

© 2014 Monica Grini

In Charis Gullickson and Sandra Lorentzen (eds.), *Sámi Stories: Art and Identity of an Arctic People*, Stamsund: Orkana forlag, 2014, pp. 49 – 67.

## **HISTORIOGRAPHICAL REFLECTIONS ON SÁMI ART AND THE PARADIGM OF THE NATIONAL IN NORWEGIAN ART HISTORY**

**Monica Grini**

Whose story is told in the history of art? There are many different answers to that question depending on which art history one refers to and on the perspective applied to examine these histories.

One approach is to look at the traditional framework for such examinations – which to a large degree still includes categories such as state, place and nation. Sápmi, the Sámi area, can be understood as a nation embracing four nation-states: Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. Since the 19th century, the history of art has been considered part of the nation-state's inventory. The production of art history has played, and still plays, a role in the constitution and the maintenance of different nation-states. How is Sámi art presented in Norwegian art history and what are the roles of the national paradigm in this presentation?

### **NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS**

Are national frameworks relevant in a time when many consider the history of art as a global subject? Still, the national paradigm continues to influence art historical research. In spite of transnational discourses, the nation-state and the idea of a “national art” constitute the framework for much of the research within the field of art history carried out today.<sup>1</sup>

The identification between art, nation and “people” is still done both on an institutional and linguistic level, although not in the same explicit way as when the idea about a national culture was first developed toward the end of the 18th century, when art was said to express certain permanent national characteristics.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed concepts like “Sámi art” and “Norwegian art” demonstrate this identification, although the context surrounding these notions differs a lot. Whereas the development of the notion of a Norwegian art ran side by side with the development of institutions as part of the nation-building during the 1800s and 1900s, the Sámi situation was linked to the endeavors of a minority group trying to maintain their identity under very difficult circumstances, partly within and partly in opposition to bigger political and historical processes in Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. In Norway, the institutional and conceptual development attached to Sámi art attained a concrete form in the 1970s, and must be seen in relation to bigger political processes, both nationally and internationally.<sup>3</sup> In accordance with a Western art concept which separates “fine art” from “craftwork,” a Sámi concept for fine art was developed: *dáidda*. Although in Sámi culture there existed a distinctive art tradition named *duodji* long before this institutionalization.<sup>4</sup> This is a rich and complex tradition, hard to translate into a hegemonic Western art concept. *Duodji* can be applied to a number of different practices and items, but is often today used synonymously with Sámi “craftwork” or “applied art.”

In *Norsk kunsthistorie. Bilde og skulptur fra vikingtida til i dag* (Norwegian Art History: Pictorial Art and Sculpture from the Viking Age to the Present, 2009), art historian Gunnar Danbolt points out that the national framework in Norwegian art history is somewhat inescapable, because the concept is inscribed in the genre.<sup>5</sup> His solution is to discuss and problematize the category and the genre. Norwegian art history is not a homogenous organism unfolding itself from a single root – like a plant – but can rather be compared to a “flowerbed to which the wind brings seeds from the entire world,” where several plants grow up, but with a slightly different character than in other places;<sup>6</sup> like the wine grape is characterized by its *terroir*, one might say. But what kind of place does Sámi art occupy in this history; do seeds in the same flowerbed equally represent it? Or rather, is it two beds with different *terroir*? Danbolt does not provide an answer to this question, as the book is free from any kind of Sámi contexts all together.

## NATION-BUILDING AND NORWEGIAN ART HISTORY

When Norwegian art history was to be written at the end of 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, one did problematize the very concept of the nation, but with another approach than Danbolt in 2009. The idea of the nation-state was on the sketch board and it was more a matter of finding content that could fill the category, to find distinctive characteristics that might support the idea of a Norwegian art. They turned to the Vikings and the Middle Ages and the time after 1814 when Norway had its own government, and gradually these periods became the main focus within the writings of Norwegian art history.<sup>7</sup> Did “Norway”, after five hundred years as a Danish province, have a national culture? Norway’s first professor of art history, Lorentz Dietrichson (1834–1917), claimed that the Norwegian farmer gave expression to central aspects of Norwegian culture; specifically through the way he used his knife. Woodcarving was seen as an expression of something typically Norwegian. The art historian Andreas Aubert (1851–1913) stated that one could also talk about a specific way of working with the brush; a certain Norwegian cognition of colors was conserved in the farmer’s rose painting tradition, he said. Dietrichson, however, rejected the rose painting as “vulgarized German Rococo.”<sup>8</sup> When art historians turned to craft traditions in the making of a national art history, how did they consider the rich Sámi tradition of *duodji*? Turning to the art historical sources the question is left unanswered, as none of the art historians of the time mentions Sámi culture.

In 1876 Dietrichson was one of the founders of the Museum of Decorative Arts and Design in Kristiania (later Oslo). One of the objectives of the museum was “the production of skilled working drawings of what he considered to be typical Norwegian woodcarving, which could be spread all over the country.”<sup>9</sup> But among these there are no examples of Sámi woodcarvings, even though in other contexts there are numerous objects from this period showing Sámi skill in the art of forming with knife. To see Sámi woodcarvings in Kristiania, one had to go to the Ethnographic Museum, which opened its doors to the public in 1857. As a matter of fact, Sámi traditions were among the decisive factors for the founding of the Ethnographic Museum. A crucial point in the establishment of an ethnographic collection at the University of Kristiania was a request from the British ethnologist Robert Gordon Latham (1812–1888) to acquire objects from Sámi culture in exchange with other “ethnographica” during the construction of “The People’s Palace” in London after the World Exposition in

1851.<sup>10</sup> This collection was the starting point for what later became the Ethnographic Museum. Neither at the Norwegian Folk Museum, founded in 1894, and supposed “to collect everything that expresses the cultural life of the Norwegian population,” was it possible to find examples of Sámi craftwork tradition at the time.<sup>11</sup>

Sámi culture was not considered part of Norwegian culture. Objects connected to Sámi culture were handled by the Ethnographic Museum and not considered art objects that, by their own value, could contribute to the Norwegian history of art. Surely, there existed rhetorical, pedagogic and political reasons for the exclusion of Sámi objects when the “Norwegian feeling of form and color” was about to be chiseled out by means of “the universal laws” in the arts. As the historian Einar Niemi underlines in a study of Norwegian historiography, minority groups like the Sámi are marginalized in Norwegian history – they are considered “the other” and therefore do not fit into the image of a homogenous and national culture. He speaks of the time between 1850 and 1940 as a period of “nation - building, ‘foreign’ minorities, and assimilation policy,” characterized by processes of Norwegianization rooted in nationalism and in the notion of the nation-state.<sup>12</sup>

The assimilation policy hardened between the world wars due to security policy considerations combined with ideas originating from racism and social Darwinism. Finnmark, with its location, its heterogeneous population and complicated border issues, was in a particular situation. The Sámi were to become Norwegians through the school system, the church, and through linguistic restrictions. At the same time questions about Sámi civic conditions were peripheral for the majority of the Norwegian population.<sup>13</sup>

#### THE ART OF THE FINNMARK PLATEAU

It is in 1940 that the first initiative to represent Sámi art in Norwegian art history appears. This is done by one of the best-known art historians of the time, Harry Fett (1875–1982). He was the Director General for Cultural Heritage in Norway from 1913 to 1946 and an important social figure of his time. He founded the journal *Kunst og Kultur* (Art and Culture) in 1910 and 30 years later, in this key publication for art historical debate in Norway, he

presents the article “Finnmarksviddens kunst. John Savio” (The Art of the Finnmark Plateau. John Savio).

The article mainly treats one artist, John Savio (1902–1938), whose life and work is seen in the context of “the European voyagers’ image of Finnmark and the Sámi” and “the Sámi’s vision of themselves and their life.”<sup>14</sup> By way of introduction, Fett asks if we, the readers and himself, actually know Norway: “From time to time I feel as if Norway is not yet discovered, at least not really. The economic area is not the only field where gold bars have not yet been minted out. It applies to Art and Culture as well.”<sup>15</sup> When the person in charge for the national cultural heritage admits such a thing then what about the reader? Do we really know the art from the different provinces of Norway, he asks rhetorically. The outermost parts of Norway, from the far north to the ultimate south are “the two scales that hold this fantastic country together.”<sup>16</sup>

The article by Fett is a part of the long art historical tradition where art and artists are seen in connection with geography, nation and “people.” But quite differently from his colleagues Fett writes about a minority culture within the framework of Norwegian art history. Fett approaches the art of John Savio through different contexts related to the place where Savio was born, and to which many of the subjects in his pictures could be related. Savio’s relationship to other Norwegian artists is to a lesser degree taken into consideration. Edvard Munch (1863–1944) is mentioned, but it seems that Fett does this more to establish Savio as a noteworthy art historical figure than to compare the works of the two artists. On a general scale, few attempts are made to place Savio in an overall presentation of Norwegian art. Rather the art of Savio is seen in relation to artists like Johan Turi (1854–1936) or Nils Nilsson Skum (1872–1951), or with “the art of the tribes living in Siberia; North-America and Greenland’s great plains up towards the Arctic Ocean, enters into the culture group of the circumpolar if you like, together with the Eskimoes and the Samoyeds,” or in relation to the millennium old Petroglyphs along the coast of Finnmark.<sup>17</sup>

It was not the first occasion Fett treated a subject unusual to Norwegian art history. With his thesis from 1908, Norwegian sculpture from the Middle Ages was for the first time considered in an art historical perspective. And in contradiction to many of his contemporary

colleagues he considered the time with absolute monarchy in Denmark-Norway with genuine interest and he busied himself in trying to nuance the biased worship of the Norwegian peasantry. That he “splashed articles about, treating the most diverse subjects,” as it is said in a speech on his 80th birthday, is among other things due to the fact that he had a theoretical and methodological approach inspired by the austrian art historian Alois Riegl (1858–1905).<sup>18</sup> Like the art historian James Elkins has pointed out, “if a significant number of art historians had taken up Riegls lead [...] art history would look entirely different”. As he “expanded the discipline of art history in part by studying provincial, ‘decadent,’ ‘decorative’ arts such as late Roman buckles, pins, and furniture designs. He is increasingly cited as a formative influence but also seldom followed.”<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore there is reason to assume that Fett had other, more specific and pressing, reasons for publishing “Finnmarksviddens kunst” in 1940. Germany had occupied Norway in April the same year and during the autumn of 1940 Germans started planning an attack on the Soviet Union. Finnmark was a strategically important area. Several aspects indicate that Fett’s article might be read as a political contribution in a time when Finnmark and Norway were occupied by “external enemies” – in a time when the culture of this part of Norway already was marginalized, so that even “internal enemies” were part of the threat.<sup>20</sup> In accordance with Fett’s belief in the importance of the art both as a *symptom of* and as the *maintenance of* a rich, humanistic civilization, the importance of writing Finnmark’s art history seems evident. The clever rhetoric of Fett covers the real “version of the matter;” to maintain Finnmark as part of Norway and draw its culture closer to Norwegian solidarity – paradoxically by emphasizing the unique qualities separating this region from the rest of the country. The appeal towards the end of the article is quite straightforward, and most certainly it was understood at once by his contemporaries, although not today:

In his art Savio not only has explained to us this vast part of the kingdom of Norway, he also has made it dearer and more inalienable to us. And the people of the Finnmark plateau has been drawn closer to us. Thus it is the deeds of a good Norwegian this young Sámi has executed for our country, and this we ought to remember particularly today.<sup>21</sup>

The rhetoric and the genre conceals the radical content of this article; an encouragement to struggle to save the kingdom of Norway. Little by little the journal of Fett became *too* patriotic for the authorities, and therefore this issue was one of the last to be published during wartime.<sup>22</sup> With his Jewish background and by virtue of being the Director General for Cultural Heritage, Fett became almost from the beginning an object of suspicion in the eyes of the Nazis. Immediately after the occupation, archaeologist Herbert Jankuhn (1905–1990) – Himmler’s special delegate for taking care of the Norwegian (i.e. “Germanic”) cultural monuments – recommended that Fett should be dismissed.<sup>23</sup>

In the cited passage above, it is clear to *whom* Fett is speaking. When he concludes by stating that Savio not only “has explained to *us* this vast part of the kingdom of Norway, he also has made it dearer and more inalienable to *us*” and “the *people of the Finnmark plateau* has been drawn closer to *us*”, it becomes evident that this article was written for someone other than “the people of the Finnmark plateau”. It is addressing an “*us*” consisting of the bourgeois and those in power in the capital city, in Oslo, appealing for the recognition of this unique part of Norway. Finnmark was important and interesting enough to be what “Europe first discovered,” Fett argues.<sup>24</sup> The examples are plentiful. Even the Medici pope Leo X was interested in this region “while Raphael were painting his *Stanze* and Michelangelo his Sistine Chapel.”<sup>25</sup>

Even when Fett uses the “unknown” aspect of Finnmark rhetorically, he makes sure to reveal the content of Savio’s art in a most present way by means of detailed image descriptions. Fett uses the present tense while writing and appeals to the imagination and feelings of the reader. We can easily imagine the challenges of nomadic life: “One has to travel long ways over snowcrust and scant ice during the night.”<sup>26</sup> And the care for the reindeer calves: “A raw heavy shower and cold weather are the most dangerous things for the small calves. The tiny lives are born in the snow, warmed up by the sun of May and the mothers licking them.”<sup>27</sup> The texts conjure up the reader’s inner images. Fett wanted to draw the reader directly into Savio’s world of motives, to make the reader identify with this world. By means of his language Fett compensates for the reader’s possible alienation in relation to Savio’s motives. But Fett also plays with contradictions in his presentation. The city of Oslo and the Finnmark plateau, urban life and countryside, become opposite poles. Here the story of a

country boy is told; the boy defying every unlucky situation, following his vocation and fighting “his battle in the streets of Oslo as well as in Svolvær and Tromsø.”<sup>28</sup>

The particular span in the art of Savio is caused by the meeting between Paleolithic era and modern time. A Sámi boy, sick with tuberculosis, with a prehistorical artistic tradition alive within, himself a part of the aristocracy of the Finnmark plateau, is thrown into the bedsits and art life in Oslo.<sup>29</sup>

As we can see Fett drew the lines all the way back to the Stone Age. Through concepts like “a living Paleolithic art” or “modern Paleolithic art” he talks as if it is an unbroken line between the petroglyphs of Finnmark and the artistic expression of Savio. Savio has “the wisdom from the great nature running in his veins” and therefore he has conveyed “some of the strength from the mountains to his art. There was something timeless in this art, a millennial tradition once again living in his woodcuts.”<sup>30</sup>

Here Fett acts similarly to what was being done when the concept of “Norwegian art” was to be filled. It was important to show that the art was tied to specific climatic and material conditions connected to *the place* – that made this art unique. While at the same time showing the timeless qualities in the art works, that they were in harmony with “the universal laws of art,” but rooted in this particular soil. One might say in this *territory* (rather than *terroir*), because it is literally speaking maintaining Finnmark as a part of Norwegian territory that is the main concern, considered in the light of the ongoing war.

It is only with the art of Savio that a dynamic element is introduced; when Fett writes “living Paleolithic art,” he literally means “art made today as they did ten thousand years ago.”<sup>31</sup> Just as Dietrichson and Aubert did not see anything dynamic in woodcarvings made by peasants, which were there to illustrate an “unchanged and essential” Norwegian art tradition.

## SÁMI ART IN NORWEGIAN ART HISTORY

What effects did the writings on Sámi art by a well known art historian have on Norwegian art history? In Fett’s own time, his article received some attention among the general public,



and the interest was precisely what he had prescribed, a stronger attachment to “the region in the far north.”<sup>32</sup> Savio entered quite immediately the history of art and was given a considerable place in Kristofer Sindig-Larsen’s textbook on Norwegian graphic art from 1941.<sup>33</sup> Later, Savio is mentioned occasionally in different art history books, but he is left unmentioned in the seven volume oeuvre covering Norwegian art history published between 1980 and 1983 and in the already mentioned textbook by Danbolt from 2009.<sup>34</sup>

Fett’s broader attempts to write a history of Sámi art did not have an evident effect on the writing of Norwegian art history. The first monographs on Sámi art do not appear until our time. In the textbooks of art history the concept of “Sámi art” is still mostly absent.

An exception is the book *Tidens øye. En innføring i norsk malerkunst* (The Period Eye. An Introduction to Norwegian Painting) from 2001. This book intends to “provide an overview of Norwegian painting in the context of European art over the past 150 years,” but in addition a “brief overview of Norwegian art before the Romantic era is included.”<sup>35</sup> Here, in this prehistory, which ends in the mid 1800s, Sámi art is placed. The subtitle “Sámi tradition” occurs in the beginning of the chapter entitled “From petroglyphs to easel painting,” right after the subtitle “Petroglyphs” (in the book this refers to the time from 2000 B.C. to 500 B.C.) and before the sections dedicated to “the Norse period,” “The Middle ages,” “Denmark-Norway. Folkloristic art and urban painting tradition,” and “Liberal pictorial art – easel painting and techniques.”<sup>36</sup> This division might perhaps in part be understood if one bears in mind that the Sámi tradition was different from the Norse tradition. The problem is, of course, that while the latter refers to a specific period (in this presentation, to the Viking age, that is, ca. 700s–1000s), the Sámi tradition described in the book stretches all the way from “the gathering and hunting culture” via the concept of *duodji* and John Savio’s art and further up to contemporary artists like Iver Jåks (1932–2007) and Synnøve Persen (b. 1950).

It is striking that these contemporary artists appear in the beginning of a chapter which otherwise seems to be ordered chronologically, stretching from the Paleolithic period (ca. 2000 B.C.) and to the mid 1800s, and which is described as part of “a short review of Norwegian art before Romanticism.” Why are they not treated as “Norwegian art the last 150 years” which is at the core of the book’s subject? This main part of the book opens with

the heading “National Romanticism” and concludes with contemporary art via different kinds of –isms like Naturalism, Realism or Modernism. Savio, Jåks and Persen all could have been included in the contexts mentioned in the book, together with artists like Kai Fjell (1907–1989), Gunnar S. Gundersen (1921–1983), Inger Sitter (b. 1929), Odd Nerdrum (b. 1944), Per Inge Bjørlo (b. 1952), Marit Slaattelid (b. 1960) or Bjarne Melgaard (b. 1967). The authors apparently wished to present Sámi art as something *different*, and by doing that they excluded productive artists like Jåks (who was alive when the book was written) and Persen from a place on the contemporary art scene that is described in and prescribed by the book. To a certain degree, this might be compared to Fett’s presentation of Savio’s art when he sees it in relation with “a millennial tradition,” even though one cannot claim that Fett in the same explicit way situates Savio on the outside of his own time – after all, he considers Savio’s art as part of “the modern time.”<sup>37</sup>

Can stories about Sámi art be included in the genre *Norwegian art history* without a scheme which reduces, marginalizes or alienates what we want to describe? Today’s art historians face many of the same challenges which Fett faced when he formulated “The art of the Finnmark plateau” within this framework. Fett’s suggestion is to see this “untouched art historical material based on what he considers to be its own premises, and not in accordance to a centralizing model.”<sup>38</sup> He does so with the concepts of his own time (like we all do) and in a historical context characterized both by a process of Norwegianization and by a racial ideology.

In Fett’s work, three different approaches can be identified that are still relevant today: He attempts to see the art of Savio 1) in connection to “the cultural sphere of the circumpolar” which in addition to a Sámi area, encompasses what Fett calls the “area of the Eskimoes and the Samoyedes,” 2) in a Sámi context (consisting of other Sámi artists or artefacts from Sámi area) and 3) in connection to contemporary or historical Norwegian artists. The first approach might be problematic because there is a danger of classifying art on the basis of the category “people,” or rather, upon an idea of a certain type of people who are matched across cultural contexts on the basis of the idea that they have something “essential in common.” One risks to ignore the specific Sámi context and to essentialize, generalize and alienate. With the second approach one risks containing the arts within an idea about Sámi

culture as something static, as something which is the same today as yesterday; furthermore one risks focusing only on a smaller part of the art production (in Savio's case, the graphic works with Sámi motives which have attracted most attention). With the last approach (which Fett uses to a very small degree) one runs the risk of marginalizing Sámi culture.

In this way Fett's article serves as an illustration and reminder of some important basic problems in the discipline of art history. Still, ultimately, the central impression of the position of Sámi art in Norwegian art history is its absence; at least in the dominating stories of the field.

### Bibliography

"Review of *Kunst og Kultur*, vol. 26.", *Aftenposten*, 28.12.1940.

Berg, Knut (red.): *Norges Kunsthistorie*, volume 1–7, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag 1981–83.

Berg, Thomas: *Kunsthistorie i 100"*, *Klarttekst*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2011, p. 14.

Danbolt, Gunnar: *Norsk kunsthistorie. Bilde og skulptur fra vikingtida til i dag*. 3. edition, Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 2009

Elkins, James: *Stories of Art*, New York: Routledge, 2002.

Fett, Harry: "Finnmarksviddens kunst. John Savio", *Kunst og Kultur*, vol. 26, 1940, pp. 221–246.

Fett, Harry: "Finnmarksviddens kunst. John Savio. En skisse fra besettelsestiden", *Sámi ællin: Sámi Særvj jakkigir'ji/Sameliv, Samisk Selskaps Årbok, 1951–1952*, vol. 1, 1952, pp. 62–82.

Fett, Hugo: *Dr. Harry Fett. Bibliografi. 1875-1962-1975*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1975.

Furre, Berge: *Norsk historie 1905-1990: Vårt hundreår*, Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1992.

Gaski, Harald: "Song, Poetry and Images in Writing. Sami Literature", *Nordlit*, no. 27, 2011, pp. 33–54.

Guttorm, Gunvor: *Duoji Bálgát – En studie i duodji. Kunsthåndverk som visuell erfaring hos et urfolk*, Tromsø: University of Tromsø, 2001.

Helljesen, Sidsel: *Norsk grafikk gjennom 100 år*, Oslo: Aschehoug, 2000.

Høydalsnes, Eli: *Møte mellom tid og sted. Bilder av Nord-Norge*, Oslo: Bonytt, 2003.

- Koefoed, Holger og Øivind Storm Bjerke: *Tidens øye. En innføring i norsk malerkunst*, Oslo: Stenersen, 2001.
- Nielsen, Yngvar: *Universitetets ethnografiske samlinger 1857–1907. En historisk oversigt over deres tilblivelse, vækst og udvikling*, Christiania: W.C. Fabritius og sønner AS, 1907.
- Niemi, Einar: "History of Minorities: The Sami and the Kvens", *Making a Historical Culture: Historiography in Norway*, William H. Hubbard, et al., Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995, pp. 325–346.
- Rampley, Matthew, et al.: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe. Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Sem Fure, Jorunn: "Heinrich Himmler som humanistisk prosjektleder", *Fortid*, no. 2, 2007, pp. 76–81.
- Sinding-Larsen, Kristofer: *Norsk grafikk i det tyvende århundre*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1941.
- Østby, Leif: *Norges Kunsthistorie*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1977.
- Aalsvik, Henning, et al.: *Norges billedkunst i det nittende og tyvende århundre*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1951–53.

---

<sup>1</sup> Matthew Rampley: "Introduction", Matthew Rampley, et al.: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe. Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, Leiden: Brill, 2012, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Characteristics of art and people were connected causally to material aspects like climate and geography. The common thought in this perspective was that certain national characteristics were stable even when the times (history) changed.

<sup>3</sup> The Sámi Artist Group (also called the Máze Group/Mázejoavku), established in 1978, came to be a generator for political and institutional changes in both the Norwegian and the Sámi art sector. See Hanna H. Hansen's article in this book for further information about the Sámi Artist Group.

<sup>4</sup> The processes in the 1970s did not occur in a historical vacuum. The institutionalisation of *duodji* might be seen in connection with, for example, the foundation of a Sámi post-college education (Samernas Folkhögskola) in 1943. See Gunvor Guttorm: *Duoji Bálgát – En studie i*

---

*duodji. Kunsthåndverk som visuell erfaring hos et urfolk*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø, 2001, pp. 130–31.

<sup>5</sup> Gunnar Danbolt: *Norsk kunsthistorie. Bilde og skulptur fra vikingtida til i dag*. 3. edition, Oslo, Det Norske Samlaget, 2009, p. 12.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 525 – 526. My translation.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 157 – 159. My translation.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159. My translation.

<sup>10</sup> Yngvar Nielsen: *Universitetets ethnografiske samlinger 1857–1907. En historisk oversigt over deres tilblivelse, vækst og udvikling*, Christiania: W.C. Fabritius og sønner AS, 1907, p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> It was first in 1949 that the Sámi collections were transferred from The Ethnographic Museum to the Norwegian Folk Museum.

<sup>12</sup> Einar Niemi; "History of Minorities: The Sami and the Kvens", William H. Hubbard, et al.: *Making a Historical Culture: Historiography in Norway*, Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995, p. 329. This time limit does not mean however that the processes of Norwegianization suddenly were brought to an end after 1940. The literary scholar Harald Gaski says that the Norwegianization process went on "until well into the 1960s", Harald Gaski: "Song, Poetry and Images in Writing. Sami Litterature", *Nordlit*, no. 27, 2011, p. 41.

<sup>13</sup> See for instance Berge Furre: *Norsk historie 1905 – 1990. Vårt hundreår*, Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1992, p. 142.

<sup>14</sup> Harry Fett: Finnmarksviddens kunst, John Savio, *Kunst og Kultur*, vol. 26, 1940, p. 232. My translation.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221. My translation.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 221-222. My translation.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 233. My translation.

<sup>18</sup> Reidar Kjellberg's speech is quoted in Hugo Fett, *Dr. Harry Fett, Bibliografi. 1875–1962–1975*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1975, p. 11. My translation.

<sup>19</sup> James Elkins: *Stories of Art*, New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 131–2.

<sup>20</sup> The fact that Fett after the war gives his article the subtitle "A sketch from the time of occupation" supports the idea that the article should be considered in light of its historical

---

context. Harry Fett: "Finnmarksviddens kunst. John Savio. En skisse fra besettelsestiden", *Sámi ællin: Sámi Særvj jakkigir'ji/Sameliv. Samisk Selskaps Årbok, 1951 – 1952*, vol. 1, 1952, pp. 62–82.

<sup>21</sup> Fett: "Finnmarksviddens kunst", p. 246. My translation.

<sup>22</sup> Thomas Berg: "Kunsthistorie i 100", *Klarttekst*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2011, p. 14.

<sup>23</sup> Jorunn Sem Fure: "Heinrich Himmler som humanistisk prosjektleder", *Fortid*, no. 2, 2007, p. 79.

<sup>24</sup> Fett: "Finnmarksviddens kunst", p. 222. My translation.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 223. My translation.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242. My translation.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* My translation.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246. My translation.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 244 – 246. My translation.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246. My translation.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 235. My translation. See also Eli Høydalsnes' thorough discussion of Fett's presentation as grounded in an ethnocentric understanding typical of his time, where "what's far away" – in this case the arctic and sub arctic culture – becomes 'something outdated', i.e. as from the Neolithic era. What is distant in space becomes distant also in time and also the most primitive in the sense that it is perceived as on a lower 'stage of development' [...]." Eli Høydalsnes: *Møte mellom tid og sted. Bilder av Nord-Norge*, Oslo: Bonytt, 2003, p. 57. My translation.

<sup>32</sup> Review of *Kunst og Kultur*, vol. 26, *Aftenposten*, 28.12.1940. My translation.

<sup>33</sup> Kristofer Sinding-Larsen: *Norsk grafikk i det tyvende århundre*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1941.

<sup>34</sup> Knut Berg (ed.): *Norges Kunsthistorie*, volume 1–7, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1981–83; Danbolt: *Norsk kunsthistorie*, 2009. Savio is mentioned in Henning Aalsvik et al.: *Norges billedkunst i det nittende og tyvende århundre*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1951–53; Leif Østby: *Norges Kunsthistorie*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1977; Sidsel Helliesen: *Norsk grafikk gjennom 100 år*, Oslo: Aschehoug, 2000 and Holger Koefoed and Øivind Storm Bjerke: *Tidens øye. En innføring i norsk malerkunst*, Oslo: Stenersen, 2001.

<sup>35</sup> Koefoed/Storm Bjerke: *Tidens øye*, p. 6. My translation.

---

<sup>36</sup> Koefoed/Storm Bjerke: *Tidens øye*, pp. 38-48. My translation.

<sup>37</sup> Fett: "Finnmarksviddens kunst", p. 244. My translation.

<sup>38</sup> Høydalsnes: *Møte mellom tid og sted*, p. 55. My translation.