

Nordic Responses

Nordic Responses

Translation, History, Literary Culture

Edited by

Jakob Lothe, Ástráður Eysteinnsson and Mats Jansson



NOVUS PRESS
OSLO – 2014

© Novus forlag AS

Cover:

Cover illustration: Anna Jóa: Jökull IV (Gracier IV), 1998, oil on canvas, 50 x 55 cm.

ISBN: 978-82-7099-xxx-x

Printed by Interface Media AS, Oslo. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Novus forlag (Novus Press).

Contents

Acknowledgments	7
Introduction	9
Jón Karl Helgason Translation and Canonization: On Posthumous Writings of Hans Christian Andersen and Jónas Hallgrímsson	23
Hólmfríður Garðarsdóttir Translating a Continent: (Re)Creating Latin American Cultures and Images	35
Ástráður Eysteinnsson Icelandic Versions of Hemingway	51
Martin Ringmar The Vicissitudes of (After-)Life: <i>Salka Valka</i> in the Nordic Translation System 1934–2008	69
Turið Sigurðardóttir The Role of Translation in a Minor Literary Language	89
H.K. Riikonen Translating into Swedish in Finland	99
Janna Kantola Scandinavians in <i>The Cantos</i> : A Nordic Reading of Ezra Pound's Crosscultural Poetics	119

6 CONTENTS

Mats Jansson

Cultural (Un)translatability: *The Waste Land* in a
Swedish Context 137

Bjørn Tysdahl

Melodrama? Literary Scholars and Translators on Lines 215–56
in T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* 155

Steen Klitgård Povlsen

What Is Bureaucracy? On the two Danish Translations
of Franz Kafka's *The Castle* 167

Ole Karlsen

Jan Erik Vold's Translations of American Poetry 177

Christian Janss, Julie Kleiva and Jakob Lothe

Olav H. Hauge's Translations of three Poems by Georg Trakl,
René Char and Stephen Crane 197

Contributors 235

Index 239

*Translation and Canonization:
Posthumous Writings by Hans Christian
Andersen and Jónas Hallgrímsson*¹

Jón Karl Helgason
University of Iceland

In early April 1906, four fairy tales by the Danish writer Hans Christian Andersen (1805–1875) were published in Iceland in a modest book titled *Úr dularheimum* (From Mystic Worlds). Three of these tales were translated by Andersen's contemporary, the Icelandic poet Jónas Hallgrímsson (1807–1845), and one was co-translated by Hallgrímsson and his colleague of former times Snorri Sturluson (1178–1241). A Danish original of one of these translations, entitled “Det er det samme” (“It is the same”), was also included in the volume, along with one tale by Hallgrímsson himself. Some of these texts had been read at a public gathering in Reykjavík a few days earlier,² but they had not been published in any language before and are generally not regarded as part of the corpus of either Andersen or Hallgrímsson.

“Det er det samme” is illustrative of all the texts in *Úr dularheimum*. Like some of Andersen's certified fairy tales, the main story is embedded within a simple narrative frame involving an older woman, who secretly believes in spiritual matters, and her granddaughter. At the request of the girl, the grandmother tells her a fable about a king who became very fond of pearls and started to collect them for his crown. He was quite successful but there was always one final pearl missing. An old man, who visited the court, noticed this and proclaimed that the pearl in question was the “Pearl of Truth”, submerged on the bottom of the “Ocean of Affection”.³ The king would have to dive for it himself to make his crown truly shine.

But as that was beyond his royal capacity, the king was condemned to use an ugly substitute. The story concludes with the grandmother putting on her glasses and spelling out the moral: “Yes, it is exactly the same with matters of spirituality’, she said to herself.”⁴

These final words expose the fundamental function of “Det er det samme” and all the other tales published in the same volume. As clearly stated on the title page, these texts were products of involuntary writing by Guðmundur Jónsson, a seventeen-year-old high-school student affiliated with Tilraunafélagið (The Experimental League). Devoted to psychic research and spiritual matters, this newly established society was steered by some very influential members of the Reykjavík intelligentsia, including the reverent Haraldur Nielsson and newspaper editors Björn Jónsson and Einar Hjörleifsson, the latter of whom was also a well known novelist.⁵ The high-school student later moved abroad and pursued a career as a serious playwright and novelist in Denmark and elsewhere under the name of Guðmundur Kamban.

It is possible to address these literary texts in several ways. For people who do not believe in psychic experiences, it may seem natural to treat *Úrdularheimum* simply as a literary fraud designed to reinforce the cause of Tilraunafélagið, which had been facing a serious crisis in the weeks prior to the publication of the volume. Members of the society had been claiming that a farmer who had been suffering from terminal cancer, one Jón Jónsson from Stóridalur in the district of Húnavatnssýsla, had been successfully treated by doctors from the spirit world.⁶ The drawback came on the morning of March 16 when Jón Jónsson sadly passed away. While the newspapers of Björn Jónsson and Einar Hjörleifsson, *Ísafold* and *Fjal-lkonan*, claimed that the patient’s death had been caused by a sudden cold, rather than the cancer,⁷ some of the other newspapers and weeklies in Reykjavík used the opportunity to condemn the two editors and other members of Tilraunafélagið for being either naive or stupid.⁸ It was under these circumstances that H.C. Andersen and Jónas Hallgrímsson started to write through young Guðmundur Jónsson, who within a few days (re)produced not only the five tales already mentioned but also a psalm that was sung at Jón Jónson’s funeral and a short fable that was supposed to prove that the farmer’s death in no way invalidated the pur-

suit of psychic research. Both texts were published in Einar Hjörleifsson's *Fjallkonan* with the initials H.C. A. and J. H. below.⁹ This context was later evoked in some of the negative book reviews on *Úr dularheimum*. In particular, literary scholar Björn M. Olsen wrote two sarcastic articles pointing out that the translation of Andersen done in collaboration by the kindred spirits of Jónas Hallgrímsson and Snorri Sturluson represented a very poor imitation of the mediaeval saga style.¹⁰

Another option is to read *Úr dularheimum* simply as Guðmundur Jónsson's (alias Guðmundur Kamban's) first book of fiction. In her 1970 monograph on Kamban's early works, Helga Kress devotes a whole chapter to the volume, cautiously assuming that these texts were indeed products of involuntary writing but originating in the sub-conscious of the young writer. From her brief descriptions of each of the five fairy tales – her favourite is the one attributed to Jónas Hallgrímsson – it emerges that Kress generally finds the literary quality of these texts wanting. But she also points out that most of the negative articles written about these texts and Tilraunafélagið in general were published in newspapers supporting Heimastjórnarflokkurinn (The Home Rule Party), a leading group in Icelandic politics at the time, while the newspapers edited by Einar Hjörleifsson and Björn Jónsson, which were traditionally the platform of the opposition, published the more encouraging reviews.¹¹

The third possible approach to this publication is to contextualize it within the history of spiritualism in Iceland, which really only set off in the summer of 1904 when a young and aspiring Danish writer, Thit Jensen (younger sister of the renowned novelist Johannes V. Jensen), visited the country. As detailed in a study by Bjarni Guðmarsson and Páll Ásgeir Ásgeirsson, Jensen's parents had been quite prominent in psychic research in Denmark and hence the daughter was able to teach Einar Hjörleifsson and some other members of Tilraunafélagið how to form a spiritual circle.¹² Early on, experiments in involuntary writing took place but a turning point for this endeavour was the discovery of the psychic powers of a young man by the name of Indriði Indriðason, who played a major role in the work of Tilraunafélagið. His main assistant in the world of the dead was the linguist Konráð Gíslason (1808–1891), a close friend and associate of Jónas Hallgrímsson. Like Helga Kress and theologian

Pétur Pétursson, who has written on Icelandic spiritual movements from a sociological point of view, Guðmarsson and Ásgeirsson emphasize how the leading members of Tilraunafélagið also formed a special group in the chief political debate of this decade about how Iceland's political position within the Danish kingdom should or could develop.¹³

In the context of translation studies, however, it is most fitting to approach the texts in *Úr dularheimum*, in particular the tale “Det er det samme”, as a curious case of *rewriting*, which André Lefevere has defined as “the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work”.¹⁴ As exemplified with the short excerpts below, the volume contains both an original and translated version of the texts that can be compared and assessed.

En Dag kom en gammel Mand til Kongen og spurgte, om han maatte se hans dejlige Perlekrone. Han havde hørt det var en stormærkelig Krone; – hver Perle skinnede som Solen, naar den stiger op om Morgen i det lyseklare Sommervej. Og han fik Lov til at se paa Kronen.

– “Men hvad er dog dette! Der mangler jo en Perle” og han pegede med Fingren paa den Plet, hvor Perlen manglede.

“Jeg har for Resten en Perle”, sa Kongen, “men den er ikke saa smuk som de andre”.¹⁵

Einu sinni kom gamall maður heim í kóngsgarð, og bað um leyfi til að líta á fallegu kórónuna kóngsins. Hann hafði heyrt, það væri mesti dýrgripur, þessi kóróna; – hver einasta perla væri eins björt og sólin á heiðríkasta sumarmorgni. – Og svo bauð kóngurinn honum að skoða kórónuna.

– “En, – hvað’ ósköp! Það vantar þarna eina perluna!” Og svo benti hann á blettinn, þar sem perluna vantaði.

– “Ég á nú annars eina perlu eftir”, sagði kóngurinn, “en það er bara eitt að: hún er svo ljót”.¹⁶

As already mentioned, a few of the contemporary critics of *Úr dularheimum* addressed the odd linguistic aspects of the volume. I. E.

Fugl, a Danish pharmacist living in Reykjavík, wrote for instance a short article declaring that the original text of “Det er det samme” contained words and sentence structures that did not belong to the Danish language. Either Andersen had not written the text or he had forgotten his native language after he died. Fisk did not cite any examples to support his claim but said that he felt it was his duty “to dissolve this ridiculous and damaging superstition”.¹⁷ In two articles published in *Ísafold*, which Björn Jónsson edited, someone writing under the pseudonym Turdus responded to this criticism, as well as to the criticism of Björn M. Ólsen. Turdus pointed out that the Icelandic translation of “Det er det samme” had all the characteristics that Hallgrímsson was known for as a translator.¹⁸ This point, also accentuated in the positive review in *Fjallkonan*,¹⁹ is worth elaborating upon.

Incidentally, the earliest Icelandic translation of a text by H.C. Andersen, the fairy tale “Kjærestefolkene” [The Sweethearts], was produced by Hallgrímsson sometime between 1843, when the story first appeared in Danish, and 1845, when the Icelandic poet died. The translation was published two years later in the journal *Fjölnir*. The tale, describing a whipping top that is wooing a small ball that lies next to it in a toy box, is also known under the title “Toppen og bolden” (The Top and Ball). As indicated by the Icelandic title, “Leggur og skel” (Shankbone and Seashell), Hallgrímsson’s translation is an adaptation of the original, taking into account that his implied Icelandic (chiefly rural) readership had not been exposed to the same kind of toys as Andersen’s Danish readers. Furthermore, Hallgrímsson inserted a new episode into the tale involving an ancient strap-ring and made various other minor changes. The Danish text opens for instance with the words: “A whipping-top and a [...] ball lay together in a box, among other toys”,²⁰ while the opening words of the Icelandic translation follow a traditional folk-tale formula: “Once upon a time, a sheep’s shankbone and a seashell lived in a toy box along with some other children’s toys”.²¹ Such changes are in line with Hallgrímsson’s general approach to translating both poetry and prose; he tended to adapt rather than translate.²² Similarly, the Icelandic version of “Det er det samme” is a rather loose or free translation of the original. The Danish text opens, for instance, with: “Grandmother was

somewhat attracted to Spiritualism”,²³ while the Icelandic translation begins: “Old Signý did not think it unlikely that it was possible to get in touch with another world – in fact, she believed it happened”.²⁴ “Det er det samme” certainly resembles some of Andersen’s authentic fairy tales, including his philosophical narrative “Det sidste perle” (The Last Pearl), while the only tale attributed to Hallgrímsson himself, “Í-jarðhúsum” (In-earth-Houses), contains some echoes from the Icelandic’s own poetry and prose. From this perspective, Andersen and Hallgrímsson are indeed writing through Guðmundur Jónsson in one way or another in *Úrdularheimum*. The term “ghost writer” acquires a somewhat literal meaning in this case.

Last, but not least, one can see this whole affair as a confirmation of Andersen’s and Hallgrímsson’s status as canonized writers in Denmark and Iceland, and concurrently highlighting certain religious connotations of the concepts *translation* and *canonization*. Within the field of literary studies, these concepts are usually applied respectively to a “faithful” rewriting of a text from one language to another and to the elevation of a text or a writer within a literary system. What I would like to emphasize below is how these concepts are also part of the vocabulary dealing with Christian Saints. In some ancient Semitic languages the concept of *kaneh* initially referred to a “measuring stick” but in the Greek context the word *kanōn* “came to refer to a standard or norm by which all things are judged or evaluated, whether the perfect form to follow in architecture or sculpture or the infallible criterion (*krit rion*) by which things are to be measured”.²⁵ In the second half of the fourth century, the term was first applied by Christian teachers to texts that were believed to contain the true word of God and belong to the Holy Bible. The concern to establish a canon of Scriptures in Judaism and Christianity probably drew on the scholarly tradition of the Alexandrian library to collect standard writing and to list classical writers, but it should also be noted that the early Church “used the term *canon* primarily in reference to a “canon of faith,” [...] that formed the essence of Christian belief”.²⁶ That sense probably inspired the use of the concept *canonization* to describe the act by which the Church declares that a deceased person is a saint and should be included in the canon, i.e. the list of recognized saints.

The concept *translation* also surfaces in the vocabulary of Christian sainthood, referring to the transference of holy relics from one place – most often a tomb – to another place – most often a church or a cathedral – where they are conventionally kept in a decorated shrine in the crypt. The Latin root of the word is *translatio*, which derives from *trans-fero* and literally means to carry something from one place to another. In earlier times, the translation of relics – i.e. parts of a departed saint's body, garments or other belongings – was an important step in the canonization of the individual in question, but from the second half of the eighth century it was also considered necessary for new Christian churches, that were to be consecrated, to be in possession of a holy relic of one kind or another. Such a relic was preferably taken from another Church or the original tomb of a saint; a tradition that also motivated both the trade and theft of relics. Accounts of these translations constituted a 'substantial hagiographic subgenre', *translationes*, which "was the result of the growing circulation of fragments of saints' remains".²⁷ If we consider literary translation from this perspective, it is evident that a translation of text by a certain author from one language to another can either confirm or contribute to his or her (or at least the text's) canonicity.

However, the analogy between the canonization of saints and writers is quite explicit in various other and more obvious ways, involving saints' days, the development of sacred places, the building of shrines and the translation of relics, just to name a few examples.²⁸ It is revealing to consider the canonization of Andersen and Hallgrímsson in this context. In 1867 the Danish writer was appointed honorary citizen of his birthplace Odense and in 1888 a statue of him was unveiled in King's Park, close to the centre of town. In 1905, the year of Andersen's centenary, his statue was moved to a more central place in front of the Odense Post Office. At the same time, the city council decided to turn his birthplace into a museum. The unveiling of the first Andersen statue in 1880 in King's Park in Copenhagen (close to the Rosenborg Castle where the Danish crown jewels are kept), along with the relocation of his statue in Odense, can be compared to the translation of a saint's body into the crypt of a church. Equally, the Andersen museum in Odense can be compared to a shrine, containing holy relics from the life of a Cultural Saint.²⁹ Hall-

grímsson's "ghost translations" of Andersen's spiritual tales were published only a year after the writer's centenary had been celebrated in Denmark. The event probably motivated the publication of the first extensive collection of Andersen's fairy tales into Icelandic in the translation of poet Steingrímur Thorsteinsson (1831–1913). This focus on Andersen may explain why he was recruited by Tilraunafélagið in the spring of 1906 – the Danish author was both topical and so highly valued (not only in Denmark and Iceland, but internationally) that he was an ideal advocate for the very controversial subject of psychic research. In view of Hallgrímsson's earlier translation of "Toppen og bolden" it seems normal that he was being employed as a mediator between the Danish originals and the Icelandic readership, but it is also possible to see the project as an element in Hallgrímsson's own canonization, which had been slowly evolving during the second half of the nineteenth century.³⁰

In the spring of 1906, Icelanders were already preparing for the poet's centenary on November 16 the following year. A major event planned for that day was the unveiling of a statue of Hallgrímsson in the centre Reykjavík. Designed by sculptor Einar Jónsson, it was the first public monument of this kind that Icelanders themselves were going to erect in their future capital-city. As a part of the preparation for the festivities, Iceland's chief archaeologist, Matthías Þórðarson, had published an article in 1905 discussing the possibilities of "translating" Hallgrímsson's bones from the Assistens Churchyard in Copenhagen to Iceland. As the grave in question had been re-used three times since the poet's funeral in 1845, Þórðarson concluded that it might be hard to find and transport his bones *home*; they were probably shattered, partially lost and deteriorating.³¹ Nevertheless, he did go to Copenhagen in 1946, more than a century after Hallgrímsson's death and only two years after Iceland declared independence from Denmark, to recover the poet's physical remains (or what was left of them) and bring them back to Iceland where they were buried in the national cemetery at Þingvellir.³² Moreover, this translation of Hallgrímsson's relics was inspired by a kind of a religious vision; industrialist Sigurjón Pétursson, who sponsored the project, claimed that he had, with the assistance of a psychic medium, been in touch with the spirit of Hallgrímsson, who had expressed the wish to be buried in his native land. I

mention this here to emphasize how closely the canonization of Hallgrímsson came to follow the patterns of Christian sainthood. Relatively recently, in 1996, his birthday was declared by the Minister of Culture and Education as “Dagur íslenskrar tungu” (Day of the Icelandic Language). Since then, November 16 is celebrated every year by Icelandic cultural institutions and within the state school system, featuring Hallgrímsson as the Patron Saint of the vernacular.

Within this framework, the fabrication of Hallgrímsson’s (and partially also Snorri Sturluson’s) translations of Andersen’s tales can be correlated to the Catholic tradition of saintly visions or *interior locution*, which refers to a religious person who receives a set of ideas – habitually a substantial volume of information, in a relatively short time – from an outside spiritual source.³³ According to Björn Jónsson’s afterword to *Úr dularheimum*, Guðmundur Jónsson had written the texts in question in an amazingly short span of time, ranging from seven minutes up to two and a half hours. Björn Jónsson also said that involuntary writing of this sort was by no means exceptional and referred to texts by H.C. Andersen and Heinrich Heine (1797–1856) that had recently been produced by the same method in Germany.³⁴ The fact, of course, is that involuntary, automatic or trance writing was a widespread phenomenon on both sides of the Atlantic during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, involving both some writers during their earthly days, including William Butler Yeats, Fernando Pessoa and André Breton, and numerous departed writers, such as Charles Dickens, Oscar Wilde and Jack London.³⁵ One of the better known cases of the latter kind is the publication of the novel *Jap Herron* in 1917, which Emily Grant Hutchings claimed to have produced, with the help of spiritualist Lola Hays, after communicating via an Ouija board with the ghost of Mark Twain (1835–1910). Just like the texts written by student Guðmundur Jónsson, the novel got somewhat dispiriting reviews. “If this is the best that “Mark Twain” can do by reaching across the barrier, the army of admirers that his works have won for him will all hope that he will hereafter respect that boundary,” appealed the reviewer of *The New York Times*.³⁶ When Twain’s daughter and his publishing house threatened to go to the courts to halt the publication, Hutchings and her book-dealer agreed to withdraw the work and destroy the copies already printed.³⁷

Certainly, there are still many issues regarding the posthumous translations of Jónas Hallgrímsson (and Snorri Sturluson) of Hans Christian Andersen to be considered. My primary concern here has been to suggest how the religious connotations of the concepts of *translation* and *canonization* can be relevant in the context of literary studies. As I have discussed more thoroughly in a separate study, Andersen and Hallgrímsson, along with many other canonized poets and writers, can be characterized as Cultural Saints, who serve a similar role within the borders of their nation states as Patron Saints do within the framework of the Catholic or Orthodox Church.³⁸ From the time Iceland got its first constitution in 1874, the country slowly progressed towards political independence from Denmark (the first Icelandic minister was appointed in 1904, Iceland acquired sovereignty in 1918, and full independence in 1944). In this context, the publication of *Úr dularheimum* can be seen as a symbolic statement (however bizarre), akin to the way in which Hallgrímsson's statue in the centre of Reykjavík mirrors Andersen's statues in Copenhagen and Odense. These relics are all part of a more extensive sanctification of nationalism as a civil religion in European societies during this period. So even if we are not convinced that Guðmundur Jónsson was a psychic scribe, diving into the unknown to deliver a final shining pearl in the crown of Andersen's and Hallgrímsson's work, we can at least see him as a conduit for the nationalist sentiment – for the people who believed they saw the missing pearl of truth and had faith that true affection for the nation would soon give their leaders the strength to retrieve it.

Notes

1. would like to thank Jane Appleton and Ástráður Eysteinnsson for their valuable help when I was preparing this paper for publication.
2. "Ósjálfráð skrift", *Fjallkonan*, March 23 (1906), 49–50.
3. Author's translation of "Sandhedspærlen" (the Pearl of Truth), submerged on "Kærlighedens Havbund" (the bottom of the Ocean of Affection). Guðmundur Jónsson, *Úr dularheimum. Fimm ævintýri* (Reykjavík: Ísafoldarprentsmiðja, 1906), p. 19.
4. Author's translation of "“Ja, det er akkurat det samme med Spiritismen”, nynnede hun for sig selv." Ibid., p. 20.
5. Cf. Bjarni Guðmarsson and Páll Ásgeir Ásgeirsson, *Ekki dæin - bara flutt . Spiritismi á*

- Íslandi fyrstu fjórtíu árin.* (Reykjavík: Skerpla, 1996), pp. 50–82; Pétur Pétursson, *Trímaður á tímamótum. Ævisaga Haralds Níelssonar* (Reykjavík: Hið íslenska bókmenntafélag, 2011), pp. 196–221.
6. “Dularfull fyrirbrigði”, *Fjallkonan*, March 10 (1906), 38.
 7. “Jón Jónsson frá Stóradal dæinn”, *Fjallkonan*, March 17 (1906), 46; “Krabbaveiki maðurinn”, *Ísafold*, March 17 (1906), 63.
 8. “Dæinn”, *Þjóðólfur*, March 16 (1906), 43; “Slysi fyrir rannsóknirnar”, *Frækorn*, March 22 (1906), 94.
 9. “Ósjálfráð skrift”, *Fjallkonan*, March 23 (1906), 49–50 (p. 50). “Jón Jónsson frá Stórada”, *Fjallkonan*, March 30 (1906), p. 54.
 10. Björn M. Ólsen, ““Úr dularheimum”?”, *Þjóðólfur*, April 20 (1906), 67–68; Björn M. Ólsen, “Asninn undir ljónshúðinni”, *Þjóðólfur*, May 11 (1906), 81–82.
 11. Helga Kress, *Guðmundur Kamban. Æskuverk og ádeilur* (Reykjavík: Menningarsjóður, 1970), pp. 27–33.
 12. Bjarni Guðmarsson and Páll Ásgeir Ásgeirsson, *Ekki dæin – bara flutt*, pp. 27–34.
 13. See: Bjarni Guðmarsson and Páll Ásgeir Ásgeirsson, *Ekki dæin – bara flutt*, pp. 80–82; Pétur Pétursson, *Spiritismen på Island. En religionsbeteendevetenskaplig analyse* (Lund: Teologiska institutionen, 1987); Pétur Pétursson, *Trímaður á tímamótum*, p. 195.
 14. André Lefevere, “Mother Courage’s Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature”, *Modern Language Studies* 7.4 (1982), 3–20, p. 4.
 15. Guðmundur Jónsson, *Úr dularheimum. Fimm ævintýri* (Reykjavík: Ísafoldarprentsmiðja, 1906), p. 19.
 16. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
 17. Author’s translation of “að eyða þessari fátæklegu og skaðvænlegu hjátrú.” I. F. Fisk, “Anda-trúin krufin og skýrð”, *Reykjavík*, April 7 (1906), 57.
 18. Turdus, “Þér á ekki að vera vært!”, *Ísafold*, May 6 (1906), 122.
 19. “Bækur”, *Fjallkonan*, April 6 (1906), 58.
 20. “Toppen og Bolden laae i Skuffe sammen mellem andet Legetøj.” Hans Christian Andersen, “Kjærestefolkene”, *Eventyr og Historier*, vol. 2, (København: Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk forlag, 1943, 49–53 (p. 49); Hans Christian Andersen, “The Top and Ball”, trans. H. P. Paull, *The Complete Hans Christian Andersen Fairy Tales*, ed. by Lily Owens (New York: Avenel Books, 1984), p. 32.
 21. “Einu sinni voru leggur og skel; þau lágu bæði í gullastokki innan um önnur barnagull.” Hans Christian Andersen, “Leggur og skel”, transl. Jónas Hallgrímsson, in *Ritverk Jónasar Hallgrímssonar*, vol. 1, eds. Haukur Hannesson, Páll Valsson, Sveinn Yngvi Egilsson (Reykjavík: Svart á hvítu, 1989), pp. 313–316 (p. 313); Hans Christian Andersen, “Shankbone and Seashell”, transl. Jónas Hallgrímsson, in Dick Ringler, *Bard of Iceland. Jónas Hallgrímsson, Poet and Scientist*, 2nd edn. (Reykjavík: Mál og menning, 2010), pp. 266–70 (p. 266).
 22. On Hallgrímsson’s translation of Andersen’s tale see: Hildur Halldórsdóttir, “Tengsl listaskáldsins góða og ljóta andarungans”, *Jón á Bægisá* 9 (2005), 25–38 and Dick Ringler, *The Bard of Iceland*, pp. 269–270, but on Hallgrímsson as a translator see *ibid.*, p. 396 and Sveinn Yngvi Egilsson, ““Kveðið eftir þjóðkunnu spænsku kvæði”. Illur lækur eftir Jónas Hallgrímsson”, *Textar og túlkun. Greinar um íslensk fræði* (Reykjavík: Háskólaútgáfan, 2011), pp. 113–28.
 23. Author’s translation of “Bedstemor var noget af en Tilhænger af Spiritismen.” Guðmundur Jónsson, *Úr dularheimum*, p. 17.
 24. Author’s translation of “Sigrý gamla var ekki frá því, að samband við annan heim

- væri mögulegt, – trúði því meira að segja, að það ætti sér stað.” Ibid., p. 21.
25. Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), p. 39.
 26. Ibid., p. 48.
 27. Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978), p. 11.
 28. For a more detailed discussion of these analogies cf. Marijan Dovi, “The Canonization of Cultural Saints: France Prešeren and Jónas Hallgrímsson”, *Slovene Studies* 33.2 (2011), 153–70.
 29. Cf. Jón Karl Helgason, “Relics and Rituals: The Canonization of Cultural “Saints” from a Social Perspective”, *Primerjalna književnost* 34.1 (2011), 165–89.
 30. Cf. Jón Karl Helgason, “Lárviðarskald. Valið milli Bjarna Thorarensen og Jónasar Hallgrímssonar”, *Tímarit Máls og menningar* 73.1 (2012): 63–78. Reprinted in Jón Karl Helgason, *Ódóinsakur. Helgifesta þjóðardýrlinga* (Reykjavík: Sögufélag, 2013), pp. 63–86.
 31. Matthías Þórðarson, “Legstaður Jónasar Hallgrímssonar”, *Eimreiðin* 11.2 (1905), 92–94.
 32. Cf. Jón Karl Helgason, “A Poet’s Great Return. Jónas Hallgrímsson’s reburial and Milan Kundera’s *Ignorance*”, *Scandinavian-Canadian Studies* 20 (2011), 52–61.
 33. Michael Freze, *Voices, Visions, and Apparitions* (Indiana: Our Sunday visitor Publishing Division, 1993).
 34. Björn Jónsson, “Eftirmáli”, in Guðmundur Jónsson, *Úr dularheimum*, 59–64 (59).
 35. For an interesting assessment of the posthumous writing of Dickens, Wilde and London see Arthur Conan Doyle, “The Alleged Posthumous Writings of Great Authors”. *The Bookman*, December (1927), 342–49.
 36. “Latest works of fiction: Jap Herron”, *The New York Times*, September 9 (1917), 336.
 37. Cf. Christine A. Corcos, ““Ghostwriters”: Spiritualists, Copyright Infringement, and Rights of Publicity”, *Law and Magic. A Collection of Essays*, ed. by Christine A. Corcos (Carolina: Carolina Academic Press, 2009), pp. 79–97.
 38. Jón Karl Helgason, “The Role of Cultural Saints in European Nation States”, in *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar*, ed. by Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet and Gideon Toury (Tel-Aviv: Unit of Culture Research, Tel Aviv University, 2011), pp. 245–51.