University of Groningen

Islenzkt pjooerni

Middel, Kim

Published in:
European journal of scandinavian studies

DOI:
[10.1515/ejss-2018-0013](https://doi.org/10.1515/ejss-2018-0013)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Middel, K. (2018). Islenzkt pjooerni: Jon Jonsson Aoils' Iceland and the road to the future. *European journal of scandinavian studies*, 48(2), 125-148. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ejss-2018-0013>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Kim Middel*

Íslenzkt þjóðerni: Jón Jónsson Aðils' Iceland and the road to the future

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ejss-2018-0013>

Abstract: In the early twentieth century, historiography was used to further the cause of independence by profiling Iceland as a fully-fledged nation. The Icelandic historian Jón Jónsson Aðils was the man who would shape Iceland's history, and the nation with it, in his work *Icelandic Nationhood*. His achievement was not self-evident; Iceland was part of the Danish realm and glorifying the past met with restrictions. This paper aims to illustrate how in this setting Aðils succeeded in constructing the Icelandic nation with the aid of existing Danish nationalist thought. I propose that using ideas of the famous Danish nationalist N.F.S. Grundtvig enabled Aðils to construct an Icelandic 'Golden Age' specifically focused on culture and freedom that held future prospects. Finally, I will discuss the consequence of this focus as a decisive factor in the development of Icelandic self-awareness, aiming to contribute to the larger debate on the creation of national identities.

Introduction

Sú var tíðin einu sinni (...) að Íslendingar stóðu í fremstu röð í menningarlegu tilliti. (...) Hver veit nema þeir eigi eftir enn þá einu sinni að láta til sín taka í menningarsögu veraldarinnar? (Aðils 1903: 256)

At the beginning of the 20th century, Iceland had known a quarter of a century of limited self-governance, after more than six centuries of initially Norwegian and consequently Danish dependency. Times were changing fast, and with the realistic prospect of independence, as for instance was about to befall Norway, the future seemed bright. In the wake of nationalist developments in the rest of Europe, the time was right for seeking full self-governance and exhibiting national self-awareness publicly for that purpose, something that on Iceland had not been possible to such an extent before. The authorities rose to the occasion by subsidising historian Jón Jónsson Aðils (1869–1920) to do relevant historic research

***Corresponding author: Kim Middel**, Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen, Oude Boteringestaat 23, 9712 GC Groningen, The Netherlands, e-mail: k.p.middel@rug.nl

that they deemed necessary.¹ In return for this he was to hold lectures about Iceland's history that were open to the public and that were consequently published in book form.² Like the lectures, as Jón had stated himself, these books were not aimed at a learned and mainly foreign elite, as had been the case with Icelandic historiography in preceding centuries: they were written in the vernacular and intended for all layers of society (Aðils 1902: 21). And they hit home: the first and most significant of these works, *Íslenzkt þjóðerni* (Icelandic Nationhood, 1903), was to determine the notion of the Icelandic self and to influence public and political discourse.

But how did Aðils achieve this? What was so new, so acceptable and attractive and so influential about his account of Iceland's past that it could pave the road to the future? Iceland may have had self-governance, but it still was a Danish dependency, so the glorification of an Icelandic past at the expense of the Danes, in order to claim an independent future, was out of the question. Besides, the general treatment of Icelandic historians by the Danish authorities had always been good, provided they played it cleverly. Therefore, there was little room or need to cause a stir (Hálfðanarson, 2000: 97). A different means for claiming independence had to be found, something that placed Iceland at the centre of the world around it, yet set it apart from the Danish realm and beyond – a unique though recognisable feature that no one could deny and that elevated the nation. This approach had worked for Aðils' predecessors Arngrímur Jónsson (1568–1648) and Finnur Jónsson (1704–89) in earlier centuries: they had succeeded in profiling Iceland by highlighting its ancient language, its scientific prowess and its independent native character, whilst using contemporary ideas to provide a recognisable image of the country (Middel 2016: 109–33; Middel 2018 *forthcoming*). A similar approach was bound to be successful. Aðils used ideas provided by the Danish theologian and nationalist N.S.F. Grundtvig and chose anchors to profile Iceland's past and future that he could use safely: culture and individuality within a national context.

This article aims to investigate how Aðils balanced over the fissure between the past and the future in writing *Íslenzkt þjóðerni*, and how he used said ideas to construct a bridge between the two. The tools he used to this aim were both old and new, connecting to signs of self-awareness and methods supplied by the Icelandic historiographical tradition, but using more modern ideas and a modern setting for creating and presenting his own take on Iceland's past. I will argue

¹ Jón Jónsson adopted the last name Aðils in 1917; I will refer to him as Aðils, although he is listed as Jón Jónsson in his earlier writings.

² None of the existing secondary literature mentions the source of this information, which is likely to have been Aðils' biography; Ólason 1920: 240.

that he moved away from a national self-image that took shape between 1600 and 1800 and that was constitutional, semi-cultural and focused on continuity from the past up to the present day, to one that was cultural-political and focused on continuity between the past and the future. Moreover, I aim to show that in order to support the depiction of an imaginary golden age, Aðils compensated for the lack of a truly glorious historical past, and of reason to rebel against Denmark, by using and twinning the nation-defining notions of culture in the widest possible sense – both indicating an ideal and a reality – and of an innate love of freedom and independence. It is my opinion that his interpretation of this golden age was the culmination of a trend that started on Iceland in the 1770s and that took ground in the mid-1800s. My aim is to show that Aðils developed and used a state of culture as an identity-building concept in his description of Iceland's past, and that this historical state of culture as the basis for the country's future is the key element of the national self-awareness professed in his work. Furthermore, I will propose that Aðils put the notion of the Icelanders' love of freedom to use for that same purpose in connecting the past with the future, with a view to claiming independence. Both elements, culture and love of freedom, served the depiction of the past and the goals for the future so well that they would produce a lasting national identity of superiority, a self-image that previously had been apologetic. Finally, I hope to shed light on the impact that *Íslenzkt þjóðerni* had on the future of Iceland, and to show how the concepts of culture and freedom designed by Aðils have defined national identity, in order to contribute to a more comprehensive appreciation of Aðils' influence on modern-day Icelandic self-awareness.

Setting out: constructing the nation

In 1874, at the country's millennial celebrations of its settlement in 874 AD, Iceland was granted legislative power by the Danish king. It was not as if this happened overnight. In the wake of Denmark's establishing regional councils in the 1830s, Icelandic dignitaries had pushed for an assembly of its own, which ultimately led to a royal decree in 1843 arranging for elections and the subsequent installment of such an assembly. It was named *Alþingi*, after its mediaeval counterpart, and the first assembly was held in 1845. This event was a boost for the Icelandic independence movement under the guidance of Jón Sigurðsson, which then developed to such a degree that in the subsequent thirty years it could fight for and succeed in acquiring legislative power, in the year that marked Iceland's millennium. But that was not the end of the battle: the next step would be self-governance, because Icelandic affairs were still decided in Denmark, in the Danish Council of

State. What Iceland needed to legitimise its aspirations with was an ideological basis that would shape the nation in undeniable ways, based on a communal history. So, by end of the century, the Icelandic government was actively pursuing cultural bonding: it was contracting writers and artists to mould highlights and heroes of the past, and the nation with it, in writing, painting and sculpture, in order to build towards a future of independence.³ It should serve the entire population, and the government was willing to pay for it.

Jón Jónsson Aðils would become the key figure in this process, and he came at the right moment. By 1899, the government had had poor experiences with grants paid to individuals that had not resulted in the desired historical writings, and decided to cancel them. The subject of their complaints was Bogi Th. Melsteð, who had received money for years, but had not produced a single sheet of paper. Having studied history in Denmark, Jón Aðils was an up and coming historiographer who had recently joined the ranks of those who obtained governmental grants, and had made a much better impression in comparison with his colleague (Ólason 1920: 229). The cancellation of grants had also affected him, and in a letter to the government in 1899 he expressed the wish that government reverse its decision and award him an annual grant that would support him completely, so that he could pursue his life's work: writing Iceland's history. It was a clever move, because it was clear that the government would be interested in subsidising someone who would actually get the job done. They had, however, grown wise with their past experiences and after discussing the matter repeatedly between 1899 and 1901, they said that they would agree on one condition: in exchange for an annual stipend Aðils was to hold public lectures about Iceland's history. Moreover, they decided that if he were to give these lectures, they would save on their expenses by granting him half the sum he desired, as he would no longer be able or need money to travel to Denmark for his research anymore.⁴

Aðils agreed to the proposition, and stated that he considered such lectures the best method for getting people interested in and excited over national history. His educational background in Danish *folkehøjskoler* [popular education centres] and the work of the Danish romantic nationalist N.F.S. Grundtvig and his adept Ernst Trier, who had been Aðils' teacher at the popular school of Vallekilde, had brought him to the conviction that popular education was more than part of a

³ The most notable artist contracted for such purposes besides Aðils was the sculptor Einar Jónsson; see Gottskálksdóttir 2011: 205–28.

⁴ No copy of the exact agreement could be traced in the Icelandic National Archive (*Þjóðskjalasafnið*), the National and University library (*Lbs-Hbs*) or in the archives of the Icelandic parliament (*skjalasafn Alþingis*); the correspondence of Aðils with Alþingi and minutes of Alþingi meetings provide information about its realisation and the details.

civilising offensive. In Grundtvigian form, with its focus on raising national awareness, it was the method to further unity within the nation – and the national cause (Sigurðsson 2003: 230; Lundgreen-Nielsen 1992: 130–6). It should be open to everyone; teaching was to be performed orally, in public lectures, with a specific focus on the nation, its history and the ideas and written legacy of its forefathers. And since the main characteristic of a nation was its language, which needed to be preserved, these lectures were to be conveyed in the mother tongue (Aðils 1902: 21).

The setting was right, for Iceland actually had a popular tradition of the oral rendition of history in the vernacular, in the home. Also, literacy among the population was high in all layers of society and there was a keen interest among the general public in disseminating written information and sources, which was supported by the increasing availability of printed secular writings and the formation of reading clubs in the second half of 19th century (Magnússon and Ólafsson 2002: 182–3, 194). And finally, there was a demand for the publication and dissemination of popular educational writings from the 1870s onwards (Sigurðsson 2003: 145). Therefore, the government's condition for awarding the grant coincided with Aðils' own beliefs and was to fall on fertile ground, both written and orally. He indicated in his letter that he had ample experience delivering lectures, be it mostly in Danish, and implied that he was qualified to take on the task. The deal was closed and Aðils started his public lectures on Icelandic history, especially to Icelandic students and the Icelandic youth movement in which he was actively involved: young people formed the main target group in which national sentiments were to be instilled (Aðils 1902: 24; Sigurðsson 2003: 236). His lectures would subsequently be published in three works: *Íslenzkt þjóðerni* (Icelandic Nationhood, 1903), *Gullöld Íslendinga* (The Golden Age of the Icelanders, 1906) and *Dagrenning* (Dawning 1910).

Íslenzkt þjóðerni (hereafter *Íþ*) was the most comprehensive of the three, a history of Iceland from its settlement to Aðils' day with a specific focus on nationhood and nationalism. It disclosed an ulterior motive, one where the government's wishes met Aðils' ideas, which he immediately brought forward in the introduction (Aðils 1903: 1). In the spirit of Grundtvig's ideas, common awareness of a nation's history would pave the way to its future. Following the Herderian concept of *Volksgeist* [people's spirit], Grundtvig had minted the concept of a comprehensive Nordic nature, *Nordens ånd* [Nordic spirit], that had always been to fight constantly for perfection of what is good and right, and therefore for a better future (Grundtvig 1909: 45). Aðils had expressed his admiration for Grundtvig and his ideas in 1902 in an article about popular education; this particular idea, in Aðils' words, was the single most significant feature of Nordic nations according to Grundtvig, and on this Grundtvig's ideas about the future were founded

(Aðils 1902: 19). It was not difficult for Aðils to let this shared Nordic characteristic coincide with the commonly accepted notion that in the 9th century AD the Icelanders had fled the Norwegian king to found a better political future on Iceland – one of freedom – which had been the beginning of the Icelandic nation. In other words, if the Icelanders lived by their nation's original disposition, the outcome had to be freedom: honouring the past that had resulted from that disposition would ensure such an outcome. This was what the government wanted, and Aðils could provide an ideological foundation for it. At the same time, the implicit political undertone of his statement indicated that the political situation of dependency set boundaries to what he could write. He had to decide on how he could draw within these lines to create a fundament so steady and acceptable that it would be the basis for his country's future.

Writing from a position of dependency, constructing the nation seemed easier said than done, but applying nationalist standards set by Grundtvig – not by Fichte and Herder directly⁵ – to the idea of an Icelandic nation would solve this problem. Grundtvig, who had shaped and secured the concept of the Danish nation, had set mediaeval Iceland as an example of what an ideal society, both in learning, government and language, should look like (Grundtvig 1908: 145). Aðils was a professed admirer of Grundtvigian thought, so what could be easier than to translate and elaborate these ideas for an Icelandic audience? For starters, Grundtvig had introduced Herderian thought about a nation's identity being visible in its language and writings into Denmark. It provided Aðils with the perfect ideological filling for the Icelandic nation's framework (Lundgreen-Nielsen 2003: 222). Why perfect? Because the concept had been tried, tested and accepted. Iceland's main claim to fame from the seventeenth century onward – the purity of the Icelandic language and Iceland's mediaeval literary legacy – served very well to fulfil the requirement of language as a nation's binding factor, with its literature, both old and modern, as written proof. The theme of language and literature as identity-defining factors had been worked out by the aforementioned Icelandic historians Arngrímur Jónsson and Finnur Jónsson earlier on: Icelandic mediaeval literature, preserved in the heritage of manuscripts, was presented as proof of the unspoiled Icelandic language being a modern classic and of mediaeval Icelanders being scholars and scientists in all disciplines. They had done this so craftily in their Latin writings that it had soon found resonance with a learned, foreign audience within Denmark and the rest of the North, and beyond (Middel 2016: 109–32;

⁵ It has been assumed that Aðils' ideas are derived largely from Fichte and Herder, with the added clause that this may have been through the work of Grundtvig, with no further investigation; Matthíasdóttir 2004: 46.

Middel 2018 *forthcoming*). These internationally canonised highlights of Icelandic history seamlessly fit into the idea of an Icelandic nation. Judging by his writings, it is likely that Aðils, who commanded Latin, used both men's works as source material. All he had to do was to present their ideas to his fellow countrymen in Icelandic, who were largely oblivious to what through Latin texts had become common knowledge abroad centuries before. But he also needed to present them with a new historical context, the fulfilment of another requirement: a glorious past which the nation had supposedly once known.

The concept of a golden age itself did not pose much of a problem. The term *gullöld* [golden age] indicating an imaginary golden era on Iceland had been in use for more than half a century. It was first used in this sense in 1846, following the re-installment of Alþingi by the Danish king, when it was referred to as "our golden age", which had been one of freedom. Already it was stated that the Icelanders had to follow in their forefathers' footsteps and read about their country's history to look to the future and find their ardour and freedom – and already it was made clear that this was possible only because the king's benign decree, intended to fortify the Icelanders' sense of community, allowed for it (*Ársrit* 1846: 3). In the following decades, *gullöld* would come to be defined as an era coinciding with Iceland's mediaeval *allsherjarriki* [commonwealth], a term coined in the second half of the 19th century to refer to Iceland's social-political structure from the establishment of Alþingi in 930 until 1262–64, when the country became a Norwegian – and later Danish – dependency (Von Maurer and Sigurðsson 1882). This golden age was characterised by purity of language, free trade, and the warrant of proper legislation and freedom under said government (*Tíðindi* 1851: 285; Þorkellsson 1858: 11; Vigfússon 1860: 70, 86; *Þjóðólfur* 1861: 153; *Baldur* 1868: 47). The term had also been used by the aforementioned leader of the independence movement, Jón Sigurðsson, to designate a time of self-governance in the future, but not without mentioning the fact that some might – unjustly – consider the era under Danish government a *gullöld* politically as well (Sigurðsson 1860: 6). Whenever the term was used, there was always an awareness of and deference to the current political situation, and even to the critical notion that a golden age is never as golden as people think and that it is a condition only recognised as such in hindsight (Gröndal 1873: 4). The result was a *gullöld* that was intrinsically linked to the past, to the future and to freedom, and whose relative merits were accepted. Half a century since its introduction, the concept needed a more tangible content to fulfil the requirement for constituting a nation. This could be dealt with by profiling it more substantially, but how?

The obvious way of doing it would have been by describing a past of great political and military achievement such as the ones other nations used to profile themselves with. The real problem was that Iceland did not have a truly glorious

past of that kind. Where Germany and the Netherlands could claim a past of political greatness, with former governments and rulers that could and did achieve imperial dominion and/or colonial aspirations, Iceland could not. When it was still independent, it had not expanded its power abroad, nor had it fought or won any wars; Aðils himself claimed they had, but those wars had taken place elsewhere in the North and they could not claim them as their own (Aðils 1903: 238–9). Under the *allsherjarriki*, things had been peaceful. A so-called aristocracy of chieftains maintained a balance of rule, and any contacts with the kings of Norway until appr. 1220 were kept on such a basis that it did not shock the system at home (Karlsson 2000: 82).⁶ With Iceland's dependency to Norway, and later Denmark, from 1262–1264 until the mid-nineteenth century, any possibility for political endeavours was gone. In other words, on the scene of occidental history, Iceland had not played a role of significance. This lack of a glorious past posed a huge gap in the construction of the Icelandic nation that Aðils somehow had to fill up.

The means that would help him solve his problem was the introduction of *folkeånd* [national spirit]. After having defined the comprehensive *Nordens ånd*, Grundtvig in the footsteps of Herder had worked out *Volksgeist* specifically for Denmark, in that the Danish nation was defined by its own national spirit. To Grundtvig, the Danish national spirit sprang both from the old Norse pagan religion and Christendom, which he considered manifestations of the same spiritual power (Pontoppidan Thyssen 1983: 100, 107). Maintaining the national spirit by honouring one's birth, blood, and love of the mother tongue and of the fatherland's ardour would lead to *folkeligheden* [nationhood], a sense of communal belonging.⁷ Consequently, in his poem of that name from 1848, Grundtvig linked the national spirit to a golden age of the past, that would shine again, now and in the near future (Grundtvig 1848: 382–3; Lundgreen-Nielsen 1995: 126, 129). This type of golden age was not typified by former imperial and military prowess – it did not have to be, because Grundtvig said that the Danes took no interest in such matters and were much more about attending to each other (Lundgreen-Nielsen 1995: 128). This statement suited his situation: he found himself both in what the Danes considered a new golden era culturally and in what he himself considered an ideal situation politically: an "opinion-guided monarchy" (Damsholt 2015: 160). On a practical note, it was the beginning of the First Schleswig War (1848–50); with the outcome undecided it may not have been the right time to claim a past of military

⁶ The sons of Icelandic chieftains were generally sent to Norway to become the king's courtiers, only to resume their autonomous position as chieftain once they returned to Iceland.

⁷ *folkeligheden* has been translated as 'the spirit of the people', 'peoplehood', 'popular feeling', 'the people's character' and 'Danishness'; what comes closest in my opinion is 'nationhood'.

success. Grundtvig's eyes therefore were focused on the next step that he was actively pursuing: encouraging the organisation of society, which in its turn would lead to the full development of all innate talents present.

Aðils was quick to pick up on this line of thought. Defining the Icelandic *þjóðarandi* [national spirit] as stemming from Nordic and Celtic branches of the same Aryan tribe, with the same combined pagan-christian background, he painted a picture of a uniquely dual national make-up that featured the Nordic perseverance, with its innate struggle for the good, and Celtic cultural prowess (Aðils 1903: 48–9).⁸ This was the make-up of a nation consisting of men who were both creative and resolute, and who, as Icelandic historiographers in earlier centuries had already written before him, were nearly all of outstanding descent. The result of this *þjóðarandi* was a national awareness, a claim to nationhood equal to Grundtvig's *folkeligheden* that Aðils called *þjóðerni* [nationhood] – hence the title of the work. Thus defining the Icelandic national spirit, he provided himself with two main themes – culture and the love of freedom – that he could render plausible by introducing the mediaeval literary legacy and state-structure “as their external features” (Aðils 1903: 1, 64). Both themes would help him give further content to the golden age that was so badly needed and construct a national identity that would yield wide acceptance to a national audience. What is more, they helped him complete his definition of the Icelandic nation in such a way that it might justify claims to independence internationally.

Step one: culture

Now armed with the tools he needed, Aðils was confident to start claiming a *gullöld* for Iceland. He opened the first chapter of *Íþ* by saying that it coincided with what he referred to as the era of the saga's, the *söguöld* [age of the sagas] (Aðils 1903: 4). Again he made use of ideas provided by Grundtvig, that all nations go through three periods – youth, adulthood and old age – before they can be born again: he set those periods for Iceland in 930–1262, 1262–1550 and 1150–1750 (Aðils 1902: 18; 1903: 238–48). Grundtvig had said that the first of these is always the best; therefore *gullöld* simply had to be the first period in Icelandic history, and it was easy to identify it with the period of the *allshejarriki* that had already been marked out. The result of Iceland's *þjóðarandi* during this time had been a society to which there was hardly any equal, implying that its two main characteristics were equally unparalleled (Aðils 1903: 238).

⁸ For information on how Aðils worked out the pagan-christian aspect, see Halink 2017: 1–18.

Culture was the first of the two traits that Aðils worked out, although the two are closely linked in his narrative. Now what exactly the concept of culture, *menning*, entailed was not immediately clear; it would fluctuate throughout the work. He introduced *menning* in chapter one as a known feature of the Vikings, but also as one that they had sought to improve by visiting the Celts, who were by far the most prominent nation culturally. There were accounts of Viking-Celtic contacts in the saga's, so he had written sources to back up his assertions (Aðils 1903: 13). He introduced the Celts as people of the mind, who were sensitive, creative and impulsive (yet backward in other aspects!); they had schools when others did not and attached great importance to scholarship and fine arts, causing their society to thrive and be characterised by these features (Aðils 1903: 22, 40–9). That is what Aðils claimed the Vikings were after in order to supplement their own introverted, practical mentality of perseverance. Irish monks and clergymen had saved the writings from ancient Greece, "the gem of world literature", from oblivion in order to improve their mind and knowledge, and as a consequence provided future generations of civilised cultures with a basic education (Aðils 1903: 43–4). The addition of the Celtic cultural mind-set to that of the Vikings was therefore bound to result in a culture that was at least equal to that of the ancient Greeks, with a similar literary legacy. It would take some time for the blending of the two to come to fruition, which is one of the reasons why Aðils left out the era of the settlement of Iceland (871–2–930) until the founding of Alþingi in 930 in his definition of the *gullöld*: Alþingi, he wrote, was the cradle of Iceland's national culture or society (Aðils 1903: 63). It was also the reason why he did include the *Sturlungaöld* [the age of the Sturlungs], the period from 1220 till 1262–1264 when the *allsherjarriki* had started to falter, in the *gullöld*: it had not been a golden age politically, but it had been culturally, given the nation's literary highlights such as *Heimskringla* that were produced at that time (Aðils 1903: 53).

Aðils' introduction of *menning* sketched a tripartite image of culture as the need for, a state of and the fruits of a high degree of mental and intellectual development. The ideological results were variously referred to by Aðils as *þjóðmenning* [the nation's culture, society], *menningarþjóð* [a nation of culture, a civilised nation] and *þjóðleg menning* [national culture] (Aðils 1903: 103, 237, 244). Its outward hallmarks were education, scholarship, science, arts, language and writing, and the type of government, which had been independent. The last two of these were the most important, and understandably so. Firstly, Iceland's mediaeval written legacy was visible proof of the idea of *menning*, and to him the fact that the Icelandic culture consisted of two branches was the explanation why its literary legacy was much more extensive and of greater consequence than, for instance, Norway's (Aðils 1903: 53). And secondly, mentioning Iceland's independent mediaeval government as a result of *menning* was a cross-reference to its also being

the result of his other main theme, the love of freedom. From the outward traits his audience could choose whichever ones in their mind determined the idea of Icelandic *menning*, but the two overarching traits, *menning* and love of freedom, served Aðils' agenda beyond Iceland to claim the superiority of the Icelandic nation both culturally and politically (in that order). This made culture in general, and at some point home rule in particular, something that had to be and could be reclaimed – unlike that of the Greeks!

So how was it to be reclaimed? How was Iceland to become the civilised nation again that it had once been? The second and third periods in Aðils' timeline, that he called the eras of decline and humiliation respectively, ran from the mid-13th until the mid-18th century, when the cultural movement of the Enlightenment in Aðils' words had put priority to the dissemination of culture in all of its aspects – housekeeping, arts, crafts as well as education and learning – among all layers of society, everywhere in the North, including remote Iceland (Aðils 1903: 209–10). Aðils followed up on this by describing the cultural movement on Iceland in the 19th century, the people who had characterised it and their literary achievements, taking turns with the uprise of nationalism and the battle for home rule. The Icelanders were on the right track: they had regained awareness of the fact that a nation thrives best in matters of the mind – its own literature – and in this respect had also regained a position that put them on a level with other civilised nations (Aðils 1903: 243). Coming from a glorious past everything was pointing at the future, and what signified the former was to be the key to the latter: Aðils wrote that the past was bound to be the origin and foundation for any true, fruitful culture of the future (Aðils 1903: 237). Grundtvig's own praise of the Icelandic society with its culture in the Middle Ages could not have come in better: it gave Aðils the ammunition to state that unlike other nations, Iceland could build its future on top of a culture of its own. Iceland's culture was a thousand years old, as visible in the legacy of the Eddic poetry and the saga's that other nations – implicitly including ruling authority Denmark, led by Grundtvig – had been happy to borrow, for lack of sources of their own (Aðils 1903: 242, 255). It was a safe statement to make, because no one could deny its truth. All the Icelanders had to do to continue developing in this direction and to further the cause of the nation was to stay away from foreign sources for the improvement of the mind and to focus on their own language and their own literary legacy instead, the cultural value of which, he added, other nations had already discovered and claimed to build their own future on (Aðils 1903: 239, 254–55). The nation-wide approach to reclaim Iceland's national culture, through popular education as prescribed by Grundtvig, had to be three-fold, Aðils wrote: by studying the country's history, by reading and honouring the old Icelandic writings and the values they represented, and by honouring its language and keeping it pure (Aðils 1903: 252). Then, and only

then, would there be a culture of the future, a *framtíðarmenning*, and a nation to go with it, that one day might hold the same position in the world again that it had once had – it was all in their own hands (Aðils 1903: 251, 256).

Step two: love of freedom

Having thus shaped and deployed culture as an identity-defining concept stemming from *þjóðarandi*, it was time to unfold and develop its other constituent: love of freedom and independence – political independence. This line of thinking was not new to Iceland: it had been introduced by the Icelandic bishop Finnur Jónsson in the 1770s in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ*. In the footsteps of Montesquieu and Mallet, who had pointed out that freedom was born in the North, Finnur Jónsson was the first historian to introduce love of freedom as a typical Icelandic trait and to link it to a past that was better than the present, thus removing himself from his predecessor Arngrímur Jónsson's constitutional-humanist image of Iceland by choosing a more cultural approach (Jónsson 1951 [1609]: 55; Jónsson 1778: 140). In turn, Aðils elaborated on Finnur's legacy by linking the trait to a fully-fledged golden age and extending its relevance from the *inhabitants* of Iceland to the Icelandic *nation*. It was a seemingly subtle but important update from Finnur's approach towards a more outspoken political line of thinking, though carefully balanced against culture as its twin characteristic by *þjóðarandi*. He added the notion that the love of freedom and sense of independence were at the roots of the Icelandic nation and its national sentiments, and that these aspects had brought them progress and prosperity in the past, when they had been free (Aðils 1903: 56, 68). The flame of independence had never died, and whenever in later times such sentiments arose, Aðils said in his introduction of *Íþ*, the nation was reminded of its former glory; it would then start honouring the highlights of that past – its language and literature – again and get back on the right track towards a future of progress and prosperity, of culture and implicitly of political independence (Aðils 1903: 2; Halink 2017: 469).

The tone was set: Aðils had unfolded the role of freedom and independence for a happy and prosperous nation. The combination of freedom and independence had been a common theme in Icelandic nationalist writings of the 19th century (Sigurðsson 1986: 92); the fact that it did not become one of the most important topics of Icelandic historiography until *Íþ* is likely due to Aðils' setting it as a condition for collective happiness. His next step was to connect both concepts explicitly to the historical context of the golden age in order to complete the function of *þjóðarandi*. And so we find Aðils repeating his earlier statement of defining the

gullöld as the *söguöld*, to go on and claim that the basis upon which the *söguöld* was built was freedom and independence – more than that, the freedom and independence of individuals within a national context, in a state regulated by laws, because their ancestors had realised that this was the way to warrant either (Aðils 1903: 56, 79–80).

Where did this come from? The seemingly paradoxical, national-liberalist connection between individual freedom and the greater whole of the nation had been on the rise in Germany since the mid-19th century, but it is not likely that this was the source of Aðils' reasoning.⁹ A more plausible explanation for his line of thinking is that it was based on the Grundtvigian notion of *frihed til fælles bedste* [freedom for the common good]. Grundtvig advocated what has been called a Nordic kind of freedom, one that kept balance between one's personal freedom and one's responsibility towards one's fellow countrymen. This freedom was a psychological concept, one that Grundtvig himself proclaimed to be "as slippery as an eel": it meant freedom of *ånd* [spirit], including *folkeånd*, and as such was a prerequisite for culture and *folkeligheden* (Grundtvig 1842: 255; Grundtvig 1907: 384–5; Bugge 1965: 293). What with Grundtvig being a theologian, the fact that to his mind personal freedom was inextricably linked to heeding the rest of society was self-evident. *Frihed til fælles bedste* meant that freedom of the individual stretches as far as the interests of society as a whole allow for; enlightenment of the people – by popular education – was the means to constitute a society where everyone's freedom relates to the common good (Birkelund 2008: 647). Society-building in this way, through education, would lead to nation-building, because it would help make each individual aware of the community to which they had obligations and of the common good that needed to be pursued (Pedersen 2015: 423–4). As said before, for Grundtvig the historical Icelandic *allshejarriki* was the perfect example of a civilised society and consequently of a nation built in this way, and in this respect equal to ancient Greece, which in his eyes served as an exemplary society built on this principle of freedom (Birkelund 2008: 226–7). He added that Iceland had had a way of living so complete that it revealed the meaning of life, and that one should therefore rather look to the Icelanders and not to the Romans for inspiration as to how they achieved this (Grundtvig 1908: 145).

It was an easy bone for Aðils to pick up and run off with. With the Icelandic *gullöld* thus portrayed as the consequence of freedom in the service of the common good, Aðils could put Finnur's notion of freedom as a typical Icelandic trait to use for the good of the nation that he was trying to build. He immediately took it

⁹ For the connection between individual freedom and collectivity in the 19th century, see Richter, Siebold, Weeber 2016: 134–137.

to the next level by opposing Grundtvig's comparison with ancient Greece. Aðils' earlier remark about Alþingi being the cradle of Icelandic society already implied that the type of government had contributed to its success. He now explained that the *gullöld* had known a type of government that kept a perfect balance in binding society as a whole on the one hand, without compromising or limiting freedom and independence of the individual too much on the other hand – hence the name *allsherjarriki* [commonwealth]. The result was a superior kind of *þjóðlíf* [society], one that even the ancient Greeks had not known: parts of ancient Greece had known a society where the individual stooped down to the whole of society, and in other parts it had been the whole of society that succumbed to the individual's personal independence. It was a comprehensive social-political – and, of course, cultural – set-up with which the Icelandic nation had secured internal prosperity and external strength during the golden age (Aðils 1903: 293). It also explained the nation's demise during the Sturlungaöld: once personal sentiments started prevailing over national sentiments, Aðils wrote, the consequences were enough to determine the fate of the entire nation (Aðils 1903: 103). With the balance between the individual and the nation now lost, *þjóðarandi* missed out on one of the two components that formed the basis for Iceland's successful *þjóðlíf* and *þjóðerni*, and culture alone was not enough to keep it intact. The entire construction started to falter and the end of the golden age, with its culture and its independence, was inevitable.

Having said that, Aðils successfully claimed and shaped a golden age that also, or even primarily, heralded the future. The prospects were bright: the tools to invoke and maintain the ancient *þjóðarandi*, to recreate *þjóðerni* and to secure Iceland's superior *þjóðlíf* in a new golden age had been laid out. It was time to put the finishing touch to the political side of his argumentation, and so towards the end of *Íþ*, Aðils ended his accolade of the *gullöld*, characterised by *þjóðlíf* and its set-up, by explicitly calling it an age of self-governance (*sjálfstjórnartímabilið*) (Aðils 1903: 239). He added that strengthening the unity within the country would further its independence, which he called one of the greatest treasures in the world, as proven by past experiences. Never had the nation thrived more than during the age of self-governance, when it had taken care of its own affairs without the interference of other nations, and consequently it had prospered both materially – agriculture and trade never were better – and mentally, with literature as tangible proof (Aðils 1903: 238–9). With the loss of freedom and autonomy, all prosperity had been lost. Based on these arguments, he wrote, it was only natural that they demanded autonomy in their own affairs, which was the main condition for prosperity and growth. The Icelanders were not to slacken in their efforts until this goal was achieved: complete self-governance was the only type of government that suited men who were born free, and only good would come of it.

How to achieve this? By staying true to the nation's innermost nature, because without a pure and unadulterated national spirit not even the best kind of government would keep the nation intact. He then played the guilt card by adding that no nation whose spirit is pure would ever put up with misgovernment. Was this a not too subtle jeer in the direction of the Danes? Hardly: it was a stern admonishment towards his fellow countrymen. A nation gets what it deserves and therefore shapes its own future, Aðils wrote: all future prosperity depended on the nation looking after its innermost nature, history set the example, and popular education of that history, language and literature would teach them how to get there (Aðils 1903: 249–53).

The message was clear: the freedom and independence that characterised Iceland's national spirit also had to be reclaimed, just as culture did. Aðils indeed had succeeded in ranking Iceland among the civilised nations and he had successfully implied that Iceland would be better off independent (Hálfðanarson 2010: 123). What was originally a psychological concept of freedom had received a political charge. The line from *þjóðarandi* to *þjóðerni* entailed a democratic element with a clear call for organised citizenship – the term *þjóðerni* implied as much, even if the current electorate was restricted.¹⁰ Once citizenship was in place and the nation was built, the logical next step would be building the state (Pedersen 2015: 424). And since the result of citizenship organised in this manner would be a superior nation, the state matching it had to be the best possible as well. They owed that much to themselves, to strive for the highest – after all, they were better than the ancient Greeks, who had not been able to reclaim anything.

Step three: independence – or not?

The nation now built in theory and a demand for autonomy expressed, it was time to get to work. Or was it? The Icelandic culture, as one feature of the golden past, might seem the easy leg of the road to the future: the basis had been laid in the preceding century with the efforts of Jón Sigurðsson and Sveinbjörn Egilsson to preserve and stimulate appreciation of both the language and mediaeval texts in learned circles.¹¹ Their idea had been to preserve the language and literary legacy

10 There is a certain interchangeability in meaning of the terms *þjóðerni* and *ríkisborgararéttur* [citizenship]; see Jóhannesson, Pétursson, Björnsson, 2013: 2. For information on the electorate, see Karlsson 2000: 261–2.

11 Sveinbjörn translated sagas of Icelanders and the Snorra-Edda into Latin, Jón saw to the publication of modern, critical text editions of old Icelandic texts, most notably Snorra-Edda.

and to make texts available to scholars, but half a century onward Aðils was aiming at a general audience, in an ideological way, as part of his nation-building scheme. By Aðils' time, there was a lively scene on Iceland for publishing both books and magazines in Icelandic to further the cause of language and literature. Following Grundtvig's writings Danish scholars and officials subscribed to the idea of a superior historical Icelandic culture, civilisation and golden age in the past and future, so no objections to writings on the topic were to be expected. Once popular education was in place – Aðils had laid the foundations for that with his lectures – it should be easy to put the dot on the cultural i. Publications, education, a cultural nation: it was a recipe tried and tested by Grundtvig c.s. in Denmark, and it would work on Iceland.

Reclaiming culture may have been considered a straightforward action, reclaiming political independence based on a historic love of freedom was another matter. Aðils finished his book by expressing the conviction that Iceland could once more occupy a position in the front lines of international culture by looking after its innermost nature, as it had in the past, when its inhabitants lived, thought and wrote as fits independent people (Aðils 1903: 256). But not a word about political independence, and no details on how to achieve this – he ended on the indefinite note that he had a firm belief that a nation that had persevered in its tolerance for centuries also had the strength and spine to fight and conquer (Aðils 1903: 257). It was a cautious ending to a zealous plea. The ideal of independency may have seemed legitimate, with the historical arguments provided, but the political aspect of state-building had been implicit; how it was to be realised therefore could not be specified. That in itself is understandable, but the reason why Aðils held back on this topic is complex, because it would seem that he had the wind in his ideological sails. Where Arngrímur Jónsson in the 1600s used the ideas of Jean Bodin to construct an image of the historical Icelandic state whose current validity the Danes could not deny, and where Finnur Jónsson in the following century had used ideas of Montesquieu to create a semi-cultural image of Iceland for the same purpose, Jón Aðils actually used ideas handed to him *by a Dane* to effect a cultural-political identity that would take them from the past into the future (Aðils 1903: 252; Boss 2015: 81). And it was not just any Dane: it was the Dane of all Danes, the great Danish nationalist who had defined Danishness. The Danes could hardly object if they had wanted to, it appeared, and unlike Arngrímur and Finnur Aðils did not have to be afraid of censorship, so why so careful?

The difference is that Arngrímur and Finnur worked in a setting of complete political dependency, that did not allow for a political agenda, whereas Aðils, for whom the tide had changed, could have one. Discussions about constitutional change, which to a lesser or greater extent all had Icelandic autonomy as a goal,

started not long after 1874 and gained momentum by the turn of the century. Finally, the first milestone was when an Icelandic minister of Icelandic affairs was appointed, although the Danes decreed the conditions. As part of the struggle for independence, this demand had been on the Icelandic nationalist agenda since 1849 (Brynjúlfsson, Þórðarson 1849: 6). The members of *Alþingi* agreed almost unanimously; their decision was a landmark in the development of a parliamentary democracy and achieving self-governance in the long run, but they thereby also recognised Iceland's being part of the Danish realm for the first time (Karls-son 2000: 271). This happened in 1902, the year when Aðils was giving his lectures and writing *Íþ*. With the political agenda of *Alþingi* limited in this way, Aðils was not able to profess explicit ideas about a constitutional change: it was neither in the cards nor in the interest of the commissioning entity. So paradoxically, his agenda was different from his fellow historiographers in earlier centuries, but his situation was not.

Another reason for his restraint was the fact that it was common practice for Icelandic scholars to be ambiguous in their attitude towards the Danes, for reasons of finance, diplomacy and/or political agendas. They exerted cautious criticism at the most, which was common in contemporary historiography anyway. Aðils followed suit: on a diplomatic note he would have realised that the restrictions imposed in 1902 were to be respected because they had opened doors for constitutional development, and in view of finances *Alþingi* was still dependent on the Danish crown, which ultimately was the source of his own income. In summary, he was working in the service of two paymasters. Also, the Danish kings truly had not been such bad rulers: they had been benefactors and protectors of Icelandic scholars and their work, they subscribed to the notion that Iceland was the cradle of Nordic languages and science, the trade monopoly that they had once installed was a thing of the past, and finally, they had granted Iceland legislative power. All in all, their attitude towards Iceland was favourable, which was the result of the hard work by Arngrímur Jónsson and Finnur Jónsson. They put Iceland on the map internationally and got the Danes to accede to their ideas, because these contributed to the glory of the Danish realm – it was not a matter of Danes and Icelanders happening to subscribe to the same ideas, as Hálfðanarson (2007 [2001]) sees it. Considering the Danes as a common enemy to claim independence from would have been convenient for the cause of an independent nation, but with Denmark's benevolent disposition concerning Iceland it simply was not possible.

One last restricting factor that ties in with the financial aspect is that there may not have been a direct need for change. Iceland was poor, a plausible reason as to why in 1918, at the end of WW I, the Danes conceded to granting home-rule (Hálfðanarson 2000: 99). Until then, Danish-Icelandic relations had been clear in

terms of taxes and budget. Building the state in a financially instable setting might pose difficulties that in 1902 Alþingi was not prepared for. One pamphlet stated that "freedom and sovereignty are much too expensive for this nation", and the almost unanimous vote to accept Denmark's conditions for an Icelandic minister of Icelandic affairs, instead of complete self-governance, might also bear witness to this (*Fréttir* 1918: 1; Karlsson 271).

All in all, Aðils needed to be cautious. His ambiguity shows in his description of the Danish kings: whilst to some extent criticising the Danes in their dealings with Iceland in earlier centuries, he actually was careful not to criticise their kings. For instance, not long after the Kalmar union of in 1389 the situation in Iceland deteriorated; Aðils wrote that this was due to the physical and mental distance between both countries, not because of any repression by the Danish crown, although he added that some might consider the Danish governance of Iceland up until the last century one of abominable neglect (Aðils 1903: 122–3). Another instance is his description of the Norwegian assumption of control over Iceland in 1262–4, which was settled in the so-called *Gamli sáttmáli* [the Old Covenant]. From Jón Sigurðsson Aðils adopted the idea that the events of 1262–4 were settled in an agreement: the Icelanders had never formally given up their independence (Aðils 1908: 113; Sigurðsson et al. 1851: 497). After realising their stupidity in giving up their freedom, he wrote, the Icelanders had stipulated various things, the most important one being that the king would ensure peace and let them retain their own laws (Aðils 1903: 106). Since the king had agreed, they had at least maintained this part of their independence, in return for which they were to become the king's subjects and pay taxes. Best of all was that they could call the change in government an agreement, not an assumption of power, and this made neither party look too bad.¹² A third example is his discussion of the Danish trade monopoly: to Aðils the monopoly itself was a misconception that was not regarded one in its day; therefore, one should not blame the kings. The Danish tradesmen were the reason why the monopoly had been disadvantageous for Iceland, not the kings, since the latter had done their best to warrant compliance with the rules by the former (Aðils 1903: 161–2). Aðils took this same ambiguous stand as early as 1895, and it was one he would maintain, though slightly toned down, in his dissertation on the trade monopoly of 1919 (Aðils 1895: 574; Aðils 1919: 206). As his description of Icelandic history drew closer to his own age, Aðils grew increasingly positive in

¹² In 1908 Aðils would use *Gamli sáttmáli* to try and get his fellow countrymen to accept a proposal towards more self-rule by the king that he called *Nýji sáttmáli* [the New Covenant], with the same tactics: it would constitute a restoration of the Old Covenant, that was abandoned on acceptance of the hereditary monarchy in 1662, and as such an honourable way out; Aðils 1908: 113–4.

his depiction of the Danes in general and Danish kings in particular, until he could not but sing the most recent kings' praises. There was nothing else he could do.

And so the fate of Aðils' nation was sealed: a cultural future was fine, a political one had to be described in implicit terms, and publishing ideas about a different state-structure for the future was off limits, because the present would not allow for it. I would argue that this is why he skipped the present in his argumentation – it is only mentioned in connection with the past (Aðils 1903: 237) – and focused on the past and the future of those national characteristics that had proven safe to profile, with the visible aid of cultural-political ideas about the nation that would support such a focus rather than more recent and outspokenly political ideas concentrating on the nation in the here and now. Aðils followed Grundtvig until the end; there may have been similarities between Aðils' line of thinking and that of Ernest Renan, as Lerner observed, but that was because Grundtvig had already formulated ideas about the will to live together and to honour communal heritage before Renan did, in his aforementioned poem *Folkeligheden*, in a cultural-nationalist framework (Lerner 2010: 93–4; Renan 1882: 26; Østergård 2015: 500–1). Aðils used what he could use: a political national identity like Renan's was out of the question. But the basis was laid: with his projection of accepted contemporary ideas onto a golden Icelandic past, Aðils not only promoted that past to one of overall greatness, but provided a prospect towards a similarly great future, that, according to the same ideas, had to be realistic. They were well on their way to achieve their former cultural greatness, and with the inextricable link between culture and politics that he had created, it was only a matter of time before they would achieve their former political greatness as well. The present was almost a minor detail – Iceland's time would come.

The road to the future

With an organic unity of history, culture, love of freedom, the nation, popular education, the future and independence, under the umbrella of *þjóðarandi* and *þjóðerni*, Aðils paved the road to the future: he updated and rooted a historical Icelandic identity within the limits of what was politically feasible. The unbreakable bond between history as the basis for culture and independence and the shaping of the nation legitimised the set-up of *Íþ*; moreover, it made history an indispensable element in Aðils' profile of the Icelandic nation and of vital importance for its future. With the active promotion of Aðils' ideas through his public lectures, there was a fair chance of the book being successful. This was likely aided by the general public's being used to the aforementioned oral historic tradition and its interest

in the reading and dissemination of historical sources, as well as the fact that legislation on education in 1907 and again in 1930 advanced the teaching of history (Magnússon and Ólafsson 2002: 194; Sigurðsson 1986: 120). And successful the book was: it got raving (yet not uncritical) reviews, was raffled in literary magazines, was read throughout the country and was immediately used as a reader and a history text book in both elementary and secondary schools (Finnbogason 1905: 36; Guðmundsson 1903: 228–31; Sigurðsson 2003: 137; *Unga Ísland* 1907: 64). Aðils had initiated a mechanism that had a self-sustaining effect: through the use of popular education he had warranted the merger of ideas on history and the self with a popular historic tradition and a need for popular education that was already in place.

It has been commonly assumed and acknowledged that Aðils' work influenced generations to come. Aðils actively pursued the foundation of popular education as part of the greater scheme (Sigurðsson 2003: 230). More importantly, he and his friend and fellow historiographer Jónas Jónsson frá Hríflu each produced history textbooks in 1915, Jónas for elementary schools and Aðils for secondary schools, that were both in use for decades (Aðils 1915; Jónsson 1915–6). Again – like other contemporaries – he wrote the book for a wider audience, for “anyone who wishes to become acquainted with our history, and enjoy themselves doing so” (Aðils 1915: iii; Sigurðsson 1986: 104–5). The question is what exactly Aðils' influence was. Both books were written before the constitutional change of 1918, when Iceland became an equal state within the Danish realm, and their tone was still as moderate in discussing Danish matters as in *Íþ*, or even more so. For instance, the Icelanders' notion of a supposed eternal *sjálfstæðisbarátta* [struggle for independence], that has been considered one of the main threads in Aðils' historiography, occurs neither in *Íþ* nor in the text books. What does occur, be it only once, is *sjálfstæðisbarátta* simply indicating the struggle for keeping their own laws as stipulated in the Old Covenant, not a struggle for political independence in the sense of self-governance (Aðils 1903: 240). In reality, this struggle had taken place in the preceding century and had successfully come to an end in 1874, so it certainly was not eternal – Aðils just provided a historical background for it. Neither Aðils nor Jónsson was in a position to describe a struggle for self-governance explicitly. It seems more likely that this notion is a later interpretation of Grundtvig's idea of the innate Northern struggle for what is right and good – which Aðils himself left up to his readers to fill in – that emerges after Iceland had already become independent.¹³

¹³ For the notion of a perceived eternal struggle for independence in Aðils' work, see Bergsson 2017: 93–124 and Hálfðanarson 2010: 128 and onward.

So how did Aðils' influence the next generation directly? Did his golden age with its twinned notions of culture and freedom remain a determining factor in the Icelandic self-image, and in the case of freedom was this even possible at all in view of the moderate tone he had had to use? The answer is yes. *Íþ* became canonical, because before too long other authors were using the Grundtvigian concepts used by Aðils to describe Icelandic history and to further the cause of the nation: it was their guidebook (Helgason 1918: 21–23, *Ísafold* 1918: 1). By the 1920s, there was a general awareness of a national culture permanently associated with a mediaeval golden age, with a pure language and a vernacular literature of its own, and this culture became an accepted part of Iceland's self-image (Helgason 1998: 40). This was Aðils' merit, that lasts until the present day. Culture and its components became vital to the image of Iceland; no history of the country has been written since that can leave out *menning*.¹⁴ Regarding the political side of the Icelandic nation, his ideas about freedom of the individual within the nation soon found resonance as well despite Aðils' moderate phrasing. This was probably helped by the fact that he was appointed the first lector of history at the foundation of the University of Iceland in 1911, his political activities and his membership of Alþingi between 1911 and 1913.

Accelerated by the events of WW I in Denmark, the call for self-determination on Iceland culminated in regaining sovereignty and home-rule in 1918, be it under a Danish monarch still (Glyn Jones 1970: 125; Karlsson 2000: 283–4). On this occasion, the concept of *gullöld* and its two key features were reproduced in the media in ways congruent with Aðils' depiction: the constitutional change with the so-called New Covenant was the beginning of a new golden era, with culture, freedom and independence, based on a past characterised in the same manner (*Morgunblaðið* 1918: 1; Jónsson 1918: 1). Once the new state structure was instituted, the concept of the individual within the nation could finally be used for purely political aims. And it was: at the start of WW II, the later prime minister of Iceland Jóhann Hafstein delivered a speech for the Independence Party in which he used *Íþ*, with Aðils' ideas on freedom and independence during the golden age, to support Iceland's claim to complete political independence – and to attract voters (Hafstein 1941: 83). Full independence was granted by Denmark in 1944, putting the finishing touch to the future that Aðils had envisioned but could not express. He may not have been the most original thinker, but he had the gift to project existing ideas onto the past in order to claim that past as something unique and then use it as proof for claiming the future – he followed in the footsteps of Grundtvig by steering towards a politics of culture that would last

14 This starts as early as 1915 in Jónas Jónsson's history text book: Jónsson 1915: 78.

(Lundgreen-Nielsen 2003: 222). One of the obituaries upon his decease in 1920 summed it up: he was *Jón sagnfræðingur*, the historian laureate of Iceland and the best historian the Icelandic nation had known for ages (Tíminn 1920: 106).

Literature

Primary Literature

- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1895–7: ‘Den danske regering og den islandske monopolhandel, nærmest i det 18. århundrede’. In: *Historisk Tidsskrift* 6-6, 535–610.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1902: ‘Alþýðuháskolar’. In: *Eimreiðin* 8-1, 4–62.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1908: ‘Nýji sáttmáli – Gamli sáttmáli: afsal eða ekki?’ In: *Reykjavík* 9-29, 113–4.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1903: *Íslenzkt þjóðerni*. Alþýðufyrirlestrar. Reykjavík.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1906: *Gullöld Íslendinga. Menning og lífshættir feðra vorra á söguöldinni*. Alþýðufyrirlestrar. Reykjavík.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1910: *Dagrenning*. Fimm alþýðuerindi. Reykjavík.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1915: *Íslandssaga*. Reykjavík.
- Aðils (Jónsson), Jón 1919: *Einokunarverzlun Dana á Íslandi 1602–1787*. Reykjavík.
- Grundtvig, N.F.S. 1842: *Krönike-riim til levende skolebrug med oplysninger*. Copenhagen.
- Grundtvig, N.F.S. 1848: ‘Folkeligheden’. In: *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* 1, 381–4.
- Grundtvig, N.F.S. 1907: *Udvalgte skrifter*, Vol. 5. Copenhagen.
- Grundtvig, N.F.S. 1908: *Udvalgte skrifter*, Vol. 7. Copenhagen.
- Grundtvig, N.F.S. 1909: *Udvalgte skrifter*, Vol. 8. Copenhagen.
- Jónsson, Arngrímur [1609]: *Crymogæa sive rerum islandicarum libri iii*. Copenhagen 1951.
- Jónsson, Finnur 1772–1778: *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ*, Vol. 1–4. Copenhagen.
- Jónsson (frá Hríflu), Jónas 1915–6: *Íslandssaga handa börnum*, Vol. 1–2. Reykjavík.
- Renan, Ernest 1882: *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?* Paris.

Secondary Literature

- Bergsson, Eiríkur 2017: ‘Iceland: Ever-Lasting Independence Struggle’. In: Eiríkur Bergsson (ed.): *Nordic nationalism and right-wing populist politics*. London, 93–124.
- Birkelund, Regner 2008: *Frihed til fælles bedste*. En oppositionel stemme fra fortiden. Om Grundtvigs frihedsbegreb. Århus.
- Böss, Michael 2015: ‘Grundtvig and cultural nationalism’. In: John A. Hall et al. (ed.): *Building the nation*. N.F.S. Grundtvig and Danish national identity. Montreal, 79–94.
- Brynjúlfsson, Gísli/Jón Þórðarson (eds.) 1849: *Norðurfari* 2. Copenhagen.
- Bugge, Knud Eyvin 1965: *Skolen for livet*. Studier over N.F.S. Grundtvigs pædagogiske tanker. Copenhagen.
- Damsholt, Tine 2015: ‘Hand of king and voice of people’: Grundtvig on democracy and the responsibility of the self’. In: John A. Hall et al. (ed.): *Building the nation*. N.F.S. Grundtvig and Danish national identity. Montreal, 151–68.

- Finnbogason, Guðmundur 1905: *Skýrsla um fræðslu barna og unglinga, veturinn 1903–1904*. Reykjavík.
- Glyn Jones, Walton 1970: *Denmark*. London.
- Gottskálksdóttir, Júlíana 2011: 'Monuments to Settlers of the North: A Means to Strengthen National Identity'. In: Sumarliði Ísleifsson/Daniel Chartier (ed.): *Iceland and Images of the North*. Sainte-Foy, 205–28.
- Gröndal, Benedikt 1873: 'Sæmundur fróði. Sæmundar-Edda'. In: *Gefn* 4, 1–33.
- Guðmundsson, Valtýr 1903: 'Jón Jónsson. Íslenzkt þjóðerni'. In: *Eimreiðin* 9-3, 228–31.
- Hafstein, Jóhann 1941: 'Sjálfstæðisstefnan'. In: Jóhann Hafstein/Gunnar Thoroddsen (ed.): *Stjórnsmál*. Ræður og ritgerðir. Reykjavík, 57–85.
- Halink, Simon 2017: 'Noble heathens: Jón Jónsson Aðils and the problem of Iceland's pagan past'. In: *Nations and Nationalism* 23-3, 463–83.
- Hálfðanarson, Guðmundur 2000: 'A peaceful secession'. In: *Scandinavian Journal of History* 25, 87–100.
- Hálfðanarson, Guðmundur 2007: *Íslenska þjóðríkið*. Uppruni og endimörk. Reykjavík.
- Hálfðanarson, Guðmundur 2010: 'Sagan og sjálfsmynd(ir) íslenskrar þjóðar'. In: *Glíman* 7, 113–35.
- Helgason, Jón Karl 1998: *Hetjan og höfundurinn*. Brot úr íslenskri menningarsögu. Reykjavík.
- Helgason, Magnús 1918: 'Erindi eftir messu í Hrepphólum 1. apríl 1918'. In: *Þjóðólfur* 65-6, 21–3.
- Jóhannesson, Guðni Th. et al. 2013: *Report on Iceland*. San Domenico di Fiesole. <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/docs/CountryReports/Iceland.pdf> [19.06.2017].
- Jónsson, Bjarni 1918: 'Ágrip af ræðu'. In: *Fréttir* 194, 1.
- Karlsson, Gunnar 2000: *Iceland's 1100 years*. London.
- Lerner, Marion 2010: *Landnahme-Mythos, kulturelles Gedächtnis und nationale Identität*. Isländische Reisevereine im frühen 20. Jahrhundert. Berlin.
- Lundgreen-Nielsen, Flemming 2003: 'Grundtvig and romanticism'. In: Jon Stewart (ed.): *Kierkegaard and his Contemporaries*. Berlin, 203–30.
- Lundgreen-Nielsen, Flemming 1992: 'Danskhed i krige og kriser. 1800–1864'. In: Flemming Lundgreen-Nielsen (ed.): *På sporet af dansk identitet*. Copenhagen, 109–51.
- Lundgreen-Nielsen, Flemming 1995: 'Grundtvig i guldealderens København'. In: *Grundtvig-studier* 46, 107–39.
- Magnússon, Sigurður Gylfi/Davíð Ólafsson 2002. 'Barefoot Historians: Education in Iceland in the Modern Period'. In: Klaus-Joachim Lorenzen-Schmidt and Bjørn Poulsen (eds.): *Writing Peasants. Studies on Peasant Literacy in Early Modern Northern Europe*. Århus, 175–209.
- Matthíasdóttir, Sigríður 2004. *Hinn sanni Íslendingur*. Þjóðerni, kyngervi og vald á Íslandi 1900–1930. Reykjavík.
- von Maurer, Konrad/Jón Sigurðsson 1882: *Upphaf allsherjarríkis á Íslandi og stjórnarskipunar þess*. Reykjavík.
- Middel, Kim 2016: 'Arngrímur Jónsson and the mapping of Iceland'. In: Lotte Jensen (ed.): *The Roots of Nationalism. National Identity Formation in Early Modern Europe, 1600–1815*. Amsterdam, 109–33.
- Middel, Kim 2018: 'Finnur Jonsson's Iceland: the periphery of the North at the centre of attention'. In: *Tijdschrift voor Skandinavistiek* 36-2, 206–14.
- NN 1846. 'Fáein orð um félagskap og samtök presta'. In: *Ársrit samið og gefið út af prestum og aðstoðarprestum í Syðri-Þórnesþingi*, 1–15.
- NN 1851. In: *Tíðindi frá þjóðfundum Íslendinga árið 1851*, 199–315.

- NN 1861. In: *Þjóðólfur* 13-37/8, 153.
- NN 1868: 'Frjettir innlendar'. In: *Baldur* 1-12, 46–47.
- NN 1907. In: *Unga Ísland* 3-8, 64.
- NN 1918. 'Dagurinn'. In: *Morgunblaðið* 6-21, 1.
- NN 1918. 'Mikilvæg tímamót. Hið fullvalda íslenska ríki'. In: *Ísafold* 45-57, 1.
- NN 1920. 'Jón J. Aðils prófessor'. In: *Tíminn* 4-27, 106.
- Ólason, Páll Eggert 1920: 'Jón Jónsson Aðils'. In: *Skírnir* 94-4, 225–48.
- Østergård, Uffe 2015: 'Nation-building and nationalism in the Oldenburg empire'. In: Stefan Berge/Alexei Miller (ed.): *Nationalizing empires*. Budapest, 461–510.
- Pedersen, Ove Kaj 2015. 'Conclusion'. In: John A. Hall et al. (ed.): *Building the nation*. N.F.S. Grundtvig and Danish national identity. Montreal, 412–26.
- Pontoppidan Thyssen, Anders 1983: 'Grundtvig's ideas on the church and the people up to 1824'. In: Christian Thodberg/Anders Pontoppidan Thyssen (ed.): *N.F.S. Grundtvig. Tradition and renewal. Grundtvig's vision of man and people, education and the church, in relation to world issues today*. Copenhagen, 87–120.
- Richter, Susan et al. 2016: *Was ist Freiheit? Eine historische Perspektive*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Sigurðsson, Ingi 1986: *Íslensk sagnfræði frá miðri 19. öld til miðrar 20 aldar*. Reykjavík.
- Sigurðsson, Ingi 2003: 'Útbreiðsla og viðtökur alþýðlegra fræðslurita'. In: Loftur Guttormsson/Ingi Sigurðsson (ed.): *Alþýðumenning á Íslandi 1830–1930*. Reykjavík, 115–47.
- Sigurðsson, Jón et al. 1851: 'Nefndarálit í stjórnarskipunarmálinu'. In: *Tíðindi frá Þjóðfundum Íslendinga árið 1851*, 496–517.
- Sigurðsson, Jón 1860: 'Um málefni Íslands'. In: *Ný félagsrit* 20, 1–22.
- Vígfússon, Guðbrandur 1860: 'Íslenskar réttitunarreglur eptir Halldór Friðriksson'. In: *Þjóðólfur* 12-18/19, 69–71 and *Þjóðólfur* 12-24/25, 95–7.
- Porkellsson, Jón 1858: 'Vatnsdæla saga'. In: *Þjóðólfur* 11-3/4, 10–2.