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Introduction

Between 1789 and 1815 Europe was devastated by a series of intermittent Wars waged by the French. The first part came about through the French Revolution, the second, the Napoleonic Wars, were about Bonaparte’s thirst for conquest. Almost at the end of them, Denmark’s attempted neutrality was to cost her the loss of Norway by cessation to Sweden under the Treaty of Kiel in 1814. The Norwegians felt particularly aggrieved by this, a ploy on the part of the British to disarm the Scandinavians and retain British Naval access to the Baltic. Thus began a half a century of particular national insecurity for Denmark, during which she felt under constant threat from German ambition through an increasingly powerful, predatory Prussia. Schleswig-Holstein was particularly at risk of annexation, because though much of Slesvig was culturally and ethnically Danish, southern Jutland had been strongly infiltrated by German influences unchecked for many decades (Sandiford 1975: 21). With a small population (2,225,000 in 1848) and now detached from those potentially sympathetic in Scandinavia, Denmark would have difficulty effectively opposing any major industrial power. Britain and Germany aside, there was also Russia, still largely undeveloped, but a power with strong Baltic interests. Maintaining Denmark’s borders through this delicately-balanced neutrality was not going to be easy for such a small nation state. Would it be remotely possible to achieve this passively by developing trade? Could enduring borders otherwise be protected by influencing perceptions of Denmark’s historic cultural identity and ethnicity?

The Nordic Cultural Background

All Scandinavians appreciated the importance of raising an international profile for their past. For Denmark, an understanding of her place in Nordic history could strengthen Norwegian and Swedish ties. All three nations had some enthusiasts who supported Scandinavism, a visionary movement intending to re-unite and share their one-time cultural unity (Sandiford 1975: 23). This was a theme J. J. A. Worsaae himself at one time addressed (Worsaae 1849). Fellow-feeling among scientists and scholars aside (Worsaae 1875: xxvii), such a union of nations would serve as prophylactic against the greater powers’ territorial interests. Of course, a unifying past did exist in the potential of Norse and Viking history. And in the early nineteenth century this history was slowly unravelling through archaeological discovery and a growing awareness of the Vikings’ extensive saga literature, then still largely unpublished and mainly in Icelandic or Old Norse dialects (Wawn 2000).

Unfortunately, however, the Vikings still enjoyed a poor image abroad. They were commonly seen as violent pillagers, rapists and land-takers; their very name evoked memories of
aggressive and uncivilised society (Wawn *idem*). This particular image was hardly a good start for promoting any glorious new Danish persona. But political pressures were making more urgent the need for an image makeover. We can now only conjecture how far Danish scholars consciously reflected upon these problems and focused on their potential solutions in 1815 (*cf.* Worsaae 1875: xii). It was not, however, to be long, before some were taking steps to tackle them.

**C. C. Rafn (1795–1868) and the Royal Society of Antiquaries of the North**

Eleven years after the Treaty of Kiel, in 1825, a new historical society was founded in Copenhagen – *Det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskriftselskab (The Royal Society of Antiquaries of the North)*. Its major objective was the re-examination of Viking history through translating and publishing saga literature (Steen Jensen 1975). The Society’s founders, who included C. J. Thomsen (Worsaae 1865a; Jensen 1992), were also concerned with promoting excavation and scholarly archaeological research. Initially, there was a complementary emphasis on Denmark’s need to display the best representative collection of National Antiquities illustrating her own past and for similar exhibitions to be made available at provincial museums, including Kiel, Holstein. The venture was also ethnographic and under a new museum initiative begun in 1843 (Worsaae 1875: xxi) was to leave Copenhagen with one of the best contemporary collections documenting the material culture, *inter alii*, of the North American Indians. So its objectives had a truly international flavour. With this broad-based agenda the Danes hoped to attract enthusiastic Scandophiles to assist in the careful, scholarly re-evaluation of the Nordic past and to invigorate their search for friendly Viking remains at home and abroad.

Carl Christian Rafn, the Society’s first secretary and founding father had an excellent pedigree for the task in hand (Worsaae 1865a). Establishing himself among a group of contemporaries as an Icelandic scholar committed to translating the Saga literature (Rafn 1821–1823; Bricka 1899), he was well-connected with other researchers, particularly the Norwegians in Oslo, then Christiania (Grøndahl 1869). Exacting scholars with sound managerial and financial acumen are few and far between. But with all three attributes, Rafn soon began recruiting patrons internationally to finance the society’s vision (Jensen and Steen Jensen 1987). Within little more than a decade the Society was publishing journals in Danish, English and French: its output would have few peers in the nineteenth century world of learning.

In his comprehensive social history from 1805 to 1975, Kristiansen (1981: 22–25) has shown how the Danes were awakened to archaeology during this period. His analyses of the social standing of the subscribers to local and national museums and societies offer fascinating insights into this awakening process. Central to generating printed material and raising standards of scholarship at home, Rafn operated on a grand scale to broadcast the History of the North abroad. Indeed, here *A Worldwide Danish Cultural Activity* – the subtitle to Jensen and Steen Jensen’s 1987 paper analyzing some of the Society’s correspondence files – most appropriately describes it.

Rafn’s surviving draft letters at the Royal Library demonstrate the flattery and diplomacy he practised in fearless approaches to anyone who caught his eye as a prospective subscriber or donor. Membership and subscription were obtainable at different levels and subscribers could have their names proudly added to the Foundation Members’ list published in the Society’s annual report for 100 rixdollars (11gns c. 1835=£11.11 shillings, perhaps $800–$1000 today (*cf.* Rowley-Conwy 2004)).

Employing this shrewd business formula, Rafn strove to attract a global membership, mainly
from the English-speaking world, by offering Foundation status to those of cultural or political influence he thought most able to pay. Many of his foreign correspondents were gentlemen (and the odd gentlewoman) of old money. Others, probably eager both for learning and social recognition, came from the new liberal merchant or industrialists’ class – the nouveau riche. Not all could afford the fee, and some (particularly scholars) bluntly turned down his approaches. Industrious and exhaustive in these promotions, Rafn regularly importuned membership from any willing Ambassador, Baron, Count, Greve, Knight or Squire, even involving, among others, the King of Siam as a foundation member (Jensen and Steen Jensen 1987: 213).

By 1850 about 2,000 had joined, a significant number having subscribed for life. For many years the invested capital provided all that was needed for perpetual publication. The Saxe-Coburgs and Romanovs were hunted down for patronage upon appropriate terms and printed lists of payments not only emphasised the publication success of the venture, but by trumpeting important patrons’ names, they guaranteed the project’s perpetuity through simple snobbery. By 1858 Rafn had recruited almost forty members of the Royal Houses of Europe, together with the Shah of Persia and Pedro II of Brazil (printed Annual Report appended to Memoires de la Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord 1858; Rowley-Conwy 2004).

Importantly, this membership included many accomplished contemporary scholars who had been selected for their skills who could comment on the translations in hand, write journal articles, and even occasionally donate their works to the Society’s library. Aided by this team of remarkable collaborators, in little more than three decades the titles of sagas translated and published had run into double figures, eventually reaching 62 volumes. A full bibliography

Figure 1. Portrait of Rafn: frontispiece from Worsaae 1875 (Mems Soc. Ants du Nord 1872–1875).
of Rafn’s remarkable output was first published by Grøndahl 1869 (47–55) soon after his death.

From early in his career, production of multilingual archaeological journals continued in parallel with saga translations. Significant among these were the Antiquitates Americanae (1837–1845) and the Antiquités Russes (1850–1852). They presented the scholarship of one of the world’s smallest developed nations to two of its largest. Publishing versions of the Antiquitates in Dutch, English, German, Italian, Polish, Spanish (Portuguese and Russian; Grøndahl 1869: 49) guaranteed a remarkably wide readership (Rafn 1838 a–c; 1839; 1840; 1855 a–d [cf. Grøndahl idem: 52]). Trumpeting that the Antiquitates were influential and globally important could have subconsciously reflected as much the status and ambition of some of the works’ recipient patrons as the excellence of its joint editors’ scholarship. By approaching all nascent educational and religious establishments, landowners and politicians in the New World (many of whom were already society members), Rafn recruited over 100 subscribers for the Antiquitates by combing the entire eastern seaboard of America, including the Caribbean (‘British and American subscribers to the Antiquitates Americanae’: 1–4, RSAN Annual Report, January 1837).

In addition to these enterprises, Rafn made important personal liaisons which might now be seen to have had more overtly political outcomes. One was with Samuel Laing, an outspoken Scotsman who translated the Heimskringla in 1844 (DNB). Laing had at one time lived in Schleswig-Holstein; knew both the peoples and their problems and was unafraid to write in the most direct terms denigrating German governance, as well as, on occasion, Swedish (Short 1969: 2, 179–192; 1972). These attitudes were circulated through two English language ‘travel’ books written around 1850 (Laing 1850; 1852). Whilst not actually mentioning the RSAN or Rafn, Laing strongly recommended the published Antiquitates (1852: 348), and more transparently promoted the Museum of Northern Antiquities which, he declared, was ‘not only instructive to the visitors, but to the governments, or heads of departments which establish and regulate museums in other countries’ (idem: 399).

Another of Rafn’s Scottish correspondents attracted to the Society’s activities was Andrew Hamilton (Short 1969: 210). He gave generously to it during the War of 1848–1849 (Short idem: 212) and wrote supportively of the Danes in their struggle to retain the Elbe Duchies where he clearly saw the Prussians as culpable of unpleasant aggression. Whilst outwardly expressing such sympathies, he was more covertly critical about some manifestations of Danish Nationalism (Short 1969: 212–215 quoting from Hamilton 1852). These expressions of sympathy for their recent conflict appearing in the English language press during the early 1850s would have given welcome succour in Danish political circles. Some must have keenly appreciated the part played by Rafn and his Society.

C. J. Thomsen (1788–1865) and The Three Age System

Nowadays Rafn’s Society is better remembered by most archaeologists for C. J. Thomsen and his legacy of the Three Age System than for publishing Saga literature (Jensen 1992). After being charged with establishing a national collection in 1817, Thomsen established a home for it in Christiansborg Palace in 1832, having already devoted much time to popularising museums and preserving monuments. As the keeper of this Royal, then National Museum, he had conceived a Three Age Classification System probably as early as 1818 (Daniel 1943: 11). But this did not appear in print until 1836 when Rafn saw an opportunity to make it known in the multi-authored Ledetraad til Norsk Oldkyndighed (Guide to Northern (or Nordic) Archaeology; Rafn et al. 1836). Unsurprisingly, the work was laced with references to Icelandic literature and, unfortunately, Thomsen’s style hardly made his contribution an easy read. In
a print-run of 5,000 the *Ledetraad* was circulated to a membership countrywide and worldwide (Steen Jensen 1975: 13), but few abroad could read it. Furthermore, outside Scandinavia the Society’s subscribers tended to be more interested in saga literature than in analyses of museum collections. Translated into German in 1838 (when another 5,000 texts were printed (Steen Jensen 1975: 12)), in Britain it was read by Lord Francis Egerton, First Earl of Ellesmere (*DNB*). A competent German scholar, he partly translated the *Ledetraad*, paid for its printing in Copenhagen in 1848, then had it distributed gratis to a host of learned bodies throughout the English-speaking world. Through meticulous translation of the Danish original, Rowley-Conwy (2004) has demonstrated how the text of the English version was adapted to the local antiquarian market.

**J. J. A. Worsaae (1821–1886)**

Worsaae stepped into this intellectual arena still barely a schoolboy. Born Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae in Vejle in 1821 (Bricka 1905), he soon developed an interest in archaeology and had written a paper on his home town by the time he was twenty (Worsaae 1841). His first post was working voluntarily for C. J. Thomsen on the Royal Collections in Christiansborg, Copenhagen from 1838. Unfortunately they may not have got on particularly well, and it eventually became an embarrassment to both that Thomsen was unable to find him a salaried museum position (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 68-69).

By this time, however, Worsaae had already raised quite a profile by publishing several controversial, if not also authoritative, articles. And in 1843, Rafn’s Society in Copenhagen commissioned him – encouraged by King Christian VIII for his ambitious criticism of contemporary archaeology – to single-handedly produce a second introduction to Danish archaeology. Just the sort of project Worsaae needed, he readily complied. This, his first book, appeared in Danish as *Danmarks Oldtid oplyst ved Oldsager og Gravhøje* later that year, but not in English translation until 1849, when it was entitled *The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark* (translated by William J. Thoms). These texts have also been re-examined by Rowley-Conwy, who has demonstrated (2004) that the English edition departs in a number of respects from the original. Thoms’ text advertised Worsaae’s radical approach to a number of contemporary themes – Runes, inscriptions, bog bodies and ethnography. Critical to his own reputation and developing career, it also rehearsed Thomsen’s *Three Age Classification System*.

Unlike the *Ledetraad*, this was a lively new work, venturing well beyond the descriptive. It invoked the Danish people to examine their past and find in it the seeds of their present state of civilisation; furthermore, Worsaae sought to justify continuing Danish independence through the establishment of a particularly ancient national pedigree. Thus, it seemed archaeology and history were being employed in a transparently nationalistic call to resist foreign domination.

In his invocations, Worsaae also wanted modern Danes to identify strongly with their forbears and to enjoy the harmony between gravemounds and their countryside. This was landscape appreciation (though thankfully not phenomenology!) to help raise a national consciousness for conservation, if not also preservation. Worsaae also intended to provoke curiosity for recognition and discovery. Klindt-Jensen 25 years ago compared Worsaae’s agenda for the new Danish nation to that of the contemporary philosopher educationist Grundtvig, who saw an appreciation of national history as the true road to personal realisation and national improvement through life-long learning, skills development and commerce (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 70–71). Both visions were complementary requirements for resuscitating national confidence.
Translated into German, these Danish nationalist sentiments were soon circulating Europe (Worsaae 1844). It could be argued that they contributed to the far-reaching revolutionary movement then sweeping the continent (Hobsbawm 1962), a movement responsible for widespread political unrest in 1848 and including the first War in Slesvig (1848–1850).

Worsae’s British-Irish Tour of 1846–1847

His reputation growing as a radical archaeologist, Worsae began to travel abroad, initially in Norway and Sweden. Neither rich nor with institutional affiliation or patronage, both then (as now) important requisites for the pursuit of scholarship, he first visited Britain and Ireland in 1846-1847.

It all came about through Rafn’s contacts. Late in 1845, Worsaae had begun making plans to study the Viking remains of Russia and North Norway supported by a bursary from King Christian VIII. Early in 1846, however, the Duke of Sutherland wrote to Rafn, requesting that the Northern Society should send a Dane to look at some of the many early Danish monuments on his extensive estates in Northeast Scotland. So through a slight shift in the geography of his original plan, Worsae was encouraged to make application to the king on February 20th 1846 for a travel bursary to the North of Norway, then on to Scotland. In the event, first Russia, then Norway were forgotten and Worsaae travelled instead to London. Worsae’s written justification to his patron King was the simple need to study lands settled by the Danes (unpubl. correspondence in Royal Archive Copenhagen).

Worsaae quit Denmark at the end of May 1846 speaking little English, but he was soon fluent. In London he was met by the Earl of Ellesmere, who had travelled from his seat at Trentham.
Hall, near Stoke, especially to welcome him. The Earl provided written introductions to a number of useful contacts and generally promoted his interests in the capital and beyond.

Thanks to the Northern Society, Worsaae’s reputation had gone before him and his *Primeval Antiquities* was already known in German translation among those he met in London. At the British Museum he discovered William Thoms (DNB) was already making an English translation. Thoms and Worsaae met in early 1847 to discuss the project. John Parker, the publisher, was keen to fill it with as many woodcuts of the subject matter as was possible, rather than just refer readers to archaeological journals.

Worsaae gives the impression that he was well sought after for lectures in London, boasting that his maiden paper in English to the Society of Antiquaries won him general applause and helped make him the first twenty-five year old Honorary Member. He makes a similar claim about being honoured by Britain’s two new archaeological societies, *The Archaeological Association* and *The Archaeological Institute* then only 5 and 6-years-old. It is difficult to confirm his successes as a speaker, though he certainly contributed to the discussions at some meetings. It seems possible that when writing in old age he confused some of the events of his first visit with one he paid later, in 1852, by which time he was received as a celebrity.

Away from these theatres of scholarship he was taken by the Danish Ambassador Count Frederik (Fritz) Reventlow (Bricka 1900) to meet the Prussian diplomat, Baron C. K. J. von Bunsen (1791–1860). There, he probably heard more than he wanted about their countries’ developing political tensions concerning their borders in south Jutland.

From the scientific circles of the metropolis, he travelled by train to York, then on to Newcastle, en route for Edinburgh, where he encountered ‘a much freer archaeological and historical atmosphere … than in England, where interest in the classical and exotic still prevailed, and the Anglo-Saxons were afforded a cultural and historical importance disproportionate to other early cultures. The patriotic, formerly independent Scots had tried to preserve a past that was quintessentially Scottish. They were not particularly fond of England but were well aware of the Scandinavian connection with Scotland, more especially with the Norse settlements in the northern and western isles’ (Hermansen 1934: 146-147). Here Worsaae found receptive ears for unprejudiced discussion about the importance of Danish-Norse elements in the British Isles, probably identifying to a degree with another small and apparently oppressed nation (Rowley-Conwy forthcoming).

Worsaae returned to Scotland in 1847 after a sojourn in Ireland (Henry 1994). This time he stayed with the Duke of Sutherland himself at Dunrobin Castle in Sutherland. If Rafn had not initially been aware of the Duke’s personal standing and family pedigree when he first agreed to find him a visiting Danish scholar (cf. Hermansen 1938: 134), he would soon become aware of it. And if it could be suggested that Rafn’s plans had been in any way rooted in political or diplomatic intrigue, sending the young Worsaae to the Second Duke of Sutherland’s Scottish estates was probably his best-conceived strategem. This 60-year-old nobleman’s early career had taken him on a political mission from the English Court to Prussia during the Napoleonic conflict. Apparently ‘he saw there a great deal of Queen Louise of Prussia who Thackeray says “Shares with Marie Antoinette in the last age the sad pre-eminence of beauty and misfortune”. It was said that the Duke’s admiration for her beauty, goodness and heroism in ineffectual efforts to save her husband’s kingdom from the clutches of Napoleon lasted as long as life and memory. Apparently, on hearing of her death Sutherland had a long and dangerous illness’ (Leveson-Gower 1947: 32). Some thirty years on, clearly the Duke had long ago recovered by the time of Worsaae’s visit. Indeed, the Sutherlands were having the Rogers or Foster of the day – the architect Charles Barry (DNB) make over their modest medieval
Castle to one of greater size in baronial style. Unfortunately, the family is rather better remembered to history for its contemporarily clearing numerous peasant farmers from their Highland crofts arguably in the better interests of a new land management regime. Besides the building works, Dunrobin was agog with books, dancing and riding. Readily taking to this convivial atmosphere, Worsaae excavated a nearby Iron Age broch for good measure (Hermansen 1938: 307-308).

Here we retrace our steps for a moment. Late in 1846 Worsaae left Edinburgh for Dublin where he had met George Petrie, already well-known to the Northern Antiquaries, though not himself a member. Petrie seems to have been put off joining by Sir William Betham who many in Ireland thought a madman. Through Petrie’s influence at the Royal Irish Academy Worsaae commissioned a young artist, James Plunkett, to delineate on twelve massive double elephant-sized sheets, sketches of all the best antiquities in the Academy’s collection. These he took back to Copenhagen where they remain one of the most important records of the contemporary National Museum of Ireland. Some finds were annotated, making it possible to attempt reprovenancing (Briggs and Sheehan 1987). Viking artifacts were illustrated on them as they then appeared, straight from the railway and building excavations around the Liffey (Briggs 1978). (Since c. 2000 there has been a bespoke website at Cork University devoted to re-provenancing these discoveries). The Royal Irish Academy also gifted a collection of Irish antiquities to the Royal Museum in Copenhagen (Briggs 1999; Eogan 1991). These illustrations and the artefacts are among the most serious gestures of scholarly diplomacy to emerge from nineteenth-century Britain and Ireland. The Danes themselves began this gift-making as early as 1815, when the Royal Irish Academy had received a small ‘collection of Danish antiquities … from the Royal Academy of Antiquaries’ (Mitchell 1985: 107 [note 1]), a predecessor body to the RSAN. Immediate reciprocation with a set of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy probably then triggered off what was to become, by Worsaae’s time, a resounding counterpoint eventually bringing the Royal Northern Society’s publications to the libraries of several venues of learning and to individual scholars in Dublin.

Although in a country where famine was raging and death common in outlying areas, for Worsaae life in Dublin seems to have been one long round of social and antiquarian appointments. Hardly a day passed without dinner in the company of a dignitary, scholar or collector. Visitors’ cards have survived to illuminate a pattern of dining with the Lord Lieutenant and Governor of Ireland, with noblemen and politicians, and also, incidentally, demonstrating that he met young ladies whilst enjoying the company of William Wilde, Oscar’s scholarly but reputedly lecherous father.

Early in November 1846 Worsaae gave the first of two talks at the Academy, on Danish and Irish Antiquities. It was an important lecture, delivered impromptu, interpreting the history and archaeology of early Hiberno-Norse relations and explaining the Danish collections at Christiansborg Museum. Although he dwelt a little on Thomsen’s Three Age System, he particularly stressed the importance of making a collection of truly National Antiquities (Worsaae 1846a). He must have seemed heaven-sent, for several Royal Irish Academicians saw these lectures as a means to lobby the (British) government for funds for bettering scholarship and improving the Irish National Collections. Worsaae took rooms in Trinity College with its Librarian, the Revd James Henthorn Todd – another member of the Northern Society. And with Todd, a sound scholar of Old Irish, he held profitable discussions about how the Irish Annals should be translated, and how that work might best be tailored to fit the Copenhagen Saga publication programme.

Overall, in Ireland, perhaps moreso than in Scotland, Worsaae was acting as advocate for strengthening national identity to a minority oppressed nation with which his own
countrymen felt great sympathy. And they made him most welcome (Worsaae 1846b).

Worsaae’s tour probably exceeded all the Danes’ expectations. In his own words, he had set out on a ‘voyage ... like an archaeological Viking raid which aimed not only to establish Scandinavian influence (or, rather, the Danish system) in the British Isles, but also to disseminate a better understanding of Danish and Norwegian monuments’ (Hermansen 1938: 137, transl. Jung). His lucid advocacy to adopt *The Three Ages* had an immediate effect on Daniel Wilson and the organization of the Edinburgh museum, though changes to English and Irish ‘national collections’ were not so immediately obvious (Rowley-Conwy *forthcoming*). His evangelism to study and encourage the study of everything Viking was also extremely effective, his success underlined by the appearance of his book, first in Danish, then in English: *The Danes and Norsemen in England, Scotland and Ireland* within six years of the trip (Henry 1994; Worsaae 1851; 1852). In it, he was more able to confidently paint his Danish forbears as farmers, traders and skilled artisans; and through this and encouraging the translation of Irish (and perhaps some Scottish) medieval texts, promoted Viking scholarship. Probably quite subconsciously a Viking image closer to the level of contemporary civilised Danes thereby emerged.

**Danish National Security**

It has already been shown that during Rafn’s, Thomsen’s and Worsaae’s lifetimes the most immediate threats to national security came from Prussia in Schleswig-Holstein. There were two main flash-points: in 1848–1850 and 1864. The origins of the problem are extremely complex and cannot be rehearsed in any detail here. Suffice it to say that in 1814, France, England and Russia had guaranteed Slesvig’s union with Denmark, and by mid-century the duchies of Slesvig and Holstein (Holsten) were well-populated and agriculturally prosperous. North Slesvig was ethnically Danish; South Slesvig, of greater ethnic mix, reached as far as the Eider on the West and Kiel (in Holstein) on the East, a southern border enclosing to its north the ancient Danish boundary of 811 A.D., the Danevirke. South and beyond lay Holstein, entirely German-speaking and buffering Jutland from mainland Prussia. Ethnicity and language did not always rationally equate with national identity, some German-speakers having strong Danish sympathies and vice versa. The point is particularly well illustrated cartographically in W. Carr’s *Schleswig-Holstein* (Manchester 1963: reproduced as Language Map of Schleswig, 1849 Map 11 in Sandiford 1975: 22).

In 1848, the immediate source of the troubles had stemmed from nationalist sentiment among the Holsteiners. They wanted Schleswig-Holstein to be united under its own constitution as part of a German alliance. Denmark’s Frederik VI (1808–1839) had refused to permit this and Christian VIII (1839–1848), not an altogether well-focused political leader, was even more hesitant. Upon his death there was a military uprising by German-minded Slesvigers which the Danish government was obliged to address. The conflict continued intermittently for two years. In her defence Denmark ably confounded Prussia by blockading Baltic ports. Strong backing against Berlin employing English and Russian diplomacy proved the most effective deterrent. The Norwegians and Swedes sent a volunteer army of 5000, but although their support was good for Danish morale, these allies never reached the battlefield. The Danes eventually gained a decisive victory at Idsted.

After a further outbreak of hostilities unsuccessful for Holstein in 1849, under the Peace of Berlin in 1850 Slesvig was left to be governed by a Commission consisting of a Dane, a Prussian and an Englishman. The joint administration of Slesvig and Holstein was then abolished.
During the 1850s Denmark’s potential for self-defence grew weaker as Prussia became more aggressive and ambitious. King Frederik VII (1848–1863) inherited an outwardly secure state and was immediately obliged to sign a fresh constitution imposing Danish administration on Slesvig. This was an overconfident move by his government, because Denmark’s defences had been neglected since the earlier incursions, and nobody could have foreseen Bismarck’s aggressive attitude or have apprehended the basic dishonour of the powers supposedly guaranteeing Slesvig’s security under the (admittedly now ageing) Treaty of Kiel (Sandiford 1975).

In consequence, when Frederik VII died on November 7th 1863 the Germans demanded withdrawal of the constitution uniting Slesvig with Denmark. Frederik’s successor, Christian IX inherited this very complex problem and was immediately obliged to sign a fresh constitution imposing Danish administration on Slesvig. The Prussians, who found this unacceptable, were already in a strong position to invade Slesvig from an occupied Holstein. Although they fought bravely, Danish forces were eventually to be overwhelmed, and after difficult negotiations (see below), the whole of Slesvig was annexed through Prussia to Austria in 1864. Schleswig-Holstein was to remain in German hands until 1920.

During the 1848–1864 crisis the most effective and dedicated statesman to involve himself – albeit intermittently – in disentangling the Gordian Knot of the Schleswig-Holstein Question was Lord Palmerston (British Prime Minister 1855–February 1858 and June 1859–1865). It is a commonplace that he is said to have exclaimed: ‘There are only three people who understand Schleswig Holstein: a German historian, now gone mad; Prince Albert, who is dead, and myself, and I remember nothing!’

Torn between the desirability and necessity of keeping peace in Europe; the German influences of the Court in London; the demands of Baltic mercantile interests and British public opinion strongly favouring the Danes, Palmerston seems to have been careful to send out most of the right messages to most of the interested parties. Thus, by 1863–1864 not only Denmark but also the British public expected Britain to intervene diplomatically, if not also to come armed to Denmark’s defence if or when it seemed necessary. Unfortunately, although Palmerston had indicated supportive intentions, in reality he failed to act, and having so failed, namely claimed that those who mediated could not also intervene. On Jutland at that moment, it must have looked as if all Denmark’s allies or guarantors had abandoned her in her hour of greatest need (Sandiford 1975: 105–120).

Archaeology and Schleswig-Holstein

Positive national sentiment was vital at home to raise Danish confidence during these threatening times and, incidentally, to raise living standards. It was also important to develop trade and commerce and in practical terms to upkep the boundaries of so vulnerable a small state. Security would best be guaranteed (if that was ever going to be possible, given the size of the Prussian threat) by maintaining the allies or guarantors of 1815, by winning new allies, and by keeping any threatening nation at bay through gestures of goodwill or cultural alliance.

It has already been explained how, as early as 1843, in Danmarks Oldtid, Worsaae had invoked the Danish people to use their past as a bastion against foreign aggression. Kristiansen has clearly demonstrated the widespread use of the Danish past as an educational tool (1981 passim). During the conflict of 1848–1850 Worsaae published papers in Danish and German on the Danevirke (Worsaae 1848b and c), the earliest Danish (Viking) border against other Germanic peoples, with further essays on Danish identity (1848a) and its national flag
A further essay on ‘so-called prehistoric German migration into Denmark’, alluded to contemporary Prussian predation (Worsaae 1849a) in Slesvig from Holstein.

Around this time Worsaae also seems to have attempted to gain access to the English media through William Thoms, his translator. Writing from London on 19th October 1848, Thoms hoped Worsaae ‘and other good men and true of Denmark’ were ‘assuming [their] peaceful occupations, throwing down the sword and resuming the pew’. Thoms explained how he had sent Worsaae’s ‘last letter to the Athenaeum, but it was so exclusively political they could not use it. [He] then sent it in original to ‘The Times’, but they neither used it nor returned it.’ Thoms expressed regret at its loss, and its message can only now be conjectured (Nat.Mus.Denmark, 2nd Dept archive III.84 Thoms-Worsaae correspondence).

Worsaae was not alone in drawing attention to the heritage of south Jutland, and in the year after the first Danish defence was mounted, the Northern Antiquaries published an article on the medieval diocese of Slesvig as shown by its boundaries clearly depicted on an ancient map (Jensen 1849).

---

**Figure 3.** Denmark and the Elbe Duchies (note Danish version of places north of the Eider). Reprinted from Toyné *The Scandinavians in History*, and from Sandiford 1975, Map I, by permission of Edward Arnold Ltd.
When later appraising Worsaae’s life, Sophus Müller described these published tracts as part-scientific, part-political, in a style which came naturally from a devoted national archaeologist and a lively patriot (Müller 1885: 178–179). Outside Denmark this patriotism was not always quite so well received. One anonymous critic reviewing Thoms’s 1849 translation of the *Primeval Antiquities of Denmark* for the Gentleman’s Magazine (January–June) in 1850, didn’t mince his words when writing (p. 264): ‘We certainly have wished that its author had taken the subject from a higher point of view, and that he had not introduced the sort of national feeling which led him to look at it “from the Danish side” instead of approaching it with the impartial judgment and the clear perception of a man of science, which he is so well capable of employing’.

Notwithstanding perceptions of his committed nationalism abroad, during his career at home such contributions, combined with Worsaae’s flamboyant political style, probably resulted in the approach he had in 1848 through ‘the Icelander Grimur Thomsen with a secret offer of having ... [his] ... debts paid together with a considerable honorarium from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Count Knuth’. The offer had but one proviso: he must ‘continue to write articles about the division of Slesvig’. Disdainfully, Worsaae turned it down (Hermansen 1934: 116–118; transl. Jung).

Could Worsaae’s account of this offer be an indication that Denmark had consciously adopted a policy of employing historians to promote feelings of national unity and heritage, and to help justify territorial boundaries? And if she had, what was wrong with that? It was an old tactic still applied worldwide to a variety of effects. And why not Worsaae, whose archaeological pedigree was beyond reproach and particularly since he had already shown himself capable of stirring the Danish national spirit?

Worsaae afterwards really only re-focused on the archaeology of southern Jutland when it had been annexed as a Prusso-Austrian dependency in the war of 1864, writing first in Danish (Worsaae 1864; 1865b), then contributing similar material in English to the Archaeological Journal (Worsaae 1866). By then, the Royal Archaeological Institute already knew what was going on in Jutland, as in 1864 they heard how the Prussians had ordered Conrad Engelhardt, director of the Flensborg Museum ‘to deliver up the museum so that the collection ... might be sent to Berlin as Old German Antiquities’. Gladstone was present at the Institute’s meeting when this matter was raised (Archaeol. Jnl 1864: 93; quoted in Ebbatson 1999: 151) and after such open complaint abroad, it seems significant that under their Treaty of Peace signed with the Austrians and Prussians on October 30th that year, Denmark was to retain ‘the antiquities and works of art in the museum at Flensborg’ (The Times November 5th 1864).

Ebbatson has drawn attention to the way ‘certain German scholars [were] engaged in a fierce and apparently unscrupulous attack upon their Danish colleagues, suggesting that the Danes were withholding and tampering with the evidence regarding the early occupations of Schleswig’. It is clear that Worsaae robustly rebutted such accusations, arguing the pointlessness of attempting ‘a scientific discussion with authors who are ... blinded by national fanaticism’ (Worsaae 1866: 105–106, fn 6).

Upon reflection, it is possible to see Danish cultural influence and historical propaganda being pursued at three levels during this period. First, through the promotion of Slesvig’s history at home and abroad (though particularly at home), emphasizing its longevity as an integral part of Denmark; secondly, by raising Denmark’s profile as a civilised nation abroad through more indirect, long-term programmes of cultural activity like the Royal Society of Antiquaries of the North’s publications, and thirdly, by covertly seeking sympathy for Denmark’s cause by lobbying the influential abroad.
Political Lobbying

There can be no doubt of the copious evidence for a Danish educational programme on Slesvig’s history during this period, and of the RSAN’s great industry in exporting Viking culture. But is anything known of more direct lobbying for Danish territorial interests demonstrably undertaken as a result of Rafn and Worsaae’s archaeological networking?

Events of the period 1850–1863 have already been rehearsed briefly. From mid-May 1860, Prussia was again threatening Denmark. Apparently insoluble, the political situation deteriorated over four years. On January 16th 1864 Austria and Prussia sent an ultimatum to Denmark on Schleswig. A German army then invaded Slesvig, capturing the Danevirke on February 6th. At this point Denmark appealed directly to Britain and the other neutral powers for material aid (Sandiford 1975: 98). The Austrian and Prussian army languished doing serious mischief in Slesvig until April 18th, when they achieved victory over the Danes in the battle of Duppel. One week later a long-winded peace conference began in London and an armistice was declared on May 12th. But the conference staggered on vainly for months attempting to restore at least some of the status quo and by the time it ended that Autumn, Denmark had lost Schleswig-Holstein.

As these events unfolded, Rafn was spurred on to seek support from among those he had enlisted into the Society through correspondence and personal contact. Some, Worsaae had ‘serviced’ during trips to Britain and Ireland over 1846–1847 and in 1852; in France (particularly Brittany) and Germany, as well as in Norway and Sweden at different times. Thomsen and Rafn had both travelled similarly, so the ground abroad was well laid. Rafn himself had never fought shy of appealing to foreigners for help, so why not approach those with sufficient clout in government to influence Britain’s policies in Denmark’s favour during this hour of need?

With the growing inevitability of a second major and decisive outbreak of hostilities, in April 1863 Rafn apprehensively contacted Augustus Paget, an accomplished diplomat who fulfilled the ambassadorial role for Britain in Copenhagen from 1859 to 1866. As 1863 closed Paget would see the accession of Christian IX, then go on to play a leading part as the problem of southern Jutland unfolded during 1864 (DNB). Addressing the question of Slesvig, Rafn told Paget how ‘The inscriptions on the ... [Runic Stones] afford incontrovertible evidence that Danish was spoken in the olden time in Slesvig to the northwest border of this Danish province, near this Danish Duchy ... [and he also enclosed for Paget] ... a volume of ... Annals for Northern Archaeology which treats exclusively of the state of things in Slesvig in the olden times.’(Rafn–Paget, 28 iv 1863 [Royal Archive, Copenhagen]).

Rafn’s watchfulness and fears of an impending political catastrophe the following year were also expressed in a letter to Andrew Symington, a recently-recruited Icelandic scholar, in Glasgow. This was less a serious diplomatic request for diplomacy or armed intervention and more a crie de coeur for sympathy and news of public opinion. On March 4th he wrote:

Matters are wearing a very doubtful appearance with us in these times, and the entire population is straining every nerve to lighten and soften the great hardships of our warriors and to take charge of those they leave behind.

The zeal with which our soldiers braving all dangers encounter the threefold superior power is worthy of all admiration, but we are very hard put to it; may a gracious Providence grant us a happy issue out of all our troubles!

I observe from the Times that on the 20th ultimo the Marquess of Clanricarde has called upon his countrymen for contributions to the Danish soldiers. He denigrates the attempt of the Germans to rob a part of the Danish monarchy [through] one of the most lawless
acts of violence, which is perpetuated since the partition of the Kingdom of Polen [Poland].

I see that at Lausanne in Switzerland has been issued a similar appeal, also at St. Petersburg and many other places, adding all this together something beneficial may be done.

I suppose the appeal of the Marquess of Clanricarde will be repeated in the Scotch newspapers. Denmark can no doubt in Scotland and in the islands northward number many friends and some who with active friendship will embrace its cause (Grøndahl 1869: 292).

As already noted, no foreign assistance ever materialized. So, unsurprisingly, as realization of that fact slowly dawned and hopes for a satisfactory settlement slipped away, four days after the invasion Rafn wrote a much more detailed request to Joseph Mayer, the Liverpool antiquary, philanthropist and owner of one of the largest collections in Europe. His letter accompanied another, more formal in its content, of the sort normally sent out with the Society’s publications.

Mayer’s reputation was nearing its peak in 1864 (DNB; Gibson and Wright 1988) and as a Fellow of the Northern Society he was obviously considered to be one of Rafn’s most influential English correspondents. Sadly, although a cultural visionary, Mayer was not a parliamentarian. Neither had he any obvious religious or local political power base. Furthermore, he might well have been influenced at that time by the prevailing climate in the North of England, where public opinion was ‘solidly for peace’ (Sandiford 1975: 98). Circumstances probably conspired to impress upon Mayer his relative impotence in an extremely complex political field where he was hardly competent to act upon a letter about national security, and there is no record of his reaction to it. Notwithstanding these caveats, it is significant that Rafn was not only driven to write in the first place, but also that he felt it worth chancing the remotest possibility that his request might evoke some positive response.

Four days after the Danes’ defeat at Duppel, Rafn pleaded:

Dear Sir,

Our political state of things is at present exceedingly complicated. The invasion of the German great powers has doubtless for its view the dismembering of the Danish monarchy and not the protecting of the German nationality, which has in no wise been aggrieved. Fanatical propagandists have for many years endeavoured to banish from Slesvig the Danish language, which in ancient times was spoken all over that country and is yet done so by more than half of the inhabitants.

The true state of things has in the course of time been duly laid before the public, latterly also in a book published in London entitled “Denmark and Germany since 1815, by Charles A Gosch”.

The German Government-commissaries use here the same proceeding as in Posen [Poznan], Hungary and Venetia. They expel the Danish functionaries, instal in their places German fanatics, and have ordered that in the Danish country Slesvig the language for government and public business henceforth is to be German, nay, they have even enjoined the editor of the “Flensburg Zeitung” to admit news from Copenhagen under the column “From Abroad”, which in the most unmistakable manner shows what their object is.

[p. 2] The German newspaper writers give erroneous views about the state of things. – Even the German population in South Slesvig desires by no means to be separated from Denmark and that a similar feeling is predominant in Holstein I thoroughly learnt during my stay there last summer for an entire month. The people lived happily and were thriving under the Danish Government and had perfect reliance, that the Danish King embraced his German subjects with equal love as his Danish.

From the Scaw to the Elbe and from the island of Sylt to Bornholm, – as he expressed himself in one of our meetings – he [Frederik VII] evinced the same love and care for our
remains of former times.

Our new King [Christian IX] has also a great interest for our ancient memorials. He is a South Slesvigian by birth, and by his Danish deposition gains gradually the love of all Danes. Quite as his predecessor does he entertain the same feeling of love towards his German as towards his Danish subjects.

But alas, these are hard times, very hard for our beloved King and his amiable family as also for all of us, and not the less for the loyal but partly inveighed and misled population of Slesvig and Holstein.

A separate Slesvig-Holstein will satisfy nobody, but we will all do our utmost to re-establish the good feeling which existed between the Germans and the Danes thirty years ago, when even in South Germany a separate Society was flourishing, namely “Gesellschaft der Danenfreunde an der Donau”.

The King of Denmark reigned then as absolute monarch and the Meeting of the German Bund at Frankfurt did not occupy itself with the internal affairs of this kingdom. Now Denmark has free institutions, and we are willing to invest our brethren in Holstein and Lauenburg with the same rights that we possess.

The nationality ought not to be any obstacle. All that is good and great in the German nationality is being felt far easier and a wider circle by having this distributed in different states, in France and Russia, in the British Empire and in the United States of America. In the Danish state it has been powerful enough to maintain its signification, and there can surely be no fear that the right of equity and equality will suffer.

I remain,
Dear Sir, yours very truly,
C. C. Rafn, Secretary
Joseph Mayer Esq.,
FSA, FRSNA &c &c RSNA

It is unclear whether or not Rafn discretely targeted others he considered of influence. Prince Albert, on whom membership had been carefully bestowed in 1852, had died in 1861 in the same year as the Duke of Sutherland. And he had been particularly knowledgeable about the workings of an earlier European political structure. Rafn well knew of the Prince Consort’s death, and the Scottish peer’s passing would not have escaped his notice. It will be recalled that the Duke’s brother, Lord Francis Egerton, First Earl of Ellesmere, had at one time also been a particular friend to the Northern Antiquaries, having welcomed Worsaae to London in 1846 and translated and financed an English printing of the Ledetraad in 1848.

So in 1864 Rafn naturally turned to him as a potentially effective political friend abroad. At this point, after nearly forty years in office, Rafn’s age was beginning to tell: perhaps a failing memory and certainly his communication network were now weakening. The first Earl had in fact died in 1857. This left his son to offer the only written sympathy the Danes might have expected from that quarter. Given the sheer complexity of the issues affecting British public and political opinion at the time (Sandiford 1975 passim), the younger Ellesmere’s response was the very quintessence of diplomacy, particularly considering it was written in early June during the abortive London negotiations:

I believe the feeling of the great majority of the people of this country is strongly in favour of Denmark, but I doubt whether that feeling is sufficiently pronounced in departing from the course of neutrality which appears to be the idea which now governs our statesmen. Whether that course may be justified too far is another question.

The Second Earl of Ellesmere was therefore able to convey to Rafn what negligible help Denmark could expect. But that he replied at all in no small way reflected Rafn’s efforts to put a clear image of Danish historic culture on the maps of contemporary Europe. There can be no doubt that whether or not the Society had been begun with any intentional diplomatic
strategem, Rafn and Worsaae’s promotions of Denmark’s interests abroad went a considerable distance beyond the scholarly and cultural. Whilst recognizing the impossibility of Denmark’s position among the West’s self-interested powers, the archaeologists’ Herculean efforts in indirect diplomacy probably enjoyed some degree of unquantifiable success.

Worsaae as Diplomat

Hermansen (1934: 16–18; transl. A. Jung) transcribed and printed Worsaae’s own memoir explaining his ‘projected participation in political and diplomatic affairs’, from which the following account derives. After he had been approached tempting him to write on Slesvig in 1848, Worsaae was subjected to further bureaucratic intrigue to get him more formally involved in political representation of the state. He seems to have been alternately attracted and repulsed by them. Over 1848–1849 he was asked by Danckwarth, director of the Department for Foreign Affairs, to take up a diplomatic career. It came to nothing when Count Moltke’s son was appointed instead.

In early summer 1857, a fresh offer was made through Krieger of an appointment as secretary of the legation in London, again under Moltke. He had for long been minister in Paris, but was recalled probably because he had been disrespectful to the Minister for Travel, Mr O. Lehmann. Moltke’s London appointment failed and Worsaae in any case turned down the job. According to Worsaae, he had been intended as the actual manager of affairs because the establishment didn’t think much of Moltke. A further piece of high-level diplomacy was the visit to Paris he planned in 1861 with the intention of presenting Emperor Napoleon II a gift of antiquities from King Frederik VII. Unfortunately, this was prevented by Countess Danner.

According to Worsaae’s memoir, during Heltzen’s ‘government’ (the status of the word in this context is unclear) he was next offered an appointment as theatrical manager as a step to entering the Cabinet as Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction. This he also declined, though eventually, in 1874, the King insisted he accept, only for Worsaae to lose it the following year when there was a change of administration.

Finally, Worsaae was in demand when the Emperor of Brazil visited Copenhagen in 1876, this time as a companion. Here again, there was the usual intrigue among government officials before it became possible to properly define his part in the event. In general, Worsaae’s memoirs give the impression that his experience of governmental or courtly representation and diplomacy was riven with the sort of pettiness that go with the job. He was right in his recognition that noble birth and fortune still brought (or bought) privilege as generally-speaking this was the case until the middle of the twentieth century.

It is possible that Worsaae’s distinction between enjoyment of archaeological diplomacy and the problems he saw in governmental statesmanship came through a sense of social inadequacy. This might explain the volt face at the end of his career when he boasted lifelong eschewal of diplomatic position and political honour (Hermansen 1934: 16), though that is not an entirely satisfactory explanation. Another possibility is that he developed a pragmatic approach to involvement with politicians for personal survival, in full appreciation that Denmark’s boundary problems were near-insoluble and in recognition that politicians were a fickle breed.

Conclusion

Historians rarely expect contemporary visionaries’ obituaries to penetrate what later becomes
historical hindsight. Thus the eulogies of Benedict Grøndahl (1869: 1–55) and J. J. A. Worsaae (1865a) on Rafn are encomiastic about their subjects’ intellectual insights but at that remove in time were unlikely to attempt, and would have been ill-equipped and unwise to essay, analyses of their contributions to political life.

The 1970s and 1980s saw a slow awakening of interest (pioneered by Joergen Steen Jensen) usefully aimed at documenting the achievements of the RSAN, and, more incidentally, of elevating Rafn’s reputation to his rightful place as its visionary founding father. And because Danish archaeology’s earlier spokesmen about its history tended to be prehistorians, by and large those who did examine nineteenth-century Scandinavia tended to focus on the development and dissemination of the Three Age System and the importance of museums of national antiquities. Thus it is unfortunate that in relatively recent times Rafn’s achievements were summarily dismissed by describing him simply as ‘a devotee of the literary antiquarianism which [C. J.] Thomsen had rejected and a prey to various fanciful ideas’ (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 57–58). Consequently, Rafn’s nuclear role in the promotion and politicisation of Danish archaeology from 1825 to 1865 has remained neglected (cf. Randsborg 2000: 216–218).

Although now many of the saga translations Rafn was involved in translating have been superseded by more exacting editions, that he ably employed their publication and distribution to enhance Denmark’s political standing cannot be in doubt (cf. Worsaae 1875: xxvi–xxvii). It remains unclear, nonetheless, how far this happened as a well-planned or conscious stratagem. With or without Ministerial knowledge he doggedly pursued his quiet diplomacy towards achieving what was to become a diplomatic version of the RSAN’s ‘world-wide cultural plan’. Whatever his political standing, being a perfectionist Rafn was probably not an easy collaborator, though his remarkable driven intellect offered many attributes for Worsaae and other young scholars to emulate.

By way of contrast, in his day and since, Worsaae, an outwardly more attractive figure than Rafn, quite soon became universally accepted as effective archaeologist and museologist (Müller 1886). If he had not understood it earlier, certainly from that moment in 1846 when he met Reventlow and Bunsen in London, he must have rapidly appreciated the vulnerability of his homeland. Given these political sensibilities, Worsaae’s first visit to Britain might now be seen as much as a diplomatic mission as an advert for the Three Age System or for Viking scholarship. Its vital driving and enabling force was Rafn and the RSAN.

The publication of Worsaae’s promotional archaeology on Slesvig-Holstein during the first War (1848–1850) probably inhibited production of his own saga so skilfully presenting the first critical analysis of Viking Britain and Ireland. But throwing in his lot with the nation’s historical propaganda must have had a very positive impact upon the nation’s morale. More indirectly, his apparent successes in nationalist scholarship may also have been contributory to the way politicians reacted to national security, particularly in relaxing their grip on maritime power during the 1850s.

By the second conflict with Prussia in 1864, Worsaae’s contributions seem to have become more pragmatic than diplomatic. Rafn certainly contacted British antiquaries to protest about the invasion, but unfortunately once the Prussians had occupied Holstein it was already too late for intellectual combat to advantage the outcome.

The Danes’ initiatives had in fact established their enduring multilingual presence in the world’s scholarly literature well before 1864. And that international standing was to be maintained without change long after Schleswig-Holstein’s annexation. With contributory
scholarship and considerable long-term investment pledged (some of it ironically from within the German-speaking world), the Society could continue reporting independently on a wide range of topics about Jutland’s past, from the prehistoric, through Viking studies to medieval settlement and trade, right down to the present day.

Contemporary records demonstrate that Worsaae certainly possessed statesman-like qualities. Thus he was encouraged to develop and employ convincing presentational skills as a burgeoning intellectual force at home and abroad. His overseas contacts stood Denmark in good stead and only political strife outside the world of learning overtook his archaeological purpose. Given this visible success, it is unclear why he never accepted full political or diplomatic office. Whereas he wrote stirringly about national identity and enjoyed considerable privilege in political circles, his memoirs indicate that he felt uneasy or unambitious for preferment in that world. In fact he was most at ease as an archaeologist, fieldworker, collector, scholar or discussant. But national security was an enduring and threatening issue, and through their calling as scholars he, Rafn and the Saga translators, all, consciously or otherwise, carried the flag of Danish culture high above their steady flow of publications. Interestingly, Randersborg asserts (2000: 217) that in the nineteenth century ‘chauvinist Continental nationalism is difficult to detect in Denmark – until 1864, indeed even today, a multi-nation kingdom – at least in academic circles’. Unfortunately, it can be seen that by the 1850s some British scholars were detecting narrowly nationalistic traits even in Worsaae’s writings.

Indubitably the RSAN’s publications for foreign readers informed a better understanding of Denmark’s past, its resilience and its development within a rapidly changing industrial Europe. So the Society not only stimulated a sense of national identity at home: in spite of some misgivings about the nationalism provoked by Denmark’s political insecurity, its published work increasingly commanded respect for her abroad. Thus, much present-day Danish historical and archaeological enquiry was founded on balanced and systematic scholarship with deep roots in dignified enquiry undertaken against a background of political aggression and instability.

Finally, although it is impossible to demonstrate the precise degree to which Denmark’s standing was affected by this antiquarian scholarship, it seems reasonable to propose that at least some of the Allies supporting her eventual repatriation with North Slesvig in 1920 had been influenced by consistent promotion of her cultural activity in archaeology and history for almost a century. That such a strong grounding in exemplary passive, if not actually pacifist, intellectualism, was a significant contributory factor in attaining partial reunification, and further, helped maintain Denmark’s stability throughout much of the twentieth century, seems beyond dispute.
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Notes
1. Sir William Wilde addressed the Director of the Copenhagen Museum on 31st June 1859 to ask ‘under what circumstances this donation was presented ... by the Royal Committee of Antiquities at Copenhagen ... and whether any memorial thereof can be found in the archives of your museum?’ (Nat.Mus.Denmark 2nd Dept Archive Kasse IV, 142).
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*Liverpool Record Office MS 920 MAY:*

Joseph Mayer letters. Organised alphabetically in six boxes, with a handwritten calendar identifying most, though not all, writers.
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*National Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark:*

Several departments keep archive material (Steen Jensen 1996), three of them relevant to the present study. These include The Department of Coins and Medals and The First Department (Prehistory). There are 7 boxes in the Second (Medieval) Department, 2 of Thomsen’s correspondence, the rest Worsaae’s. Two or three more boxes appear not to contain material relating to Britain and Ireland. The correspondent in both sets were indexed by museum staff after 1975.

Several other boxes include miscellanea, mainly family letters and personal papers on which Hermansen’s study (1934 & 1938) was based. This was presented to the Museum by Worsaae’s daughter. The boxes are organised in three categories: Thomsen-Worsaae, Worsaae-Thomsen and Worsaae-family and friends. Further Hermansen collections are to be found in the Royal Archive but none of these were consulted.
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The listing of RSAN correspondence from Rafn’s time is explained briefly by Jensen and Steen Jensen (1987: 219). C. C. Rafn’s drafts and incoming letters are referenced 1599 2°. This comprises two basic categories: Danish and foreign. Great Britain and Ireland are catalogued ‘2f’ among the latter. The correspondents are arranged alphabetically.