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Locating Norway in ‘the North’: the Cultural Geography of Norway in Strickland’s ‘Arthur Ridley; or, a Voyage to Norway’ (1826) and Andersen’s ‘Elverhøi’ (1845)

Elettra Carbone

In *The Idea of the North*, Peter Davidson explores ‘the North’ as a shifting idea, one that is relative and that ‘moves always out of reach, receding towards the polar night’: for every North there always exists a further North.¹ This multiplicity of Norths enables speculation about what or where the ‘true North’ may be, suggesting once again that for each individual there is a place that represents ‘the north in essence’.² It is only natural, as Peter Fjågesund also observes at the beginning of *The Dream of the North*, that the cardinal points ‘are not perceived or interpreted identically across the globe’.³ This said, ‘the North’ – defined in geographical terms as northern or Protestant Europe, Russia, North America, and the Arctic – has also come to be recognised as a ‘politically and culturally distinct area’.⁴ In the history of representations of ‘the North’, however, Norway, together with Iceland, has always been one of
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the regions which has served as a geographical and cultural link between the deserted or almost deserted Arctic and the rest of ‘the North’. 

In this chapter, I examine the place of Norway in Northern representations of ‘the North’ by analysing and comparing the representation of that country in a British short story for children and in a Danish fairy tale: ‘Arthur Ridley; or, A Voyage to Norway’ (1826) by Agnes Strickland (1796–1874), and ‘Elverhøj’ (1845) by Hans Christian Andersen (1805–1875). I have two main areas of interest. First: the tropes which these texts use to define Norway and how those tropes reflect the different kinds of cultural and historical relations existing between, respectively, Norway and Britain, two longstanding commercial partners, and Norway and Denmark, which had until the Treaty of Kiel in 1814 long been part of the same kingdom. And, second: the extent to which the representations of Norway in these texts deploy a distinction between ‘the North’ and ‘the high North’ comparable, in essence, to the more familiar binary opposition between ‘the North’ and ‘the South’, and used, like it, to demarcate difference in the service of romantic-nationalist agendas.

In later life Agnes Strickland became particularly well-known for historical narratives like The Lives of the Queens of England (1840–1849) and The Lives of the Queens of Scotland (1850–1859), inspired by the historical novels of Walter Scott (1771–1832), but she was also one of the most popular writers for children of her day. ‘Arthur Ridley; or, A Voyage to Norway’ was first published in 1826 as part of Strickland’s collection of children’s stories entitled The Rival Crusoes, which had been republished six times by 1851 and translated into French by 1858. Literature for children published in the late eighteenth century was rarely explicitly political, based in part on the belief that the world of an innocent childhood had nothing to do with that of current events and politics. Attitudes began gradually to change during the first decades of the nineteenth century, however, in the aftermath of the French Revolution and the propagation of Jacobin and anti-Jacobin ideas throughout Europe. In ‘Arthur Ridley’, Strickland reflects this change, combining geography – a subject which had for a long time been considered suitable for the purposes of entertainment and education – with politics, specifically in the form of a discussion of social mobility.

While Strickland’s story is characterised by adventure mixed with realism and didacticism, Andersen’s ‘Elverhøj’ is a fairy tale where the main characters, acting in the role of Norwegians and Danes, are, respectively, trolls and elves. Inspired by the well-known Danish folk ballad
‘Elverhøj’ (which Lis Møller makes the subject of her essay in this volume), Andersen’s ‘Elverhøi’ was one of only two stories which he wrote with Norway and Norwegians as motifs.\textsuperscript{11} It was published for the first time in \textit{Nye Eventyr. Første Bind. Tredie Samling} [New Fairy Tales. First Volume. Third Collection] (1845) and republished in 1849 in \textit{Eventyr} [Fairy Tales] (1850) and again in 1863 in \textit{Eventyr og Historier} [Fairy Tales and Stories]. By 1845, Andersen had made his breakthrough after the success of his previous collections, \textit{Eventyr, fortalte for Børn. Første Samling} [Fairy Tales, told for Children. First Collection] (3 volumes, 1835–1838) and \textit{Eventyr, fortalte for Børn. Ny Samling} [Fairy Tales, told for Children. New Collection] (3 volumes, 1838–1842). It is well-known that Andersen regarded himself as much as a writer for children as a writer for adults, and this came increasingly to be reflected in the titles of his collections: \textit{Nye Eventyr} [New Fairy Tales], the first part of which was published in 1844, is the first collection where Andersen leaves out the subtitle ‘fortalte for Børn’ [told for Children].\textsuperscript{12}

A blend of material drawn from folk tales and realism (including references to the cultural history of Norway), with a didactic focus on the definition of good and bad behaviour, ‘Elverhøi’ can be and has been read in a variety of ways: as a new version of the folk ballad; as a story of rebellious youngsters; as a comment on the differences between Denmark and Norway, and so on.

Cultural geographers and those who have studied the representation of place in literature agree that place has both a geographical and a symbolic function, the physical place and the cultural values inscribed upon that place.\textsuperscript{13} My discussion of ‘Arthur Ridley’ and ‘Elverhøi’ accordingly pays particular attention to the interplay which both exhibit, in their imaginings of Norway, between the cultural and the physical geography of this part of ‘the North’. The two texts belong to very different genres: ‘Arthur Ridley’ is a children’s story featuring a journey \textit{to} Norway made by the British boy of the title to prove his loyalty and his bravery to his father; ‘Elverhøi’ is a fairy tale about the journey \textit{from} Norway by the old Dovre troll and his sons to the castle of the Danish Elf King.\textsuperscript{14} But both texts have in common the attempt to formulate an imaginative geography of Norway rooted in questions of specific national identity and belonging. Norway, in other words, emerges from these texts not as an ill-defined part of ‘the North’, but as a determined and determinable entity, with a geopolitical and a cultural configuration of which the British and Danish ‘others’ in the texts are more or less aware.
A useful point of entry into Strickland’s and Andersen’s representations of Norway is, therefore, the tension between what the cultural geographer Joël Bonnemaison has described as the geography of iconology and the geography of circulation, or what we might in the terms of this volume call the geography of exchange. This latter focuses on ‘flows, movement and modernity’ and examines how ‘circulatory movement brings about changes in the organisation of the world, regions and nations’ while the former is concerned with those ‘cultural images that are embodied in territories’ and represent a stable identity by resisting movement and change. In his introduction to Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto, Stephen Greenblatt encapsulates this tension in a single question which I intend to use also as the framework for my discussion here: ‘what are the mechanisms at work when movement encounters structures of stability and control?’ In both stories, the encounter with Norway is due to the ‘circulation’ of people: Arthur and the crew of his father’s ship Aurora (a name with obvious links to ‘the North’) travel to Norway, and the old Dovre troll and his sons travel from Norway to Denmark. It is thanks to these journeys that the possibility of change is introduced – but which kinds of change, and why, and with what effects? Which national identities (British, Danish, Norwegian) are seen to be influenced by these circulations? To what extent are these journeys seen as formative for those involved? In short, what – if any – forms of cultural exchange do these texts narrate? And why is Norway chosen as a backdrop? Answering these questions will illuminate not just how and where Strickland and Andersen ‘place’ Norway in ‘the North’ but also illustrate their senses of the different relationships obtaining between Norway and its two much more influential Northern neighbour states, Britain and Denmark.

WHY NORWAY, OR THE IMPORTANCE OF EXCHANGE

As Greenblatt has observed, ‘the process of circulation’ is the driving force behind cultural encounters, which are born thanks to the tension between ‘places’ and ‘out-of-placeness’ created by the movement of individuals, ideas, and cultural objects. In both ‘Arthur Ridley’ and ‘Elverhøi’, the encounter between Britain and Denmark and the Norwegian ‘Other’ comes about thanks to ‘the churning together of people, goods and ideas, to use Bonnemaison’s phrase’. The nature of and the reasons for these journeys which enable the cultural encounter with Norway and Norwegians are slowly unveiled in the frame narratives which embed
both stories. In the case of ‘Arthur Ridley’, the frame narrative embeds the
story of the journey to Norway, giving us background information about
the main characters – Arthur Ridley and his family – and explaining
the aims of the voyage to Norway. In fact, while the story is subtitled
‘A Voyage to Norway’, no mention of that ‘voyage’ is made for the first nine
pages and indeed the section which deals specifically with Norway makes up
only 14 out of the 41 pages of the story. The first nine pages outline the
social status of the Ridley family as well as the essence of the social conflict
that leads up to and, to a certain extent, triggers the necessity of the journey
to Norway. As in other stories by Strickland, one of the central themes of
‘Arthur Ridley’ is the desire for social mobility.

The main character of Strickland’s story, Arthur Ridley, belongs to a
fragmented family. Having lost his mother, he lives with his widowed
grandfather, Old Ridley, while his father Walter Ridley is at sea. Besides
taking care of Arthur, Old Ridley takes into his home Rachel and Phoebe,
the widow and the daughter of his youngest son, Hugh, also a sailor. Old
Ridley is characterised from the beginning as a ‘farmer’, more precisely a
‘small landowner’ called ‘statesman’. Neither son wishes to take over the
family farm, ‘which had descended from father to son for three centu-
ries’. Walter, the eldest son, becomes a merchant by marrying into this
position as his wife is a tradesman’s daughter. Hugh, the youngest son, is
the captain of a privateer. After Old Ridley’s death, Walter takes it upon
himself to change the course of the Ridley family history by making a
‘brave fellow’ of Arthur, that is to say a sailor:

There’s been too many parsons and farmers among the Ridleys. Nobody
would believe they came of the same bold fellows who used to ride the
border some three hundred years ago.

It should be remembered, of course, that in stories of this nature, ‘social
mobility’ has more to do with the cultural construction of the new middle
class than with a concrete attempt to overturn social hierarchy. While
Strickland seems to suggest that Old Ridley is a labourer who works on his
own farm, he is in fact the owner of that land, which can be legally passed
on to his sons. This makes him technically part of the middle class or
‘middle ranks’ (the wealth of a small landowner being dependent on
whether or not the farm was able to satisfy the family’s needs as well as
turn a profit). By having Arthur serve as sailor on a merchant ship, then,
Walter Ridley hopes to fulfil his desire for social mobility by transitioning
him from the rural, lower middle class to the professional, upper-middle class. To achieve this goal, Walter needs to take Arthur on a journey of initiation that will turn him into ‘a different sort of lad’ and, ultimately, allow him to become an officer of the Navy. The journey that Walter believes will trigger this transformation in Arthur is the shipping of a valuable cargo to Norway.

Strickland’s choice of Norway as the destination for this journey deserves some consideration. The journey to Norway is seen as dangerous and therefore suitable for Arthur’s initiation. The element of danger is introduced when Jack Travers, Walter’s friend and one of the sailors on his ship, recounts an earlier encounter with Norway and the Norwegians during his service on another vessel, ‘the unfortunate Daedalus’, which ‘was wrecked’ off the coast of Norway:

Now, there was no great understanding between the English and the subjects of the King of Denmark, because of the battle of Copenhagen, the carnage of which was so great as to occasion general mourning and sorrow throughout Denmark and Norway. However, the brave Norwegians did not look upon us in the light of enemies, but as suffering and shipwrecked men, and treated us most kindly during the time we remained with them; which was more than three of their winter months.

To the perils of shipwreck – albeit lessened by the succour of ‘brave Norwegians’ – are added the risks from natural phenomena such as vortexes which spare no-one and nothing, and of the Norwegian coast, which he describes as ‘inaccessible to the naval power of its enemies’. And while in Strickland’s story there may be no mention of sea monsters (a common trope in early British writing about Norway), Travers is not much less dramatic. He describes, in great detail, one of the two most violent maelstroms known in the north of Norway, namely the Moskstraumen at the southern tip of the Lofoten islands. Strickland drew his report, as Fjågesund and Symes note, more or less directly from the 1810 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Besides offering the potential for an adventurous expedition, the journey from Newcastle to Christiania (Oslo), which Walter chooses as the route for Arthur’s first experience as sailor, is a plausible commercial journey for the Aurora, and its selection by Strickland evidences the existing trade links between Britain and Norway. This is particularly clear in the section dedicated to the arrival of the Aurora in Norway, when
Captain Ridley is ‘very busy in disposing of his cargo, and buying the different commodities that Norway produces’.30 Among the products which Strickland mentions are valuable metals such as copper and iron, as well as goatskins, seal skins, and furs of fox and marten.31 Her information on these points is not incorrect but it does appear to be partially out-of-date: while these were important British imports from Scandinavia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, by the nineteenth century, domestic production had begun to replace them.32 Curiously, however, Strickland makes no reference to timber and wood products, which, in the early nineteenth century, constituted the main Norwegian export to Great Britain.33 Finally (as I will consider in more detail later) the selection of Norway as a destination for Arthur allows the narrator to introduce the geography, history, culture, and politics of the country, thus underlining the importance of travel and education in the construction of Arthur’s middle-class subjectivity whilst also strengthening the formative function of this narrative for children’.34

Strickland’s story identifies three factors as crucial to Arthur’s potential for social mobility: integrity, experience of trade, and familiarity with foreign places and cultures. Norway seems to provide the perfect stage for Arthur to demonstrate that he can acquire all of these. This function is made possible to no small extent because Strickland represents Norway as distant and unfamiliar, perhaps dangerously so, despite the well-established trade connections between Norway and Britain on which she also draws in her story. In Andersen’s fairy tale, conversely, Norway and the Norwegians are well-known neighbours. As in Strickland’s story, the frame narrative of Andersen’s ‘Elverhøi’ introduces the Norwegian motif and provides the context for the ‘circulation’ or ‘exchange’ between Norway and Denmark which the story will narrate. Here, too, the desire for social mobility is key: the Norwegian visitors want to secure a marriage with one of the daughters of the Danish Elf King.

In Andersen’s fairy tale, as in pre-industrial societies in general, marriage is seen not only as the fulfilment of a personal union, but also as a means for achieving social and economic stability and advancement.35 Like many paters in nineteenth-century Norwegian society, the old Dovre troll takes on the task of selecting a suitable partner for his sons. As I will argue in more detail later, the selection of two of the daughters of the Danish Elf King is represented as an attempt at social climbing not just because although the old Dovre troll is said to own a castle and wear a crown but is never called ‘King’, but also because the Danish elf maidens
represent culture and sophistication, attributes featured as Southern in comparison with the Northern rusticity of the trolls.

The importance of the marriage agreement reached by old Dovre troll and the Elf King is emphasised by the suspense created around the arrival of the Norwegians. The disclosure of their identity is framed by the narrative of the three lizards, the earthworm, and the raven. These creatures live outside the old elf hill and can therefore only perceive what is happening inside from afar. While trying to sleep outside the elf hill, the lizards are disturbed by the rumbling and grumbling, but they are unaware of the reason for this commotion. A better informant is therefore introduced, namely the earthworm. He cannot see, but, by living in his hole in the hill, can ‘feel his way about and listen’ [‘føle sig for og høre efter’]. 36 According to what he has heard, there is no doubt that the Elf King is preparing to welcome ‘Fremmede, […] fornemme Fremmede’ [‘Strangers, […] grand Strangers’], but the identity of these strangers is not revealed either because the earthworm does not know or because he does not want to say. 37 The great tumult and preparation for the ceremony that is to take place upon arrival of the guests seems to suggest that they are highly regarded by the Elf King. The older elf maid who comes out of the hill to ask the raven to deliver the invitations to the feast confirms the earthworm’s information, stating that the Elf King is expecting ‘høi-fornemme Fremmede, Troldfolk der have noget at sige’ [‘very distinguished Strangers, Trolls who have something to say’]. 38 The curiosity of the reader regarding the identity of these strangers is only satisfied when the youngest of the Elf King’s daughters, echoing the question initially asked by one of the lizards, asks ‘Søde Fader! […] faer jeg saa at vide hvem de fornemme Fremmede ere?’ [Dear Father! […] shall I know now who the distinguished strangers are?] 39 Only at this stage is it revealed that the guest of honour, the old Dovre troll from Norway, is in fact an old acquaintance of the Elf King and that the aim of the feast is to consolidate their relationship by agreeing the marriage between two of the Elf King’s daughters and two of the sons of the old Dovre troll.

The journey of the Norwegian trolls to Denmark is thus represented in Andersen’s fairy tale both as a means of securing suitable matches for the young trolls and, by extension, as a means of perpetuating the strong cultural bonds between Norway and Denmark. In Andersen’s story, however, Norway and Denmark are not equal partners in this relationship, an inequality which reflects the actual historical relationship between the two countries. Prior to the Treaty of Kiel (1814), which ended hostilities
between the three kingdoms of Britain, Sweden, and Denmark-Norway, Norway had been under Danish rule for almost 300 years. Although independence seemed at first possible, Norway was ceded instead to Sweden. As Andersen’s fairy tale progresses, the narrator takes the opportunity to clarify the power relationship between Denmark and Norway, and between Norway and Sweden, by having the Norwegian troll evidently and consistently more interested in preserving his relationship with Denmark than in establishing one with Sweden. The Dovre troll insists, in fact, on finding his sons a Danish wife, just like his, who was ‘en Datter af Klintekongen paa Møen’ [‘a daughter of the cliff-King at Møn’]. Keen to maintain this Danish connection, the old troll prefers to undertake a longer and more difficult journey to the Danish Elf King rather than follow an easier route via Sweden. ‘Jeg vilde at de skulde gaae over Sverrige’, the Danish Elf King observes pointedly, ‘men den gamle hælder endnu ikke til den Side! Han følger ikke med Tiderne’ [‘I wanted them to cross Sweden, but the old one is still not inclined towards that Side! He does not keep up with the Times’].

The reference in this passage to events following the forced cession of Norway from Denmark to Sweden by the Treaty of Kiel (signed on 14 January 1814) is evident. Norway resisted the cession, declared independence, adopted a constitution on 17 May 1814, and elected Christian Frederik (1786–1848), the heir to the Danish throne, as King of Norway. Sweden retaliated with a military campaign against Norway in July 1814 which concluded with the Convention of Moss on 14 August. On 4 November, Charles XIII of Sweden was elected King of Norway; the union between the two countries would remain in place until 1905. It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that the decision by the Norwegian trolls to make a more difficult and dangerous sea journey to Denmark rather than set foot in Sweden alludes to the efforts made by Norway to resist integration with Sweden, and that the attitude of the Dovre troll emphasises the extent to which the union with Sweden lacked the historical and sentimental bonds which had united Norway and Denmark. The Danish Elf King reinforces this sense of relationship and loss, stressing how much he looks forward to seeing again the old Norwegian troll and how much time has passed since last they drank to their lasting friendship.

The visit of the Norwegians to Denmark and the lavish preparations made to receive them are not, however, merely a demonstration of the friendship between these countries. Rather, Andersen’s story also reflects the differences between them, ostensibly giving Denmark the upper
hand, but not in an entirely unqualified sense. The Danish Elf King wants to ‘show off’ [‘vise sig’] by making a display of decorations, food, and dances; by inviting the most distinguished local creatures, including mermen, goblins, and demons); and by polishing his golden crown.

In short, he makes a demonstration of power and wealth, in marked contrast to his Norwegian guests who travel economically and whose leader wears a crown of hardened ice and pine cones. As Bode and Eilittä show in this volume, a perceived contrast between a ‘natural’ Norway which is of ‘the North’ and a ‘sophisticated’ Denmark which seems, at least by comparison, to belong more with ‘the South’ was not often seen by British travellers, steeped in ‘romantic’ attitudes, as to the credit of Denmark. Andersen the Dane, however, does seem to represent the balance of power tipped in Denmark’s favour. As Storsveen argues, the appearance of the old Norwegian troll points to his origin in a primitive (but not ‘romantic’) culture, and his journey to Denmark amounts to a quest for something more sophisticated. After all, not only does the old Dovre troll want to fetch suitable wives for his sons from Denmark; it also seems that it will be up to those wives to ‘teach [his sons] some manners’ [‘sætte Skik paa dem’].

In contrast, then, to British romantic perceptions of ‘the North’, which tended to validate and to emphasise ‘natural’ landscapes and communities, Andersen’s remediation of the folk ballad in ‘Elverhøi’ reflects an urbane Denmark seen in ‘the North’ as what Glenthøj and Ottosen have characterised as ‘the gateway to the world’. Despite the foundation of The Royal Frederik University at Christiania in 1813, the first in Norway, Christiania could not compete in the early nineteenth century with the cultural offer of Copenhagen, and even after the dissolution of the Norwegian-Danish state in 1814, Norwegian artists continued to flock to Copenhagen even as their Danish counterparts increasingly went to ‘the North’ in search of the Norwegian sublime! For the old Norwegian troll, then, marrying his two sons off to the daughters of the Danish Elf King might also be interpreted as a means of keeping open the Danish ‘gateway to the world’.

**GENERATIONAL CONFLICT AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE**

In both Strickland’s and Andersen’s stories, the circulation of people to and within ‘the North’ figures a desire for social mobility. Circulation, in the form of journey or cultural exchange, can, as Bonnemaison and others
have argued, challenge iconography, replacing the stable with the fluid.48

‘Arthur Ridley’ and ‘Elverhøi’ demonstrate how circulation and exchange can either bring cultures and generations together or pull them apart. In Andersen’s story, the younger trolls do not share their father’s ambition to preserve the cultural bonds which still unite Norway and Denmark, bonds which they do not really understand. In Strickland’s story, conversely, the journey made by Arthur and Walter to Norway shows how the resolution of the generational conflict between them goes hand in hand with the formative experience of encountering ‘the North’.

As I have already suggested, the representation of the Norwegians in Andersen’s ‘Elverhøi’ is characterised by a split between the generations. The old Dovre troll is described as ‘an honest old Norwegian fellow, jolly and straightforward’ [‘en gammel ærlig norsk Gubbe, lystig og ligefrem’], an image which certainly also accords with contemporary British representations of Norwegians as honest, generous, and hardworking.49 The younger generation of trolls, however, does not meet these standards. They are described as rough and rowdy, a parody of the ‘free Norwegian’, who, far too focused on their own national identity, is unable to cope with meeting the outside world.50 They defy their father’s attempts to keep them under control and not offend their hosts. They are inappropriately dressed, arriving ‘with bare necks and without Braces’ [‘barhalset og uden Seler’], and they have no table manners, putting their feet on the table!51 Proud of the Norwegian mountains, they mock the Danish ‘hill’ [høi], stating that ‘it would be called a Hole up in Norway’ [‘det kalde vi oppe i Norge et Hull’].52 And their arrogance persists throughout the story until the very end when, despite their father’s efforts to find them suitable Danish wives who appreciate essential Norwegian values, the young trolls declare that they have no interest in getting married and prefer instead to hold a speech, get drunk, and fall asleep on the table.53

The reference to drunkenness here might be more than a general observation about a perceived lack of respect and manners amongst the younger generations and in fact be a specific allusion to one of the many negative consequences of the cession of Norway to Sweden. During the period of Danish rule, the Danes maintained a monopoly on the Norwegian alcohol market, thus limiting, to a certain extent, the amount of alcohol available for consumption. Following the Constitution of 1814 and further to the changes made to the law under Swedish rule in 1816, Norwegians were allowed to establish distilleries of their own, which led
not only to an increase in the domestic production of alcohol but also to a marked increase in consumption and immoderate drinking. Hence Andersen’s reference to the drunkenness of the Norwegians is hardly unique and indeed, as Fjågesund and Symes observe, several British travellers also note it in their accounts.\textsuperscript{54} Excessive drinking, as well as other problems associated with poverty, were, however, also the consequence of the gradual industrialisation of Norway, as was first suggested by studies made by the Norwegian theologian and sociologist Eilert Sundt (1817–1875) in the 1840s.

Besides alcohol and speeches, the only thing which really interests the young Norwegian trolls is the fact that they and the Danish elves are able to understand each other: ‘the only thing that made them wonder down here, they said, was that they could understand the Language without difficulty!’ [‘Det eneste der undrede dem hernede, sagde de, var at de saaledes uden videre kunde forstaae Sproget!’].\textsuperscript{55} Here, too, Andersen makes specific historical allusion to the contested place of Norway in ‘the North’. Immediately after the dissolution of the Danish-Norwegian state by the Treaty of Kiel, the status of the Norwegian language became a matter of contention between the Norwegians and the Danes. As Glenthøj and Ottosen note, in an attempt to prevent any merging with Sweden, the Norwegian Constitutional Act of 1814 stressed ‘the name and status of the Norwegian language’ as part of an attempt to impede the union with Sweden.\textsuperscript{56} However, this granting of official status to the Norwegian language – which was, in 1814, still regarded as ‘one and the same’ as Danish – was dismissed by many Danes who saw it as ‘an attempt by some to undermine the spiritual fellowship that Danes and Norwegians had been building up for centuries and that was symbolized and guaranteed by their common language’.\textsuperscript{57} By 1830, the idea of a Norwegian language had gradually been accepted, but the written language remained Danish.\textsuperscript{58}

Even the similarity of the languages, however, is insufficient to convince the young Norwegian trolls to take Danish wives, suggesting an irreparable fissure between generations and, in an allegorical reading, in the former ordering of ‘the North’: Norway and Denmark severed despite past bonds. The lack of respect which the young Norwegian trolls show to their father and their hosts (a country and a culture so close to their own) contrasts markedly with the handling of generational and cultural exchange in Strickland’s story. Far from emphasising the differences between generations and cultures, the journey made to Norway by Arthur Ridley enables him to bridge the gap between his grandfather
and his father while at the same time learning about the cultural bonds between Britain and Norway.

From the beginning, Strickland makes it clear that Arthur’s father and grandfather have different plans for his future. Arthur’s father, unable to cope after the death of his wife, leaves Arthur in the care of his grandfather. Living with his Old Ridley, his aunt Rachel, and his cousin Phoebe, Arthur learns to appreciate the peaceful life of the farmer and ‘secretly resolved never to be anything but a farmer’. As he grows up, Arthur excels at being a farmer and becomes convinced, like his grandfather, that by taking pride in this work he could serve his country. Having summoned Arthur to his deathbed, Old Ridley asks the boy to be a dutiful child to his father, ‘whatever his commands may be’. Even though he may have hoped that Arthur would take over the farm, Old Ridley cannot ask the boy to go against his father’s wishes and therefore encourages him to put his respect for his father above his own or his grandfather’s hopes. Obedience to the father becomes a central topic of the story. While Arthur silently submits to his father’s wish that he become a sailor and agrees to undertake the voyage to Norway, we learn at the beginning of the story that Old Ridley’s sons had ‘both [...] made light of the wishes of their father’ by becoming sailors. The greatest subversion is committed by Hugh Ridley, Old Ridley’s younger son, who becomes captain of a privateer. Hugh disobeys his father’s ‘express commands’ and ‘this act of disobedience’ is soon punished as he is killed trying to take a French merchant ship. Since Arthur conversely accepts his father’s wishes, the reader can assume that he will not be punished and that his journey to Norway will be successful. While Walter is convinced that the journey to Norway will make Arthur brave, what Arthur really gains from this experience is not courage – a quality he already possesses – but knowledge of his father’s profession and of a new country, Norway.

The dilemma in which Arthur finds himself, caught between the wishes of his father and of his grandfather, is made symptomatic by Strickland of a wider lack of understanding between the farmer and the sailor, rooted in very different lifestyles and value systems. The farmers consider the sailors crude and immoral while the sailors see the farmers as cowards. Old Ridley refers to Hugh’s privateering as little better than piracy, while Walter repeatedly refers to his son’s life ashore as a sign of cowardice, calls Hugh a ‘brave fellow’, and wishes that Arthur could inherit some of his ‘manly spirit’. During the voyage to
Norway, however, as Arthur experiences the life of a sailor and as Walter gets to know his son, these gaps in understanding – between father and son, between sailors and farmers – are gradually bridged and mutual respect develops. And this process is paralleled by Arthur’s encounter with Norway and Norwegians: here, too, it is shared values, the bonds between Britain and Norway, rather than the differences, which are discovered and emphasised.

REPRESENTING NORWAY: BUILDING ON EXCHANGE

In Strickland’s story, Arthur learns to reconcile the values of his sailor-father and farmer-grandfather, and gradually understands what it means to serve his country. While he creates his personal and cultural identity through compromise and exchange, however, the young Norwegian trolls in Andersen’s story refuse to be affected by the journey to Denmark, thereby increasing distance between them and both their father and their Nordic neighbours the Danes. Strickland’s and Andersen’s stories thus represent the effects of circulation and exchange on the development of their main protagonists. But, as part of this process, both narratives also construct an image of ‘Norway’ which constitutes a fixed object against which the British and Danish characters can measure and compare their own personal and cultural subjectivities. It is to those images of Norway that I now turn my attention.

Drawing again on the vocabulary of Bonnemaison, it is possible to say that three ‘cultural complexes’ – that is, groups of ‘cultural texts that are set towards the same purpose’ – are rendered as typically Norwegian by both narratives: ‘a landscape’, ‘a set of behaviours’ and ‘a corpus of texts or oral literature’. The physical geography of Norway is a central concern of both stories: Norway is a ‘landscape’, a ‘localised’ country, mostly united by its distinctive geographical environment. But while Strickland links the Norwegian landscape primarily to a ‘set’ of cultural values (‘behaviours’) encapsulated in the trope of the brave and honest Norwegians, Andersen forges connections between the natural environment and the folkloric tradition which it has inspired and which has been inscribed upon it.

In ‘Arthur Ridley’, Arthur’s – and, by extension, the reader’s – main source of information about Norway and Norwegians prior to his arrival in the country is Jack Travers, who became ‘intimately acquainted with the customs and manners’ of the country following his earlier shipwreck. Travers’s experiences of Norway are told in the first person and constitute
the most substantive account of Norway in the story. The representation of Norway here functions on two levels. On the one hand, Strickland emphasises ‘subjectively’ the positive role that Norway and the Norwegians have played in the narrative of Travers’s own life by saving him from the shipwreck and giving him a future: it is thanks to a merchant from Trondheim that Travers reaches Hamburg where he will meet Walter Ridley, an encounter which changes Travers’s life as Walter – keen to help a fellow sailor in distress – offers him the position of mate on the *Aurora*. By narrating this key role that Norway and Norwegians have played in Travers’s life, then, Strickland’s story also prepares us for the formative effects of Arthur’s engagement with Norway. On the other hand, Travers’s narrative also functions ‘objectively’ as a compact and comprehensive overview of Norway and Norwegians. Travers focuses in particular on two recurrent tropes of British representations of Norway: the hospitality of the Norwegians and the wilderness of Norwegian nature.

As Fjågesund and Symes point out, ‘the hospitality of Norwegian people became legendary in travel reports’. As already noted, in Strickland’s story, Travers’s encounter with the ‘brave’ and ‘good’ Norwegians takes place against the background of the impact on ‘the North’ of the Napoleonic Wars. Travers remembers that at the time of his shipwreck and capture ‘there was no very good understanding between the English and the subjects of the King of Denmark’ because of the British bombardment of Copenhagen from 2–5 September 1807, during which the city suffered heavy damage, with almost 200 civilians killed and almost 800 injured. Britain, fearing that the Danish-Norwegian fleet, then the fifth largest in the world, might fall into the hands of Napoleon, gave the Danish government an ultimatum to surrender it; when this was refused, British ships shelled Copenhagen to force the surrender. The consequences for Denmark in loss of life, property, and influence were substantial, but the decision of the Danish government subsequently to ally with Napoleonic France also meant that Norway suddenly found itself at war with its most important trading partner, Britain.

The kind treatment which Travers receives from the Norwegians, who are able to set aside political resentments and help the ‘suffering’ English sailors, therefore emphasises that the bond of shared values between the countries persists despite the war, and also partakes, in Strickland’s narrative, in a sense that it is the French who are the true ‘enemies’ of both Britain and Norway. Strickland makes no attempt, in other words, to formulate any kind of binary opposition between Britons and Norwegians.
Conversely, her representation of them is entirely consistent with what Fjågesund and Symes identify as the dominant trend in British romantic-period travel accounts: the Norwegians are ‘a distinctive people, recently discovered near neighbours who exhibit striking similarities with the British’ and who, in order to communicate, were able and willing to use the English language. Bode’s essay in this volume reminds us that Mary Wollstonecraft’s observations in her *Letters* are very much the exception to this rule. Edward Clarke’s remarks in his *Travels*, made during wartime, are far more representative: ‘Every Englishman was considered by the Norwegians as a brother; they partook even of our prejudices; and partici-
pated in all our triumphs [. . .] Their houses were furnished with English engravings, and English newspapers were lying upon their tables [. . .] [T]here was nothing which an Englishman, as a sincere lover of his country, might more earnestly have wished for, than to see Norway allied to Britain.’

In Strickland’s story, this cultural bond is underlined by Travers’s desire to reciprocate the kindness he receives: he tells Arthur that he ‘was not willing to eat the bread of idleness’ and endeavoured to help the people offering him shelter. Most of all (as in Andersen’s narrative), it is through the lack of apparent language barriers that shared cultural identity is most emphasised. Listening to Travers’s tale, Arthur wonders ‘did you not spend your time very miserably, to pass so many months in a strange country, the language of which was to you?’ But Travers replies that communication with the Norwegians was not a difficult: ‘I found the inhabitants of the sea-coast very familiar with the English tongue; and I knew a little German [. . .] so, between the two, we made out very well’. Arthur, in his turn, illustrates at the end of the story the values held in common between Britons and Norwegians: just as the Norwegians had spared the lives of Travers and his fellow sailors, so Arthur, having rescued the *Aurora*, spares the lives of her would-be French captors, despite the cruel treatment he and his shipmates have received at their hands.

As noted earlier, in addition to providing Arthur with an account of his experience of Norwegians, Travers also describes the wild and dangerous geography of the Norwegian coast. This part of his narrative is intended to prepare Arthur (and, again, the reader) for their first sight of Norway, but it also functions in the narrative as a means of introducing aspects of Norway which Arthur (and the reader) will not encounter: Travers was shipwrecked near Trondheim during the Norwegian winter; the *Aurora* is heading for Christiania, much further to the south, at the beginning of
summer. These, as Strickland’s narrative confirms, are very different ‘Norways’ and the difference between the expectations raised by Travers and the landscape Arthur encounters effectively reflects a tension in British romantic-period writing about Norway between an imagined version of ‘the North’ and the actual country of Norway.

As the Aurora nears land, Arthur, informed by what he has heard from Travers, struggles to accept that the scene before him is the same country which Travers described during the voyage. The passage is worth quoting at length:

Arthur had expected to see an icy, desolate coast; he could not think that fair sunny days would smile so far northwards; and when the Aurora entered the Bay of Christiania, he could scarcely believe it was the port to which they were bound.

Before them lay the town of Christiania, situated at the extremity of an extensive and fertile valley, forming a semicircular bend along the shore of the beautiful bay. The grounds, laid out in rich enclosures, gradually sloped to the sea. Behind, before, and around, appeared the inland mountains of Norway, covered with dark forests of pines and fir, the inexhaustible riches of the North. The most distant summits were capped with perpetual snows. From the glow of the atmosphere, the warmth of the weather, the variety of the productions, and the mild beauties of the adjacent scenery, it was hardly possible to believe that they were nearly under the sixtieth degree of latitude.

‘Is it possible?’ said Arthur, as he stood on deck by the side of Travers; ‘can this blooming land be one of the coldest and most barren regions of the North?’

Once again, this prospect, which a footnote by Strickland informs the reader is drawn from Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden and Denmark (1784) by William Coxe (1748–1828), stages an almost Wordsworthian moment of tension between an imagined and an actual Norway. Travers attempts to reconcile this tension by explaining to Arthur that he sees Christiania ‘in the midst of its short lovely summer’ and that ‘its aspect would be bleak and horrid, were you to visit it during the nine winter months’. This leads to a discussion of the more northerly parts of Norway ‘where the sun is continually in view at midsummer’ and ‘in the depth of winter […] for some weeks invisible’, and of the aurora borealis, which Arthur has heard from his grandfather is an omen ‘that something very dreadful would soon happen’. Travers immediately corrects this, allowing Arthur himself to reach the conclusion that ‘converting into an
omen of ill a harmless and beautiful meteor’ was ‘folly’, even though he is initially unhappy to hear ‘the opinion of his venerated grandfather treated with so much contempt’. As a narrative device, then, the combination of Arthur’s impressions and Travers’s memories not only enables the reader to piece together a more complete and accurate picture of the natural environment in this part of ‘the North’, but also underlines again the extent to which Arthur’s engagement with Norway is formative.

In contrast to Arthur’s growing maturity through cultural exchange with ‘the North’, the young Norwegian trolls in Andersen’s fairy tale consistently misbehave, as we have seen, leaving it to their father to entertain their Danish hosts with tales of his homeland, tales which constitute Andersen’s representation of Norway. The old Dovre troll also focuses on the natural environment:

He spoke so wonderfully about the proud Norwegian Mountains, about the Waterfall that crashed down white froth, with a Noise like Thunder and the sound of the Organ; he spoke about the Salmon that jump up against the falling water when Nøkken [water spirits in Norwegian folklore] played the Golden harp. He spoke about the shining Winter nights, when Sleigh bells ring and Boys run with burning Torches over the glossy ice, which is so transparent that they see Fish growing frightened under their Feet.

Although much more compact than Travers’s narrative, the essential elements of Andersen’s representation of Norway here are the same as those given by Strickland: evocative images of mountains, waterfalls, and winter nights. The description given by the old Dovre troll has an acoustic as well as a visual element: the Norwegian landscape comprises not just sights but also sounds, some natural, some manmade. The association of the waterfall with the roaring thunder and the sound of an organ identifies nature as wild and untameable and yet also harmonious. The ringing of sleigh bells on sleighs reminds us of the presence of Norway’s inhabitants. The use of alliteration and onomatopoeia reinforce this impression of a full sensory experience, as Andersen’s narrator makes clear, remarking at the end of the troll’s account: ‘Yes he was such a good storyteller that one saw and heard what he talked about: it was as if the Sawmills were going, as if the Boys and Girls sang Ballads and danced the Halling dance; hurrah!’ [Jo han kunde fortælle, saa at man saae og hørte hvad han sagde, det var ligesom Sægmøllerne gik, som om Karle og Piger sang Viser og dandshed Hallingedans; hussa!] But Andersen’s narrator does not merely confirm
for us here that the old Norwegian troll is a good storyteller, steeped in the
nature and traditions of his country. Rather, he also reminds us of the
extent to which the combination of audiovisual elements in the troll’s
account underlines that Norway is a place where nature and culture cannot
be dissociated. This is an image of Norway both traditional and modern:
the Halling dance, a traditional folk dance in Valdres and Hallingdal, is
combined with the sound of sawmills, one of Norway’s most important
economic activities, which expanded to an even greater extent during the
industrial development of the country in the first half of the nineteenth
century following the introduction of the circular saw.84

Despite this reference to the industrial development of Norway, however,
the country is primarily represented in Andersen’s narrative as a place
of folk tradition, at least as far as the older generation is concerned –
perhaps not surprisingly given that the entire story is based upon the
encounter of folkloric characters, Norwegian trolls and Danish elves.
From amongst the seven elf maidens, the old Dovre troll selects the one
who could ‘tell Stories, as many as she wished’ [‘fortælle Eventyr og det
saa mange hun vilde’].85 No doubt his choice reflects the burgeoning,
antiquarian interest in traditional Norwegian culture which began in the
early the nineteenth century. The first collection, Norske Sagn, was pub-
lished by Andreas Faye (1802–1869) in 1833. Four years later, Peter
Christen Asbjørnsen (1812–1885) and Jørgen Moe (1813–1882) made
their journey to gather Norwegian folk tales, later publishing the results in
the five volumes of their Norskse Folkeeventyr (1841–1844).86 The fact that
Andersen’s ‘Elverhøi’ was published just a year after the completion of
Norske Folkeeventyr suggests a clear engagement with this trend.

That engagement is further confirmed when the old Dovre troll asks
the elf maiden to show him her skills as storyteller by telling a story for
each one of his fingers. (He has five, in case that needs to be clarified for
trolls!) After the first three stories, the old troll is satisfied and proposes
leaving ‘Guldbrand’ and ‘Per Spillemand’ wanting.87 Although ‘Per
Spillemand’ appears to have been commonly used to refer to the little
finger, particularly when speaking to children, Andersen’s choice of the
expression in this context also forges a connection with another fictional
storyteller, namely the Peer Spillemand employed by the Danish writer
Steen Steensen Blicher (1782–1848) as fictional narrator for a number of
his short-story collections from 1839 onwards. Moreover, according to
Norwegian folk tradition, Per – who features in the well-known folk tale
‘Per Gynt’, which Asbjørnsem included in his own collection Norske
Huldre-Eventyr og folkesagn (1845, 1848) – was celebrated for his ability to tell stories. 88 Set against the backdrop of this growth in interest in Norwegian folklore, the complaint of the old Norwegian troll in Andersen’s narrative that Norway lacks good storytellers must be seen as ironic or even satirical: ‘you will come to tell’, he assures the Danish elf maiden, ‘because no-one up there really does this well yet!’ [‘Du skal nok komme til at fortælle, for det gjør endu Ingen rigtig deroppe!’] 89 Like Scheherazade in One Thousand and One Nights, then, the seventh Danish elf maiden will become a wife thanks to her ability to tell stories. 90 And in exchange for her storytelling, the old Dovre troll offers her protection from the cold, drink from the horns of Norwegian kings and, most importantly, more storytelling.

Both Andersen and Strickland, then, represent Norway to their readers as a dramatic landscape inscribed with cultural values. For Andersen, those values consist mostly in folk tradition. Strickland emphasises more the connection between the Norwegian landscape and the moral character of its inhabitants. This is not to say, of course, that Andersen’s story lacks moral or political resonances. After all, his trolls are from Dovre, a mountainous area long associated with trolls in Norwegian tradition, but also one which was selected as an emblem of Norwegian national identity in 1814: ‘Enige og troe, indtil Dovre falder’ [‘united and faithful, until Dovre falls’] was the oath sworn by the Norwegian Constitutional Assembly on 20 May 1814, implying that the newly signed Constitution and self-proclaimed independent Norway were to be as enduring as the Dovre mountains. 91 But this said, Andersen’s account of Norway is certainly not so consistently politicised as Strickland’s. The best example of this ever-present tone is perhaps the footnote which Strickland adds to the mention of the eiderdown feathers comprising part of the cargo that Captain Ridley is shipping from Norway to England and which did indeed, at the time, constitute one of Norway’s most valuable exports to Britain. In her footnote, Strickland remarks upon the quality of these feathers, the method employed to collect them, and so on. At the end of her footnote, however, Strickland also adds a passage on how eider duck raise their young: ‘They take their young on their backs to sea; then dive to shake them off, and teach them to shift for themselves’. 92 This description clearly functions as a metaphor for the bravery and independence which Strickland’s narrative consistently attributes to the Norwegians themselves. And at the same time, it serves as a parallel with Arthur’s own story. Like a duckling, he is taken to sea and, thanks to his formative
encounter with Norway and Norwegians, he finds his calling in life: to serve his country as a ‘gallant and distinguished officer’.  

**CONCLUSION**

My argument here is that the representations of Norway by Strickland and Andersen do not render that country merely as an ill-defined, quasi-imagined part of ‘the North’, but rather seek to afford it concrete, historical, and cultural identity. Neither author leaves the reader in any doubt about what Norwegian-ness involves for them, and the inclusion by both of elements characteristic of the natural and cultural landscapes of Norway – including descriptions of nature and natural phenomena, lists of local products, traditions, and mythological creatures – root these varied ideological representations in a clearly defined place. While both authors represent their home countries as dominant in the process of cultural exchange with Norway, both also underline common cultural bonds and shared ‘Northern’ identity. Denmark may be wealthier and more cultured than Norway in Andersen’s fairy tale, but the Danish Elf King celebrates his longstanding connection to and friendship with the old Dovre troll. Similarly, while the use of expressions like ‘the natives’ to describe the Norwegians in Strickland’s story might be taken to suggest that they are a less civilised people than their English visitors, ‘Arthur Ridley’ makes numerous references to the kinship between the British and the Norwegians, particularly when it comes to norms of conduct and belief. The Norwegians are, in other words, represented either as rediscovered or as newly discovered relatives, who may be less cultured, but whose friendship is nevertheless worth preserving or establishing.

Both texts also underline the extent to which the terms of British and Danish cultural exchange with Norway were transformed by the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, and, in particular, by the Treaty of Kiel, which redrew the national boundaries of ‘the North’. In Strickland’s story, British-Norwegian relations, a common bond of bravery and honour, are contrasted with the poor behaviour of the (‘Southern’) French. Moreover, while the emphasis on social mobility in ‘Arthur Ridley’ might seem to have something to do with ideas stemming ultimately from debates occasioned by the French Revolution, in the immediate context of the story, it is through the encounter with Norway that Arthur forges his new, middle-class identity. Presented initially to Arthur as a place of natural and political hazards, Norway comes in the end to stand for knowledge and morality by opening Arthur’s reluctant eyes to the
possibilities offered by the life of a sailor and the experience of new places and cultures. Cultural exchange stimulates growth, and the reality of Norway takes on a social value that imaginings of ‘the North’ might be said to lack.

The opposite, however, is the case with the journey made from Norway to Denmark by the young trolls in Andersen’s tale. They are not transformed by it. While their father, who represents an older generation of Norwegians still alive to the importance of the cultural bonds with Denmark, will return to Norway with yet another Danish wife, the young trolls refuse the offer of social and cultural mobility offered by a marriage with the Elf King’s daughters.

Hence, if we read the younger generations in both stories as representing the future of their respective countries, we may arrive at the conclusion that Arthur, in Strickland’s story, represents Britain’s bright prospects and openness towards new cultural encounters, while the uneducated and misbehaving young trolls, in Andersen’s narrative, reflect an arrogance which could only ultimately lead Norway to isolation and stagnation. While the encounter with the actual, historical Norway triggers development and enrichment in Strickland’s story, in Andersen’s story, Norway remains more of an imagined, fixed fairy-tale world. Even industrial activities, such as sawmills, are made part of this fantasy world which, though geographically defined, seems in the end to have little more to offer than the wildness and beauty so often celebrated in romantic-period British travel accounts.
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