Manuscript copy of an essay written for a publication that will be published in connection with Joar Nango's exhibition, fall 2020.

Control, Collect, Copy

Scenes from Four Hundred Years of Colonial Knowledge Production on "Danish Finnmark"

Mathias Danbolt

On October 25 1979, the Sámi Action Group held a press conference in the Danish parliament at Christiansborg Palace in Copenhagen under the statement "A Cry for Justice". In front of a homemade map of Sápmi[1] – the land of the Sámi since time immemorial, which crosses the borders of today's nation states of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia – the group's spokespersons, Mikkel Eira and Ánde Gaup, delivered a strong appeal to the Danish public:

> We have come to Denmark to tell the Danish people, the parliament and the government, that they have a responsibility which dates back to the 17th and 18th century. We refer to the Lapp Codicil of 1751 which was signed by Denmark (Norway was in union with Denmark at that time). This treaty says that the Sámi should be able to use the land without hindrance by borders. But this is no longer the case today. Obstacles are set in the way of reindeer herders living in the border areas. […] The Lapp Codicil and its contents have been totally neglected by these states. It is the responsibility of the Danes to comply with this treaty, as Denmark ruled over us at the time it was signed. We appeal to the Danish people, the Danish government, and the parliament for support for our cause. We hope that we receive international support in our cry for justice.[2]

The press conference was the first stop on the activists' solidarity tour in Denmark, organized by the Copenhagen-based NGO International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. Their plea

[1] The name of the Sámi Action Group's handmade map was actually written in Norwegian, "Sameland". The Sámi political, cultural and linguistic revitalization that took place in the 1970s pushed forth the use of Sámi names, and the Northern Sami spelling Sápmi became the most used designation which covers both the Sámi nation and the Sámi people. In line with Northern Sámi research traditions, I use the terms Sámi and Sápmi throughout the text, unless I cite historical sources which unfortunately insist on using derogatory exonyms such as "Finn" or "Lapp", which will be discussed further below.

[2] Samisk Aksjonsgruppe: "…og vi dro til Danmark…", *Charta 79 – et manifest* (3), 1979, 10. My translation from Norwegian. All Norwegian and Danish quotes have been translated to English by me, including the historical documents which have been slightly modernized for the purpose of comprehension.

came as a response to the Norwegian government's decision to build a hydroelectric power plant in the Áltá-Guovdageaidnu waterway in Finnmark, on the Norwegian side of Sápmi. The dam would not only impede traditional Sámi fishing practices, it would also submerge large areas of land used by Sámi reindeer herders, and destroy Sámi sacred places and archeological sites. The mobilization against the government's extractivism had peaked a few weeks prior to the press conference in Copenhagen. On October 8 1979, Sámi activists began a seated protest in front of the Norwegian Parliament in Oslo, where Eira and Gaup and eight others had initiated a hunger strike. Following massive media attention and violent police action against the Sámi activists and their allies, the Norwegian government announced on October 15 that they would temporarily suspend the construction work on the dam. In order to maintain pressure on the government, the activists sought international support in their fight against Norway's treatment of its indigenous population. But the Sámi Action Group's appearance in Copenhagen involved more than merely asking for solidarity; they also raised questions of accountability for the colonial rules and regulations of Sápmi that the Danish state had signed more than two hundred years earlier – regulations which still had a bearing on the present.

Several Danish media outlets reported from the Sámi Action Group's press conference.[3] The left-leaning newspaper *Information* even published a long interview with Eira and Gaup, and followed up with an editorial which gave full support to the activists' criticism of Norway's treatment of the Sámi.[4] But none of the articles mentioned the activists' appeal to Denmark's role in the colonization of Sápmi. Instead, the editorial in *Information* compared the "grotesque" policies against the Sámi in Norway with Denmark's treatment of Greenland: "Seen in relation to Norway's Sámi politics, Greenland's home rule is almost revolutionary", the editorial suggested, making the Danish approach to Greenland incomparable to "the total subjugation practiced by the Norwegian majority society towards the Sámi".[5]

It is no surprise that the Danish media didn't convey the call to Denmark's historical responsibility for the situation in Sápmi. Sámi Action Group's plea met a Danish public void of knowledge about this chapter of Danish-Sámi history. Even today, following a rise of scholarly interest in Nordic colonialism, the colonization of Sápmi has yet to be properly

[3] Torben Lodberg: "Samisk aktionsgruppe på oplysningsturné i alle større danske byer", *Socialistisk Dagblad*, 26.10.1979, 5; *Politiken*: "Samerne om deres kampe", *Politiken*, 26.10.1979, 9; Philip Lauritzen: "Samernes opgør med undertrykkelsen i Norge", *Information*, 26.10.1979, 10.
[4] Philip Lauritzen, "Nordens samer", *Information*, 27.10.1979, 16.
[5] Ibid.

addressed in research on Denmark-Norway's imperial past. As a Norwegian art historian, based in Denmark, I must admit to having been unaware of these historical imbrications myself, until I came across Eira and Gaup's statement from the press conference in Copenhagen in the third issue of the Sámi Action Group's newspaper *Charter 79* with the title "A Manifesto" (1979), that Tanya Busse and Joar Nango reprinted and redistributed as part of their ongoing project *The Nomadic Library* (2018–).[6] The Sámi Action Group started *Charter 79* in reaction to the Norwegian media's one-sided representation of the Áltá-Guovdageaidnu conflict, and to secure the presence of indigenous voices and perspectives in public discourse.[7] With *The Nomadic Library*, Busse and Nango have sought to set marginalized voices and perspectives like these in motion again, enabling counter-cultural publications from Sápmi and the Barents region to reach new audiences. My encounter with Eira and Gaup's statement led to an extensive research process as I have been trying to unpack and understand their claim of Denmark's role and responsibility for the colonization of Sápmi. This essay can, in other words, be seen as a belated response to Sámi Action Group's call for solidarity from a Danish-Norwegian perspective, in a present moment where the Norwegian government continues its colonial resource extraction, as mining companies, wind farms, and tourist development projects continually get concessions to build on Sámi lands.

In the spirit of *The Nomadic Library*'s reexamination of printed matter from social movements from pasts that are not passé, this essay revisits and reconsiders colonial knowledge production of Sápmi housed in archives in Copenhagen, in order to address the effects of Denmark's role in this unfinished colonial history. After an initial discussion of how and why Sápmi has been excluded from most histories of Danish-Norwegian colonialism, I zoom in on crucial moments in the colonial consolidation of the borders of "Danish Finnmark", as the Copenhagen-controlled part of Sápmi was called in the 1700s. In this brief history of what I propose to call the *Danification period* in Sápmi during the 17th and 18th century, that predates the assimilation politics of the *Norwegianization period* in the 19th and 20th century, the mission holds a central role as a political tool and colonial

---

[6] Busse and Nango's *The Nomadic Library (Charta 79 – et manifest nr. 3/79) / Johttigirjerádju (Charta 79 – et manifest nr. 3/79)* was part of the traveling exhibition *Let the River Flow: The Sovereign Will and the Making of a New Worldliness* (2018-2019) which engaged with the history and legacy of the "Áltá-Guovdageaidnu conflict, curated by Katya García-Antón with Antonio Cataldo for OCA: Office for Contemporary Art.
[7] Tanya Busse & Joar Nango: "CHARTA79: Interview with Ánde Somby", leaflet inserted into Tanya Busse & Joar Nango's: *The Nomadic Library (Charta 79 – et manifest nr. 3/79)*, 2018.

knowledge producer. The missionary Knud Leem's seminal book *An Account of the Laplanders of Finmark, their Language, Manners, and Religion* (1767) is of specific interest in this regard. His work not only gives a glimpse of Sámi perspectives on this colonial process, his attentive and detailed descriptions and visualizations of Sámi ways of life might also be of use to indigenous projects of reclaiming ownership of knowledge and history.

Definitions and Borders: Sápmi in Nordic Colonial Histories

Was Sápmi a Danish-Norwegian colony? The answer depends on one's definition of colonies and colonialism, and whether one recognizes Sámi as an indigenous people, with rights to the lands they have used since ancient times. The question itself thus only really makes sense from within a colonial world-view, for as long as Sápmi remains under the authority of four nation states, one ought instead to ask *how* Sápmi was colonized not if it ever was. And yet, the issue of how one defines a colony is relevant if we are to understand the lack of tradition in analyzing Sámi history as a colonial history in Danish as well as Norwegian historical research. The fact that the recent groundbreaking five-volume book series *Denmark and the colonies* [Danmark og kolonierne] (2017) even mentions the "'inner' colonialism in the North of Norway" in the preface of the work appears as something new, even though the reference is merely there to explain why Sápmi falls outside the scope of this massive research endeavor, which focuses on the former Danish-Norwegian colonies in today's India, Ghana, US Virgin Islands and Greenland.[8] The reason Sápmi is not part of the story seems to be because it fails the so-called "saltwater test" of colonies, as historian Gunlör Fur calls the often-used geographical criteria of colonies, that centers on "possessions separated from and at a considerable distance from the motherland".[9] The editors of *Denmark and the colonies* are far from alone in implying that the annexation of Sámi land has been an "internal" problem which falls outside the scope of discussions of colonialism proper. Similar reductions of the colonization of Sápmi to an internal conflict can be found in several Swedish and Finnish reference books.[10] But it is worth questioning the historiographical and ideological effects of the exclusion of Sápmi from histories of Nordic colonialism on this ground.

[8] Niels Brimnes, et.al.: "En ny dansk kolonihistorie". In Mikkel Venborg Pedersen (ed.): *Danmark og kolonierne: Danmark – en kolonimagt*. Copenhagen: Gad, 2007, 6.

[9] Gunlög Fur: *Colonialism in the Margins: Cultural Encounters in New Sweden and Lapland*, Leiden og Boston: Brill, 2006, 13; Brimnes, et.al.: "En ny dansk kolonihistorie", 6.

[10] For a critique of the use of the terms of "inner" and "internal" colonialism in Swedish and Finnish histories of Sápmi, see Fur: *Colonialism in the Margins*, 7, and Veli-Pekka Lehtola: "Sámi Histories, Colonialism, and Finland", *Arctic Anthropology*, 52 (2), 2015, 26-7.

Especially since the idea of an "'inner' colonization" presupposes that Sámi lands have *always* belonged to Nordic states, as *terra nullius* – a no man's land – within the borders of the states. This idea not only neglects the numerous historical sources, including from the Saga Age and Middle Ages, which describe "Finnmork" – which literally means "Sámi land" – as a territory which *borders* with Norway, as we can see in *Historia Norvegiæ* (ca. 1195) and *Egil's Saga* (ca. 1230).[11] The idea of "inner" colonialism also precludes analyses of Denmark-Norway, Sweden-Finland and Russia's expansion into Sámi territories as a colonial process and history.

It was precisely this complicated colonial history that Eira and Gaup addressed with their reference to the border treaty that Denmark-Norway and Sweden signed on October 2 1751, which included the addendum often called the Lapp Codicil.[12] The border treaty concluded a centuries-long conflict of sovereignty between the Nordic states over Sámi lands. The fact that the border between Denmark-Norway and Sweden – from Kornsjö in the south to Golmmešoaivve máttageahči in the north – was set as late as 1751 underscores that the incorporation of Sápmi into the Nordic states was a prolonged and highly tumultuous process.[13] The result ended up dividing Sápmi in two, and the fragmentation had dire consequences for the Sámi community, specifically the Sámi families who followed their reindeer's seasonal migration between the coast and inland – areas now belonging to different states. These challenges were not lost on the Danish and Swedish negotiators of the border treaty, who composed a supplementary document with the explicit aim to secure the "conservation of the Lapp Nation", as the negotiators expressed it.[14] With the Lapp Codicil as an addendum, the border treaty between Denmark-Norway and Sweden recognized the Sámi

[11] Lars Ivar Hansen: "Fra Nöteborgsfreden til Lappekodicillen: Folkegrupper og statsdannelse på Nordkalotten med utgangspunkt i Finnmark". In Steinar Imsen (ed.): *Grenser og grannelag i Nordens historie*, Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag, 2005, 365-6.

[12] The full title of the Codicil reads "Første Codicill og Tillæg til Grendse-Tractaten imellem Kongerigerne Norge og Sverrig Lapperne betreffende". For a full transcript of the addendum, see
Steinar Pedersen: "Lappekodicillen i nord 1751-1859: Fra grenseavtale og sikring av samenes rettigheter til grensesperring og samisk ulykke", *Dieđut* (3) 2008, 532-540.

[13] The final consolidation of the borders in Sápmi came in 1826 with the border treaty between Norway and Russia, which conformed then border of 1751 with what then had become Norway and Finland. For an analysis of the consequences of this treaty, see Steinar Pedersen: "Lappekodicillen", 200ff.

[14] Quoted in Steinar Pedersen: "Lappekodicillen", 24. The Danish phrase reads "den Lappiske Nations Conservation".

right to traditional use of land and water across the new national borders.[15] It was this legally binding obligation, which coincided with the colonial fracturing of Sápmi, that the Sámi Action Group called attention to in Copenhagen more than two centuries later.

Indigenizing Sámi History

The indigenous rights framework that Eira and Gaup drew on in their critique of the Nordic countries' "structural institutionalized oppression that had paralyzed the Sámi people", as they phrased it, was relatively new in the 1970s.[16] The Sámi political mobilization in the beginning of the 20th century had laid an important foundation for the border-crossing Sámi identity to which Eira and Gaup referred. The pan-Sámi nation building project was developed in direct opposition to the forced assimilation policies that the nation states leveled against the Sámi – often referred to as "Norwegianization" and "Swedification" – with growing intensity in the latter part of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. [17] In the 1740s, when the Lapp Codicil was drafted, Denmark-Norway and Sweden were not yet nation states in the sense of our contemporary understanding of the term, but conglomerate states, comprised of different provinces and colonies with several peoples and languages held together by a sovereign monarch. The "Lapp Nation" mentioned in the context of the border treaty of 1751 was thus not a threat to the cohesion of the Danish-Norwegian state. At that time, the states fought *about* the Sámi, not *against* them,[18] as they were seen as a taxation opportunity, and thereby as potential witnesses and evidence in the states' claims for territorial sovereignty. By using a colonial treaty from 1751 to fight Norway's colonial policies in 1979, Sámi Action Group effectively played two different colonial-national frameworks off against each other.

---

[15] For a discussion of the Lapp Codicil's importance for contemporary conflicts of land and water, see Øyvind Ravna: "Lappekodisillen av 1751 og dens rettslige betydning i dag', *Lov og rett* 49 (7), 2010, 393.

[16] Samisk Aksjonsgruppe: "…og vi dro til Danmark…", 10.

[17] For an analysis of the first oppositional Sámi movement, see Ketil Zachariassen: *Samisk nasjonale strateger: Samepolitikk og nasjonsbygging 1900-1940. Isak Saba, Anders Larsen og Per Fokstad*, Kárášjohka: ČálliidLágádus, 2012; and Lars Lien: "Sámi ál Sámi álbmotbeaivi – 'samefolkets dag' eller 'samenes nasjonaldag'?", *FLEKS: Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice*, 5 (1), 2018, 1-14.

[18] Helge Salvesen: "Synet på og holdninger til samer før og etter Knud Leem: En ideologihistorisk analyse av samisk minoritetspolitikk". In Jan Ragnar Hagland & Steinar Supphellen (eds.): *Knud Leem og det samiske: Foredrag holdt ved et seminar i regi av Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab 11.-12. oktober 2002*, Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag, 2003), 102.

Up until the 1970s, the notion of Sámi history was mainly understood as "history written about Sámi by non-Sámi for non-Sámi", as the Norwegian historian Knut Bergsland once put it.[19] Although Sámi political pioneers in the first oppositional movement, such as Karin Stenberg, had published critiques of "Sweden's 'colonial politics'" as far back as in 1920,[20] it was not until Sámi activists and academics started writing histories on their own terms in the 1960s and 1970s that Sámi history started to be framed through concepts of indigeneity, imperialism and colonialism. The rise of the global indigenous movement, with organizations such as the World Council of Indigenous People at the forefront, was of great importance for this second political and cultural awakening in Sápmi of which the Sámi Action Group was a part. *Charta 79* also demonstrates the important role that exchanges with other indigenous communities in the so-called Fourth World Movement had in the development of these new perspectives.[21] In this struggle for self-determination, the Lapp Codicil was given an important new position as "the oldest document that can be said to contain a proper codification of the rights of the Sámi", as stated in the resolution text from the Sixth Nordic Sámi Conference in 1968.[22] In the 1970s, the Lapp Codicil became a frequent point of discussion in Sámi publics and among Norwegian anti-imperialist critics. The Lapp Codicil was described by some as the consolidation of the colonialization of Sápmi and criticized how it set the needs of nomadic reindeer herding families above and against other Sámi constituencies.[23] Meanwhile, other Sámi politicians and activists hailed the Lapp Codicil as the first formal recognition of the Sámi nation: a "charter of freedom for the Sámi in Norway and Sweden", as the Sámi politician and researcher Israel Ruong wrote in his 1969

---

[19] Knut Bergsland: "Synsvinkler i samisk historie", *Historisk tidsskrift* 53, 1974, 1. An important exception to this pattern is Johan Turi: *Muitalus sámiid birra / An Account of the Sámi* , Kárášjohka: ČálliidLágádus, 2010 [1910].

[20] Karin Stenberg: *Dat läh mijen situd! Dat läh mijen situd! Det är vår vilja: en vädjan till den svenska nationen från samefolket,* Stockholm: Svenska forlaget, 1920*,* 69.

[21] See Máret Sára, Egil Utsi og Ánde Somby: "MANIFEST Charta 79", *Charta 79 – et manifest* (3), 1979, 3. For a discussion of the Norwegian left-wing understanding of the Sámi anti-imperialist fight, see Erik Patrick Joten: "Den radikale venstresidens historiebruk i kampen for samiske rettigheter på 1970- tallet", MA dissertation in history, Bergen: Universitetet of Bergen, 2019. For a critique of the "cultural imperialism" of the Norwegian left's engagement with Sámi politics, see Alf Isak Keskitalo: "Norge i sameland", *Dagbladet*, 24.11.1973.

[22] Quoted in Henry Minde: "Innledningsforedrag: Lappcodicillen av 1751 – var det samenes Magna Charta?", *Dieđut* 1, 1989, 4.

[23] Per Otnes: *Den samiske nasjon. Intresseorganisasjoner i samenes politiske historie*, Trondheim: Pax, 1970, 68; Gutorm Gjessing: *Norge i Sameland*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1973, 113.

book *Samerna*.[24] Others simply called it the "Sámi Magna Charta".[25] When the discussion on instituting a Sámi national day was raised in the late 1970s, several prominent figures suggested that it should be assigned to October 2, the date of the signing of the treaty.[26]

The central role of the border treaty of 1751 in Sámi publics contrasts sharply with the tradition within the majority of Nordic scholarship of implying that Sápmi has always been part of the states, and hence never really colonized. The figure of "internal" or "inner" colonialism can thus in itself be seen as part of the nation states' assimilation project. Eira and Gaup's appeal to Denmark's role and responsibility for the 1751 border treaty breaks out of this framework, and functions as a reminder of the importance of not reducing the colonization of Sápmi to the history Norwegianization and Swedification in the 19th and 20th centuries. Their appeal serves as an enduring invitation to examine the process and practices involved in the Danish-Norwegian annexation of Sápmi in the 17th and 18th centuries, or what I propose to call the *Danification before Norwegianization*.

The perhaps surprisingly positive views of the Lapp Codicil held by some Sámi critics should not lead one to think that the colonial politics under this so-called Danification period were necessarily "better" than what followed during Norwegianization. As the Sámi historian Veli-Pekka Lehtola has noted, it is important to avoid reproducing generalizing approaches that overlook the nuances, contradictions, and differences that shaped the colonial history of Sápmi: "There is good reason to abandon the idea of [colonialism as] a unidirectional tidal force, which leaves behind clearly discernible repressors and repressed, high-handed decision makers, and helpless victims. There were very dissimilar actors on both sides with their own goals and strategies. Their relations should be analyzed on several levels to uncover different power relationships."[27] For Lehtola, the lens of colonialism ought to work as an analytical

---

[24] Israel Ruong quoted in Minde: "Innledningsforedrag", 4.

[25] Bjørn Aarseth: "Rikets "samling" i nord", *Ságat: Ávissa sámiide / avis for samene* (21-22), 21.12.1972, 4.
Axel Wigdehl: "Lappekodicillen", *Dyade: Tidsskrift for kultur, filosofi, samfunn*, 2, 1976, 29-34; Bjørn Aarseth: "Grensetraktaten med Sverige og Lappekodicillen av 1751", *Ságat: Ávissa sámiide / avis for samene* (30), 5.8.1977, 4; Bjørn Aarseth: "Lappekodicillen av 1751 i dagens samepolitiske bilde", *Ságat: Ávissa sámiide / avis for samene* (31), 12.8.1977, 1, 3.

[26] See for instance Arne Wulff: "Samisk nasjonaldag", *Ságat: Ávissa sámiide / avis for samene* (47) 3.12.1976, 2;
Ole Mathis Hætta, "Samisk nasjonaldag', *Ságat: Ávissa sámiide / avis for samene* (45), 19.11.1976, 4. The date for the Sámi national day was not decided until the Sámi Conference in 1992. The chosen day ended up being February 6, the day for the first pan-Sámi meeting in Tråante / Trondheim in 1917.

[27] Lehtola: "Sámi Histories", 29.

approach that can provide “a more diverse and profound view of the Sámi past” – one which gives room for Sámi voices, experiences, and perspectives.[28] Following Lehtola, it is obvious that the categorical disconnection of Sápmi from historical research on Denmark-Norway’s colonial past has not only resulted in an amputated and one-sided understanding of Nordic history; the disconnection has made it easy to ignore the important position that Sápmi held in the Danish-Norwegian imperial project, and the effects this history have had – and continue to have – for Sámi many communities.

The Perpetual Struggle for Sovereignty in Sápmi: The Kalmar War and Beyond

The absence of Sápmi from modern Danish history is not only due to narrow definitions of colonialism. It is also a result of the fact that the discipline of history writing has been connected to the project of modern nation building, with the effect that stories connected to territories which are no longer part of the Danish state – such as Norway, Sápmi and other former colonies – have been largely excluded and ignored.[29] The only point at which Sámi tend to appear within Danish historical research is in connection with the Kalmar War that Denmark-Norway fought with Sweden in 1611-13. This is also the case in Michael Bregnsbo and Kurt Villads Jensen’s important critical re-reading of Danish history in *The Danish Empire: Greatness and Fall* [Det danske imperium: Storhed og fald] (2004). It is worth taking a closer look at how this book describes this war, as it gives an opportunity to recap important events in the colonial history of Sápmi while also demonstrating that although Sámi people do get mentioned, they are repeatedly reduced to passive objects rather than active subjects with any bearing on the future of the Danish-Norwegian empire.

The conflict over Sápmi enters *The Danish Empire* in a brief mention of the Danish-Norwegian King Christian IV’s journey in 1599 to Finnmark and Kildin on the Kola Peninsula, where the king aimed to “assert sovereignty over Northern Norway as well as the North Sea”, as the authors note. This is the context for Bregnsbo and Villads Jensen’s discussion of the aforementioned border issues between Denmark-Norway and Sweden:

> In Northern Norway, the borders were unclear and loose, and the Danes/Norwegians, the Russians and the Swedes kept laying claim to the right to incur taxes from the Sámi people. Sweden strongly increased its activities in

[28] Lehtola: “Sámi Histories”, 31.

[29] Rasmus Glenthøj: *Skilsmissen. Dansk og norsk identitet før og efter 1814*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2012, 47.

> this regard at the start of the 17th century, not only in terms of taxation but also in relation to trade. The Swedish enterprise was a central factor in the deteriorating Swedish-Danish relationship that led to the Kalmar War (1611-13). A lasting result of the peace in Knærød in 1613 was that the border between Sweden and Norway was established, and that the Swedes had to recognize the Danish-Norwegian right to tax the coastal Sámi in Northern Norway and otherwise abandon their activities in the area.[30]

While Bregnsbo and Villads Jensen mention the central role that taxation of the Sámi had in the conflict of sovereignty of Sápmi, their description of the peace treaty in Knærød in Sweden in 1613 is not only inaccurate but directly misleading. While it is correct that the Swedes officially gave up their claims of gaining access to the North Sea in 1613, King Charles IX of Sweden (1550-1611) had long aspired to territorial sovereignty over the full coast and mainland in Finnmark. Charles IX's choice to take the title "King of the Lapps in Nordland" at his coronation in 1607 underscored this imperialist strategy, which was one of the provocations that led Christian IV of Denmark-Norway to eventually go to war.[31] When peace negotiations began in November 1612, the right to incur taxes from the Sámi was one of the main points of dispute. Although the peace treaty affirmed that the Swedish state had to give up their claims of territories on the coast and thus the right to collect taxes from the coastal Sámi, both kingdoms reserved the right to continue to demand taxes from Sámi living in the borderless "common areas" in the inner parts of Finnmark. The peace treaty never set the border between Denmark-Norway and Sweden, largely due to the fact that this would have required in-depth investigations that would have delayed the peace treaty for several years.[32] The border problem was therefore raised in all the peace negotiations following the wars between Denmark-Norway and Sweden in the 1600s, and it was not until the peace settlements after the Great Nordic War (1700-1721) that the states decided to commence the border negotiation. This process started in 1734 and came to an end fifteen years later in 1751.

---

[30] Michael Bregnsbo & Villads Jensen, Kurt: *Det danske imperium: Storhed og fald*, Copenhagen: Aschehoug, 2004, 128.
[31] Oscar Albert Johnsen: *Finmarkens politiske historie, aktmæssig fremstillet.* Kristiania: Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter, ser. II, Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse, No. III, 1923, 122.
[32] Johnsen: *Finmarkens politiske historie*, 130.

Despite this long stormy process, the Kalmar War has continually been referred to as the end point to the conflict of sovereignty in the north in the majority of Danish history books,[33] a gesture that effectively stops the history of the colonization of Sápmi almost before it can be said to have begun. As Lars Ivar Hansen has noted, the struggle for the right to incur taxes from the Sámi was just the first stage on the way to state formations in Sápmi.[34] The expansion of colonial administration and the enforcement of jurisdiction over the Sámi came in the second phase, closely linked to the ecclesiastical expansion and missionary activities that intensified on the Danish-Norwegian side as late as the 1700s. The conversion of these powers to territorial rights constituted the third phase, with the boundary treaty of 1751 being one of several landmark events. In short, the perpetual uncertainty over territorial sovereignty in the north was an important reason for Denmark-Norway's colonial advance in Sápmi in the first half of the 18th century; an advance that had major consequences for Sámi culture, religion and language, and where the mission played a crucial role as an agent of power and knowledge.

The Sámi Mission: From Fear of Witchcraft to the Danger of Wandering Priests

Contrary to the impression given in many history books, Sweden did not give up its imperial ambitions in Sápmi after the Kalmar war. During the 1600s, Sweden developed a well-organized state apparatus in Sápmi and initiated a series of measures to persuade Swedish settlers to move up north to the supposedly "unoccupied" land.[35] Sweden had also been early in their missionary activities in Sápmi. King Gustav I Vasa of Sweden (1496-1560) sent the first missionary to Sápmi in 1526, and as the Swedish mission intensified in the 1600s, numerous Sámi churches were built in common areas, including in Anár (1647), Guovdageaidnu (1701) and Ohcejohka (1710). The Swedish presence was looked upon with great concern by the bishop in Trondheim, Peder Krog (1654-1731). In December 1705, after one of his rare visits to Finnmark, Krog wrote to King Frederik IV of Denmark-Norway highlighting the need for more priests and teachers to curb the Swedish mission, which

---

[33] See for instance, Lars Hovbakke Sørensen: *Slagbrødre eller broderfolk: Nordens historie gennem 1300 år,* Copenhagen: Aschehoug, 2004, 77; Gunner Lind, "Christian Frederiksen 1588-1613". In Due-Nielsen, Carsten, Ole Feldbæk & Nikolaj Petersen (eds): *Dansk udenrigspolitisk historie. Bind 1: Konger og krige 700-1648*. Copenhagen: Danmarks Nationalleksikon, 2001, 385.

[34] Hansen: "Fra Nöteborgsfreden til Lappekodicillen", 363-4.

[35] Liv Helene Willumsen: "Isaac Olsens kopibok som kulturuttrykk på tidlig 1700-tall", *1700-tal: Nordic Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 14, 2017, 61.

ultimately could threaten Denmark-Norway's claims of sovereignty on the coast and the common areas in Finnmark.[36]

The concern for territorial sovereignty was taken seriously. In January 1706, Frederik IV sent the theological candidate Povel Resen (1674-1725) to examine the conditions in Sápmi. In addition to describing the life and religious practices of the Sámi from Trondheim in the central part of Norway to Finnmark in the north, Resen was also tasked with mapping the Swedish missionary practices and taxation system, and delivering ideas for how a Danish-Norwegian mission could be organized.[37] When Resen returned to Copenhagen more than a year later, his reports confirmed Bishop Krog's concerns. Resen explained that the Sámi on the Swedish side were good Christians, an effect of the Swedes' effective and systematic mission with Sámi-speaking priests and Sámi churches. In the Danish-Norwegian areas the situation was a different one. The church was poorly organized and the Sámi were in many places more "pagan" than Christian, in Resen's opinion.[38] According to Resen, the Danish-Norwegian areas needed more churches, more Sámi speaking priests, and schools. King Frederik IV listened to the suggestions. In 1707 the bishop in Trondheim was asked to send young theologians northward so that they could learn Sámi, and eight new churches with parsonages were approved to be built in Sámi areas. The Danish-Norwegian "Finnemission", as the Sámi mission was called, had officially begun.

The Sámi mission was part of King Frederik IV's state-pietist ideology, that saw missionary activities as an important tool in the imperial ambitions of the state.[39] The King had established the College of Missions in Copenhagen in 1714 to be in charge of the activities in the Danish-Norwegian colony in Tranquebar in South East India, and they soon took over the responsibilities for the missions in Sápmi and Greenland as well. The Norwegian pietist priest Thomas von Westen (1682-1727) was appointed to head the Sámi mission's new educational institution, *Seminary Scholasticum* in Trondheim, which were to prepare missionaries, catechists and schoolmasters to work in Sápmi. Von Westen followed the Lutheran idea that missionary work should take place in the language of the people, so teaching the priests Sámi was key. Von Westen himself made three long mission trips in the 1720s, which laid an important foundation for the development of the Sámi mission in the

---

[36] Margarethe Lööv: "Povel Resen og tidlig norsk misjon blant samene', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjonsvitenskap* (1), 2017, 48.
[37] Willumsen: "Isaac Olsens kopibok", 60.
[38] Lööv: "Povel Resen", 54.
[39] Salvesen: "Synet på og holdninger til samer før og etter Knud Leem", 98.

decades to come. As a missionary, von Westen not only sought to replace the Sámi spiritual world with Lutheran-Protestant Christianity – by force if needed – he was also invested in understanding the so-called Sámi "paganism".[40]

The Sámi's alleged expertise in witchcraft had long since been a point of concern in Denmark. From the Middle Ages, demonological manuals across Europe often described the northern regions as a center of evil, and Sápmi was consequently severely affected by the witchcraft persecutions in the 15th and 16th centuries.[41] King Christian IV had been instrumental in the organized attack on Sámi spirituality. On his trip to Finnmark in 1599, the King had met a Sámi man who know the art of casting spells.[42] When Christian IV revealed his political policy plan for the northern territories in 1609, he ordered the administrative officers in Nordland and Finnmark to quash Sámi witchcraft without mercy. This crackdown on Sámi religion was motivated by territorial issues, as the King claimed that fear of Sámi sorcery had affected the colonization in Finnmark, as Norwegians and "other pious people" did not dare to settle in the fjords where the Sámi resided.[43] According to historian Rune Hagen's examination of the witchcraft trials in Finnmark, the Danish-Norwegian officials were adamant in following the King's orders. The Sámi were not only accused of witchcraft if seen with the outlawed Sámi drums, but conflicts with the Danish-Norwegian authorities regarding rights to land and water also triggered accusations of sorcery.

Although the colonization process left a strong mark on the Sámi religious practices in the 1600s, Christianization did not cause the Sámi to abandon all of their traditional beliefs. Thus, on his mission trips in the 1720s, von Westen collected stories of Sámi "paganism" in his so-called Confession Books, and confiscated more than one hundred Sámi drums, which were sent to the College of Missions in Copenhagen. While the drums were regarded by the missionaries as the devil's work, they were among the most highly valued collectables in Europe's art and curiosity cabinets at the time. Confiscated Sámi drums can be found in the registers of the earliest collections in Denmark from the first part of the 17th century, including Ole Worm's famous *Museum Wormianum* and the Royal Kunstkammer of King

[40] Daniel Thrap: *Thomas von Westen og Finne-Missjonen*. Kristiania: P.T. Mallings Boghandels Forlag, 1882. 69.
[41] Rune Hagen: "Harmløs dissenter eller djevelsk trollmann? Trolldomsprosessen mot samen Anders Poulsen i 1692", *Historisk tidsskrift* 81 (2-3), 319.
[42] Jonas Carisius: "Christian den fjerdes reisetur til Norge og Vardøhus i Finnmarken" [1599]. In Rune Blix Hagen & Per Einar Sparboe (eds.): *Kongens reise til det ytterste nord: Dagbøker fra Christian IVs tokt til Finnmark og Kola i 1599*, Tromsø: Ravnetrykk, 2004, 53.
[43] Quoted in Hagen: "Harmløs dissenter eller djevelsk trollmann?", 343.

Frederik III.[44] Nearly all of the drums von Westen stole from Sápmi, however, went up in flames together with most of his notes in the Copenhagen city fires of 1728 and 1795, although six Sámi drums still reside in the collections of the National Museum in Copenhagen today.[45] Although von Westen was given the status of the "Sámi apostle" in the Danish-Norwegian areas in Sápmi, the College of Missions had long complained about the lack of insight into the development of the mission and its financial organization. His poor standing in Copenhagen was instrumental in the closure of the *Seminary Scholasticum* upon his death in 1727, which put a temporary stop to the mission's practice in Sámi language. Both Bishop Krog and his successor Eiler Hagerup believed that the Sámi people ought to learn Danish rather than that the missionaries should learn Sámi. Knowledge of the Danish language would also ensure that the Sámi would become properly included into the Danish-Norwegian kingdom.[46]

This Danish turn in the mission practice was far from successful. The development in the Danish-Norwegian and Swedish border conflict ensured that changes were made.[47] By 1738, the Border Commission had begun its initial work of preparing the border negotiations between the states, which involved the gathering of intelligence on the topographic, societal, and economic conditions in the border areas, where testimonies from Sámi people about their taxation histories in the "common districts" were of specific importance. In an early draft of the border treaty, the Swedes proposed that priests should have the right to follow their Sámi parishioners on their annual wandering with their reindeer herds across the state border. This proposal was met with great opposition in Copenhagen as it was believed that these

---

[44] There are drawings of Sámi drums in the register from 1655 of Ole Worm's "Museum Wormianum" as well as in the catalogue of Frederik III's *Museum Regium* from 1696. See Camilla Mordhorst: *Genstandsfortællinger: Fra Museum Wormianum til de moderne museer,* Copenhagen: Museum Tusculaneum, 2009. For a discussion of the European interest in Sámi drums at this time, see Mårten Snickare: "Kontroll, begär och kunskap: Den koloniala kampen om Goavddis', *RIG: Kulturhistorisk tidsskrift* 97 (2), 2014, 65-77.

[45] Birgitte Jørkov: "Den stærke tromme", *Siden Saxo* 17 (1), 2000, 9. The most well-known drum that is in the collection of the National Museum in Copenhagen was taken from the Sámi *noaidi* Anders Poulsen in 1692. It has been located at Sámiid Vuorká-Dávvirat (Sámi Collections) at the RidduDuottarMuseat in Karasjok on the Norwegian side of Sápmi since 1979.

[46] Asbjørn Nesheim: "Efterord". In Knud Leem: *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper.* Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1975 [1767], 5.

[47] Rolf Grankvist: "Seminarium Lapponium Fredericianum i Trondheims-miljøet'. In Jan Ragnar Hagland & Steinar Supphellen (eds.): *Knud Leem og det samiske: Foredrag holdt ved et seminar i regi av Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab 11.-12. oktober 2002*, Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag, 2003), 51.

"wandering priests" would favor the Swedes, who already had a well-organized infrastructure of both Sámi-speaking and Sámi priests.[48] Even though Denmark-Norway refused the suggestion, the state urgently sought to secure that the so-called "Danish Lapps" would have their own Sámi-speaking priests, in order to prevent the Swedish mission from gaining ground on the Danish-Norwegian side of the border.

In 1752 a new educational institution was established in Trondheim, *Seminarium Lapponium Fredericianum*. As the name implies, King Frederik V had contributed with fresh capital, which emphasized the institution's national importance. The College of Missions in Copenhagen named the priest Knud Leem as head of the seminar and gave him the title "Professor Linguæ Lapponicæ" – professor of Sámi language – a position he held until his death in 1774. Leem himself had a background in the Sámi mission, as he had been admitted to von Westen's *Seminary Scholasticum* in 1723 and been posted as a missionary in Finnmark in 1725. After four years as a missionary among the Sámi in Porsanger and Laksefjord, he was appointed the parish priest in Áltá where he served until 1734, before being sent to the parish in Avaldsnes in the south west of Norway. Only a year after Leem's arrival in Finnmark, von Westen praised Leem in a letter for his ability to preach in Sámi, writing that he "was much loved by the Lapps".[49] In contrast to von Westen, Leem was not invested in missioning by force, but instead was engaged in understanding the Sámi life and world in which he lived and worked. Leem used this knowledge as the basis for a number of publications on Sámi language and culture published by the College of Missions, including the North-Sámi grammar book, *En lappisk Grammatica* (1748), the bilingual Danish-Northern Sámi dictionary *En lappisk Nomenclator* (1756), and the topographical work *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper, deres Tungemaal, Levemaade og Forrige Afgudsdyrkelse* (1767), translated into English in an abbreviated version in 1808 under the title *An Account of the Laplanders of Finmark, their Language, Manners, and Religion*. The latter book (hereby referred to as *An Account*) is of special interest in this context, for besides being a unique example of the mission's colonial knowledge production of Sápmi, Leem's book and its publishing history also provide important insights into the ways in which the

---

[48] Grankvist: "Seminarium Lapponium Fredericianum", 51.

[49] Von Westen, quoted in Jan Ragnar Hagland: "Knud Leem – ei kort biografisk skisse". In Jan Ragnar Hagland & Steinar Supphellen (eds.): *Knud Leem og det samiske: Foredrag holdt ved et seminar i regi av Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab 11.-12. oktober 2002*, Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag, 2003), 12.

border conflict not only reorganized Sámi communities but also the knowledge and histories of Sápmi.

Between "Danish Finmark" and "Sámi-Ednam": Knud Leem's Account of Northern Sápmi

Knud Leem had worked on a description of the Sámi in Finnmark for many years but completed the manuscript during an extended stay in Copenhagen in 1747-48. Although the College of Missions had agreed to publish the book in 1750, the manuscript was not printed until 1767. But the final result was impressive: a 544-page book with text in two columns in Danish and Latin, where the book's 23 chapters covered every conceivable aspect of the Sámi people: their origins, language, clothing, housing, reindeer husbandry, food habits, living conditions, and faith – as well as the history of the Sámi Mission. The institutional endorsement of the work was emphasized by the addition of two well-respected names to the book's list of authors: the bishop of Trondheim and scientist Johan Ernst Gunnerus, who contributed with footnotes to accompany Leem's text, and the Secretary of the Danish Chancery, Erik J. Jessen, had authored a "Treatise on the Pagan Religion of the Norwegian Finns and Laplanders", which was included as an appendix to the book. The work also included 101 copper etchings engraved by Odvart Helmodt von Lode, based on sketches that Leem had commissioned an artist to produce.

The College of Missions had several reasons to fund such a costly publication. On the one hand, *An Account* fulfilled the College of Missions' need for information and propaganda internally which could legitimate the colonizing mission in the north. On the other hand, the book served as a strategic counterpart to the influential work *Lapponia* (1673), which the German-born Uppsala professor Johannes Schefferus had written upon order of the Swedish state.[50] *Lapponia* was the first scientific attempt to gather available knowledge about the Sámi, and the work was translated into several languages and quickly became a central reference point nationally and internationally. In Leem's preface to *An Account* he explicitly positions his book in relation to Schefferus' work which he praises for containing "accurate and truthful" information, although it also holds "false accounts in some things" which might

[50] Ole Henrik Magga, "Knud Leem som utforsker av samisk språk og kultur". In Jan Ragnar Hagland & Steinar Supphellen (eds.): *Knud Leem og det samiske: Foredrag holdt ved et seminar i regi av Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab 11.-12. oktober 2002*, Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag, 2003), 39-40.

have to do with the fact that the Schefferus, in contrast to Leem, never visited Sápmi.[51] Leem not only uses the comparison to demonstrate how he is a more credible author than Schefferus, he also makes clear that whereas *Lapponia* almost exclusively deals with the "Swedish Lapmark", Leem has sought to fill the gap of knowledge on "Danish Finmark".[52]

Like any books published under the censorship of the absolute Danish-Norwegian monarchy, *An Account* opens with a dedication to the King. In addition to praising the monarch, Leem also uses this rhetorical exercise to position the Sámi mission in a broader context of the Danish-Norwegian colonial project:

> One might wonder why anyone would want to describe the inhabitants of Finmark, the so-called Lapps, their conducts and ways of life, and one might think that time is being wasted on describing such an unworthy and poor people. But not when considering the admirable royal grace that the greatest monarchs – the memorable King Frederik IV, King Christian VI, and King Frederik V, and the Greatest Monarch, our now reigning King and Lord, King Christian VII – has shown to Finmark and the Lapps residing there, by sending missionaries, as to East India, West India and Greenland, in order to ensure their thorough enlightenment and promotion in the true and salvaging knowledge of God.[53]

Leem's tribute to the monarch not only situates the mission in Sápmi as on par with the missionary work in the other colonies in the Danish-Norwegian empire; he also explicates his hope that *An Account* will become as valuable to the understanding of Sápmi as "the Greenlandic description authored by Mr. Bishop Egede" had been to Copenhagen's understanding of the colony in Greenland.[54] While Leem's work never gained the status in Denmark as Egede's would do, the book did raise Leem up the ladder in the Danish-Norwegian colonial system – even before the book was printed. While residing in Copenhagen in 1748, Leem had the opportunity to appear before King Frederik V, where he gifted him his recently published Sámi grammar book as well as a handwritten copy of the manuscript for *An Account* which included a set of hand-painted illustrations.[55]

---

[51] Knud Leem, *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper,* Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1975 [1767], 2.
[52] Reidar Djupedal: *Knud Leem og hans 'Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper'*, unnamed place and publisher, 1959, 12.
[53] Leem, *Beskrivelse,* a2.
[54] Leem, *Beskrivelse*, 9.
[55] Djupedal, *Knud Leem*, 9.

Given his relationship with the monarch and his efficiency in delivering manuscripts to the College of Missions, it is not surprising that Leem was chosen to lead the *Seminary Lapponium Fredericianum* when it was established in 1752. But it may be more difficult to understand why it took nineteen years between the King receiving a manuscript copy of *An Account* to the book finally being published in 1767. One of the reasons for the delay was due to the censor at the Danish Chancery, who had multiple objections to Leem's manuscript. Besides being requested to remove several topographical chapters on the nature and wildlife in Finnmark, Leem was also asked to ensure that "absolutely nothing concerning the Swedish Lapmark" would be included in the book.[56] A longer exchange of letters between Leem and the Chancery between 1750 and 1752 makes clear how the border conflict between Denmark-Norway and Sweden impacted both the Sámi mission as well as its accompanying knowledge production. In a letter from 1751, the Chancery asks Leem whether there is "any firm reason to consider all the people residing in Finmark, both the Sea Finns and the Mountain Finns, as proper Lapps, and to claim that they are the same kind of people".[57] In his reply, Leem explains that despite "their widely dispersed places of residence, the Lapps cannot cease to be but one and the same Nation".[58] While the Chancery seeks a scientific license that can support the state division of Sápmi, Leem argues that the colonial divide between Sámi groups does not make sense from a Sámi perspective. But although Leem objected to the Chancery's censor, he was eventually forced to adapt his work according to the wishes of the state. In the printed version, the manuscript's initial 29 chapters were reduced to 23, and according to historian Reidar Djupedal, who has studied the development of Leem's manuscripts, the descriptions of the Sámi on the Swedish sides of Sápmi were rewritten and curtailed.[59]

Leem's *An Account* harbors an obvious friction between the ideological framework that runs through the introductory prefaces highlighting the work's focus on the "Land of Danish Finmark", as it is called, and the main body of the text, where Leem repeatedly explains that the Sámi are "one kind of people, which uses the same language, the same forms of clothing and the same traditions". That the increased attempt at making the Sámi identify as "Danish

---

[56] The Danish Chancery quoted in Djupedal, *Knud Leem*, 17.
[57] Letter from the Danish Chancery (authored by E.J. Jessen) to Leem, Copenhagen July 1 1751, quoted in Djupedal, *Knud Leem*, 18.
[58] Letter from Leem to the Danish Chancery, September 9, 1751, quoted in Djupedal, *Knud Leem*, 18.
[59] Djupedal, *Knud Leem*, 9.

Lapps" or "Swedish Lapps" conflicted with Sámi self-conceptions also comes to the front in some of Bishop Gunnerus' remarkable footnotes in *An Account*, where he gives space to Sámi views on the matter:

> On my visiting trips in Nordland and Finmark I have often noticed that especially the Finns in Finnmark, both the Mountain Finns and Sea Finns, do not want to be called Lapps […], although they are undeniably one People together with the Russian Lapps and the Swedish Lapps. Yes, I even read the same about the Swedish Lapps in Schefferus' *Lapponia*, so it was not surprising that they did not like this name: Lapps, which according to Schefferus' is an offending word that others have put on them. […] Every Finn I have asked to name his people in his own language has replied that it is: *Sabmeladzh*; in plural *Same*. In Lappish or Finnish it is *Samas*. They call their language *Same-gieel* and their country *Same-ednam*.[60]

It is thought-provoking to read Gunnerus' more than 250-year-old remark on the Sámi resistance to the offensive name-giving practices of the colonial powers – especially in light of today's heated discussions about minorities' right to self-determination, where critique from the minorities against derogatory name-giving traditions has often been dismissed as ahistorical moralization over historical terms which are merely a "product of their time".[61] But Gunnerus' remark demonstrates that the resistance against degrading terms is as old as the colonial entitlement to defining and naming the world. The deliberate act of insisting on using derogatory names can indeed be understood as part of the "'inner' colonization" of Sápmi, in the sense of a colonization of the Sámi mind.

It is worth remembering that the missionary project of which Leem was a part had the explicit aim of fostering the "inner" transformation of the Sámi – a spiritual turn from "darkness" to "light" which involved renouncing and disowning traditional Sámi self-conceptions. It was in short not only the state borders that worked to split the Sámi people.

---

[60] J.E. Gunnerius' footnotes in Leem, *Beskrivelse,* 9n6; 6n5.

[61] Mathias Danbolt: "Retro Racism: Colonial Ignorance and Racialized Affective Consumption in Danish Public Culture", *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 7 (2), 2017, 105–113.

The missionary project's expulsion of traditional Sámi knowledge and spiritual practices also worked to disconnect the Sámi from their own history.

Visual Pedagogies: The Colonial Reproduction of Leem's Sápmi

Even though Leem's *An Account* was part of the Danish colonial knowledge regime, it is not difficult to understand why the work has come to occupy a central position in Sámi research on language, history, and aesthetics. In contrast to almost all of the colonial scholars before him, as well as most of the non-Sámi researchers who have written about Sápmi in the centuries that followed – myself included – Leem held an in-depth knowledge of the Northern Sámi language. His language skills not only enabled him to preach in Sámi, but more importantly, it equipped him with the ability to record Sámi words, concepts, and perspectives. Except for the somewhat coarse account of the Sámi as an "unworthy and poor" people in his dedication to the King and his insistent use of the term "Lapp", Leem's work is relatively absent of the otherwise widespread exoticizing and degrading views on the Sámi which characterizes many of his contemporaries' takes on the subject. Instead, Leem's writing is marked by a curious, open, and detailed-oriented approach to the topics he addresses – whether he covers Sámi architecture, clothing traditions, reindeer herding techniques or wedding rituals. Leem is in short clearly invested in understanding the culture that his own presence as a colonizing agent inevitably worked to change. But this inquisitive approach to the Sámi was not to last. After the border was set in 1751, the Sámi mission lost political priority in Copenhagen. When Leem passed away in 1774, the *Seminarium Lapponium* in Trondheim closed down, and the position he had held as professor of Sámi language was not continued. Sámi ceased to be the privileged language in the Sámi mission. The new consensus was that the people of the "Land of Danish Finmark" should speak Danish.[62]

If Leem's language skills make his work appear as an anomaly in the colonial knowledge production on Sápmi, his attention to the visual appearance of the Sámi also stands out. The etchings in *An Account* are perhaps the most well-known element of Leem's book, as a number of these prints have been excessively reproduced in works on Sámi culture. Leem clearly considered the illustrations to be an integral part of his project. Before he travelled to Copenhagen in 1747 and finished the manuscript – and thus before he knew whether the book would be published by the College of Missions – he had paid an unnamed artist to illustrate the work based on sketches he had made during his years in Sápmi.

---

[62] Leem: *Beskrivelse*, 508.

According to a letter sent to the College of Missions in 1752, Leem complains of the costs of having had the illustrations made, as he not only had paid the artist individually for each of the 97 images he had made, but also hosted him for free in his parsonage in Avaldsnes for the duration of over a year.[63] There is reason to believe that the artist Leem refers to is the Danish court painter Johannes Rach (1721-1783), whom we know visited Avaldsnes around 1746-47, since there exists a prospect painting of the church in Avaldsnes signed and dated by Rach that year.[64] But Leem never mentions the name of the craftsman behind the illustrations that functioned as the reference point for von Lode's engravings that he made in the early 1750s, and which were included in the book. These illustrations – or a version of them – were also part of the manuscript that Leem presented to King Frederik V in Copenhagen in 1748. This led the monarch to commission a series of 35 paintings of the lives of the Sámi based on Leem's sketches, an assignment given to Rach and his collaborator, the court painter Hans Heinrich Eegberg (1723-1783), who executed the paintings in 1748-49.[65]

The three series of images which relate to Leem's *An Account* are radically different in form, style and genre, as they have been made to serve distinct functions respectively: as handmade illustrations in the manuscript, as printed etchings in the book, and as imperial paintings in the King's court. It is the etchings by von Lode that have been the most frequent subject of commentary. The original illustrations, on the other hand, which today can be found in the manuscript collection in the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, have rarely been reproduced or studied, similar to Rach and Eegberg's paintings which today are in the collection of the National Museum of Copenhagen, where a selection is on display in a dark and decontextualized corner of the ethnographic collection from the Arctic region. While a thorough analysis of these different images is beyond the scope of this essay, suffice to say they are important examples of the visual presence that Sápmi had in the Danish-Norwegian colonial culture in the 18th century.

"Primitive", "clumsy", "charming", "amateur", and "naïve" are recurrent terms used in present day descriptions of the etchings that von Lode made on the basis of Leem's illustrations in the manuscript of *An Account*. Art historians have noted the "fairytale style" that characterizes the prints, and their "unmistakable rococoesque quality" has been said make

---

[63] Djupedal: *Knud Leem*, 22-23; Jahn Holljen Thon: *Talende linjer: Lærde illustrerte bøker 1625-1775*. Oslo: Novus Forlag, 2011, 206.

[64] For a discussion of Rach's Norwegian prospect paintings, including the one from Avaldsnes, see Knut Ormhaug & Dagfinn Moe: "Johannes Rach – Norske prospekter og historiske hager', *Kunst og Kultur* 93 (3), 2010, 138.

[65] Thon: *Talende linjer*, 207.

them seem “at far remove from the harsh realities on the plains in Finnmark”.[66] This might be an apt description of Rach and Eegberg’s paintings, as their representational quality might at first glance make one think of the fantasy-inspired appearance of the Sámi referenced in Disney’s popular movie *Frozen*. But we might do well to avoid judging the book illustrations – the handmade as well as the printed ones – according to standards of mimetic realism, as art historians have tended to do. As the book historian Jahn Holljen Thon has noted, the illustrations need to be seen in relation to the text they accompany – a relation that underscores that their pedagogical purpose trumps their representational function.[67] This is particularly evident in the original hand-made illustrations, that I assume were made by Rach and Leem, which are far simpler and much more graphically stylized than the etchings made by the classically trained von Lode. To call these drawings “primitive” would ignore the aspect of didactic and analytic simplification central to these illustrations. The over twenty images that focus on Sámi architecture is a case in point. In Rach/Leem’s drawings of different Sámi huts – *goahti* – the Renaissance ideal of central perspective is time and again replaced by what we can call a value perspective, which emphasizes educational details rather than naturalist impressions. Often Rach/Leem provide the viewer with multiple perspectives in the same illustrations, which allows us to see the construction and organization of the dwelling simultaneously. As Thon suggests, the illustrations function as elaborate pictograms – abstracted blueprints which seek to capture the activities and practices of the Sámi as Leem understood them. Even the more scenic images, such as the one used by Joar Nango as the poster for his exhibition at Bergen Kunsthall, can also be said to center on the tradition of Sámi *indigenuity*, to use Nango and Silje Figenschou Thoresen’s concept that speaks of the ingenuity of indigenous forms of improvisational skills[68]: As the text in Leem’s book makes clear, the illustration demonstrates a Sea Sámi tradition of turning the oars and sails from a boat into a tent in case of “bad weather or other reasons forces one to take to the shore at a place where nobody lives”.[69]

---

[66] Harry Fett: “Finnmarksviddas kunst: John Savio”, *Lofotposten*, December 23, 1980, 20-21; Caroline Serck-Hanssen: “Fra mørkets rike til midnattsolens land: Bilder av Nord-Norge fra det 16. Tiæ det 19. Århundre”. In Anne Aaserud (ed.): *Nordnorske bilder og bildet av Nord-Norge*. Tromsø: Nordnorsk Kunstmuseum, 2002, 12.

[67] Thon: *Talende linjer*, 210-2.

[68] Joar Nango & Silje Figenschou Thoresen: *The Indigenuity Project*. Self-published postcard booklet, 2010.

[69] Leem: *Beskrivelse*, 105.

Despite their obvious pictogrammatic quality, the prints in Leem's book have continually been presented as charming and authentic windows the past. But in the same way that Leem's *An Account* contributed to the consolidation of the colonial territory of "Danish Finmark", these images have been part of *producing* the history they are seen to merely represent. Nowhere has this productive aspect been more evident than in the case of a "Sámi" drum which can be found in the collection of the University Museum of Bergen. After the museum was founded in 1825, one of the institution's founding "fathers", the Norwegian attorney and County Governor of Bergenhus Stiftsamt, Wilhelm Friman Koren Christie (1778-1849), went in search of a traditional Sámi drum to include in the ethnographic collection.[70] The result was a large frame drum with an intricate pattern of symbols on the drum head, identical to the symbols depicted in two of the most famous prints from Leem's *An Account*. Given that few historical Sámi drums remain, the presence of this exact drum appeared exceptional to the Norwegian archeologist Gutorm Gjessing who went to examine the drum in Bergen in the 1950s. Upon closer inspection, Gjessing realized that the drum frame was made of whalebone and the drumhead of seal skin, unlike the wood frames and reindeer hide used in all other known Sámi drums. The drum also sported a small handle on the side, similar to those found on Inuit drums in Greenland. Additional research revealed that what the museum had presented as a Sámi drum was in fact the "President's Little Forgery", as Gjessing phrased it in an article in *Bergens Tidende* in 1953.[71] When Christie bought the drum in 1848 from The Royal Norwegian Society of Sciences and Letters in Trondheim, he appears to have believed that the absence of painted symbols on the drum head was a result of them having faded away with age.[72] Not knowing (or wanting to know?) that the drum was of Greenlandic origin, Christie commissioned someone to "re-paint" the drum head with the symbols from Leem's book. The resulting transcultural hybrid not only stands as an anachronistic symbol for the interconnectedness between the colonial histories of Sápmi and Greenland – connections which the Sámi Action Group sought to foster in the context of the global indigenous movement in the 1970s. The drum also effectively demonstrates how colonial knowledge sought to create Sápmi in its own image – an image which not only

---

[70] For a discussion of the establishment of the Sámi collection at the University Museum of Bergen, see Marie Doeke Boekraad and Knut Rio, "Kolonitidens lange røtter og den samiske samlingens aktualitet i dag", *Årbok 2019 – Røtter*, Bergen: University Museum of Bergen, 2019, 102-120.

[71] Gutorm Gjessing: "Presidentents vesle falskneri", *Bergens Tidende*, 4.4.1953, 4.

[72] See the text about the drum in University Museum of Bergen's exhibition *Verdsbilete* written by Konsta Ilari Kaikkonen.

displaced and replaced indigenous histories and perspectives, but also the truth of its own destructive-productive labor.

Coda: An Unfinished History of Colonization

In the autumn of 1981, two years after the Sámi Action Group's appeal to the Danish people, and after the emergence of the largest political and environmental movements in recent Norwegian history, the Norwegian state resumed the construction of the hydroelectric power plant in the Áltá-Guovdageaidnu waterway. Even though the Sámi lost the battle for the river, many have suggested that the Sámi won the war. The Áltá-Guovdageaidnu conflict became "a symbol of the Sami fight against cultural discrimination and for collective respect, for political autonomy and for material rights", as described by the Sámi historian Henry Minde.[73] And as such, it also ended up being seen as the official end point of the Norwegianization period. In the still-ongoing truth and reconciliation process on the Norwegian side of Sápmi, the history of colonization often gets equated with Norwegianization. But Eira and Gaup's statement from 1979 points to the relevance of attending to the Danification period that preceded the Norwegianization period, which not only laid the foundation for the colonial practices that followed, but which might also provide us with both juridical and historical ammunition in the fight against the continuing appropriation of Sámi land and history.

This article is part of the research project "The Art of Nordic Colonialism: Writing Transcultural Art Histories", supported by the Carlsberg Foundation. Thanks to research assistant Emilie Bjørn, as well as Joar Nango, Steinar Sekkingstad, and Britt Kramvig for their comments and support.

---

[73] Henry Minde: "Assimilation of the Sami – Implementation and Consequences", *Acto Borealia*, 20 (2), 122.