology* **8**, 236–71.

Ward, C., 1996: *Anarchy in action*, London.

Welch, J.R., 2017: Cycles of resistance. Introduction to anarchism in archaeology, *SAA archaeological record. The magazine of the Society for American Archaeology* **17**(1), 17–21.

Wengrow, D., 2010: *What makes civilization? The ancient Near East and the future of the West*, Oxford.

Wengrow, D., and D. Graeber, 2015: Farewell to the 'childhood of man'. Ritual, seasonality, and the origins of inequality, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* **21**(3), 597–619.

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

Widgren, M., 1998: Kulturgeofrafernas bönder och arkeologernas guld – finns det någon väg til en syntes?, in B. Stjernquist, L. Larsson and B. Hårdh (eds), *Centrala platser – centrala frågor. Samhällsstrukturen under järnålderen: en vänbok till Berta Stjernquist*, Stockholm, 281–96.

Witte, F., 2015: Danevirke. Udgravninger ved porten, *Fund & fortid*, **2015**(2–3), 86–88.

Young, G., 1979: Marx on bourgeois law, *Research in law and sociology* **2**, 133–67.

Young, R.J.C., 2009: What is the postcolonial?, *ARIEL. A review of international English literature* **40**(1), 13–25.

Zachrisson, T., 1994: The Odal and its manifestation in the landscape, *Current Swedish archaeology* **2**, 219–238.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203819000199 Published online by Cambridge University Press