

Lars Ivar Hansen

The Trading Networks of the High North during the Sixteenth Century

Introduction

The aim of this article is to sketch the main features of the trading networks that dominated northern Fennoscandia and part of northwestern Russia during the period when the Reformation was introduced in the North, and the following century. By drawing a broad picture of the various actors that were engaged in these interactions in the borderless region in the North, I hope to highlight some of the motivating forces that lay behind their actions, and the kind of “space of action” they had at their disposal. Thus, the focus will be not only on the producers and traders taking part in the exchange of commodities and valuables within the three separate, but partly overlapping, trading networks. The policy of the surrounding states will also be taken into consideration as well: how aspiring government authorities tried to influence and regulate trade, in order to gain more unilateral control over territories and population groups in these regions, and extract some of the production surplus from various parts of the region.

In order to map out some basic features of the “space of action” which were at the disposal of the various actors and authorities, the interaction within and between the networks may be construed as a “social field” in the Bourdieuan sense of the term, that is, as a system of relations between positions occupied by specialized agents and institutions, who are contending for something they have in common.¹ A passage from Bourdieu’s dialogues with Loïc Wacquant stands out as particularly instructive:

In analytical terms, a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (*situs*) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology etc.).²

¹ Broady 1990 p. 270.

² Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 p. 97; the following definition in Bourdieu 1984 p. 115: “[...] tous les gens qui sont engagés dans un champ ont en commun un certain nombre d’interêts fondamentaux, à savoir tout ce qui est lié à l’existence du champ: de là une complicité objective qui est sous-jacente à tous les antagonismes.”

Thus, it should be possible to sketch out how various actors (“agents”) try to position themselves and control the interactions, whether they were professional merchants, producers, central state authorities, or local state representatives (like bailiffs).

The structure will be as follows: first, the situation after the Middle Ages, concerning the aspirations and pretensions of the surrounding states to control territories, populations, and resources in the borderless North, will be presented. Then, the focus will be directed towards the main features of the three separate, but partly interacting, trade networks, as well as towards the connections between certain trading centers and various areas of production. This is followed by a summary of the main measures of the states’ policy during the sixteenth and first part of the seventeenth century, aiming at controlling trade, trade interaction, and defining legal marketplaces. Finally, an overview of the established, functioning markets and trade meetings in second half of the sixteenth will be presented.

The Struggle for Dominance during the Late Middle Ages

From the late Middle Ages, the emerging statehoods surrounding northern Fennoscandia engaged in a competitive struggle to gain dominance over territories, population groups, and production surpluses in the region, and to integrate them within their networks of power based on centers outside of the area. This comprised *direct colonization* through settlement, the *right of taxation* of resident Sámi populations, the authority to *regulate access to trade* within the area, the control of *local administration and jurisdiction*, and the integration of the areas within *separate church organizations*.

On the western side of the Gulf of Bothnia, the expansion of Swedish state power and organization of society can be traced from the outset of the fourteenth century, comprising both the present-day regions of *Västerbotten* and *Norrbottnen*, where the Swedish provincial *law of the Helsings* (“Hälsingelagen”) was implemented in 1340, followed by the introduction of Swedish national law in 1350.³ The coastal landscapes surrounding the northern and northeastern parts of the Gulf of Bothnia (Ostrobothnia) received an influx of diverse settlers from the south, through various waves during the Middle Ages. This comprised both Karelians and Helsings from the west, as well as people from the southwestern parts of Finland.⁴

³ Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 54–55; Tornedalens historia I pp. 303–304.

⁴ Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 33–36, 55.

Along the western and northern fringes of the Scandinavian peninsula, the fishing village settlement in northern Troms and Finnmark expanded from the turn of the thirteenth century and developed throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, probably triggered by the establishment of a permanent office for the Hanseatic League in Bergen and the regular import of grain from central Europe, which made Norse settlements outside the grain-growing districts possible on a more permanent basis.⁵ A regular *royal taxation*, in the form of the so-called “*leidang tax*” (based on the duty of conscription to the naval fleet), was imposed on the Norwegian population during the high Middle Ages. In the North, it was also supplemented with a tax collected from the Sámi population, the so-called “*Finn tax*.”⁶

From the beginning of the twelfth century, the city republic of Novgorod seems to have expanded northwards, and subjected many of the peoples in the region, in order to secure deliverances of furs and collect tax or tribute (*dan*) from them.⁷ With this in mind, established fortified administrative strongholds and centres were also established – so called “*pogosts*,” under the command of an official sent out by the Novgorodian government. In the first decades of the thirteenth century, its sphere of interest may even have reached the southeastern coast of the Kola peninsula (“the Ter coast”). However, the exaction of tribute from the Sámi was carried out extensively by *Karelian* collectors, since the Karelians enjoyed a semi-independent position under Novgorod’s rule, with a certain amount of self-government.⁸

Through two peace agreements in the 1320s, the scope of taxation and spheres of interest of the three emerging nation-states was regulated. In 1323, a treaty was concluded between the kingdom of Sweden and the republic of Novgorod at its newly built fortification Orekhovec, or Nöteborg, at the river outlet of the Ladoga. Three years later, another corresponding agreement was reached through a treaty between the Norwegian kingdom and Novgorod. Both treaties seem to have delimited common areas where collectors from both states had the right to collect tribute from the Sámi, by delineating external borders, which the collectors from the other region were not allowed to trespass.⁹

Thus, a dividing line was drawn northwest in the southern parts of present-day Finland, and the region to the south and west of this line, should be considered as purely under the

⁵ Hansen 2010 p. 205; Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 50–52.

⁶ Hansen et al. 2015 p. 52.

⁷ Hansen 1996 pp. 52–57; Hansen 2010 p. 214.

⁸ Hansen 2010 pp. 199, 213–215; Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 58–60.

⁹ Hansen 2001 pp. 32–38; Hansen 2003 pp. 17–26; Hansen 2005a pp. 369–374; Hansen 2010 pp. 215–220; Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 63–71.

authority of the Swedish kingdom, while tribute collectors from both Russia and Sweden could operate freely northwest of it. In the same way, an intermediary common Norwegian-Russian sphere of interest was defined, with its western delimitation along the coast at the promontory of Lyngstuva, situated in what is now the northern part of present-day Troms county, and the eastern delimitation at the easternmost point of the Kola peninsula, where Sámi siida *Pyenne/Ponoj* was located.¹⁰ Notwithstanding these agreements, the competition for exacting tribute from and carrying out trade with the Sámi still led to open quarrel and struggle, and the Icelandic annals report about five incidents of rivalries and military confrontations between Russians/Karelians and Norwegians during the last part of the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth century.¹¹

From the turn of the thirteenth century, and on through late medieval times, about seventeen churches or “chapels” were established in the newly established fishing villages along the coast of Finnmark. A central event in this process took place in 1307, when the archbishop of Nidaros himself consecrated the church in Vardø, the easternmost fishing village.¹² However, the whole coast of Finnmark was still considered as “terra missionis” as late as the 1480s, so there was no ordinary parish organization and these “chapels” had no fabrica-property of their own or tithe rights as normal churches. All the income from these chapels went instead to the archbishop of Nidaros.¹³

In the late Middle Ages, there was a long-lasting dispute between the archdiocese of Uppsala and the diocese of Turku/Åbo, about the borders between the church provinces in the northern parts of the Gulf of Bothnia, and which parishes should belong to which diocese. On the west coast of the Gulf of Bothnia, the parishes of Umeå, Bygdeå, Piteå, Luleå, and Tornio had all been established by the bishop of Uppsala, while the parishes of Pietarsaari, Salo, Ii, and Kemi on the east coast had been established by the bishop of Turku. The issue was, above all, that the bishops wanted to collect tithes from as many large salmon rivers as possible for themselves. A compromise was reached in the 1470s, when it was decided that the border between the dioceses should be between the Kemijoki and Torne rivers, and the Kemi river in

¹⁰ Based on a comparison between the formulations in the treaty of 1326, with the statements in another document about the borders between Norway and Novgorod, the hypothesis has been raised that “a dual set of borders” existed. *A single, definitive border of territorial-jurisdictional nature – side by side with a mutual, overlapping taxation within widely defined regions* (Carsten Pape 2004 pp.161–187; 178–180).

¹¹ Hansen 2010 pp. 220–225; Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 68–71.

¹² Icelandic Annals, Storm 1888 p. 74.

¹³ Hamre 1977 p. 30.

itself belong to the bishop of Turku/Åbo. But the border dispute erupted again in 1374, and in the 1470s, with a final compromise in the 1480s.¹⁴

The Network along the Coast

A primary condition for trade along the coast was the establishment of the Hanseatic League in Bergen, with a permanent “managing office” (“*kontor*”) from the turn of the thirteenth century, based on regular import of grain from central Europe, in return for dried fish (cod) and other fish products. (Map of Hanseatic trading relations between Bergen and Eastern and Western Europe.) From about 1360 and until the first decades of the sixteenth century, the Hansa seem to have exercised a *monopoly* on this trade, since they offered the fish producers grain and other imported goods *on credit*. In return, the fish producers had to constrain themselves to deliver the fish products to the same merchants in the future. Though serving as a relief in years with poorer proceeds from the fisheries, the incessant debt burden (“*nordfarergjelda*”) tied the fish producers steadily to specific German merchants.¹⁵ At the same time, a long series of royal commandments and law amendments prohibited any foreigners from sailing north of Bergen (1294, repeated 1302 – 1304 – 1348 – 1425, and confirmed by ordinances of 1528 – 1545 – 1560 – 1562 and 1568).¹⁶ Doing trade “in the fjords” (“*fjordprang*”) and “in the countryside” (“*landkjøp*”) – outside the towns (“*kjøpsteder*”) – was also forbidden.¹⁷

This led to a fierce rivalry between the Hanseatic merchants and those of the Bergen burghers, who wanted to play an independent role and carry out intermediary trade with the population in the North. The Hansa tried to exclude the burghers from trading activities, by implementing a *boycott* of them (1412, 1440 – as well as an unsuccessful attempt 1540).¹⁸

¹⁴ Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 78–79.

¹⁵ Nedkvitne 2014 pp. 461–466.

¹⁶ First time prescribed in the treaty with Lübeck 6/7-1294 (*DN V*, no. 23; *RN II*, no. 752). Emphasized through law amendments by Håkon V Magnusson 11/11 – 1302 (*NgL III*, no. 15, pp. 55–56; *RN III*, no. 61) and 1302–1313, (*NgL III*, no. 53, pp. 134–135). Repeated by Magnus Eriksson 1348 (*NgL III*, no. 83, p. 170). Emphasized by Eric the Pomeranian, 7/5-1425 (*NgL 2*, rekke, I, no. 63 a,b,c, pp. 118–120; *RN X*, no. 489). Confirmed by ordinances of 1528 (*NRR I*, p. 14), 1545 (Laursen I, p. 650), 1560 (Paus, Forordn. pp. 339–40), 1562 (*NRR I*, pp. 348–349) and 1568 (Paus, Forordn. pp. 358–359).

¹⁷ First time prescribed by Håkon d. 5’s law amendment of 16/10-1299 (*NgL III*, no. 12, pp. 41–42). Repeated as prohibitions against buying and selling in the fjords and the fishing villages 1364 (*NgL III*, no. 95, pp. 184–185). Repeated in 1372 (*NgL III*, no. 101, pp. 190–191) and in 1384 (*NgL III*, no.121, pp. 222–223; *RN VII*, no. 1191; *NMD* no. 96), as well as in undated law amendment by Håkon d. 6. (*NgL III*, no. 114, pp. 202–210).

¹⁸ Hansen 1990 p. 111; Nedkvitne 2014 pp. 486–496.

In addition, the archbishop of the Nidaros province was also engaged in the export of stockfish via the Hanseatic merchants in Bergen, through his organization of *special commissioner* or “*stewards*” (so called “*setesveiner*”), who resided along the coast. Primarily, they collected the dried fish and other commodities that were given as land rent, tithe, and other duties the archbishop was entitled to, but along the Finnmark coast they also seem to have been engaged in the purchase of stockfish, which was shipped to Bergen for export. Out of the 42 commissioners he had stationed along the north Norwegian coast, 15 were residing in 9 of the fishing villages in Finnmark.¹⁹

Picture: Hansen01.jpg

Text below picture: Trading routes between Norway and England and the European continent in the medieval period (Nedkvitne 1976).

The trading monopoly of the Hansa was broken in the 1530s and 1540s, partly because of the Hanseatic League’s involvement in the “Count’s Feud” (“*Grevefeiden*”), and the introduction of the Reformation.

Even before that, in 1521, Duke Christian (the later king Christian II) had issued an ordinance which forbade clerics from engaging in trade in northern Norway, or from compelling any peasant or tax-paying inhabitant to sail as crew on their ships. This was due to a complaint from one of the district governors, who claimed that “... priest-men in Nordland county engage in great trading and transport, so that they remove most of the goods, for which your (i.e., the king’s) poor subjects should pay tax and do account ...”²⁰ This ordinance seems addressed directly against the activities of the archbishop’s commissioners.

As a result of these changes, the Bergen burghers and other residents engaged in trade in northern Norway achieved an independent position. The trade network along the coast now displayed a *double structure*: partly, the fish producers engaged in the transport of stockfish and other products to Bergen – either by themselves, or by entrusting it to a resourceful local *cargo boat owner*, through the so called “*district vessel system*” (“*bygdefar-jekt*”, “*bygdefar-systemet*”).²¹ And partly, the Bergen burghers engaged in the transport themselves, and

¹⁹ This set of special commissioners had its origin in the old agreement or concordat between the monarchy and the Church which had been concluded in 1277, and whereby the archbishop was allowed to have a following of 100 retainers, who themselves should be exempted from tax duties, together with one or two men each. – Olav Engelbrektssons rekneskapsbøker, 1532–1538 (publ. by J. A. Seip), Riksarkivet, Oslo 1936; – *NgL*, vol. II, pp. 467–468, *NMD* pp. 136–151; Hamre “Setesvein”, *KLNM*, vol. 15, col. 162; cf. Hansen 2012 pp. 315–316.

²⁰ *DN XIII*, no. 183; *NgL IV* p. 392.

²¹ Nedkvitne 1988 pp. 266–275.

established “trading stations” in the North, where either they themselves, or authorized managers, carried out the transactions and organized transport to Bergen. This system was most dominant in the northern parts, in *Andenes* county of the Vesterålen region and in *the fishing villages along the Finnmark coast*. Successively, some of the burghers of Bergen – and of Trondheim as well – began establishing “burgher residences” (“*borgerleier*”) in Nordland and Troms county, where they stayed for shorter or longer periods during summer.²²

The Network of the Gulf of Bothnia

In the Gulf of Bothnia, a Swedish-dominated network developed, with its center in southern Swedish towns, above all in the largest export harbor, *Stockholm* – but also with participation of burghers from several towns in southern Sweden and present-day Finland. Around the northernmost parts of the Gulf of Bothnia, there were several regional centers, which during the fifteenth century had acquired the status of “*legal harbours*” (“*laga hamnar*”), and served as ports for shipment of goods and commodities from the northern regions to Stockholm (*Härnösand, Umeå, Bygdeå, Löfvånger, Skellefteå, Piteå, Luleå, Kalix, Torneå, Kemi, Ijo, Oulo, Salo, Pietarsaari* and *Mustasaari* – see map, fig. 2.).

Picture: [Hansen02.jpg](#)

Text below picture: Regional centers and legal harbors in northern Bothnia.

The naval freight and exchange of commodities around the Gulf of Bothnia was primarily carried out by three groups. 1) The so-called “*rural merchants*” (“*landskjøpmennene*”) – wealthy peasants from the coastal regions in the north. 2) “*Peasant travellers*” (“*bondefarmenn*”) – less wealthy members of the local, resident farming population, who sailed themselves to Stockholm, and transported own and other people’s goods.²³ These two groups constituted the so-called “*Bothnian Fleet*” (“*Bottnaflotten*”), which each year rallied to seasonal trading activities in Stockholm during summer – not dissimilar to those of Bergen. 3) Citizens of Stockholm and other towns in southern Sweden also played a significant part in this trade.²⁴

²² Hansen 1990 p. 112.

²³ Olofsson I, 1962 pp. 319–342; Hammarström 1956 pp. 72ff.; N. Friberg, G. Kerkkonen, A. Luukko, V. Mattila and H. Yrwing, “Bondeseigration,” *KLNM*, vol. 2, cols. 104–113; N. Friberg, “Norrbottenshandel,” *KLNM*, vol. 12, cols. 348–354; Friberg 1983 pp. 48–53.

²⁴ Friberg 1983 pp. 46–48.

The goods that were transported northwards were, above all, victuals like *grain* and *flour*, but also textiles such as frieze and linen cloth, hemp, and items of iron. In return for these goods, products from the hunting and catching activities of the Sámi – primarily *furs* – as well as products from the animal husbandry of the coastal population, were transported south. In addition, large quantities of fish were shipped out, primarily salmon and other freshwater fish from the inland areas, but also regular deliveries of fish from the Norwegian coast that were purchased / bartered from the coastal Sámi (dried cod, coalfish, and skate).

In the far north, a special group of merchants were attached to the Bothnian trading network, and heavily engaged in trading with the Sámi, the so called “*Birkarls*.” They were people from the agriculture-based, coastal landscapes around the Gulf of Bothnia who had specialized in trade with the Sámi – both in the interior of northern Fennoscandia and with the coastal Sámi residing along the Atlantic and the Arctic sea. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the *Birkarls* appear as loosely organized corporations of merchants with roots in the coastal regions, but separate and different from the group of “rural merchants” who regularly trafficked to Stockholm. In the more southerly lappmarks, the *Birkarls* were mainly of Swedish descent, but in the two northernmost lappmarks (Torne and Kemi), they were most often of Finnish descent.²⁵ In sixteenth century sources on the Norwegian side, these people were regularly called *kvener*, that is, ‘Qwain people’ or ‘East Kvens.’²⁶ As early as 1498, there was a complaint on the Swedish side about the Norwegian authorities making the travels of the *Birkarls* in the coastal areas difficult; thus, the trading journeys over the mountains must have been in operation at least by this point in time (See picture, fig. 3.).²⁷

Picture: Hansen10.jpg

Text below picture: The goods that the “*Birkarls*” could provide for the Sámi were: victuals like grain, flour, bread, butter, and salt; hemp, linen cloth, and other textiles: frieze, coarse linen, woolen cloth from central Europe (“*nersk*” from Naarden and “*engelsk*” from England). Apart from this, the Sámi also demanded copper kettles and various iron objects, primarily tools for hunting and catching, like axes, hammers, knives, fishing sinkers, fox traps, locks, etc. These items reflected the extensive Swedish iron production of the times. In addition, the “*Birkarls*” also brought with them silver to the trade meetings with the Sámi.²⁸

²⁵ Steckzén 1964 pp. 104–118; Hansen 1987 p. 219.

²⁶ Vahtola 1987; Hansen 1990 pp. 116–117; Tornedalens historia I pp. 215–221; Hansen and Olsen 2014 pp. 151–154.

²⁷ *DN XVI*, no. 329; Fellman 1915 I pp. 10–12; cf. Steckzén 1964 p. 288.

²⁸ Hansen 1984 p. 56; cf. Hoppe 1945 p. 60; Steckzén 1964 p. 344; Bergling 1964 pp. 146, 152 (note), 216; Hansen and Olsen 2014 p. 242.

The Eastern Networks

On the Russian side, there was a double structure: on the one hand, a professional merchant class residing in *the towns around the White Sea*, such as in *Kandalakša*, *Kem'*, *Suma*, and *Kholmogory*, and in the inland town *Kargopol'* as well as in the town of *Kola*.²⁹ Over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, another type of institution came into existence in the areas south of the White Sea and on the Kola Peninsula: *the Russian orthodox monasteries*. They came to have great significance for the colonization of the east Sámi areas. In addition to their function as centers for missionary activity and religious jurisdiction, the monasteries had *significant economic functions*. They were engaged in various forms of production, such as fishing and salt extraction with hired labor, and also traded with the Sámi and other Finno-Ugric groups in the vast hinterlands. These monasteries were built on the west coast of the White Sea, on the *Solvkij islands*, in the towns on the south coast of Kola (*Kandalakša*, *Umba*, and *Ponoj*), and in *Kola* and *Pečenga* (Beahcán).³⁰ With some administrative reforms in 1565, the Russian settlement areas at the mouth of the Dvina were directly subjugated to the tsar, but the districts on the south coast of Kola and along the Karelian coast in the west were excluded so that the ancient rights of the inhabitants of the Dvina from the late Middle Ages would remain in force. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Russian authorities appear to have acted on the assumption that the western *siidas* on the Kola Peninsula had been assigned to the Pečenga monastery “instead of the farmers,” that is, that they were regarded as belonging to the monastery in the same way as serfs were otherwise subject to noble estates in Russia. One sign that they belonged to the monastery was that they did not pay tax directly to the tsar.³¹

Along the rivers *Dvina*, *Vyčegda*, and *Sukhona*, there were connections from the White Sea area to regional centers in northern Russia, such as *Velikij Ust'ug* and *Vologda*. And – thanks to the trading networks that the other rivers formed – there were also further connections to *the Baltic Sea*, as well as trading routes overland to Central Europe, ending up in *Leipzig* (see map). After the navigation connection between Western Europe and the White Sea had been (re-)discovered in the 1550s, and not least because Sweden had conquered the important export harbor Narva in the Baltic, the town of *Arkhangel'sk* was founded in 1584, further out along the mouth of the Dvina than Kholmogory. Since the late Middle Ages, both Russian and

²⁹ Hansen 1990 pp. 117–118.

³⁰ Storå 1977; Nickul 1977.

³¹ Tanner 1929 p. 364.

Karelian merchants had been engaged in trade with the Sámi and visited them in their settlement areas, stretching far westwards into the central parts of northern Fennoscandia.³²

The eastern networks brought much the same kind of goods northwards, like the navigation on the Gulf of Bothnia (victuals, like grain and flour, and cloth, like frieze and linen cloth, as well as iron items). But the Russian merchants were known for providing large quantities of hemp and cloth, as well as tallow, wax, soap, hides, and tanned leather.³³

Picture: [Hansen03.jpg](#)

Text below picture: Trading networks on rivers and overland.

The majority of trade with the Sámi, from the Swedish and Russian sides, was conducted by travelling, professional merchants who themselves visited the Sámi at their winter dwelling places, both in the interior and in the fjords to the north and west. Trade contact, therefore, was primarily bilateral between the Sámi producers and the buyers. In the Sámi area, there were few real markets, that is, regular trade meetings with attendance by several producer groups and/or merchants from several places.

Trading Relations and Production Areas

A central role within the trading networks in the high north during this period was played by some trading centers that served as contact places for *distant trade* – either as points of supply or reloading for visiting merchants – while they also had relations to groups of producers, who by local trade connections channeled commodities and items to them. This group comprises both legalized ports of trade in the northern part of Bothnia, which functioned as centers for deliveries to ports in the southern part of Sweden, and several Russian centers, which had direct contact with visiting merchants from other European countries. The town of Kola was visited by merchants from England and the Netherlands, and both Kholmogory and, from 1584, Arkhangel'sk were in addition visited by merchants from Germany and Bergen. On the Russian side, a similar role was played by some monasteries, which did not have any status as a port or city. Both the monasteries at Pečenga and on the island of Solovetsk were

³² Hansen 1990 pp. 118–126.

³³ A. Luukko, “Ryska kopmán,” *KLNM*, vol. 14, cols. 518–521; Tegengren 1952 pp. 27–28.

visited directly by English and Dutch merchants. These kinds of relations are sketched out on the four following maps.

Picture: Hansen04.jpg

Text below picture: The trading relations of Torneå with areas of production (dotted lines), and other distant trading centers (continuous lines).

Picture: Hansen05.jpg:

Text below picture: The trading relations of Kola with areas of production (dotted lines), and other distant trading centers (continuous lines).

Picture: Hansen06.jpg:

Text below picture: The trading relations of Arkhangel'sk and Kholmogory with areas of production (dotted lines), and other distant trading centers (continuous lines).

Picture: Hansen07.jpg:

Text below picture: The trading relations of the Solovetsk and Pečenga monasteries with areas of production (dotted lines), and other distant trading centers (continuous lines).

The Policy of the Surrounding Nation-States

In their struggle to gain control and domination over territories, resources, population groups, and production surplus in northern Fennoscandia, the surrounding states – and particularly Sweden and Denmark-Norway – launched a policy for regulating and curtailing the uncontrolled transactions between the trading networks:

1) The trade with *foreign merchants* should be concentrated in a limited number of towns (preferably one town), which should serve as exchange and reloading centers for the trade with merchants from abroad. Any activities of foreign merchants outside these centers should be banned and suppressed.

2) The other forms of trade should be concentrated in definite places and at fixed times, in order to facilitate control by the state's authorities, and so that the interests and demands of the specific state could be more easily implemented: pre-emptory rights to certain goods, collection of customs, taxes, and other dues. The prohibition of "rural purchase" ("*landsköp*") in Sweden and "rural offering" ("*landprang*" / "*fjordprang*" / "*forprang*") along the Norwegian coast, should be seen in this context, as it aimed at the abolition of uncontrolled trade with commercial goods outside scheduled times and places.

3) Apart from securing the interests of the state, the measures also aimed at favoring and giving priority to the activities of professional merchants attached to the nation-state in question – like the burghers of Bergen and Trondheim, or the burghers of Stockholm.

4) In addition, specific instructions were directed at state officials – like priests, bailiffs, county governors, and castle commanders – prohibiting them from trying to make use of their positions and engage in trading for their own interests.

Gustav Vasa’s Measures – Expressions of a “State Household Policy” Aimed at Channeling Resources into the Central State Apparatus

From the turn of the sixteenth century, Gustav Vasa made the Birkarls’ traditional trading with, and taxation of, the Sámi a royal prerogative.³⁴ This was part of a more comprehensive reform, with the aim of securing greater control of administration and revenue incomes from the northern parts of Sweden, at this time making up the bailiwick of *Västerbotten*. Apart from changes in taxation, the Birkarls were deprived of their role as tax-collectors and a new set of specialized “Sámi bailiffs” were appointed. The latter would be responsible for collecting the taxes from the so-called “lappmarks,” the Swedish administrative districts encompassing the Sámi settlement areas.³⁵

As early as the 1520s, Gustav Vasa had launched measures for enhancing tax collection in general, and introducing new control systems.³⁶ Medieval collective taxes collected from the farmers were replaced by an individual farm-specific land tax, as farms were made subject to tax.³⁷ A new tax assessment was conducted in the bailiwick of Ostrobothnia in 1538-40, followed by reforms in the western Bothnian regions in 1542 and 1547.³⁸ An actual tax reform was carried out in 1557, when the principles of tax collection were redefined.³⁹

From the 1540s, Gustav Vasa also encouraged settlement in the forests and in the wide common areas, accessible for usufruct (“*allmänningar*”), in the western Bothnian regions. In February 1542, permission to clear and settle forests and wildernesses was granted to those inhabitants “in *Dalecarlia* and elsewhere” who wanted to. In April, this was followed by an offer to the poor population of *Ångermanland*, *Medelpad*, *Gestrikland*, and *Helsingland* to clear farms for themselves in the forests and the common areas. Two years later, the king

³⁴ Fellman IV 1915 p. XXIX.

³⁵ Steckzén 1964 p. 339; Olofsson I 1962 p. 319; Lundmark 1982 pp. 78–80.

³⁶ Fellman IV 1915 p. 12; Olofsson I 1962 pp. 262–275.

³⁷ Groth 1984 p. 66.

³⁸ Olofsson I 1962 pp. 281–291; Hansen et al. 2015 p. 73.

³⁹ Hansen 1990, Appendix A pp. 1–26; Hansen et al. 2015 p. 73.

supplemented the declaration by addressing a similar letter to *Lapland* as well. No one should be allowed to forbid poor men from building their homesteads in the wildernesses of Lapland, because, as he argued, there was plenty of space for both the Sámi and the settlers to pursue their livelihoods.⁴⁰

He also aimed at reducing the visiting activities of Karelian and Russian merchants to the Sámi's settlement areas within the Swedish 'lappmarks.'⁴¹

A number of measures taken by the Swedish king served the purpose of centralizing the trade with the Russians to *Torneå*.

In 1553, a separate 'Royal Fur Chamber' was established at the royal castle in Stockholm, which was supposed to be in charge of the *further export to the European markets*.⁴² The export via the fur chamber in Stockholm increased from the middle of the century and reached a peak in the 1570s. At this time, the Swedish crown also claimed the explicit right to purchase furs and demanded that fur goods must first be offered to the king's bailiffs before they could be sold to others. In the peak year of 1574, 3384 beaver pelts, 3586 fox pelts, and 5372 otter pelts are supposed to have been exported from Stockholm.⁴³ At the same time, significant quantities of fur goods also went east, likely shipped out via the White Sea ports.

Karl IX's Measures – Institutionalization of Fixed Market Places and Times Combined with Establishment of Churches

When Karl IX began a new offensive along the same lines as Gustav Vasa at the end of the sixteenth century, one of his main objectives was to curtail the trade of the Birkarls. Supply and purchaser channels other than those officially sanctioned by the crown either had to be stopped or subjected to such strong restrictions that they would no longer pose any real threat. In order to accomplish this, permanent markets were to be established in the lappmarks, at special places where churches would be built and justice administered as well. By a decree in 1602, it was decided that henceforth, trade on the Swedish side was to occur twice a year, at *a selected place within each of the administrative districts called a lappmark*. The crown's bailiffs should undertake inspection and arrange for booths to be built there. Inland Sámi, Birkarls, and Russian merchants and others who wished to engage in trade with the Sámi *must be directed to attend these markets*.⁴⁴ Three years later, in 1605, the centralization policy was

⁴⁰ Hansen et al. 2015 pp. 73–74.

⁴¹ Olofsson I 1962; Steckzén 1964 p. 326.

⁴² Steckzén 1964 p. 322.

⁴³ Steckzén 1964 p. 361.

⁴⁴ Fellman IV 1915 pp. 92–93.

followed up by a new, general decree on tax collection, trade, markets, *and church-building* in the lappmarks. On the advice of the local bailiffs, *one of the Sámi's traditional winter dwelling places within each lappmark was selected to be a market and church location by building booths and a church.* Trade should take place over a two- to three-week period, for fixed terms.⁴⁵ The Sámi were ordered to construct the buildings, and, as a consequence, churches were erected at *Åsele, Lycksele, Arvidsjaur, Arjeplog, Jokkmokk, Jukkasjärvi, and Enontekis.*⁴⁶ Henceforth, there would be an end to the merchants' free travelling, despite the Birkarls' protests, invoking the privileges they had received in Gustav Vasa's time. At the same time, a new fee on the Birkarls' trade was introduced, the so-called *Birkarlian tithe.* How successful Karl IX's measures actually were is shown by the fact that these selected market and church places, with few exceptions, came to function as such through the following centuries, and that a majority of them still today function as significant town centers.

Danish-Norwegian Measures

On the Danish-Norwegian side, there was less concern with establishing permanent markets at this point in time, but in the first decades of the seventeenth century, a number of prohibitions were issued against the Birkarls or "the Kvens" coming over to the coast for trading purposes. The prohibitions were also valid for the inland Sámi, who in their nomadic migrations to the coast often brought along goods to sell, both of their own production and merchants' wares.⁴⁷ When the Swedish government granted privileges to a number of the towns around the Gulf of Bothnia at the beginning of the 1620s, there was a sharp reaction from the Danish-Norwegian side, and the prohibition was repeated in 1629.⁴⁸ These prohibitions, though, do not seem to have had any special effect before the middle of the seventeenth century. Following a short war between the kingdoms in 1643-1645, the peace treaty concluded in Brömsebro asserted explicitly that all trade by Swedish merchants over the border to Denmark-Norway was to be prohibited.⁴⁹ However, just a few years later, in 1653, the sources

⁴⁵ Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia, 39. Delen, pp. 184f., pp. 217ff. and p. 189; cf. Fellman IV 1915 pp. 117ff., p. 122 and pp. 132ff.

⁴⁶ Bergling 1964 pp. 145–171.

⁴⁷ *NRR* IV, pp. 300f. and 436–437; "Instrux for Underhandling om Fjeldlapperne 1613," Qvigstad and Wiklund II pp. 288–293.

⁴⁸ Royal ordinance of 19 October 1629, *NRR* VI, pp. 167f.; cf. letter to Frantz Kaas, governor of the fief of Nordlandene, of 28 July 1631, *NRR* VI, pp. 338–339, announced at the county court assembly at Vardøhus June or 16 July 1630, Finnmark Justisprot., No. 2, fol. 79f. (Statsarkivkontoret i Tromsø).

⁴⁹ Laursen vol. 4 (1626–1649) 1917 pp. 418ff.

mention that special markets were to be established for such trade on the Danish-Norwegian side as well. The absolute prohibition enunciated in the 1645 peace agreement was evidently about to be rescinded. It was now presented as if such markets had existed in northern Norway ‘from time immemorial’ and that the Swedes’ trade would still be allowed at these markets.⁵⁰ Thus, the legal situation on both sides after 1653 was such that the Swedish merchants’ trade with the Sámi and the other local population was allowed in connection with special markets that were fixed and approved by royal order: in the interior in the name of the Swedish king and in the coastal regions in the name of the Danish-Norwegian king. In practice, this meant a restriction of the Birkarls’ relatively free travel in the coastal regions, even though earlier, a few Norwegian bailiffs had sought to prevent this.⁵¹

Institutionalized Trade Meetings in the Period 1550–1600

Partly as a result of the restrictions and curtailment laid down by the state authorities on the free, visiting activities of travelling merchants, a number of institutionalized markets arose, where trading activities were presumed to take place at fixed locations and at fixed times. According to the various groups of producers and merchants who attended to these markets, as well as their network connections, they may be classified in four categories (Cf. map, fig. 9.).

1) Meetings between several different producer groups and several merchants, who were participating in one trade network.

Typical examples in the southern inland regions on the Swedish side, where nomadic Sámi from various *siidas* met with merchants partaking in the Bothnian network, as well as bailiffs of the Swedish crown, who collected tax. These markets regularly took place in mid-winter, or in late winter/spring.⁵²

2) Meetings between producer groups having various specialized livelihoods, and various attachments to trading networks. Intermediary trade. (For example, meetings between inland Sámi visiting the western coast during summer and/or in the autumn, as part of their seasonal migrations, and the coastal Sámi of the particular area.) Such markets regularly took place in the innermost parts of the fjords on the Norwegian side, from the southern part of Troms

⁵⁰ Instruction in missive of 6 May 1653 to Preben von Ahnen, governor of the fief of Nordlandene. (*NRR X*, pp. 630f.) The establishment of such markets was already mentioned in a missive of 11 July 1646 to the viceregent Hannibal Sehested (*NRR VIII*, pp. 417f.), and was further developed in an instruction to all the governors in Norway, dated January 1653 (*NRR X*, pp. 555–557).

⁵¹ Steckzén 1964 p. 288; Hansen and Olsen 2014 pp. 164–165.

⁵² Hansen 1984 pp. 62–63.

county, and in Nordland. (Examples mentioned in the sources before 1600: *Namdalen* in Trøndelag, *Grunnfjorden* i Tysfjord in Nordland, and the farm *Hergotten* of Rombaksfjord, Ofoten.)⁵³

At these meetings, the inland Sámi offered a variety of goods: produce from hunting, catching, and gathering, as well as products from reindeer herding, which they had begun but yet not developed as it was later; various types of furs, gloves, feathers, and “feather-beds” (“*benkedyner*”) are mentioned – together with slaughtered reindeer, reindeer skins, leggings, and brogues.⁵⁴

They also engaged in a certain intermediary trade. Apart from goods which they traditionally bought from their trading connections on the Swedish side – like flour, butter, salt, cloth, and silver – they purchased specific furs (particularly fox and otter furs) from the coastal Sámi and sold them to the “Birkarls” on the Swedish side.⁵⁵

3) The activities in summertime at such exchange- and reloading centers as *Torneå* and *Kola*. These centers seem to have served as meeting places for professional merchants, attached to separate trading networks. While there were some Western European merchants visiting Kola in summertime, the Torneå markets were also attended by Russian merchants, in addition to the “rural merchants” trafficking the Gulf of Bothnia, regional farmers, and citizens from the southern Swedish towns.⁵⁶

The *transit function* – between various kinds of merchants – appears to have been most central at the market in *Torneå*, since commercial navigation in the Gulf of Bothnia was reserved for domestic traders, by so called “Bothnian commercial compulsion” (“*Bottnisk handelstvång*”) so that no foreigner should be allowed to sail to other ports than Stockholm, and the main commercial navigation was taken care of by the citizens of this town. In addition to the Stockholm merchants’ purchasing of furs from the whole interior, brought to Torneå by the Birkarls, a considerable amount of furs were also bought by representatives of the Swedish crown, the so called “Lapp bailiffs.” Through the above-mentioned “Royal Fur Chamber,” formidable quantities of furs were *exported to the European markets* during the

⁵³ Historisk-topografiske skrifter om Norge og norske Landsdele forfattet i Norge i det 16^{de} Aarhundrede, (publ. by Gustav Storm, Christiania 1895), p. 166; “Claus Urne’s Statement”, Aug. 1599 – NRA (Danske kanselli, skapsaker, skap 15, pk. 125B).

⁵⁴ Hansen 1984 p. 56; Bergling 1964 p. 216. The earliest evidence of sales of meat from slaughtered reindeer appear from the beginning of the seventeenth century: “Hartvig Billes Statement” of 1609; Peder Claussøn Friis’ Norges Beskrivelse av 1613; both referred in Qvigstad and Wiklund vol. 2, 1909 pp. 286, 288.

⁵⁵ Hansen 1984 pp. 56–57; Qvigstad and Wiklund vol. 2, 1909 p. 227; Steckzén 1964 p. 378; Fellman vol. 4 1915 p. 55 (The complaint of the Rounala Sámi against the tax collector Niels Oravainen).

⁵⁶ Hansen 1984 pp. 57–59.

latter half of the sixteenth century, with an exceptional “boom” in the 1570s.⁵⁷ But considerable quantities also went eastwards, through the networks of Russian merchants. Not only did Russian traders take an active part in the Torneå markets, but both they and Karelian merchants regularly visited the Sámi in their dwelling areas, and bought up large amounts of fur directly. Estimates on the basis of a special fee, collected by the Swedish crown on transactions with the Russians (called “*köpmannspenningen*” or “the merchant’s penny”) indicate that the value of the Russian purchases in Torne during the second half of the 1550s may have been approximately three times the amount the Swedish authorities simultaneously collected as tax from the Sámi in Torne lappmark. And the amounts that were not registered at the Torneå market may have been even greater. A stock of furs held by a Russian merchant, but which was confiscated by Swedish authorities in 1555, may have amounted to the value of approximately *1800 lispounds of hemp*, that is, 5-6 times as much as the Swedish tax income.⁵⁸

For its part, Kola served as *a port of shipment and reloading for Western merchants* (above all English and Dutch) and probably also for storing furs that were purchased from the Sámi of the Kola siidas. To a greater extent than the midsummer market in Torneå, the trade meeting in Kola may therefore be characterized as a *meeting of professional merchants attached to different networks*. The primary intermediary functions seem to have been those relating to Western European networks.⁵⁹

Picture Hansen08.jpg:

Text below picture: Trade meetings (markets) 1550–1600

4) Meetings between various producer groups with different livelihoods, and different trading attachments, as well several groups of professional merchants, attached to various trading networks. This group comprised the markets in *Varanger*, at “*Kjørståg*”/*Aiddegoppe*/*Vajdaguba* on the Rybačij Poluostrov (“Fisherman’s peninsula”), as well as one on *Kildin*

⁵⁷ Steckzén 1964.

⁵⁸ In 1555, Swedish authorities confiscated an extensive Russian fur stock right outside Tornio which, among other things, included 555 reindeer pelts, 1816 red fox pelts, 87 beaver pelts, 464 otter pelts, and 2058 pieces of squirrel. How sizeable this consignment was can clearly be seen when compared with the quantities of furs that were received by the royal fur chamber the same year. Of corresponding furs, the fur chamber received from the whole of Norrbotten only 174 red fox, 54 beaver, and 15 otter pelts; the only significant quantity was in the form of less valuable squirrel pelts, 7735 in total. Based on that period’s conversion rate, the Russian fur stock would have been worth five to six times as much as the tax that the Swedish crown was demanding at this time from the Sami in Torne lappmark and along the Norwegian coast (Steckzén 1964 pp. 356, 359; Hansen and Olsen 2014 pp. 238–239).

⁵⁹ Hansen 1987 pp. 227–228.

island. These three markets were characterized by the fact that several groups of professional merchants – operating within different trading networks – had dealings with each other, *and* with several groups of producers, the Sámi from adjacent siidas.⁶⁰

A central meeting place for the Sámi was the *Varanger* market, which seems to have had origins that date far back in time. A source from 1530 mentions a regular, recurring meeting in Varanger immediately after Christmas, where trading Kvens, Russian tax collectors, and delegates from the commanding officer (bailiff) at Vardøhus were assumed to participate. It is therefore reasonable to assume that such markets had already been a standard occurrence for a long time, attended by various kinds of trading people and tax collectors.⁶¹ We know from later sources that Norwegian, Russian, and Swedish traders participated in the market, side by side with Sámi from Varanger, the other fjords in East Finnmark (*Tana*, *Laksefjord*, and possibly *Porsanger*), as well as the Skolt siidas *Njávđán* and *Báhčaveadji*.⁶² There were also regular trade meetings in *Aiddegohpi* (Vajdaguba) on *Rybačij Poluostrov* (“Fisherman’s peninsula”) and on *Kildin* island. These meetings involved the Sámi in the adjacent siidas and merchants from several quarters (Russian, Norwegian, English, and Dutch), and took place in summer during the sailing season on the White Sea.

Conclusion

It can be ascertained that the “*space of action*” of the professional, travelling merchants who themselves visited the Sámi at their winter dwelling sites, had been strongly curtailed and restricted due to the measures introduced by the surrounding states during the second half of the sixteenth century and the first years of the seventeenth. On the Swedish side, the activities had been effectively regulated. Not only had Gustav Vasa deprived the Birkarls of their right to taxation of the Sámi and made it a royal prerogative. Due to the measures implemented by Karl IX, their access to trade with the Sámi in the Swedish “lappmarks” had been confined to selected fixed places, where markets should be held only twice a year, and which also should

⁶⁰ Hansen 1984 pp. 59–62.

⁶¹ Letter from Hans Eriksson (probably bailiff at Vardøhus castle) to the governor of the fief of Vardøhus, Archbishop Olav Engelbrektsson, dated 1530 (*DN VIII*, no. 623, March 6. 1530). The itineraries of the Russian tax collectors are known from the instructions issued by the Grand Duke Vasilij (III) Ivanovič in 1517, and are rendered in Lilienskiold’s “*Speculum Boreale*” 2, pp. 185–189, as well as in Major Peter Schnitler’s *greenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller 1742 – 1745* (publ. by Kjeldeskriftfondet, vol. 3, Oslo 1985), pp. 329–332.

⁶² Hansen 1990 pp. 140–143; The “Matricul” of Niels Knag 1694, and “Joerde-Boeg og Mandtal ofuer Nordmend og Finner udj Ost og West Findmarchen ...”, *Nordnorske samlinger* vol. 1, Oslo 1932, pp. 22–34; Assize minutes for Finnmark, No. 11, fol. 54b et seq. (10 September 1677); Royal decree of 10 December 1698, quoted by Lilienskiold, *Nordnorske samlinger* vol. 4, 4th, Oslo 1943 pp. 291, 293; Chr. B. Harøe, “Findmarchens Beskrifvelse”, *Nordnorske samlinger* vol. 1, p. 67.

serve as church places. The inland Sámi, the Birkarls, the Russian merchants, and others who wished to engage in trade had to attend these markets. Due to measures and prohibitions from the Danish-Norwegian authorities, the Birkarls were also at first prevented from trading contact with the Sámi along the coast in the north and west, but from the turn of the seventeenth century they were allowed to trade with the coastal Sámi at fixed, institutionalized markets.

Not only did the Swedish authorities seek to prevent direct contact between Karelian and Russian merchants and the Sámi in the interior, but in general they tried to direct trade to certain legalized ports of trade along the Gulf of Bothnia, primarily to Torneå. Concerning the fur trade organized by the Swedish state, it was channeled to Stockholm and the “Royal Fur Chamber” for further export to European markets. On the Danish-Norwegian side, these trade connections to privileged ports had a parallel in the position of Bergen and Trondheim.

This delimitation and regulation of the free, visiting trading activities of travelling merchants attached to various networks must be viewed together with the other initiatives of the surrounding state authorities, aimed at dividing the common borderless region in northern Fennoscandia, where all three powers had enjoyed free access to collect tax from, and trade with, the Sámi.

In this territorial partitioning of the region, resulting in unilateral sovereignty and jurisdiction over land, and population groups and resource exploitation in separate areas, the efforts at dominion over the coastal Sámi became the first crucial issue, taking the form of a struggle over the right to levy taxes. In this period, taxation was a manifestation of authority that governments referred to first and foremost when they wanted to justify their territorial pretensions, that is, demands for sovereignty over areas. The mutual partitioning between the states started in 1595, when Sweden and Russia made peace after prolonged wars, which, with some pauses, had continued since 1572. In the peace treaty concluded at *Teusina* (Täysinnä) on the border of Estonia, Sweden had to make concessions in relation to some far-reaching pretensions about controlling the whole of the Kola Peninsula, but otherwise achieved a breakthrough to the Arctic Ocean. The Swedish-Russian border was to be drawn a few kilometers east of Varanger. As for the Russians, they were excluded from the right to tax the coastal Sámi west of Varanger, as well as the inland Sámi in Kemi lappmark and the inner part of Finnmark county.⁶³

⁶³ Hansen 2001 pp. 42–45.

Thus, the further struggle for dominion over the areas in the North became an issue between Sweden and Denmark-Norway. In the arbitration and negotiations that followed, the two states based their arguments on different viewpoints. The Danish-Norwegian authorities claimed that the mountain ridge traditionally called “the Keel” constituted the traditional border between the kingdoms. Yet in North Troms and Finnmark, where the Keel flattens out and the landscape changes to gentle ranges of hills and rounded hilltops, references to a mountain ridge were not very relevant. For these areas, therefore, the Danish negotiators argued more vaguely that the border should be drawn “[...] at the places [...] where it has been for time immemorial.”

Basing their view on the conclusions of the peace treaty of Teusina, for their part the Swedish authorities drew the conclusion that Sweden *had the right to two-thirds of the territory between Malangen and Varanger*, since the Russians’ rights had now fallen to Sweden, and that consequently two-thirds of the total taxation rights over the Sámi in this area was now possessed by Sweden. On the contrary, from Malangen and southwards, Sweden and Denmark-Norway had equal rights (50–50), since the Sámi in this area traditionally had been liable to taxation from these two states. On this basis, Karl IX made several proposals for territorial portioning.

Increased tension between the two northern states finally led to an open conflict, the so-called *war of Kalmar (1611–1613)*. In spite of the fact that the clash was provoked primarily by controversy over issues of sovereignty in the North, military action took place in southern and central Scandinavia, and the war received its name from the Swedish fortress town of Kalmar, which was besieged for a time by Danish forces. The result was that Denmark-Norway gained full dominion over the coastal area and the fjords. Thus, sovereignty over the coastal Sámi areas was unambiguously established as Danish-Norwegian. The only remaining “common taxation districts” were the Sámi communities in the interior of present-day Finnmark county, where both Sweden and Denmark-Norway had aspirations of dominion, and in the areas south of the Varanger fjord and in the westernmost parts of the Kola peninsula, disputed by Denmark-Norway and Russia (see map below).

Picture: Hansen09.jpg: After the Teusina peace and the Kalmar War

Text below picture: After the Teusina peace of 1595 and the Kalmar War 1611–1613

The “field of social relations” or the “space of action” in the borderless region of northern Fennoscandia had been considerably changed, when moving from the late Middle Ages into

the early modern period. The state authorities had taken on many new functions and had grown in power, so that they were capable of controlling very many of the positions in the North, and also established new ones. This applied not only to the trading networks of the North, and the traveling and visiting merchants, who now were only allowed to trade at fixed, institutionalized trading places and markets. It also had great repercussions for the taxation of the Sámi by the surrounding states, as well as for the exertion of local administration and jurisdiction.

The taxation of the Sámi had also undergone great changes, and was now only a matter for state authorities and not for delegated tax-collectors like the Birkarls, at the same as the “common taxation area” where all three adjacent powers rightfully had collected tax from the Sámi was, for the most part, divided between them. The expansion of positions of state authority was further strengthened by the development of institutions for local administration and jurisdiction, as well as the expansion of church organizations with the erection of new churches.

All in all, this not only strengthened the territorial consolidation of the separate state authorities in the North, but it also led to a development where the majority of the Sámi were defined as subjects of only one nation-state (with the exception of a few Sámi communities in present-day inner Finnmark, which was still considered as common territory between Denmark-Norway and Sweden).

In its turn, this changing of positions and power relations laid down new premises for how the Reformation was to be introduced – through different interpretations from the Danish-Norwegian and Swedish sides. And consequently, it formed the premise for how the new, intensivated mission activity towards the Sámi should be implemented, through different approaches and the development of a new set of positions held by missionaries, who developed new networks and who were partly in conflict with the established church organization.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Storm 2014; Storm 2016.

References

- Bergling, Ragnar 1964, Kyrkstaden i övre Norrland. Kyrkliga, merkantila och judiciella funktioner under 1600- och 1700-talen, Umeå: *Skytteanska Samfundets Handlingar* No. 3.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1984, *Questions de sociologie*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and L.J.D. Wacquant 1992, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge and Malden: Publisher?, MA.
- Broadly, Donald 1990, *Sociologi och epistemologi. Om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin*, Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- DN – Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, vols. 1–23, Christiania/Oslo: Publisher? 1874–2011.
- Fellman, Isak 1910–1915, *Handlingar och Uppsatser angående Finska Lappmarken och Lapparne*, vols. 1–4, Helsingfors: Publisher?.
- Friberg, Nils, G. Kerkkonen, A. Luukko, V. Mattila and H. Yrwing Date?, “Bondesegregation,” *KLNM*, Place of Publication: Publisher, vol. 2, cols. 104–113.
- Friberg, Nils Date, “Norrbottnenshandel,” *KLNM*, Place of Publication: Publisher, vol. 12, cols. 348–354.
- Friberg, Nils 1983, Stockholm i bottniska farvatten, Stockholms bottniska handelsfält under senmedeltiden och Gustav Vasa. En historisk-geografisk studie, i samarbete med Inga Friberg. Uppsala: Forskningsprojektet kontaktfält och handelsomland. Historisk-geografiska studier, Meddelande 4; *Meddelanden Serie B 59*, Kulturgeografiska Institutionen, Stockholms Universitet, Stockholm: LiberFörlag.
- Groth, Östen 1984, Ur Norrbottens historia, *Norrbotten 1*, Luleå: Skrivarförlaget.
- Hammarström, Ingrid 1956, Finansförvaltning och varuhandel 1504–1540, Studier i de yngre sturarnas och Gustav Vasas statshushållning, Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Hamre, Lars 1977, Litt om kyrkjelege og benefisialrettslege tilhøve i Finnmark i mellomalderen, in Knut Bergsland (ed.), *Samenes og sameområdenes rettslige stilling historisk belyst. Foredrag og diskusjoner på symposium avholdt 7.–9. november 1973*, Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Instituttet for sammenliknende kulturforskning, *Serie A: Forelesninger XXVIII*, Place of publication: Publisher, pp. 29–31.
- Hamre, Lars 1982, “Setesvein,” *KLNM*, Place of Publication: Publisher, vol. 15, col. 162.
- HSH – *Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens Historia*, 39. Delen, Stockholm 1858.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 1984, Trade and Markets in Northern Fenno-Scandinavia A.D. 1550–1750, *Acta Borealia, A Nordic Journal of Circumpolar Societies*, no. 2/1984, pp. 47–79.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 1987, Handel på Nordkalotten ca. 1550–ca. 1750, in Julku, Kyösti (ed.), *Nordkalotten i en skiftande värld – kulturer utan gränser och stater över gränser*,

- Studia Historica Septentrionalia 14:1, Rovaniemi: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, pp. 216–243.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 1996, Interaction between Northern European Sub-arctic Societies during the Middle Ages: Indigenous Peoples, Peasants and State Builders, in M. Rindal (ed.), *Two Studies on the Middle Ages*, KULTs Skriftserie 66, Oslo: Research Council of Norway, pp. 31–95.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2001, Grensefastsettingen på Nordkalotten fra middelalderen til 1751: Folkeslag – strategier – prinsipper, in Fagertun, F., Myhre, J. E. and Ryymin, T. (eds.), *Det farefulle nord. Trusler og trusseloppfatninger knyttet til Nord-Norge gjennom tusen år*, Skriftserie fra Institutt for historie, Universitetet i Tromsø, No. 1, Tromsø: Publisher?, pp. 11–51.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2003, Fredstraktaten mellom Norge og Novgorod av 1326, *Middelalderforum*, Oslo, no. 1–2/2003, pp. 6–28.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2005a, Fra Nöteborgsfreden til Lappekodisillen, ca. 1300–1751. Folkegrupper og statsdannelse på Nordkalotten med utgangspunkt i Finnmark, in Imsen, Steinar (ed.), *Grenser og grannelag i Nordens historie*, Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag, pp. 362–386.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2005b, The Overlapping Taxation Areas of the North and the Nature of the Russian-Norwegian Border in Medieval and Early Modern Times, in Jackson, T. and Nielsen, J. P. (eds.), *Russia – Norway. Physical and Symbolic Borders*, Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, pp. 40–61.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2010, The Arctic Dimension of “Norgesveldet,” chapter 9 in Imsen, Steinar (ed.), *The Norwegian Domination and the Norse World c.1100–c.1400*, Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag, pp.199–228.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2012, Juxta paganos: The Delineation of the Religious Frontier in the North, chapter 13 in Imsen, Steinar (ed.), *“Ecclesia Nidrosiensis” and “Norges veldi,”* Trondheim: Akademika forlag pp. 301–330.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar 2014, The Successive Integration of Hålogaland and Finnmark into the Realm of the King of Norway, in Imsen, Steinar (ed.), *Rex Insularum. The King of Norway and his “Skattlands” as a Political System c.1260-c.1450*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, pp. 347–369.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar and Bjørnar Olsen 2014, *Hunters in Transition: An Outline of Early Sámi History*, Leiden: Brill.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar, Kj. Lundholm, V. Semënov and J. Vahtola 2015, The Dawn of State Formations 800–1550, in Elenius, L. (ed.), *The Barents Region – A Transnational History of Subarctic Northern Europe*, Oslo: Pax Forlag, pp. 18–84.
- Historisk-topografiske skrifter om Norge og norske Landsdele forfattet i Norge i det 16de Aarhundrede*, publ. by G. Storm, Christiania 1895.

- Hoppe, Gunnar 1945, Vägarna inom Norrbottens län. Studier öfver den trafikgeografiska utvecklingen från 1500-talet till våra dagar, Uppsala: *Geographica, Skrifter från Upsala Universitets Geografiska Institution* No. 16.
- KLNM – Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder* 1982, vols. 1–21, 1956–1978 (2nd printing), Place of Publication: Publisher?, 1982.
- Laursen, L. 1912–1917, *Danmark-Norges Traktater 1523–1750 med dertil hørende aktstykker*, vols. 1-4, Copenhagen: Publisher?.
- Lilienskiold's "Speculum Boreale," Finnmark omkring 1700, publ. by O. Solberg, *Nordnorske samlinger*, Oslo: Etnografisk Museum, vols. 4 & 7, 1942–43, 1945.
- Lundmark, Lennart 1982, *Uppbörd, utarming, utveckling. Det samiska fångstsamhällets övergång till rennomadism i Lule lappmark*, Arkiv avhandlingsserie 14, Lund: Publisher?.
- Luukko, A., "Ryska köpmän," *KLNM*, Place of Publication: Publisher, vol. 14, cols. 518–521.
- Nedkvitne, Arnved 1976, *Handelssjøfarten mellom Norge og England i høymiddelalderen*, Sjøfartshistorisk Årbok, Bergen: Bergens Sjøfartsmuseum, pp. 7–254.
- Nedkvitne, Arnved 1988, "Mens Bønderne seilte og Jægterne for." *Nordnorsk og vestnorsk kystøkonomi 1500–1730*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Nedkvitne, Arnved 2014, *The German Hansa and Bergen 1100–1600*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Hansischen Geschichte, herausg. vom Hansischen Geschichtsverein, Neue Folge Vol. 70, Cologne–Weimar–Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.
- NgL – Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, vols. 1–5, 1846–95, publ. by R. Keyser, P.A. Munch, G. Storm and E. Hertzberg, Christiania.
- Nickul, Karl 1977, Skoltsitans arkiv, in Bergsland, K. (ed.): *Samenes og sameområdenes rettslige stilling historisk belyst. Foredrag og diskusjoner på symposium avholdt 7.–9. november 1973*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Instituttet for sammenliknende kulturforskning, Serie A: Forelesninger 28, pp. 166–199.
- NMD – Norske middelalderdokumenter*, publ. by S. Bagge, S. H. Smedsdal and K. Helle, Bergen–Oslo–Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget 1973.
- Nordnorske samlinger*, 1933–1947, publ. by Etnografisk Museum, Oslo, vols. 1–8.
- NRR – Norske Rigs-Registranter*, 1523–1660, publ. by Kildeskriftfondet, Christiania 1–11, 1861–1891.
- Olav Engelbrektssons rekneskapsbøker*, 1532–1538, publ. by J. A. Seip, Oslo: Riksarkivet, 1936.
- Olofsson, Sven Ingemar 1962, Övre Norrlands medeltid, Övre Norrlands historia under Gustaf Vasa och hans söner, in *Övre Norrlands historia* vol. 1, Tiden till 1600, Umeå: Publisher.

- Olofsson, Sven Ingemar 1965, Övre Norrlands historia under Carl IX och Gustaf II Adolf, in *Övre Norrlands historia*, vol. 2, Tiden 1600–1721, Umeå: Publisher?.
- Pape, Carsten 2004, Rethinking the Medieval Russian-Norwegian Border, *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 52/2004, pp. 161–187.
- Paus, Hans 1751, *Gamle kongelige Forordninger og Privilegier*, Copenhagen: Publisher?.
- Qvigstad, J. and K. B. Wiklund 1909, *Dokumenter angaaende flytlapperne m.m., samlede efter Renbeitekommissionens opdrag*, vols. 1–2, Kristiania.
- RN – Regesta Norvegica*, kronologisk Fortegnelse over Dokumenter vedkommende Norge, Nordmænd og den norske Kirkeprovins, (Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt/Riksarkivet) Christiania 1898, Oslo 1978–2015 vols. 2–10.
- Schnitler, P. 1742–1745, *Major Peter Schnitler's grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller 1742–1745*, publ. by Kjeldeskriftfondet, vol. 3, Oslo: Publisher? 1985.
- Steckzén, Birger 1964, *Birkarler och Lapper. En studie i birkarleväsendets, lappbefolkningens och skinnhandelns historia*. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar. Historiska Serien 9, Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Storm, Dikka 2014, The Mission Networks and the Religious Situation, in Hansen, Lars Ivar, Bergesen, Rognald Heiseldal and Hage, Ingebjørg (eds.), *The Protracted Reformation in Northern Norway. Introductory Studies*, Stamsund: Orkana Akademisk, pp. 185–210.
- Storm, Dikka 2016, The Complex Religious Situation in Southern Troms in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century, in Berg, Sigrun Høgetveit, Bergesen, Rognald Heiseldal and Kristiansen, Roald E. (eds.), *The Protracted Reformation in Northern Norway. Vol. 2. Towards a Protestant North*, TROLL: Tromsøer Studien zur Kulturwissenschaft, vol. 14, Hannover: Wehrhahn Verlag, pp.173–204.
- Storm, Gustav 1888, *Islandske Annaler indtil 1578*, Christiania: Det Norske historiske kildeskriftfond skrifter 21.
- Storå, Nils 1977, De ryska klostren och Kola-samernas rätt till jakt och fiske, in Bergsland, K. (ed.), *Samenes og sameområdenes rettslige stilling historisk belyst. Foredrag og diskusjoner på symposium avholdt 7.–9. november 1973*, Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Instituttet for sammenliknende kulturforskning, Serie A: Forelesninger 28, pp. 78–102.
- Tanner, V. 1929, Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo-området. I. Skolt-lapparna, *Fennia* vol. 49 (4)/1929, pp. ??-??.
- Tegengren, Helmer 1952, *En utdöd lappkultur i Kemi lappmark. Studier i Nordfinlands kolonisationshistoria*, Acta Academiae Åboensis. Humaniora. 19.1, Åbo: Åbo: akademi.
- Tornedalens historia* 1, Från istid till 1600-talet, publ.by Tornedalskommunernas historiebokskomiteé, Malung 1991.

Vahtola, Jouko 1987, Birkarlaproblemet, in Julku, Kyösti (ed.), *Nordkalotten i en skiftande värld – kulturer utan gränser och stater över gränser*, Studia Historica Septentrionalia 14:1, Rovaniemi: Rovaniemi: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, pp. 324–333.