From Ethnology and Folklore Studies to Cultural History in Scandinavia

Anne Eriksen

This article presents a northern perspective on cultural history, that of the Scandinavian countries Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Within the two disciplines of ethnology and folklore studies, these countries share a tradition in cultural history dating back to the 19th century. Once closely related to the projects of nation-building and the idea of national culture, these disciplines have slowly been transformed into modern cultural history. Since Peter Burke coined the term "the discovery of the people" in his now classic study, numerous works have provided detailed knowledge on how this discovery was closely related to the processes of modernisation.[1] Burke's perspectives have been elaborated on and criticised in a flood of studies discussing the role of folk culture in nation-building in Europe and elsewhere. One issue of major theoretical pertinence has been how this discovery of a domestic version of the noble savage—the European peasant—influenced reflexive thinking on culture. In the same way as we see in the encounter with the "exotic" culture of other continents, the realisation that groups of people in Europe were in possession of cultural forms and expressions which were largely unknown to the elite fuelled discussions on culture and cultural value *per se*. The discovery of the people and the subsequent use of folk culture in nation-building, as well as the significance given to such projects in the broader modernisation processes, is a rather general phenomenon. Within the general frames, we find many and considerable local variations with respect to the impact of folk culture on national culture and its political pertinence, as well as the duration and academic impact of the interest in the cultural forms of ordinary people.

1 Burke, 1978.

In Scandinavia, the "discovery of the people" was not merely a short-lived romantic affair of the late 18th and the early 19th centuries. The awakened interest also led to more serious and long-lasting relationships. In Denmark, Sweden and Norway the archives and collections that followed from the initial discovery survived the first stages of antiquarianism, romantic philology and ardent nation-building. Out of this initial enthusiasm grew the two academic disciplines European ethnology and folklore studies. During the 20th century they gradually liberated themselves from their romantic and nationalistic foundations and, have been the basis for a new interest in developing cultural history as a modern discipline during the last two or three decades.

Discovery of the people in Scandinavia—19th century

Political contexts were important reasons for the discovery of the people having such an impact in Scandinavia, but the implications were not the same in all three countries. At the beginning of the 19th century both Denmark and Sweden faced the future as dramatically diminished states with reduced political influence. Traditional rivals, both states had been influential European powers during the 16th and 17th centuries. Both monarchies were also multi-ethnic and multilingual. Denmark included Iceland, the Faroe Islands, Norway and the duchies of Slesvig and Holstein. To Sweden belonged Finland and during the period of the empire (1611-1718) also some possessions in the Baltic region. Scania, long a Danish possession, became part of Sweden in 1658. However, both countries gradually lost influence and adopted approximately their current sizes. Sweden suffered a decisive blow with the loss of Finland in 1809. Denmark was massively reduced by the loss of Norway, which gained national independence after the Napoleonic wars. After some months of freedom in the summer of 1814 Norway was forced into a union with Sweden but allowed to keep its newly composed Constitution and the recognition as a state. In the 1860s Denmark suffered another blow with the loss of the duchies of Slesvig and Holstein to Germany.

Hence, the three countries had different reasons for embracing the enthusiasm for folk culture which became so popular all over Europe. Denmark and Sweden turned to folk culture as part of the process of compensating for the loss of external political power through the development of a more acute sense of internal national unity. When the old conglomerate monarchies were to be replaced by new nation states, a common national culture was needed and folk culture became an important element in this construction work. In Norway, while the situation was

different, the interest in folk culture was just as strong. With the freshly gained political independence it was important to demonstrate the legitimacy of the new state and folk culture served this end. It gave the impression of demonstrating a continuity spanning from the middle ages to the present. This implied focusing on the period when Norway was the stronger of the Scandinavian states and reigned over large possessions in the North Sea region. Postulating close connections between present-day folk culture and that of the Middle Ages—including the Norse saga literature—was a way of claiming a cultural continuity of *Norwegianess* through periods when no state had existed. Moreover, folk culture was thought to demonstrate the existence of a culture, mentality and language clearly different from the Danish and specifically Norwegian.

As a general phenomenon, the early interest in folk culture mainly concentrated on oral folklore, more particularly on poetry and fairy-tales. In Sweden, the first collection of folk ballads was published in 1814-1818 by Geijer and Afzelius, while in Denmark, Svend Grundtvig published an extensive collection of medieval ballads in the 1850s.[2] The work of the German Grimm brothers had great influence on collectors of legends and fairy-tales in Scandinavia. In Norway, Andreas Faye published a book of legends in 1833 after an early visit to Germany. P.Chr. Asbjørnsen and Jørgen Moe's collection of fairy-tales from 1841 onwards also drew heavily on Grimm and earned their warm praise. For the second edition of the book, appearing in 1852, Moe wrote an introduction that is generally considered to be the first scientific text on Norwegian folk tales. One of the main aims was to point out the distinctive national features of the narratives. The work of the Norwegian collectors was in turn an inspiration to the Swede Olof Hyltén-Cavallius in his work on legends and beliefs during the 1850s and '60s, and to the Dane Evald Tang Christensen, who published his tales and legends in the 1890s.

These men were archive-builders who laid the ground for collections that still exist today, such as the Danish collection of folklore at the National Library in Copenhagen and the Norwegian Folklore Archives at the University of Oslo. During the last decades of the 19th century, folklore studies grew into an university discipline. Svend Grundtvig was not only a collector of ballads, but also became the first Danish professor in folklore studies. Molten Moe, son of the collector Jørgen Moe, became the first professor as well as the heir to his father's great collection, which was bequeathed to the University of Oslo upon his death in 1913.

2 Strömbäck et al., 1971.

Open-Air Museums and early research

The activities presented so far would have been part of the history of philology and not of cultural history, if other elements such as an interest in material folk culture and the social life of the common people had not been included. This interest was expressed in part through the open-air museums, and in part through some important research works. The first open-air museum in Scandinavia was established at Skansen, in Stockholm Sweden, in 1891, as an extension of the Nordic Museum, a collection dating back to 1873. The man behind the project was Arthur Hazelius, an avid collector of folk art and antiquities from both Sweden and Norway, hence the name *The Nordic Museum*. From the very beginning Skansen became renowned for not merely exhibiting old buildings, but also showing realistic interiors and domestic scenes—initially populated by mannequins, but quite soon replaced by real people and living animals.[3]

Only three years later, in 1894, Norsk Folkemuseum opened in Oslo, Norway. The museum was laid out as a park on the peninsula of Bygdøy. Its origin was a small collection of peasant's houses and a stave church, belonging to King Oscar II.

An important motivation behind the establishment of the museum was to stop Hazelius from exporting Norwegian objects to Sweden. A more positive assessment of this rivalry will note that popular material culture was becoming a highly valuable part of national history at this time, worthy of care and preservation. The leading ideologue behind the museum in Oslo was the professor in folklore studies, Moltke Moe. In his inaugural speech he declared that:

> "The aim of this collection is to give the Norwegian people a picture of the life that was lived in Norway down through the centuries, our fathers' ways of building houses, their furniture, their tools and utensils, their dress, in short the entire environment in which they moved and lived, and of which the memory now is gradually fading."[4]

Moe considered it self-evident that knowing material folk culture meant knowing national history. Judging by the success of the museum, many agreed with him. From the 1890s and well into the 20th century, open air-museums sprang up around the country, conceived as expressions of cultural identity. A new wave of national enthusiasm swept over the country from 1905 when the union with

3 Hillström, 2006.

4 Aall, 1920, bilag 1, translated here.

Sweden was dissolved, up to 1914, the centenary of the Constitution, leading to the establishment of many new museums.

The most monumental Danish contribution to the Scandinavian tradition of cultural history is without doubt Troels Frederik Troels-Lund's work *Dagligt Liv i Norden i det sekstende Aarhundrede* (Everyday life in the North in the 16th century), originally published in twelve volumes from 1879 to 1893. One could say the aim of this exploration was exactly the same as Moltke Moe's description for the museum: To give an exhaustive picture of the way of the lives of the people.

Troels-Lund approached his task very systematically. The separate volumes of his work are given to such topics as food (vol. 5), dress (vol. 4) and annual feasts (vol. 7). One entire volume is on childbirth and baptism. Two volumes treat buildings and construction. The first is about the houses of common men, the second about castles and fortresses. A look into the first of these two volumes reveals a number of subtopics. The chapters dealing with houses in towns and cities also comprise texts on the cleanliness of the streets, stray dogs, epidemic diseases and night watchmen; the chapters on the interiors of the same houses deal with such topics as different kinds of beds and bedding, the temperature in the houses and ways to keep warm.

Troels-Lund's work was immensely popular, and has been reprinted numerous times to this day. But was it history? This question was posed in an extremely irate article by the German history professor, Dietrich Schäfer, who published his *Das eigentliche Arbeitsgebiet der Geschichte* in 1888, and then repeated his question in 1891. Troels-Lund's answer was the text *On cultural history* from 1893, which has been printed as a foreword to all subsequent editions of his work, and which can still be read as a kind of manifesto on the worth and significance of cultural history.[5] The Schäfer/Troels-Lund dispute was partly the result of the contemporary political situation, not least of the recent wars between Germany and Denmark, ending with Denmark losing the duchies of Slesvig and Holstein. Nonetheless, it also has a more general relevance for the history of cultural history. As a representative of the German historical school, Schäfer's point of view was that the state, its expansion and political life were the real objects of historical studies. Hence, he expressed his concern over the growing interest in such lower themes as the everyday life of the masses and all those "dark necessities belonging to the animal part of the human race".[6] The only excuse for treating such topics at all, according to Schäfer, must be that in a small and

5 Troels-Lund, 1914/1893.

6 Quoted in Troels-Lund, 1914/1893, p. XXXVI.

powerless state such as Denmark, which was not given any "national mission",[7] there was not much else to write about. Cultural history was an expression of political impotence and perhaps a natural reaction after a confrontation with the Prussian state and its war machinery. But it was not history.

Troels-Lund did not see things this way, which is abundantly clear in his answer to Schäfer. Even he related his work to the war, but he considered a patriotic duty to demonstrate through his scholarly work that even though Denmark had lost political power, there still existed a Danish culture to be proud of. Perhaps more interesting today is his general defence of cultural history as a discipline. Troels-Lund makes it very clear that writing about everyday life means writing about the most important dimensions of human development: Those aspects of change occurring slowly over the centuries, which involve us all, but where the differences are so small and so gradual that they can only be studied by means of the details of everyday life—the way we eat and dress, live and die. He is equally clear that in these very fundamental historical processes, the births, lives and deaths of common people are just as important as those of the elite. He has made his choice, he declares, to study history "not from the top of the cone, in its full, flowing sunshine, but from the wide and solid bottom, upon which the cone rests."[8]

I do not suggest that European ethnology and folklore studies, as they emerged in Denmark, Sweden and Norway in the late 19th century, represented a full-fledged version of modern cultural history. My argument is that this development has supplied a kind of Scandinavian *Sonderweg* to the modern field of cultural history and that it fundamentally defines our approach even today. Apart from the fact that cultural history has been institutionalised and thus has existed as a continuous strand of knowledge and research, this Scandinavian tradition has some distinctive features of its own. One of them is the interest in popular culture, the culture of peasants, working people and commoners. The original concept of folk culture (as the core of national culture) put a heavy emphasis on peasants—people living so far away from cities, foreigners and all consequences of modernity that they could be believed to have preserved the true, ancient culture of their nation. Later, the ideas about an archaic folk culture were replaced by a broader and more general interest in popular culture. Even today, *ordinary people* and everyday life are key issues in our research, while studies of elite culture are less frequent, though not absent. Another important feature, probably connected to the first, is the idea of cultural history as a critical, even

7 Id.

8 Id., p. 7.

oppositional discipline. The interest in everyday life and the experiences of the non-elite have been linked to the wish to have more democratic perspectives on history and the claim that history is more than merely the study of economic and political change. The Danish cultural historian Palle O. Christiansen goes so far as to define cultural history as such. In the introduction to his book *Kulturhistorie som opposition* (Cultural History as Opposition, 2000), he states that the history of cultural history can only be understood in relation to other developments within the discipline of history. Cultural history has always been a "reaction against dominant ideas about history and historic reality."[9] Rather than presenting a narrative of continuous development, Christiansen structures his history of cultural history as a collection of *answers* to positions and issues within mainstream history from the mid 19th century to the present. While on the one hand this gives cultural history a position on the periphery, Christiansen emphasises the critical potential, and portrays cultural history as a running corrective for other forms of history.

Twists and turns

Among the numerous *turns* in cultural theory during recent decades, two are particularly relevant for understanding how the Scandinavian tradition of ethnology and folklore studies has evolved into cultural history in the modern sense. The first is the reflexive turn. New and more acute ways of thinking about how scholarly work not only creates knowledge on phenomena already existing in the world, but also itself contributes to the existence of these phenomena, has had profound impact on the self-understanding of these two disciplines. New and critical perspectives on the history of ethnology and folklore studies as parts of the processes of nation-building emerged from within the disciplines themselves.[10] Ethnologists and folklorists of the 19th century studied folk culture and helped to *discover* it. To many of them, their work represented a mixture of scholarly and political interest. With the reflexive turn, the interest in the political agendas of these founders of the disciplines became more prominent and a critical history of the disciplines became an object of study in itself in the late 20th century. An understanding that studying and *discovering* popular culture also contained elements of construction became part of this reflexive and deconstructive perspective.

9 Christiansen, 2000, p. 7. See also Christiansen, 2008, p. 65.

10 E.g. Eriksen, 1993.

To scholars of the 19th century, the more general processes of modernity also justified their work with popular culture: It was important to gain knowledge on traditional forms of culture before they disappeared. The reflexive perspective made it clearer that such ideas in themselves are integral parts of modernity. The act of describing specific cultural forms, expressions or even whole ways of living as *traditional* or *ancient* in itself means that a threshold is inserted between then and now, between what is and what has been. Such a process defines tradition, but also defines what is contemporary. Our endeavours to save or investigate tradition makes the modern stand out more clearly.[11]

Greater insight into the ways scholarly work contributes to the existence of what is being investigated created a much keener theoretical awareness within the two existing disciplines. Most specifically, it meant a definite liberation from old political projects, and more generally, it created an interest in such theoretical issues as cultural representations and conceptual history. On a more concrete level, the same insight has led to studies in, for instance, museology and collective memory, in both cases raising questions on how past experience is conceptualised, given cultural form and communicated.

The *anthropological* turn had an impact on ethnology and folklore studies in several ways. Thanks to the influences of Mary Douglas, Edmund Leach, Clifford Geertz, Victor Turner and others, the study of carnivals, witch hunts, magic, popular medicine, the list goes on, became the work of historians. In ethnology and folklore studies, these topics were not new; they had been the staple of these disciplines since their origins. Nonetheless, up to then they had contributed to the reputation of the two traditions as being more about curiosities than real history and had created an image of ethnologists and folklorists as the true heirs to the antiquaries of earlier centuries. The anthropological turn changed this, transforming old topics of ethnology and folklore studies into important issues in new forms of historical enquiry. The material collected in the 19th and early 20th centuries became a goldmine for studying world-views and mentalities of past ages, and old studies based on this material gained new relevance.

As inspiring as this development might have been, another aspect was even more important. Behind the new interest in rituals, carnivals, witches and so on was a new understanding of culture that focused on meaning and symbols and on communication and representations. In ethnology and folklore studies, this new way of thinking about culture led away from an interest in forms, motives and lines of traditions alone. The anthropological turn was decisive for the refashioning of ethnology and folklore studies into a discipline that invested

11 Bauman/Briggs, 2003.

in representations and construction of meaning and was less preoccupied with studying the wanderings of historical forms and morphologies. During the 19th century, popular culture had been collected and archived as objects or items. It the late 20th century it re-emerged as elements in communication and constructions of meaning.[12]

Recent Work

At present, the Scandinavian tradition of ethnology and folklore studies seem, to be developing in two directions. One part understands itself and cultural history in the modern sense, while the other has chosen to fashion itself more in the direction of cultural studies or social science. These distinctions are not always very clear, but may be discerned as trends, for instance to be read out of the names of departments, occurring in study programmes and so on. The general trend seems to be that the majority of ethnologists have turned to social science and undertake contemporary studies in Sweden. A smaller proportion works as cultural historians. The post-graduate education, which evolved at Nordiska museet in Stockholm is important here, as is the University of Gotland with its emphasis on cultural heritage studies. In Denmark, the cultural history tradition holds a stronger position. At the University of Copenhagen, a historical perspective is deeply integrated in the work of such scholars as Bjarne Stoklund, Tine Damsholt and Signe Mellemgaard.[13]

In Norway, the situation is mixed. At the University of Bergen, ethnology and folklore studies were renamed Cultural Studies some years ago. Cultural studies programmes are also offered at some of the university colleges. The University of Oslo has chosen to go in the other direction. Seven years ago, in 2003, ethnology and folklore studies were combined to the cultural history course of studies, which is now the official name of the discipline. Starting as a patchwork of projects and courses based in ethnology and folklore, a more integrated tradition of cultural history has been established.

Courses in cultural history are now offered at both the bachelor's and master's levels. At present, there are about 75 students in the bachelor's programme and 50 in the master's programme. A separate master's programme in museology was opened in 2010. At present nine there are also Ph.D. students, some working on individually designed projects and others engaged in projects initiated

12 E.g. Palmenfelt, 1993; Anttonen, 1997.

13 Stoklund, 2003; Damsholt, 2000; Mellemgaard, 1998.

by senior scholars. The main source for project funding outside the universities is the Norwegian Research Council. Recently, a programme on cultural values has funded some quite substantial projects in cultural history at the University of Oslo and has also improved the possibilities to build international networks.

Together with its history as a product of the two older disciplines, these projects define the profile of cultural history at the University of Oslo at present. One of them, entitled *Patterns of Cultural Evaluation* and headed by Saphinaz Naguib, studies museums of cultural history in an epoch after the collapse of grand national narratives. The aim is to analyse representations of diversity in Norwegian museums of cultural history and to explore the dialectics between historical narratives and perceptions of culture and belongingness, and the ways these narratives are conveyed visually in exhibitions. The notion of diversity is used to encompass a great number of complex issues pertaining to ethnicity, religion, social class, education, economy, gender, age and lifestyle. The project examines how exhibitions draw upon and reproduce older models and stereotypes about the nation and Norwegianess, how new visions and paradigms are introduced and which visual and aesthetic schemes are applied in exhibitions. The project is also highly interested in the ways in which ethnic groups and minorities represent themselves in their own museums. In this project, the notion of citizenship is vital, both as an analytical tool and as a concept to be investigated: At present, the idea that the task of museums is to contribute to an experience of citizenship is very strongly expressed in European political rhetoric.

While the above-mentioned project focuses on cultural representation, the other project is based on an interest in the history of knowledge. Entitled *Animals as Objects and Animals as Signs* and headed by Liv Emma Thorsen, the project explores how nature—animals—is turned into knowledge. The project aims to explain the processes that make animals into representations for scientific purposes and for social practices. It will also look into the connection between natural history representations and a more general aestheticisation of animals. Objects on display in museums of natural history are a major example. They do not only have a history of their own, as animals, but also as museum exhibits and scientific items. The animals represent ways of seeing nature, of transforming nature into knowledge and of communicating that knowledge to others by means of very definite strategies. Hence, this part of museology is very closely related to yet another field, that of the cultural history of science.

Another important field in cultural history in Oslo is museology. Contrary to what might be believed, it does not originate from the open-air museums, but rather reflects an interest in the history of knowledge and a study of cultural representations. Museums and collections represent ways of organising knowledge,

and these ways have changed historically. Refusing to equate museums with the great public institutions that were established during the 19th century, based on a predominantly historical and often national way of thinking, the studies of museums reach back into early modern collections and work their way up to the present. Today, the grand narratives of national culture that were the basic premise of museum building in the 19th century are being challenged both by migration and multiculturalism, by new modes of communication and by the new media.

Material culture is another strong field, not only in Oslo but as a general feature in the Scandinavian tradition of cultural history. To early scholars like Troels-Lund and the museum founders, material culture was of great significance. The open-air museums were mainly collections of artefacts from premodern, peasant society: tools, utensils, textiles and costumes, and not least buildings. The early research focused on the function, history and typologies of this type of artefact. In more recent years, inspiration from international material culture studies has transformed the field and given it theoretical premises of its own. Within this large cross-disciplinary field, at least three approaches can be discerned that have influenced the work on material culture within Scandinavian cultural history. The first of these was a new interest in the symbolic meaning of artefact, leading to a predominantly semiotic approach. In cultural history, this led to greater interest in the artefacts of mass culture, which until then had not been regarded as worthy of research interest. This changed when attention turned from the objects themselves to the cultural meaning ascribed to them. The second approach was inspired by phenomenology and focused on the experience of materiality rather than the objects *per se*. From this followed studies of, for instance, artisan skills and the tacit knowledge forming the basis of practical competences. The latest perspectives, inspired by the actor-network theory of Bruno Latour, study the interaction that takes place between humans and their artefacts.[14] Taken together, these new perspectives have widened the field of study from the (frequently handmade) artefacts of traditional society to materiality *per se*. The focus is no longer exclusively on the objects, but on their workings in a cultural context.

Competence in the field of traditional popular culture in Scandinavia continues to be strong. The Norwegian Folklore Archives are still a part of cultural history at the University of Oslo, and extensive digitalisation projects have made them accessible for research in new ways in recent years. Large parts of the material are now available to scholars through the web. Just as important, the

14 Stoklund, 2003; Damsholt et al., 2009.

new technology opens the way for a different type of question than before, as it is now possible to work with a larger amount of material. The search options also create new ways of combining information. At present, a large range of Norwegian court cases on witchcraft are available online; about 650 cases can be accessed. The material tells of witchcraft and magic from the 16th to the 18th centuries. On a more general level, the material is also a source for the investigation of early modern mentality and world-views. Supplementing this, a collection of magic books is also available online. The books, in the vernacular known as *svartebøker* (black books), were cloaked by an aura of mystery in folk tradition. They contained recipes and instructions on how to cure diseases in humans and animals. Aided by the books, the wise men and women who once owned them could also find thieves, tell fortunes and secure desired love partners. The majority of the books in existence are from the 19th century, but some date back all the way to the 15th century. Great collections of traditional oral poetry and narratives are also available online. Large parts of the archives on fairy-tales, popular legends and medieval ballads can be accessed. This part of the collection mainly stems from the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The last field to be mentioned in this presentation of cultural history in Oslo encompasses collective memory, heritage studies and the notion of history. The book *Det var noe annet under krigen* (Things were different during the war)[15] introduced studies in collective memory in Norwegian academia. The book is an exploration of how a broad tradition of knowledge on Norway during the German occupation (1940-1945) has served as the foundation of the modern Norwegian identity. Based on extensive detailed historical research, the tradition is found to have a highly realistic basis and is devoid of serious factual errors. However at the same time it is an extremely heroic narrative, which means that important aspects of what actually took place have been omitted and also that the included events are ascribed a significance they might not at all have had. Not reserved merely to scholarly genres, this tradition has been and still is communicated through monuments and memorials, in museums, films, textbooks for schools, literature and so on. The general message is to tell all Norwegians that they (or their parents and grandparents) contributed heavily to the allied victory and that they did so mainly by being good Norwegians. Taking this work as their point of departure, a number of young scholars have then further developed the study of the collective memory of World War II.[16] Our work in the field of collective memory has developed into studies of uses of the past and the idea

15 Eriksen, 1995.

16 Esborg, 1995; Kverndokk, 2000, 2007; Sem, 2008.

of history. The general point of departure here is the assumption that cultural history is not defined by its subject matter but rather by its approach. Cultural historians study productions of meaning in past societies. An important field in production of meaning, however, is the past itself. In modern societies, the past is conceived as history, today even as *heritage*. How was it conceived and conceptualised before the 19th century paradigm of history? How did people negotiate the past to make it meaningful and relevant without understanding history as change, uncontrolled events and temporal processes, but rather as a spatial unfolding of constant elements like human vice and virtue?[17] Even more important to the discipline of cultural history are the questions of epistemology: Are we as historians able to study history as a culturally specific way of lending meaning to the past, or have we so completely naturalised this way of thinking that it is impossible for us to apply analytical perspectives on it? I think the answers to these questions hinge on how much cultural history understands itself as simply a history of culture (as the production of meaning) and how much it allows itself to be informed by a more theoretical approach.

Literature

Aall, Hans, Norsk folkemuseum 1894-1919. Trekk av dets historie, Kristiana 1920.

Anttonen, Pertti, Transformations of a murder narrative. A case in the politics and history of history and heroisation, in: Norveg 2 (1997), p. 3-28.

Bauman, Richard/Briggs, Charles L., Voices of Modernity. Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality, Cambridge 2003.

Burke, Peter, Popular culture in early modern Europe, London 1978.

Christiansen, Palle Ove, Kulturhistorie som opposition. Træk af forskellige fagtraditioner, Copenhagen 2000.

Id., L'expérience et la vie quotidienne: L'historie culturelle en Scandinavie, in: L'histoire culturelle: un "tournant mondial" dans l'historiographie, ed. by Philippe Poirier, Dijon 2008, p. 65-78.

Damsholt, Tine, Fædrelandskærlighed og borgerdyd. Patriotisk diskurs og militære reformer i Danmark i sidste del av 1700-tallet, Copenhagen 2000.

Damsholt, Tine et al. (eds.), Materialiseringer. Nye perspektiver på materialitet og kulturanalyse, Århus 2009.

17 Eriksen/Sigurðsson, 2009.

Eriksen, Anne, Den nasjonale kulturarven—en del av det moderne?, in: Kulturella perspektiv 1 (1993), p. 16-25.

Id., "Det var noe annet under krigen". 2. verdenskrig i norsk kollektivtradisjon, Oslo 1995.

Id., The Murmur of Ruins. A Cultural History, in: Ethnologia EuropaeaEthnologia Europaea 36, 1 (2007), p. 5-20.

Eriksen, Anne/Sigurðsson, Jón Viðar (eds), Negotiating Pasts in the Nordic Countries. Interdisciplinary Studies in History and Memory, Lund 2009.

Esborg, Line, "—Og så var vi alle gode nordmenn—" Fortellinger om den symbolske motstanden under okkupasjonen av Norge 1940-45. Master's thesis, University of Oslo 1995.

Hillström, Magdalena, Ansvaret för kulturarvet. Studier i det kulturhistoriska museiväsendets formering med särskild inriktning på Nordiska museets etablering 1872-1919, Linköping 2006.

Kverndokk, Kyrre, "De kjempet, de falt, de gav oss alt". Om den rituelle bruken av norske krigsminnesmerker. Master's thesis, University of Oslo 2000.

Id., Pilegrim, turist og elev. Norske skoleturer til døds- og konsentrasjonsleirer, Linköping 2007.

Mellemgaard, Signe, Kroppens natur. Sundhedsopplysning og naturidealer i 250 år, Copenhagen 1998.

Palmenfelt, Ulf, On the Understanding of Folk Legends, in: Telling Reality. Folklore Studies in the Memory of Bengt Holbek, ed. by Michael Chesnutt, Copenhagen/Turku 1993, p. 143-167.

Sem, Leiv, "For oss er Falstad det norske holocaust". Ein diskursanalytisk studie av debatten om krigsminnestaden Falstad i 2003-2004, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oslo 2008.

Stoklund, Bjarne (ed), Tingenes kulturhistorie. Etnologiske studier i den materielle kultur, Copenhagen 2003.

Strömbäck, Dag et al. (eds), Leading folklorists of the North. Biographical studies, Oslo 1971.

Troels-Lund (T.F.), Dagligt Liv i Norden i det sekstende Aarhundrede. Copenhagen 1879/1914.