

Summaries

Jörgen Weibull

Curt Weibull

Curt Weibull, my father, has passed away at 105 years of age. Feeling the need to contribute to the debate concerning the rise of the critical, or Weibullian school of History and the role which Curt played in this context, I have thus taken it upon myself to commemorate him.

Since the papers left behind by Curt Weibull and his brother Lauritz contain neither correspondence between themselves nor other manuscripts on methodological questions, a discussion concerning the rise of the critical school of History and the collaboration between Curt and Lauritz Weibull can therefore only be conducted on the basis of their publications. In light of this situation, an account of my personal memories of the collaborative efforts between the brothers may prove valuable.

Questions concerning the background to Lauritz Weibull's epoch-making work *Kritiska undersökningar till Nordens historia omkring år 1000* (*Critical Studies on the History of the Nordic Region around the Year 1000*) and the pattern on which he modeled his study have caused much debate within Swedish historical research. Yet it would seem that the role which Curt Weibull played in this context has been largely ignored. According to Curt himself, it was he and not Lauritz who initially showed interest in the international debate concerning method, a movement which was represented by men such as Ernst Bernheim and Charles Seignobos. Lauritz was thus inspired by his work with Curt and thereupon began subjecting the sources to ancient Nordic history to a new type of critique, far more rigorous than it had been in previous Swedish historical research. The thorough knowledge of the material was Lauritz's. Yet the manner in which these sources were to be employed and the reconstruction of history itself were the results of the brothers' teamwork, with Curt's interest in and orientation towards modern source critique and the debate on method playing the decisive role.

Within Swedish historiography and the debate on method, Lauritz and Curt Weibull have consistently been viewed as one unit under the heading the "Weibull brothers". The close collaboration between them does not, however, entail that their views on method necessarily coincided, and the differences between them in this respect did indeed widen with time. Those who partook in the debate will remember that these divergences were clearly apparent during the 1950s. Lauritz Weibull's views were firmly anchored in Positivist notions rooted in the scientific advancements and humanistic radicalism of the 1880s. Source critique granted the discipline of History an objective base. Although he adhered to the same fundamental beliefs, Curt Weibull eventually began expressing reservations concerning the possibility of objectively reconstructing the realities of a time bygone, of the course of its events and the motives which dictated the process. This difference of opinion which can here be detected was further manifested in their works. Lauritz Weibull devoted the later part of his life to what he saw as the historian's primary task, namely the editing and commenting of historical diplomas and documents. Yet Curt Weibull's works were already at an early stage characterized not merely by analysis, but also by synthesis and the reconstruction of the past from a wider perspective.

Jarl Gallén

Who was Ulf Jarl, Father of King Sven Estridson?

This posthumous article by Professor Jarl Gallén (1908—1990) was compiled on the basis of several unfinished versions on which Professor Gallén had worked intermittently for some years.

The article takes its point of departure in an article in *Scandia* from 1931, where Erik Arup advocated the view that Ulf Jarl was of Anglo-Saxon and not Scandinavian origin, as was generally thought. Proof of this Arup found in a genealogy of Ulf's family quoted by William Ramsey, "writing soon after the middle of the 12th century", which reads: "Ursus genuit Spratlingum, Spratlingus Ulsium, Ulsius Beorn". Here Ulsius had to be a Latinization of Anglo-Saxon Wulfsige, which the Danes had then translated into Ulf. This reinterpretation influenced Arup's view of Canute the Great's English policy. Arup's finding gained widespread acceptance among Scandinavian historians, but seems not to have influenced English scholarship.

Gallén was, however, not convinced by Arup's arguments. The earliest source to indicate Ulf Jarl's origin is Adam of Bremen. In one chapter Adam reports on several marriages arranged by King Canute. First he married his sister Estrid off to the Norman Duke Richard, and when she was rejected to Ulf Jarl. Next he married Ulf's sister off to Duke Godwin. Through these marriages King Canute, according to Adam, wished to strengthen the loyalty of the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans towards the Danes. Arup quotes this in support of Ulf's English nationality. If, however, Ulf was English the marriage between his sister Gytha and Duke Godwin hardly makes sense in the context, since they were then both English. Surprisingly, Gallén remarks, all their sons had purely Scandinavian names. Also in the same chapter Adam presents Ulf as "Wolf dux Angliae". This Arup incorrectly translates "the English Duke Wolf" instead of "Wolf Duke in England".

There are, however, more serious flaws in Arup's approach. Turning to the Ulsius-source, Gallén notices that the same genealogy, but in reverse order, is also found in the so-called *Chronicon ex chronicis*, ascribed to Florence of Worcester. It has this reading: "Beorn comes, filius avunculi sui Danici comitis Ulfi, filii Spraclingi, filii Ursi, ac frater Sueni Danorum regis". Arup knew this text and even admitted it to be older than William Ramsey's text. Initially wondering why Arup chose to rely on the later version of William Ramsey in preference to the earlier version, Gallén also points out that Arup has overlooked that his William Ramsey was not the later Abbot of Cluny (†1180), "writing soon after the middle of the 12th century", but a monk in Crowland Monastery, writing in the 13th century. This fact was established long before Arup wrote. Worse, however, Arup, in quoting *Chronicon ex chronicis*, only starts from "comitis Ulfi, filii Spraclingi ..", thus omitting the preceding "Danici". Worse still, in quoting William Ramsey Arup omits the clause, which follows immediately upon the text he quoted "... Ulsius Beorn": "cognomento Boresun, id est, Ursi filium. Hic Beorn Dacus fuit natione". Accordingly even the source, on which Arup based his theory of Ulf's English origin, explicitly attests his Danish nationality. The "Ulsius" of William Ramsey is, in Gallén's view, obviously secondary to the "Ulfus" of "Florence of Worcester" and can easily be explained as a misreading. Finally, in contemporary Latin documents issued in England, where we would expect an Anglo-Saxon to be called by his Anglo-Saxon name, we find Ulf Jarl mentioned not as

"Wulfsige" but as "Ulf dux". Accordingly, all English sources indicate that Ulf Jarl was "Danicus", i.e. Danish or Scandinavian.

Turning to the Scandinavian sources, Gallén finds that they confirm Ulf's Scandinavian origin but do not allow us to decide whether he was Danish as suggested in the Norse Sagas or, perhaps, Swedish, as Saxo maintains.

John Lind

Conny Blom

The Parable of King Albrekt

Jest and ridicule as a political weapon in a medieval rhyming chronicle

The Parable of King Albrekt, in the form in which it is now known, comprises 225 verses. Only one manuscript is preserved, from the 1430s, containing the first 116 verses, while the rest of the poem is known only through a printed edition published in 1616 by Johannes Messenius.

The parable is an allegorical attack on the Mecklenburg regime and the actions of its supporters in Sweden. The poem must have been written during the time between King Albrekt's capture at Åsele in 1389 and his release and final clash with Queen Margareta in 1395. There is also a close agreement between the Parable and the manifestos and proclamations issued by the queen and her supporters as part of the struggle for the castles and the castle fiefs (units administered for the crown by captains and bailiffs). The intention was partly to make the broad masses accept the new regime, partly to bring order to the country's economy by making the peasantry accept increased financial sacrifices.

The methods used to influence the peasantry were ridicule and jest. It was essential to make the German intruders and their collaborators appear as ridiculous as possible. The poem presents them as incompetent upstarts, lacking both birth and wealth but still trying to masquerade as genuine knights and nobles. The author mocks their clumsy attempts to live up to the courtly ideals extolled by the poem. The author is a prisoner of his own aristocratic conceptual world, lacking the ability to bridge the gap between this and the reality of the peasants. The Parable is the first, not wholly successful, attempt to mobilize the support of the peasantry in political struggles. This would later be increasingly common, but people had not yet learned what was necessary for it to be effective.

Translated by Alan Crozier

Maria Sjöberg

Iron Settles Country — A Reality with Variations

The concept protoindustry has been used in historical research concerning the preludes to industrialization. Protoindustrial areas are characterized by insufficient agriculture, which consequently forced the inhabitants to turn to the extensive production of marketable goods to be sold outside of the particular area. An increase in demand made further means of subsistence possible, which allowed for population growth. However, it has proven difficult to distinguish which factors led to industrialization on the grounds of the general criteria for protoindustry, namely, insufficient agriculture, long-distance trade, and population growth.

During the 17th and 18th centuries, the Swedish iron manufacture, whose decisive role in the industrialization of Sweden can hardly be overestimated, was structured in a manner similar to 18th century Western European protoindustry. Credits, or advances, represented one method through which the buyers (ironworks owners) could control the workforce (miners, "bergsmän") and its production (pig iron). A closer analysis reveals that this had varying repercussions in different parts of Bergslagen. The consequences of protoindustrial iron manufacturing are linked to several points, and there appears to be a connection with the manner in which iron production was established in a given area. In areas where "iron settled country" during the 17th century, the miners' conditions were largely dictated by commercial capital. The credit system was more widespread there, and debts drove the miners to leave their freeholds. The transition from protoindustry to industry seems to have progressed more smoothly in such areas. The concrete example employed in the essay was the parish of Grangärde in the southern Dalarna.

In Norrbärke and Söderbärke, the two parishes adjacent to Grangärde, the development took on a somewhat different character. The commercial capital's demand for iron was not the sole force behind colonization. An already founded and independent farming community existed in 17th century Norrbärke and Söderbärke, and supported itself by combining iron production with cattle raising and agriculture. Some continued to subsist in this manner during both the 17th and 18th centuries. The credit system was not as widespread there as it was in Grangärde, and this is seen as indicative of the difficulties which commercial capital encountered in breaking into an already established, small scale farmer's production. The ironworks establishments in 17th century Norrbärke and Söderbärke also entail that iron must have settled country to a certain extent even in these parts. Many carried out the miner's task under the ironwork's direct supervision.

Whereas the population grew in Grangärde during the 18th century, it remained virtually stagnant in Söderbärke. Protoindustrial activity did not become industrialized in Söderbärke as it did in 19th century Grangärde. The Söderbärke parish can thus be seen as an example of a deindustrialized area. One could conceivably observe a certain interaction between the parishes, with the respective parishes' development preconditioning the other. This would confirm a correlation between the penetration of commercial capital and the differentiation of the miners.

The construction of theories around the concept of protoindustry has proven useful in studying conditions in the Swedish iron manufacture, since it enables us to examine the successive elements in the industrialization process as well as variations in different

areas. The dynamics within the process become particularly tangible if one reconciles the discussion on protoindustry with a proletarianization perspective. Furthermore, the development of protoindustry seems to have a chronological correlation, which implies that the conditions for continued industrial development were enhanced where iron settled country.

Translated by Jasmine Aimaq

Eva Österberg

Peasant Mentality and State-Formation

State-formation in early modern Europe is often regarded as being correlated to a process of integration on two levels. On the one hand, the international economy expanded and regions, countries and continents became increasingly interrelated and dependent on trade and financial net-works across state boundaries. On the other hand, state-making presupposed that the main strata of the population supported the political system — at least in the long run.

Theoretically, integration in society may assume different forms. One might speak of *utilitarian*, *functional* integration when economic collaboration, for example, is established; or *coercive* integration through control and suppression from above; or *identitive* integration by means of mutually shared norms, values or mentalities. However, a fourth possibility can be discussed, namely, integration through *interaction*, through *communicative capacity* — even if interaction leads to discourse rather than to actual results.

Coercive and functional integration in the early modern period have long been analyzed in international and national research, which has emphasized the importance of questions such as economic net-works and military power. The problems of identitive and communicative interaction, on the other hand, have been relatively less investigated, and the intention of this article is to illuminate these issues.

The author seeks to reconstruct the values and beliefs of the Swedish peasantry in certain ethical, cosmological, religious and social matters by drawing on arguments on culture and mentality provided by Eric Wolf, Peter Burke and Aron Gurevich, among others.

This is, however, a difficult task. All sources and methods of reconstructing culture have their pitfalls. The manifestation of the peasants' views must be sought in a broad cultural spectrum. Thus, all of the following methods are employed to a certain degree:

- to interpret the peasants' beliefs and values via their own statements, an analysis "from within";
- to depend on an analysis of material "from above", that is, to reconstruct the peasants' perceptions and ideas through descriptions provided by the authorities;
- to look through the eyes of temporary visitors, travellers' reports on the peasantry;
- to attempt to interpret certain kinds of behaviour, e.g. criminal actions, as expressions of underlying values.

The article suggests that the peasants' view of the world in early modern Sweden was based on the following facts and mental preconditions:

1. A strong sense of freedom and property, derived from a historical tradition in a country where a large portion of the peasantry owned its own land as long as it could manage the farming and paid its taxes to the crown without fail. The relative reluctance to steal, evident from a comparative analysis of court records, supports this analysis of the sense of property.
2. An emphasis on law and legal argument, the custom of viewing the local courts not only as a place where punishments were meted out, but also as a social arena where reconciliations were made and conflicts resolved through negotiation. Justice, how-

- ever, was not an abstract category, but rather something based on reason, determined by tradition and the circumstances of the particular case.
3. The experience of communal organization, primarily by parish assemblies or hundred courts, designed to achieve the Common Good or Peace. Communalism presupposed consensus and collective agreements, in a period where communal life was still not very formalized. Norms of everyday social behaviour which were supported by most contemporary popular religious texts — such as caution and trustworthiness — seem to be readily compatible with this sense of community.
 4. The idea of a functional division of society into different Estates, with peasants belonging to the working Estate.
 5. The mentality of patriarchalism.

The first three elements support an interpretation which depicts the peasants as active subjects, both at the local level and in central politics and legislation. The notion of patriarchalism and the different Estates may also be compatible with this interpretation, given that one minimizes the dimension of hierarchy in these concepts and instead stresses the dimension of reciprocity. On the other hand, patriarchalism and "treståndsläran" might just as well have imposed a strong sense of hierarchy on the people. In that case, the question is to what extent the principles of communalism, legalism and freedom were able to balance and counteract the principle of subordination in the lives of the peasantry.

The reality, according to the author's interpretation, included both sides of the coin. Swedish history in the early modern era must be understood in the light of this *tension* between two principles: the *principle of hierarchy*, as upheld primarily by the state but also by the nobility and the heads of the households — and the *principle of reciprocity, negotiation, legalism and dialogue*. It was a tension which coloured both the local and the central political arenas, a tension visible in parish life and mentality as well as in parliament, in national legislation, and in local court practice.

Nils Vollertsen

**Denmark, Iceland, North Schleswig
National movements and Danish politics, 1848—1920**

In 1918 Iceland achieved independence, in personal union with Denmark, and in 1920 North Schleswig was reunited with Denmark. Thus the Icelandic question and the North Schleswig question were solved. What the Icelanders had wanted since 1848, an independent Iceland, recognized as sovereign by Denmark, came about in 1918; what the people of North Schleswig wanted, reunification with Denmark, took place in 1920.

The Danish government also achieved in 1918 and 1920 what it had wanted since 1848: the formal preservation of the kingdom. In reality, however, it was only North Schleswig which came back to Denmark, while Iceland was separated from Denmark. It was thus neither the Icelandic movement nor the North Schleswig movement which had given way, but Denmark, and this happened because Germany had lost World War I. Denmark finally had the political freedom to resolve the national issues in Iceland and North Schleswig. This gave the opportunity to make a decisive move in the two questions without risking anything. It was therefore Denmark which in 1918 went furthest, in that the Danish state gave up its right to Iceland; and Denmark had already in 1871 given up the aspiration of regaining the whole of Schleswig, and instead contented itself with North Schleswig.

The two national movements in Iceland and North Schleswig were nevertheless influenced by developments in Denmark, especially in the sphere of agriculture, because they were both farmers' movements; and they developed in parallel.

With the development and opening of Icelandic society, the bearing stratum, especially the peasants, were organized and given the necessary competence and awareness, thus becoming independent of Denmark. The economic and cultural breakthrough came in 1906/10, a tendency which was reinforced by Iceland's isolation from Denmark in 1916—18 as a result of the war.

The Icelandic movement developed out of an opposition to Denmark, with Icelanders using every Danish democratic opening to demand an ever greater degree of political freedom and independence from Denmark. This made it possible for Iceland to achieve independence in 1918, in personal union with Denmark.

With the development of agriculture in North Schleswig, the bearing stratum, the farm owners, were organized and given the necessary competence and awareness, resulting in the North Schleswig movement becoming stabilized. The breakthrough, economically and culturally, but not politically, came around 1906/08—14.

The North Schleswig movement, unlike the Icelandic movement, developed out of a popular cultural link with Denmark, which made it culturally and economically strong (inspired by the cooperative movement in Denmark), so that it was able to assert itself in German society. This made it possible for North Schleswig to be reunited with Denmark in 1920.

Translated by Alan Crozier