Norske Folkeeventyr
A Polysystemic Approach to Folk Literature in Nineteenth-Century Norway

Mette Rudvin

This paper examines the transformation ("translation") of a corpus of oral narrative — generally considered to be a marginal genre — into an influential written text. The corpus under examination consists of a collection of folk tales and legends, *Norske Folkeeventyr* (hereafter NF[1]) "retold" by Peter Christen Asbjørnsen and Jørgen Moe in the mid nineteenth century, inspired and guided by National Romantic philosophy (presented in section 1). The linguistic and narrative innovations contained in the NF will be discussed (section 2) and the previous findings will be reinterpreted in the light of several key polysystemic concepts (section 3).

1. A nation *willed* into existence

Until 1814, Norway had been part of a 400-year long union with Denmark and Sweden. After its dissolution this "Calmar Union", as it was called, was followed by a second union with Sweden from which Norway eventually gained full independence in 1905. To what extent Norway had constituted a "nation", the pre-Union period is an issue on which there is some disagreement among scholars. Øyvind Østerud notes that although Norway was at the time fragmented and torn in strife between rival kings and dynasties and between Viking chiefs, "eleventh-century literature bears witness to the fact that the Norwegians had begun to feel they constituted a nationality".[2] Furthermore, there is general agreement that during this period Norway had been a leading Scandinavian power in terms of trade, commerce and aggressive expansion, as well as in the field of culture (in which context the saga literature can be

[1] The first modest volume was published by Johan Dahl in Christiania, now Oslo, in 1841 (postdated 1842), rapidly followed by two enlarged volumes published jointly in 1842 (postdated 1843); the first complete edition appeared in 1852 with a long introductory essay by Moe on the origin and diffusion of folk tales, which can be found in Moe's collected works (Moe 1914).

[2] Østerud (1984: 76); see also Elviken (1931: 365) for confirmation of a pre-Union national sentiment. All translations from Norwegian are my own.

mentioned). All these factors strengthened the tendency of nineteenth-century Norwegian Romantics to regard pre-Union Norway as a fully-fledged independent, political and cultural nation (in the nineteenth-century sense of the word). Whether or not this was actually the case has no bearing on my argument here; what is important is that the Norwegian National Romantics conceptualized the country in this light: they saw — and portrayed — themselves as having once been a nation, so that upon their shoulders lay the task of retrieving their lost nationhood. A nation was willed into existence, as it were.

The Romantics' nationalist aspirations, however, were thwarted by the fact that their *linguistic* territory — their "national language" — was deeply fragmented. When the Calmar Union was first established in 1397 the three Scandinavian kingdoms were united under the same ruler. Although the three countries in theory enjoyed equal rank and recognition, this was not carried out in practice. There were no formal arrangements for the sharing of power and obligations, and Denmark soon became the leading partner. With the forced introduction of the Lutheran State Church in 1537, Denmark became completely dominant and Norway's status was reduced to that of a province (see e.g. Elviken 1931: 365-366). The Danish language slowly crept into use in Norway, predominantly in urban and administrative circles, and resentment towards Denmark began to grow gradually. When, over 400 years later, Norway gained independence from Denmark, the country was completely dominated — politically, culturally and linguistically — by Denmark. The Danish language was by then used for all official purposes; indeed, the use of "real" Danish was so ingrained that the Dano-Norwegian language form was simply regarded as "Norwegian".

Although by 1814 the physical and political separation from Denmark was a fact, Norway in many ways still functioned, and was regarded as, a provincial outpost of Denmark. During the nineteenth century, spurred on by the pan-European Romantic-Nationalist movement (in particular in Germany) but also by new ideas on nationhood in the wake of the French Revolution, and coinciding with the new division of Scandinavia subsequent to the Napoleonic wars[3], an independence movement took shape in Norway, demanding a complete break with Danish culture and language, and eventually also full independence from Sweden[4]. As folklore studies has shown, folklore and oral narrative tradition often flourish and grow in such times of struggle for independence from political and cultural domination. For this purpose "The

[3] Norway was "handed over" to Sweden at the Congress of Vienna in 1812 as part of Napoleon's war-debt; see e.g. Haugen (1968: 23) or Østerud (1984: 55).

[4] Again, there is some disagreement on the vehemence of national feelings prior to separation from Denmark; see Lundén (1982).

Past" and "The Folk", or similar cultural constructions, are used as building blocks to (re-)construct an independent national "character" or "identity" as distinct from that of former oppressors. Norway could be considered a prime example of such a process in that the strong focus on the past served as a tool to create a future for the nation. The Norwegian Romantics' claim to an independent (i.e. non-Danish), ancient past, a Viking "Golden Age", served to lend authority and validity to a nation in search of an independent, modern identity: it could be said that a (re-)claimed independent past served to justify an emerging autonomous present. Naturally enough, when this past was created it fulfilled its function, of constructing a "Norway" as the Romantics would like it to be and to have been.

The political/ideological underpinnings of the Norwegian National-Romantics' views on nationhood and the consequent interest in oral narrative traditions were deeply influenced by European political philosophy, primarily of course in France and Germany. The assumption of a stylistic and narrative link between the sagas of the Viking Age and the nineteenth-century oral narrative tradition had been inspired by the folkloric theories of the German Romantics, especially the Grimm brothers who saw German oral narrative as the heritage not only of the German *Volk* in general, but also of an ancient Germanic Golden Age — witness their own work with the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*.[5] The Grimms had seen their role as that of bringing forward the "essence" of these tales which, they believed, carried the germ of their nation's "character" (see e.g. Holbek 1987: 32ff). They believed that these folk tales had

[5] In Denmark the Grimm Brothers' *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, translated into Danish, had achieved a certain amount of popularity, not least because the Grimms had shown a great interest in Denmark and also in Norse philology and mythology more generally. The situation was somewhat complicated by conflicting interests in the Schleswig-Holstein war (see Dollerup 1993: 191) but a connection had been permanently established between the Grimms and the Scandinavian academic elite. This of course extended also to Norway, since the Norwegian intelligentsia was still very much part of and dependent on the Danish academic environment. Indeed, the Grimms were highly enthusiastic about the NF: "[Asbjørnsen and Moe's] end product so appealed to Jacob Grimm that he described them as the best *Märchen* in print" (Dorson 1964: ix). Thus, not only was there an academic and cultural link that served as a channel for the diffusion of Romantic politics and poetics, but an interest in folk tales had emerged and was strengthened by the Grimm Brothers' personal interest in the Nordic countries. However, from then on, Norway and Denmark reacted quite differently to the further development of the folk tale genre. In Denmark, the Grimms' collection was eventually canonized and internalized as a central part of the Danish literary polysystem. In Norway, the need to create and strengthen an independent national literature had first priority and the Grimms' collection took second place to their own folk tale collection.

once existed in a different, more sophisticated *Urform*, as the art of the ruling Teutonic elite, but had subsequently been passed down orally through generations among the "lower classes" (the peasantry, the *Volk)*, thereby losing their original form. This view later came to be known as the "gesunknes Kulturgut" theory (ibid.).

In their function as collectors and re-tellers of the NF, Asbjørnsen and Moe followed the Grimms' line of thought: they saw their own role as the final step of restoration in this assumed historical process. The creation of a new artistic unity in the transition from oral tale to written text could be seen as an attempt to regain a lost national and artistic unity (Liestøl 1977: 42), which seems to indicate clearly that the adaptations of the textual material were carried out in the light of their own preconceived Romantic role as "re-tellers/poets" — in an attempt to "bring out" in the tales what they believed was the national "essence" and *Urform* of the Norwegian oral tradition (see Moe 1845 and 1852)[6]. Asbjørnsen and Moe differentiated strongly between the passive "collecting" or "writing down"[7] on the one hand, and on the other hand what they themselves did: the more creative act of "telling"[8].

The underlying assumptions of narrative continuity lent further credence to the notion of a cultural and literary homogeneity, and therefore also to the continuity of Norway as a long-standing, independent entity. The NF was thus a product of the intense interest in the ancient past and in oral narrative as an expression of a Herderian "national character", as well as of the Rousseauian interest in the environment surrounding the oral narrative tradition as a repository for both "nation" and "national language". The texts were first *selected* on the basis of this ideology and they were further *produced* on the same basis. That is, they were written and adapted to promote certain values that would uphold the rhetoric of Romantic discourse and to cater to the political/cultural need to forge an independent national identity, distinct from their Danish neighbours. In short, the "fact" of narrative continuity was

---

[6] This was also — and to a much greater extent — the case with the Grimms, whose adaptations of their informants' texts were occasionally drastic. Dollerup, Reventlow and Hansen argue that the high level of adaptation, for which the Grimms have been severely rebuked by a number of modern folklorists, was perhaps due precisely to their Romantic vision of themselves as "poet-genius" whose duty lay in restoring a lost *Urform* (Dollerup 1986: 18).

[7] See Liestøl (1977: 41). Unlike the Grimm brothers — whose informants usually came to visit the two scholars in their home — Asbjørnsen and Moe were keen field workers, travelling around many parts of the country to collect material.

[8] Unpublished tales are referred to by Asbjørnsen and Moe as "our untold fairytales" and in a number of prefaces they refer to their work as that of "collectors and re-tellers". See Moe's 40-page Introduction to the first complete (1852) version of the NF as well as the short 1845 essay "Om Fortællermaaden af Eventyr og Sagn".

instrumental in the conscious construction of nationhood.

Theoretically, the similarities between various national versions of internationally recognized folk tales could be seen as a contradiction of any claim to national identity. The origins of folk tales have long been a principal issue of investigation in folklore theory, and many complicated migratory routes have been suggested connecting different national oral traditions. This was true also of late nineteenth-century folklore studies. Asbjørnsen and Moe were aware that many of the Norwegian tales stemmed from other countries, but this was not seen as an obstacle. They suggested that the national trait, the "Norwegianness", of the tales lay in their narrative style rather than in plot structure or content. The fact that similarities in narrative technique were found between the folk tales and the sagas upheld this argument and legitimated a narrative creation that was to combine urban Danish and old rural Norwegian into a new linguistic system.

2. Re-constructing a new language

2.1. Can the oral be identified?

By the time of independence from Denmark in 1814, the old national language of Norway had virtually disappeared and had been replaced — for all official uses as well as for everyday use in bourgeois and academic circles — by a form of Danish, i.e. Danish orthography and grammar with Norwegian pronunciation. Remnants of the pre-Union national language (Old Norse) had nevertheless survived in the dialect forms spoken mainly in isolated rural areas. The vernaculars had maintained, albeit in different forms in the different geographical areas, a close linguistic bond with Old Norse. It was a combination of this fragmented and diversified dialect language with the official Dano-Norwegian that developed into modern Norwegian, or more correctly perhaps, into the different forms of modern Norwegian that currently coexist[9]. Oral narrative occupied a central position in this creative process.

With the collection and publication of the NF, the old national language

[9] Today there are two official forms of Norwegian: *bokmål* and *nynorsk*, "book language" and "new Norwegian", as well as a plethora of dialects and sociolects. On the parallel development of on the one hand the more conservative *bokmål* and, on the other, the more radical *nynorsk* (a synthetic construction built on regional dialects in the late nineteenth century), see e.g. Skard (1973), Haugen (1968), Burgun (1919-21), Dahl (1981), Jorgenson (1978) or Koht (1977); Rudvin (1995) includes further bibliographical references on the emergence of the two language forms as well as their internal, still ongoing, linguistic development.

forms were re-introduced to the Norwegian urban public, but before the tales could function as "literature" they had to be read and understood as such by the urban middle class, i.e. to be formulated in a recognizable form. Hence, they needed to be presented in a Dano-Norwegian urban sociolect. This daunting challenge, to incorporate a rural Norwegian theme into a Danish urban expression also, however, implied a subversion of the official Danish through the introduction of new elements of vocabulary, style and, to a lesser degree, syntax. To have written down the folk tales *wholly* in the official Dano-Norwegian would have been to divest them of their "Norwegianness", Moe believed.

Now, in terms of the "first translational phase" — mentally processing and writing down notes while listening to the oral performance — much must be left to conjecture and informed guesswork[10]. Apart from the fact that many of the original notes have been lost, it will never be known what the informants actually said, not to mention *how* they told their tales and what actually took place in the collectors' minds during that first phase. Even in those cases where we do have performance notes, Asbjørnsen and Moe occasionally "translated" (e.g. replaced dialect words) as they listened and wrote; in other words it was not a straightforward process of dictation. Of what took place during the period between performance notation on site, often just bare outlines, and the editing process leading to the final, polished, publishable version, is impossible to tell, nor do we have any indication of how much or how little time passed in each case. Much must also have been discussed orally between the collectors (scholars disagree as to how closely the two worked together, whether or not Asbjørnsen relied on Moe for advice on literary style, etc.), and much based on memory. The "black box" will always remain just that.

A first source for the identification and examination of "original source texts (STs)", i.e. the oral performances, is to compare Asbjørnsen and Moe's versions with other versions of the same tales by other collectors in different parts of the country. Ørnulf Hodne, in his 1978 doctoral dissertation (published 1979), carried out a meticulous study of Moe's handwritten notes and compared them with the earliest editions of the NF. His study is an excellent guide to original sources — in the sense of the performers, the informants — and to Moe's travels and his notes. Very few comprehensive studies have been

[10] Although folklorists once virtually exclusively studied written texts, modern folklore studies gives increasing importance to the performance situation, to the emergence and construction of "meaning" in the relationship between performer, audience and folklorist, and to the changes that inevitably take place in the transition from oral performance to written text. Scholars such as Barbara Babcock, Richard Bauman, Dan Ben-Amos, Ruth Finnegan, Lee Haring, William Hendricks, Dell Hymes and Dennis Tedlock can be mentioned here.

made of the informants and Hodne's study of Moe's informants (he concentrates exclusively on Moe), searching through library archives, interviewing family, etc., is therefore invaluable. Moe himself also wrote short essays on some of the informants (Moe 1914), and a few other studies[11] also offer glimpses into the informants' lives, social environment and artistic abilities.

Some evidence can further be gleaned from the existing letters between the two collectors (see Moe 1915) where we find descriptions and discussions about actual textual decisions. Furthermore, the fact that their painstaking linguistic and stylistic editing work was so closely guided by a conscious philosophy means that indirect evidence of the translation process from oral to written mode and from dialect to standard form can be found in Moe's writings (essays, NF prefaces and other short pieces; see Moe 1914) on folklore theory — on the origins and diffusion of folk tales, on the "national" character of the tales, etc. In the only long study that Moe completed, the lengthy academic introduction to the 1852 edition of the NF, we clearly see how his "translation policy" (editing technique) is indeed governed by his National-Romantic views and his acknowledged links with the Grimm brothers (see Moe 1845 and 1914). J. Moe's son Moltke Moe, himself an eminent collector and folklore scholar, took over his father's revision work of the NF with Asbjørnsen when J. Moe, a clergyman, decided to dedicate his life wholly to the church. Moltke Moe also wrote at length about Asbjørnsen and Moe's language style in the NF (see M. Moe's collected works, 1925-27). However, for practical reasons, the present study can only undertake a comparison in the strict sense of the word between the subsequent written editions.

2.2. Studying the written

A large number of studies have been undertaken on changes in the Norwegian language influenced by the publication of the folk tales — where "language" can be understood as referring to the linguistic and stylistic levels of description. For reasons we have just mentioned, these analyses largely focus on the language evolution from one written version to another.

2.2.1. The introduction of linguistic norms

Even though scholars disagree on the extent to which rapidly developing

[11] See Liestøl (1932), Hansen (1932), Hovstad (1933), Ribsskog (1966), Sand Bakken (1935), Øverland (1902).

linguistic norms were influenced by the NF in the post-Union phase, it is generally recognized that the tales, strengthened by their new status, indeed constituted a strong innovatory element in this process. One of the reasons the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus received such national acclaim and consensus was precisely that it embodied both the myth of a national identity and of a national language in a relatively conservative (i.e. Danish) form, and therefore functioned as a compromise between an emerging national identity and the maintenance of an (elite) conservative linguistic and literary form.[12] For example, many of the dialect words used in the NF slid into the Dano-Norwegian language; in this way Asbjørnsen and Moe's translation policy was instrumental in laying the foundation for a new and viable national language form which steadily developed further and further away from the Danicized language that represented the colonized past into a new, independent language — neither Danish, nor rural dialect. For a general non-chronological picture, it suffices to sum up Skard's (1973: 45ff) and Øyslebø's (1971: 70ff) observations. According to them, the main changes and innovations in language introduced through the Asbjørnsen and Moe tales can be listed as follows:

1. *Syntax.* The over-defined noun[13]; free indirect speech (*oratio tecta)*; repetition of the personal pronoun at the end of a phrase[14]; paratactic rather than hypotactic form; the use of relative and nominal subclauses also in speech (see Skard 1973: 46) and the use of "oral-style" conjunctions giving the impression of "directness"; a shift from nominal to verbal expressions[15]; changes in morphology and orthography tending towards an analytical narrative style (partly through paratactic sentence structure)[16]; general omission of relative and principal clauses, and other linguistic techniques allowing sentences and clauses to interact more independently of each other and also leading to a more "spoken" form; and lastly, a shift from reported

[12] See Elviken (1931); Østerud (1984: 56ff); Kielhau (1931: 289) or Skard (1973).

[13] For a brief discussion on the use of the double definite form in Norwegian literature, including the Asbjørnsen and Moe tales, see Lundeby (1956) and Knudsen (1966).

[14] This is a colloquial idiom in Norwegian roughly corresponding to the English "I'd take that with me, I would"; see also Skard (1973: 46) on the "folkish" use of repetition of the personal pronoun.

[15] Logically, as Øyslebø points out, the last two elements in combination, "Norwegian" vocabulary and spoken language, lead to an impression of *Norwegian speech* (Øyslebø 1971: 72).

[16] Moe, in a letter to Faye, specifically mentions wishing to avoid the heavy latinized sentence constructions with frequent hypotaxis and relative clauses in favour of a paratactic style, and to avoid the progressive "-ing" form in favour of subclauses; see Sørensen (1962: 31). See also Liestøl (1979: 223ff) and Foss (1923).

to direct speech.

2. *Idiom/Vocabulary*. The introduction of many non-Danish, "typically Norwegian" words and idioms[17]; the omission of foreign words (Latin, Greek and German loan words); and the frequent use of idiomatic and colloquial expressions in dialogue[18].
3. *Alliteration.* Alliteration and rhyme in folk and idiomatic expressions[19]; alliteration in syntactic repetition; and the use of tautologies[20].
4. *Spelling.* The main orthographical features which Asbjørnsen used in his legends and tales (a number of these features were not included in the first versions, but only in the revised versions) and which played a significant part in the emergence of *bokmål* (as the developing language eventually came to be called) in its separation from Danish and in the attempt to "Norwegianize" the language, are described in the Popp survey (see Appendix 1).

In the next subsection (2.2.), I will deal in greater detail with some of the more clearly stylistic phenomena of Skard's list. For a detailed chronological account of all linguistic alterations it may be useful to look at Popp (1977), summarized in a table at the end of this paper (see Appendix 1). Popp demonstrates that Asbjørnsen was following a deliberate "personal programme" when revising the NF, and that his reforms were not only followed by other writers but influenced official language policies. Some versions stand out in the degree of change running parallel to major official language reforms[21]. A measure of the success of these changes, i.e. those that were consistently and permanently absorbed into the language, is the language of the modern edition, where the general morphological, lexical and orthographical trends of the early revisions have been consistently and more radically implemented.

---

[17] See Foss (1923: 216ff) and Skard (1973: 46-47).

[18] Øyslebø notes that the technique of using idiomatic, often colourful, expressions in reported speech, which gives the impression of "directness" and brings the reader into a "real-life situation", was also used in the sagas (Øyslebø 1971: 73).

[19] See Foss (1923: 221ff) for a detailed list. See also Skard (1973: 47-48) and Hovstad (1933).

[20] By this is meant two — often rhyming — synonyms side by side, e.g. *Rægler og Historier* was changed to *Rægler og Remser* (see Skard 1973: 52).

[21] See Haffner (1942); see also Popp (1977) and Seip (1933: 68). The years 1893 and 1907 saw major language reforms in *riksmaal,* whilst *landsmaal* reforms took place in 1901 and 1910; in 1907 there were major language reforms for both *riksmaal* and *landsmaal* (see e.g. Gundersen 1967). *Riksmaal* and *landsmaal* were two temporary terms for two different versions of the emerging language or language forms, *riksmaal* being the more conservative and today denoting a conservative urban sociolect.

To provide examples of changes in language from the first edition to the subsequent ones I have examined eight versions of the tale *Østenfor Sol og Vestenfor Maane* ("East of the Sun and West of the Moon"). The result of this detailed linguistic comparison between the 1843 edition, six subsequent editions (to 1914) and the 1982 edition[22] can be consulted in Appendix 2. The revisions have been classified in terms of punctuation, orthography, lexicon, morphology, and "other". Judging by a cursory reading of randomly chosen samples of other tales, the results of this analysis seem to be representative of the development of the tales in general, also confirming Popp's conclusions (1977) regarding Asbjørnsen's contributions to the linguistic development of the emerging language. Even though the "Norwegianization" of the language within one and the same edition was not always consistent (for example, some *ede*-verb endings have been Norwegianized in the 1866 edition, but many have been retained; the same inconsistency can be found in orthography and lexica), and although some transitions were more radical than others (e.g. the 1874-1904 transition, after the 1893 reform, and the 1904-1909 transition subsequent to the 1907 reform), my textual comparisons clearly show how the NF was indeed gradually "Norwegianized".

2.2.2. The efficient ambiguity of narrative norms

The NF's Norwegianness was not seen to be limited to a strictly linguistic level: it was echoed in the style, closely connected to linguistic phenomena but perceived as an additional trait of identity.

Alex Bolckmans finds that the emphasis in the tales lies, generally, more on speech and statement than on thoughts and actions, descriptive passages, psychological insight or authorial commentary, and the language consequently tends to be very "direct" (Bolckmans 1960: 129-157). Both direct and free indirect speech are indeed frequent in these texts. In keeping with the direct style, Asbjørnsen and Moe tended to avoid heavy participle and relative clauses and used instead a paratactic form that was "lighter" and more attuned to the oral tradition. The use of direct speech could, however, in part be due to Asbjørnsen and Moe's informants, Bolckmans concludes. Further, it seems a link can be made between the NF's directness and the sagas, where direct speech and dialogue are also central to the narrative in what is often called a "journalistic" style: short, precise summaries of action.

But what can be concluded about the reception of this stylistic norm? Is

[22] After the collectors' deaths the main language revisions were undertaken primarily by Moltke Moe, at Asbjørnsen's specific request, and later by other folklorists and scholars such as Krogvig, Alnæs and Liestøl.

the oral to be considered as a totally alien feature for the urban bourgeoisie? Maybe not, for as Richard Dorson notes, the saga influence may have been manifested through Asbjørnsen and Moe's *expectations* regarding the narratives: "Asbjørnsen and Moe thought of the reciters of Icelandic sagas as the ideal and prototypical Norwegian storytellers, and sought to achieve this ideal standard when their informants fell short" (Dorson 1964: ix). We see, then, that this technique (the "journalistic style") was not only in keeping with the source culture (SC) literary tradition, but was also construed to adapt to target culture (TC) expectations (and indeed requirements) vis-à-vis the SC.

Another narrative technique that brought into focus the "direct language" style was Asbjørnsen's "framing" technique. In his *Norske Huldre-Eventyr og Folkesagn* ("Norwegian *Huldre* Tales and Folk Legends") which he published alone in 1845[23], Asbjørnsen introduced a narrative technique that met with success and that was later used in the revised versions of the joint folk tale collection: that of providing an introduction, a "frame", to the tale through the recollections of an imaginary narrator, thus creating a "realistic" impression[24]. Willy Dahl notes that it is in this more *literary* framing technique that the difference between folk and urban narrative is most clearly manifested; in the introductory frames the language tends to be more "complex" (for example more frequent genitive constructions and more descriptive than "active" adjectives), whilst the tales themselves tend to be characterized by short main clauses and few adjectives (see Dahl 1981: 112). In this way, the oral style of the stories that followed the frame was rendered particularly visible. Although a novelty, this framing technique was again nothing if not a concession to TC tastes and susceptibilities, creating a safe demarcation between rural and urban linguistic traditions and therefore (through descriptions of bourgeois city households contrasted with descriptions of rural life) social and cultural traditions.

According to Dahl (1981) only one of all these oral features created a real precedent in the urban literary norms, i.e. an innovation: that of free indirect speech. Pointing to the extensive use of free indirect speech in the tales, Bolckmans demonstrates how Asbjørnsen and Moe used this technique in a highly creative manner, setting a precedent for coming literary genres. The collectors employed the technique to bring out certain traits in the characters or

[23] Asbjørnsen published a series of collections, primarily legends, on his own (see References); these were later incorporated into Asbjørnsen and Moe's joint NF editions.

[24] It should be noted that Asbjørnsen was not, however, the first to use this technique for folk tales. The Irish field collector T. Crofton Croker had published a volume of fairy tales in 1825 making use of precisely this narrative technique (Dorson 1964: viii).

to set a mood for the story. By putting direct speech in the middle of a passage of free indirect speech, or via the transition from indirect to reported speech, they could emphasize a particular character trait. Bolckmans shows in one example how the "vagueness" of free indirect speech makes a character look weak, subservient, reticent — even hypocritical — when it stands in contrast to the directness of the person with whom he is communicating. In another example he shows how a girl's humility vis-à-vis the forces of nature is emphasized through the use of free indirect speech in her meeting with the four Winds. From 1850 onwards a number of writers had started to follow Asbjørnsen and Moe's lead, Dahl observes. Although others had occasionally used this technique before, Asbjørnsen and Moe were the first to use it consistently and consciously (Dahl 1981: 114-115).

The multiple — ambiguous — interpretations of the tales' ambivalent narrative features allowed them to have a broader cultural and ideological influence in that they could be seen, just like the linguistic traits, to represent the "true Norwegian character", once more without totally disrupting TC expectations. In fact, the NF's style continues to the present day to have an enormous thematic and stylistic impact on literature as well as on other aspects of culture — music and painting, for example[25].

3. A polysystemic approach to NF

I would, at this point, like to introduce some core concepts and results of polysystem theory and demonstrate how they can contribute to a better understanding of the corpus under study. Polysystem theory was first introduced as a working hypothesis by Itamar Even-Zohar (1978: 117-129), who proposed that any culture constitutes an articulated *network* or "polysystem" of smaller (sub)systems within which all cultural products occupy a "space" or position. The theory was one of the first to acknowledge that translations can play a crucial role in the dynamics of such a system and Even-Zohar's novel viewpoint was that *TC* (rather than *SC*) principles govern the translational process, including the selection of works to be translated. "It is clear", Even-Zohar claimed, "that the very principles of selecting the works to be translated are determined by the situation governing the (home) polysystem: the texts are chosen according to their compatibility with the new approaches and the supposedly innovatory role they may assume within the target literature" (Even-Zohar 1978: 47). He went on to examine the shifts of genre and status that texts undergo when translated and appropriated into a

[25] See Skard, Dahl, Hodne or P. Berman. Wergeland, Bjørnson, Ibsen, Grieg, Bull and Werenskiold can be mentioned, but the list is long.

"receiving" culture. These issues raised further questions about the emergence of new genres and about innovations in existing TC genres. Even-Zohar also raised the issue of a text's transition, through translation, from a central position in the SC to a peripheral position in the TC, or vice versa.

Gideon Toury's seminal work *In Search of a Theory of Translation*[26] was firmly grounded in this polysystemic approach but offered a more specific conceptual framework for examining the translation process. One of Toury's most important contributions to the discipline was to redirect the central idea of translational equivalence in a purely descriptive direction; in Theo Hermans' words, "Toury simply turned the matter on its head. He started from the position that a translation is that utterance or text which *is regarded as* a translation by a given cultural community, i.e. which is accepted and functions as a translation in a sociocultural system" (1991: 157; emphasis added). Equivalence is, then, what a given system accepts as equivalence.

It was within this framework that Toury introduced the concept of "norms", by which he meant, approximately, the TC's social, cultural and literary expectations and prohibitions. Norms, he said, can be understood as constraints or incentives for social and professional behaviour which guide the translator and which are generally accepted by a particular community, thus *shaping and directing* the translational process. As Hermans explains, the success of a translation in a particular TC thus hinges upon whether or not the translator has managed to conform to TC norms, to what has been judged as "correct" and "acceptable" by the members of a given community (1991: 166). Toury subsequently differentiated between the "preliminary" norms that govern ST selection and "operational" norms regulating the actual translation process, and finally added a more abstract category which he called the "initial" norm, directing the degree to which a translator gives priority either to the (assumed) meaning of the ST or to expectations in the target system (1980: 55; 75; 141-142).

In the present analysis I discuss cultural norms in terms of linguistic expression and grammatical/stylistic features. A case can be made for such a usage here, since in the particular context of nineteenth-century Norwegian culture linguistic features were a *direct* result and expression of a specific cultural system. The preliminary norms — responsible in this case for the selection of the folk tales — could be said to be directly governed by the National-Romantic philosophy of nineteenth-century Norway. As a political, cultural and literary system, it formed and was formed by the academic/bourgeois approach to art and literature, and particularly towards verbal folk art (see Dahl 1981: 123-129; Bø 1972: 24ff). Thus, it was also the

[26] Gideon Toury (1980). At the time this paper was begun, Toury's 1995 volume (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*) had not yet been published.

very foundation of Asbjørnsen and Moe's translational activities. The choice of establishing a new genre — namely the written folk tale — through translation was closely linked to a desire for an independent Norwegian literature to authorize, justify and affirm an independent Norwegian cultural system.

On an operational level, one of the most acute problems inherent in this process was the transferral of standard Dano-Norwegian into what was to become a national Norwegian language. Asbjørnsen and Moe's introduction of new words, syntax, narrative techniques, etc. couched in a generally conservative Danish orthography and an urban/literate narrative style provided solutions to this dilemma, and thus constituted elements of literary/linguistic conventions that became accepted and systematized as effective "problem solvers" (Hermans 1991: 163). It is only to be expected that not all the solutions proposed by Asbjørnsen and Moe to the linguistic problems inherent in the corpus were effective. In the case of the NF, they were occasionally included (in other words deemed effective) in one publication and the next revised version, but might then disappear from the collection without being maintained in the emerging language (see Appendices). The gradual establishment and taking root of literary and linguistic innovations introduced into the polysystem through the NF illustrates the above-mentioned polysystemic process of the regularization of conventions in terms of their "correctness" and efficiency as "problem solvers" which gradually became established as norms in the TC polysystem. The NF can be said to have played a key role precisely because its global polysystem was "weak" and in a position to accept change (see Even-Zohar 1978: 48; 124; De Geest 1992; Hermans 1991).

Keeping in mind the premises discussed above, the remainder of this section will be devoted to discussing the NF corpus at the more abstract level of the initial norm. In particular, it would be interesting to ask whether or not the success of the NF was based on its adherence not so much to SC as to TC norms, as Toury would probably predict. The conclusions reached earlier in this paper confirm that the tales were indeed subjected to a large number of language-related changes before they could be accepted as "literature", illustrating the principle of target-related conventions guiding text production (what Toury has termed "acceptability"). Further evidence of this tendency is that a number of collections which did *not* adopt or conform to TC norms, maintaining instead dialect form and a stylistic and linguistic form that was in effect much closer to the oral tradition, never achieved the NF's popularity or recognition, not to mention its status as national symbol. On the other hand, the maintenance of narrative techniques pertaining particularly to norms in the Norwegian *oral* tradition in the transition to written form illustrates the principle of "adequacy".

We see here that the SC and TC norms underpinning the importation of

literary and linguistic innovations to the target polysystem through the TT (the NF) from the ST (the oral narrative tradition) were linguistically and poetically conflicting (in terms of orthography, grammar, syntax, etc.). For example, the dominant literary (and in effect Danish) mode lay at a higher hierarchical level, at a more "abstract" level with a "higher" register and "tone" than the rural spoken language. Nevertheless, these competing norms complemented each other in striving for a common goal. Lexical innovations, for instance, were only permitted because changing norms in the target system demanded this "rural authenticity", the search for a national identity.

The dualistic nature of the text production process was not only marked by two conflicting translational practices. It is clear that a reciprocity between the intentions ("adequacy") and the practices ("acceptability") governed the translation process. In other words, the overriding function of the transition from non-standardized oral mode to literate/standardized mode was a form of nationalism in which the *explicit* purpose was to retrieve the oral literary tradition of the peasant — in what was *claimed* to be an "authentic" and "untouched" form — whereas *in actual fact* the translation served to promote a primarily bourgeois national identity. This claimed authenticity (extreme "adequacy") collapsed at the moment the tales had to be adapted and re-created to conform to TC expectations ("acceptability") and were no longer "quintessentially Norwegian" (i.e. rural). For the tales to become a truly national symbol that could be understood and accepted by the urban bourgeoisie, they had to be transmitted in a literary form and in the (quasi-) Danish language — precisely that language form from which Norway was struggling to free herself (with a few exceptions: scholars and writers like P.A. Munch or Welhaven; see e.g. Dahl 1981: 110ff). I would claim, then, that the explicit and fundamental prerequisite, authenticity, was false, and, equally important, that had it not been false (i.e. bourgeois, and not rural) the folk tales would not have gained acceptance as canonized literature. The next step was for the new polysystem to stabilize this identity, to regularize and stabilize the conventions and norms that were to serve as a model of "correctness" for the emerging national language. What this new genre and the new linguistic constellation did was to fulfil the needs of a polysystem in transformation and to affirm its most basic and pressing requirement at that moment in time — namely that of a distinct identity.

The position of the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus within the polysystem was from this perspective a logical consequence of its norm pattern. Through the transferral from oral to written form, and through the adoption of TC norms, a new genre was created. The process of translation inherent in the transferral was not merely formal but also implied a radical shift in status, spurred on precisely by the tension between adequacy and acceptability described above. From a peripheral, marginalized genre mainly unknown to the

urban community (see e.g. Dahl 1981: 100ff), the written folk tale not only became highly popular, but acquired a prestigious place in the canon (as illustrated for example by Sigurd Hoel's enthusiastic praise of the NF; Hoel 1963; for comments see Skard 1973: 52). Thus, along with the acceptance of TC norms came the privilege of sitting at the high table of canonized literature. If we agree that the position of a TT in a TC is a result of the initial norm, and therefore of the balance (or compromise) between adequacy and acceptability, it can be concluded that the position of the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus was a direct result of its claim to and partial compliance with authenticity ("adequacy") on the one hand and its newly gained position in the urban polysystem (through "acceptability") on the other. Following the descriptive definition of translational equivalence, the extent to which these tales were true to their original form is less relevant than how and why they were regarded as equivalent by the TC (see Toury 1980: 68).

Should it be concluded that in its role as "authentic" the text functioned as a keeper of the literary and linguistic status quo within the target system? Clearly not. Rather, its second function as an "acceptable" translation was given higher priority, or had a more immediate impact than its being "authentic", as is borne out by the conclusion reached earlier regarding the contradiction (and complementarity, even symbiosis) of its implicit and explicit functions. It could thus be argued that in its function as authentic ("adequate"), it embodied the idea of the timelessness of the nation which reified and upheld a Romantic belief, but did not "faithfully" represent any real, existing literary canon or prevailing linguistic norms. It was precisely the fact that the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus came to enjoy such prestige as a national symbol that enabled it to act as a vehicle of linguistic and literary innovation (see Toury 1980: 141-142).

There is one final aspect regarding the position of the Asbjørnsen and Moe texts as TT that must be mentioned here, namely that in due course, and in part contemporaneously, the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus also became canonized as a "children's classic" (see Dahl 1981: 109-110 and Hagemann 1963). Consequently the Asbjørnsen and Moe collection held, and still holds, a twofold position in the Norwegian literary polysystem. Following the 1883 publication of the children's version of NF[27], there was an inherent ambiguity regarding its position and status in the polysystem, perhaps influenced by the Grimms' *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* versions whose very titles ("Small and Big" editions) indicated their double function (see Ward 1988: 100). Again, this confirms De Geest's claim that:

> […] particular texts or translations may form and integrate part of more

[27] P.Chr. Asbjørnsen and Jørgen Moe (1883).

> than one (con)textual system at the same time, and as a result their specific systemic position (and their normative and evaluative prestige) may vary according to the set of norms and the types of systems that they actually belong to. Next to the global levels of the language system, the political (nationalist) system, the cultural system and the overall system, we must take into consideration a.o. the generic system, the poetic conventions and the discursive conventions as well. Only from this point of view can the controversial and highly multifunctional reception of certain texts be completely accounted for. (De Geest 1992: 44)

4. Conclusion

This brief case study has attempted to outline how the cultural and literary expectations and constraints of the Danicized bourgeois establishment in nineteenth-century Norway affected and, indeed, formed, through intralingual translation, a collection of Norwegian folk tales. The translation involved a transition from eclectic, linguistically and thematically highly diversified "texts" told in oral dialects, to an artistically uniform, written, standardized literary product. TC norms, directed by events at an abstract, macrostructural level, thus governed the concrete translation process in terms of literary and linguistic expressions in competition with, but also in a complementary relationship with, SC norms. The case study has clearly demonstrated how polysystemic theory can be applied to — and works for — intralingual translation, and how it accounts for ST-TT transformation at both macro- and microlevels; the textual and supratextual process culminating in the production of the NF, as described above, clearly confirms its main theses.

The *preliminary* norms underlying the text selection process are, it can be concluded, those expressed in the prevailing National-Romantic discourse where the (collector-)poet was regarded as a catalyst for a presumed national "essence" or "character". The *operational* norms are those specific linguistic and literary norms guiding the transformation/production of the oral tales into literary works, as well as those innovations introduced through the acceptance of elements of oral narrative tradition into the (written) target polysystem. The *initial* norm underlying the text production process was, it has been argued above, strongly marked by a tension — as well as by a complementary relationship — between "adequacy" and "acceptance", both reflecting and influencing the development of the nineteenth-century Norwegian literary and linguistic tradition. This claim supports what Toury has repeatedly stated, that a combination or compromise of conflicting norms is always involved in a

translation process. The system of norms interplaying as constraints and incentives in a dynamic polysystem is, here too, a flexible one which therefore requires a thorough investigation of as many linguistic and extralinguistic, synchronic and diachronic, factors as possible. In polysystemic terms, the production of the corpus catered to *TC norms*, but the texts were also *innovatory* in that they introduced a number of source-language elements into the emerging polysystem. Indeed, they were not only innovatory, but also instrumental in shaping the emerging polysystem, both in literary and linguistic terms. Both of these factors were equally important and complemented each other ideologically, although the competing linguistic norms were reconcilable only with some effort and sustained by help of a potent nationalist rhetoric.

The *presentation* and *promotion* of the NF, the final step in the text-production process, mirrored its selection process in that the text was presented on the premises of the TC, and was appropriated by the urban elite as part of its own literary canon. It would be wrong to imply, however, that it was simply a question of appropriation, entirely ignoring the SC. Rather, through this process and through the parallel developments in language and politics, the rural community was drawn into the dynamic cultural developments of the time and thus empowered, politically and culturally (although often, as Østerud and Koht have noted, only subsequent to relinquishing their status as "folk" through a process of urbanization and modernization); in time, the rural population began to take an active part in the nation-building process.

Once the tales were published in printed form, they gained a certain position and prestige in the polysystem, and could in turn "exert authority" by influencing the target polysystem. In their function as channels for innovation in linguistic and cultural developments, they were instrumental in creating the emerging national language, *bokmål* (as Popp 1977 has shown), and indelibly marked the cultural output of the country for generations to come. As Toury and Even-Zohar have stated above, a translation, or a set of translated texts, despite (or indeed because of) the fact that it is a product of conflicting norms, can be a central force within the wider polysystem. Moreover, through the process of translation *its own position* may undergo a radical shift in status. The oral narrative tradition in nineteenth-century Norway, initially a collection of marginalized "texts" (to the extent that it was even known at all and certainly to the extent that it was acknowledged as "art") thus achieved, through the establishment and canonization of the Asbjørnsen and Moe corpus, a central position within the emerging polysystem; indeed, it could be concluded that through the Asbjørnsen and Moe collection, a new, multifunctional and symbolically powerful genre was introduced into the Norwegian polysystem.

References

1. Texts collected by Asbjørnsen and Moe

Asbjørnsen, P.Chr.

1845 *Norske Huldreeventyr og Folkesagn fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen*, (published in Christiania at the author's own expense).

1848 *Norske Huldreeventyr og Folkesagn, fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen. Anden Samling*, Christiania: Jacob Dybwad.

1884 *Eventyrbog for Børn. Norske Folkeeventyr af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen. II*, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag.

1887 *Eventyrbog for Børn. Norske Folkeeventyr af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen. III*, edited by M. Moe, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (first volume of 1884-1887 series by both Asbjørnsen and Moe).

Asbjørnsen, P.Chr. and Jørgen Moe

1841 *Norske Folkeeventyr samlede ved Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe*, Christiania: Johan Dahls Forlag.

1843-1844 *Norske Folkeeventyr samlede ved Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe. Første Deel* and Asbjørnsen, P.Chr. and Jørgen Moe, 1844, *Norske Folkeeventyr samlede ved P.C. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe. Anden Deels Første Hefte* (1843 and 1844 published together in one volume), Christiania: Johan Dahls Forlag.

1852 *Norske Folkeeventyr samlede og fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe*, Christiania: Johan Dahls Forlag.

1866 *Norske Folke-Eventyr fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe*, Christiania: Jacob Dybwad (3rd edition).

1874 *Norske Folke-Eventyr fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe*, Christiania: Jacob Dybwad (5th edition).

1883-1884-1887 *Eventyrbog for Børn. Norske Folkeeventyr af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe. I*, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (next 2 vols. 1884 II and 1887 III published by Asbjørnsen alone).

1898 *Eventyrbog for Børn. Norske Folkeeventyr af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe. Andet Oplag*, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag.

1904 *Norske Folke-Eventyr fortalte af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe, Fællessamlingen vols. I and II*, edited by Moltke Moe, Christiania: Aschehoug.

1907 *Udvalgte Folkeeventyr. Ny Samling*, Christiania: Gyldendalske Boghandel Nordisk Forlag.
1909 *Asbjørnsen og Moes Barne-Eventyr*, edited by Moltke Moe, Christiania: Aschehoug.
1914 *Norske Folke-Eventyr fortalt af P.Chr. Asbjørnsen. Folke-Utgave. Ottende Utgave*, Christiania: Aschehoug.
1930 *Barne-Eventyr. Asbjørnsen og Moe. Sjette Oplag*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
1936 *P.C. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe Norske. Samlede Eventyr, Norske Kunstneres Billedutgave* (illustrated edition), Oslo: Gyldendal.
1977 *Asbjørnsen og Moes erotiske eventyr*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
1982 *Samlede eventyr I-II* (2 vols.), Oslo: Den Norske Bokklubben.
1994 *P.C. Asbjørnsen. Jørgen Moe Norske Folkeeventyr* (facsimile copy of *Norske Folkeeventyr samlede ved P.C. Asbjørnsen og Jørgen Moe*, 1843-1844), Oslo: Damms Antikvariat.

Moe, Jørgen
1845 "Om Fortællermaaden af Eventyr og Sagn", *Den Constitutionelle* 231 (19 August), pp.2-3.
1914 *Samlede Skrifter. Hundredeaarsudgaven I-II*, edited by A. Krogvig, Christiania: Aschehoug (first published in 1877).
1915 *Fra det nasjonale gjennembruds tid: breve fra Jørgen Moe til P.Chr. Asbjørnsen og andre*, edited by A.Krogvig, Christiania: Aschehoug.

2. Folk tales collected by other Norwegian collectors

Berge, Rikard
1909 *Norsk folkedigtning: med opskrifter fra Sophus Bugges utrykte samlinger*, Christiania: Gyldendal.
1924 *Norsk sogukunst: sogusgjerara og sogur. Skildringer og uppteikningar av Rikard Berge*, Christiania: Aschehoug.

Braseth, Karl
1910a *Hollraøventyra, Svanøventyra: gamalt paa Sparbumaal*, Sparbu: [no publisher given].
1910b *Øventyr, Sagn: gamalt paa Sparbumaal*, Sparbu: [no publisher given].

Bugge, Sophus

1971 *Gamle norske folkeviser*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget (first published in 1858).

Bø, Olav (Ed., Introduction and Commentary)
1981 *Norske segner: segner i utval*, Oslo: Samlaget.

Faye, Andreas
1948 *Norske Folkesagn*, Oslo: Norsk Folkeminnelags Skrifter (63).

Haukenæs, Th.S.
1884-1896 *Natur, Folkeliv og Folketro i Hardanger: belyst ved Natur og Folkelivsskildringer, Eventyr, Sagn, Fortællinger osv. fra ældre og nyere tid samlet og udgivet af Th.S. Haukenæs*, Hardanger: [no publisher given].

Landstad, M.B.
1925 *Norsk Folkeviser fra Telemarken*, edited by K. Liestøl, Oslo: Aschehoug.

Liestøl, Knut
1939-1959 *Norsk Folkediktning. 1. Eventyr*, Oslo: Samlaget.

Loupedalen, Torjus
1956 *Ættesoga samla og skrivi av Torjus Loupedalen*, editor unknown, Kviteseid: [no publisher given].

Løland, Rasmus
1895 *Blodstyring og andre sogar*, Christiania: [no publisher given].
1898 *Jordvand. Segn og æventyr*, Christiania: [no publisher given].
1905 *Norsk eventyrbok. Etter uppskrifter paa folkemaalet*, Oslo: Samlaget.
1941-1942 *Skrifter i samling. Forteljingar og skildringar*, edited by O. Midttun, Oslo: Samlaget.

Moe, Ingebrikt Moltke and Ivar Mortenson
1877 *Norske Fornkvæde og Folkeviser. 1*, Christiania: [no publisher given].

Nergaard, Sigurd
1924 *Eventyr, barnevers, spurninger og ordspråk: Folkeminne fra Østerdalen*, Christiania: Folkeminnelag.

Olsen, Ole Tobias
1909 *Norske folkeeventyr. Samling i Nordland*, Christiania: Cappelen.

Opedal, Hallvard O.
1985 *Makter og menneske. XIII. folkeminne ifrå Hardanger*, Bergen: Norsk bokreidningslag.

Qvigstad, Just and G. Sandberg
1887 *Just Qvigstad. Lappiske eventyr og folkesagn*, Christiania: Cammermeyer.

Skar, Johannes
1961-1963 *Gamalt or Sætesdal*, edited by O. Bø and R. Djupedal, Oslo: Samlaget.

3. Studies

Alver, Brynjulf
1989 "Folklore and National Identity", in R. Kvideland and H. Sehmsdorf (Eds.), *Nordic Folklore: Recent Studies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.13-19.

Babcock, Barbara
1977 "The Story in the Story: Metanarration in Folk Narrative", in Richard Bauman (Ed.), *Verbal Art as Performance*, Illinois: Waveland Press, pp.61-80.

Bauman, Richard (Ed.)
1977 *Verbal Art as Performance*, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Ben-Amos, Dan and Kenneth S. Goldstein (Eds.)
1975 *Folklore Performance and Communication*, The Hague: Mouton.

Berman, Patricia G.
1993 "Edvard Munch's Peasants and the Invention of Norwegian Culture", in B. Brown (Ed.), *Nordic Experiences: Exploration of Scandinavian Cultures*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, pp.213-233.

Bolckmans, Alex
1960 "Halvreplikkene i Folkeeventyrene", *Maal og Minne* 1960, pp.129-157.

Burgun, Achille
1919-1921 *Le développement linguistique en Norvège depuis 1841* (vols.1-2), Christiania: Jacob Dybwad.

Bø, Olav
1972 *Utsyn over norsk folkedikting*, Oslo: Samlaget.

Bø, Olav (Ed. and Preface)
1977 *Norsk Folkediktning: Eventyr 1*, Oslo: Samlaget, pp.48-54.

Dahl, Willy
1981 *Norges Litteratur. 1: Tid og Tekst 1814-1884*, Oslo: Aschehoug.

De Geest, Dirk
1992 "The Notion of 'System': Its Theoretical Importance and its Methodological Implications for a Functionalist Translation Theory", in Harald Kittel (Ed.), *Histories, Systems, Literary Translations*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Dollerup, Cay, Iven Reventlow and Carsten Rosenberg Hansen
1986 "A Case Study of Editorial Filters in Folktales: A Discussion of the *Allerleirauh* Tales in Grimm", *Fabula* 27:1/2, pp.12-30.

Dollerup, Cay
1993 "The *Grimm Tales* in 19th Century Denmark", *Target* 5:2, pp.191-214.

Dorson, Richard
1964 Preface in R. Th. Christiansen (Ed.), *Folktales of Norway*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp.v-xviii.

Dundes, Alan
1985 "Nationalistic Inferiority Complexes and the Fabrication of Fakelore: A Reconsideration of Ossian, the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, the *Kalevala*, and Paul Bunyan", *Journal of Folklore Research* 22:1, pp.5-18.

Elviken, Andreas

1931 "The Genesis of Norwegian Nationalism", *The Journal of Modern History* III:3, pp.365-391.

Even-Zohar, Itamar
1978 "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem", in J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. Van den Broeck (Eds.), *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, Leuven: Acco, pp.117-129.
1990 *Polysystem Studies*, special issue of *Poetics Today* 11:1.

Falnes, Oscar J.
1968 *National Romanticism in Norway*, New York: Columbia University.

Finnegan, Ruth
1976 "What is Oral Literature Anyway? Comments in the Light of Some African and Other Comparative Material", in B. Stolz and R. Shannon (Eds.), *Oral Literature and the Formula*, Ann Arbor: Center for the Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies at the University of Michigan, pp.127-166.
1977 *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1975 *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays*, Rowley MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Foss, Thorbjørg
1923 "Ordforrådet i Asbjørnsen og Moes første eventyrutgaver", *Maal og Minne* 1923, pp.209-237.

Fürst, Lillian
1969 *Romanticism*, London: Methuen.

Gundersen, Dag
1967 *Fra Wergeland til Vogt-komiteen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Haffner, H.J.
1942 *Asbjørnsen og Moe's norske folkeeventyr. En bibliografisk undersøkelse*, Oslo: N.W. Damm & Søn.

Hagemann, Sonja

1963 *Jørgen Moe. Barnas dikter*, Oslo: Aschehoug.

Hansen, Hans
1932 *P.Chr. Asbjørnsen: Biografi og karakteristikk*, Oslo: Aschehoug.

Haring, Lee
1972 "Performing for the Interviewer: A Study of the Structure of Context", *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 36, pp.383-398.

Haugen, Einar
1968 *Rikspråk og Folkemål: Norsk Språkpolitikk i det 20. århundre*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget (English edition: 1966 *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press).

Hendricks, William O.
1973 *Essays on Semiolinguistics and Verbal Art*, Paris: Mouton.

Hermans, Theo
1991 "Translational Norms and Correct Translations", in K.M. van Leuven-Zwart and T. Naaijkens (Eds.), *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp.155-170.

Hodne, Ørnulf
1979 *Jørgen Moe og Folkeeventyrene: En studie i nasjonalromantisk folkloristikk*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
1994 *Det nasjonale hos norske folklorister på 1800-tallet*, Oslo: Norges forskningsråd.

Hoel, Sigurd
1963 "Eventyrene våre", in Nils Lie (Ed.), *Essays i utvalg*, Oslo: Gyldendal, pp.100-110.

Holbek, Bengt
1987 *Interpretation of Fairy Tales. Danish Folklore in a European Perspective* (*FF Communications)*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Holmes, James S., José Lambert and Raymond Van den Broeck (Eds.)
1978 *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, Leuven: Acco.

Holmes, James S.
1988 "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies", in R. Van den Broeck (Ed.), *Translated! Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp.66-80.

Hovstad, Johan
1933 "Eventyrmålet hjå Asbjørnsen og Moe", *Syn og Segn* 39, pp.289-299.

Hymes, Dell
1975 "Breakthrough into Performance", in D. Ben-Amos and K.S. Goldstein (Eds.), *Folklore Performance and Communication*, The Hague: Mouton, pp.11-74.

Jorgenson, Theodore
1978 *Norwegian Literature in Medieval and Early Modern Times*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Kielhau, Wilhelm
1931 *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennem tidene: Tidsrummet 1840 till omkring 1875*, Oslo: Aschehoug.

Knudsen, Trygve
1966 "'Overbestemthet' i Forskningsfelt", *Maal og Minne* 1966, pp.58-65.

Koht, Halvdan
1977 *Norsk Vilje*, Oslo: Noregs Boklag.

Larsen, Karen
1950 *A History of Norway*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Liestøl, Knut
1932 "Jørgen Moe som eventyrforteljar", *Syn og Segn* 38, pp.145-156.
1977 Introduction in Olav Bø (Ed.), *Norsk Folkediktning: Eventyr 1*, Oslo: Samlaget, pp.7-47.
1979 *P. Christian Asbjørnsen: Mannen og Livsverket*, Oslo: Gyldendal.

Lundeby, Einar
1956 *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske språk*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Lundén, Kåre
1982 *Norsk grålysning. Norsk nasjonalisme 1770-1814*, Oslo: Samlaget.

McGlathery, James (Ed.)
1988 *The Brothers Grimm and Folktale*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Moe, Moltke
1895 "Ævintyri paa vandring", *Syn og Segn* 1, pp.87-116.
1925-1927 "Det nasjonale gjennembrud og dets mænd", in K Liestøl (Ed.), *Moltke Moes Samlede Skrifter*, Christiania: Aschehoug, pp.1-196 (first published in 1896).

O'Giollain, Diarmuid
1990 "Folklore: The Nation and the State", *Suomen Antropologi* 4, pp.29-38.

Popp, Daniel
1977 *Asbjørnsen's Linguistic Reform*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Raabe, G.
1942 *Asbjørnsen og Moes eventyr og sagn. Bibliografi*, Oslo: Cammermeyer.

Ribsskog, Øyvin
1966 *Eventyrkongen og Romerike*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Rudvin, Mette
1995 *The Role of Norms in Text Production: A Case Study of a Norwegian Folktale Collection and its Role in Shaping National Identity*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Warwick.

Sand Bakken, Hallvard
1935 "Omkring Asbjørnsen - Hvorledes P.Chr. Asbjørnsen begynte som sagnforteller - for egen regning", *Edda* 32, pp.463-497.

Seip, Didrik Arup

1933 *Fornorskningen av vårt språk og forutsetningene for den*, Christiania: Skandinavisk kulturforlag.

Shavit, Zohar
1981 "Translation of Children's Literature as a Function of its Position in the Literary Polysystem", *Poetics Today* 2:4, pp.171-181.

Skard, Vemund
1973 *Norsk Språkhistorie 1814-1884*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Sørensen, Ernst
1962 *Norske Folke og Huldreeventyr*, Oslo: Riksmålsforbundet.

Tedlock, Dennis
1975 "On the Translation of Style in Oral Narrative", in A. Paredes and R. Bauman (Eds.), *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore*, Austin: University of Texas Press, pp.115-133.
1990 "From Voice and Ear to Hand and Eye", *Journal of American Folklore* 103, pp.133-156.

Toury, Gideon
1980 *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
1992 "'Lower-Paradise', a Cross-Road. Sifting a Hebrew Translation of a German *Schlaraffenland* Text through a Russian Model", in H. Kittel (Ed.), *Histories, Systems, Literary Translations*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, pp.46-65.
1995 *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ward, Donald
1988 "New Misconceptions about Old Folktales: The Brothers Grimm", in J. McGlathery (Ed.), *The Brothers Grimm and Folktale*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp.91-100.

Wilson, William
1976 *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Østerud, Øyvind
1984 *Nasjonenes selvbestemmelsesrett: Demokrati og samfunnstryring*,

Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Øverland, Andreas
1902 *Hvorledes P.Chr. Asbjørnsen begynte som sagnforteller*, Christiania: Det norske aktie forlag.

Øyslebø, Olaf
1971 "Stilviljen bak Asbjørnsens endringer i huldreeventyrene", in Olaf Øyslebø, *Stilstudier*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, pp.64-76.

Appendix 1: Synopsis of Popp (1977)

1. *Doubled vowel letters and "supporting e"*. "By carrying out his plan in 1859 Asbjørnsen achieved virtual consistency in his overall treatment of long vowels in words with closed-syllable root forms [...] he anticipated the acceptance of Knudsen's 1861 proposal for reform on this point and quite possibly then influenced the decision in favor of acceptance of Knudsen's program. Second, he did this as a literary figure, his case is in fact the earliest we know of, since Wergeland never completed a comparable revision in his practice and Ibsen did so only in 1862" (Popp 1977: 35).
2. *"Silent e"*. "It is reasonable to suppose also in the case of 'silent *e*' that *Asbjørnsen's anticipation of the reform influenced the decision to adopt that reform*" (Popp 1977: 40; emphasis added).
3. *"Silent d and t" in postvocalic clusters.* "So far as it is now known no other literary figure in Norway had moved to eliminate the letters up to that time. Asbjørnsen's treatment of the clusters could hardly have escaped the attention of the delegates at Stockholm in 1869 [...]. Løkke's report and Asbjørnsen's 1870 texts reached the public at approximately the same time [and] *no doubt both influenced the official decision to endorse Aeries' spelling list of 1885*" (Popp 1977: 44; emphasis added).
4. *"i" versus "j" for /j/ in unstressed syllables.* "In the case of literary texts, we know yet of no consistent treatment of /j/ which can compare with Asbjørnsen's in 1870, and the principled and exacting solution which he provided might easily have influenced the official decision to endorse Aeries' spelling list in 1885" (Popp 1977: 49).
5. *"æ" and "e" for short vowels.* "Asbjørnsen's solution was Norwegian and not Danish. It perhaps set a precedent for truly Norwegian solutions, *thus laying certain ground for the reform to come in 1917, which, based even more radically on native phonology, brought a complete break with Danish tradition*" (Popp 1977: 59; emphasis added).
6. *"æ" and "e" for long vowels.* "Of spellings which Asbjørnsen did not revise, all those for words with Old Norse etynoms in *ei* show *e* for /e:/ [...]. That Asbjørnsen's treatment of such words was so uniform suggests that spellings with *e* were standard at least for this group" (Popp 1977: 63).
7. *Capitalized initial letters.* "But aware as [the delegates at Stockholm in 1869] surely were of the step which Asbjørnsen had taken in 1859, they may have considered his revisions a sign that resistance was already weakening in Norway [...]. *Only Asbjørnsen's treatment of indefinite pronouns was in a position to influence decisions made at Stockholm, and thus to be of consequence in the movement for lower-case forms in Norway"* (Popp 1977: 68-69; emphasis added).
8. *Spacing and hyphenation.* "it is possible that Asbjørnsen's solution to the problem of the reading difficulty which these presented was heeded by many who expected that such terms would become increasingly common in written Norwegian, among whom of course would be delegates at Stockholm" (Popp 1977: 76).

9. *"c", "q", "x", z", and "th", "ou" in native words and early loans.* "The general indication is that Asbjørnsen was a leader of the development which saw the rejection of *c*, *q*, and *z*" (Popp 1977: 79).
10. *Recent loans of non-Germanic origin.* "it is important to notice in particular that Asbjørnsen had partly adopted naturalized forms well in advance of the 1862 reform. The texts from before 1859 *were thus in a favorable position to influence the official decision which came in that year, as well as the recommendations which came from Stockholm in 1868. These texts show that Asbjørnsen was well ahead of developments in Norway on these points*, and at least keeping pace with developments in Denmark" (Popp 1977: 87; emphasis added).
11. *"sk" for "dsk" in root consonant clusters and "ls", "lt", "rt" and "ns" for older "lts", "ldt", "rdt", and "nds" or "nts"* (see Popp 1977: 92).
12. *Doubled consonant letters before "r"*. This feature, however, was not taken up by the language reformers. "This is one instance, the only one, in which his orthographic revisions fail to anticipate the general line of development. Asbjørnsen nonetheless remains the first major Norwegian writer we know of to have concerned himself directly with the problem of consonant letters before *r*. He worked out a solution which seems as principled as it could be, *and which can be readily understood as a response to native linguistic conditions*" (Popp 1977: 47; emphasis added).

Appendix 2: My analysis

Punctuation

1843-1852: Virtually unchanged, in the transition from the 1843 to the 1852 texts, the punctuation is, if anything, more conservative. One of the features that distinguishes Dano-Norwegian from modern Norwegian is the use of commas (see e.g. Øyslebø 1971 or Dahl 1981). In the former, commas are used much more frequently, partly due to a higher frequency of parataxis. In Dano-Norwegian, commas are used before relative clauses, for example before the infinitive marker *at* and before prepositions and connectives, *som, til, og, at*. The omission of commas in cases other than marking the separation of a relative clause from the main clause is one of the features that renders the text under study "Norwegian" rather than "Danish-Norwegian"; this particular feature is slower to appear than modernizations in orthography and lexica, however, and it is not until the 1904 edition that economy in punctuation really breaks through.

1852-1866: On the whole unchanged; some more commas have in fact been added, which — if anything — renders the syntax more rather than less conservative.

1866-1874: In this edition the punctuation is actually slightly more conservative in regard to the use of commas; in some cases the exclamation marks of the previous version have been substituted with commas, rendering the text more "bookish" and less "oral". In this version the dialogue is now marked with a dash (–) for direct (and

sometimes free-indirect) speech.

1874-1904: The 1904 edition has significantly simplified (and "Norwegianized") the text, in the main by a considerable reduction in the frequency of commas. As regards the format, this version has been divided into more paragraphs, mainly by changing the format of dialogue sequences, starting on a new line for most new instances of reported (direct and free-indirect) speech, a substitution of the previous dashes. Also, in a few cases the sentences have been divided into shorter units. All of these modifications are a development in the direction of less conservative, less Danish, and less formal style towards a lighter, more "oral" narrative mode.

1904-1909: Virtually unchanged, three cases of long sentences divided into shorter units.

1909-1914: Unchanged.

1914-1982: Mainly unchanged.

Orthography

1843-1852: A few orthographical modifications were found in the second title, signalling a gradual Norwegianization: *gj - g* (*gjildt - gildt*), *oe - o* (*troe - tro*, but only in the first occurrence), *aa - o* (*aarkede - orkede*), *ld - l* (*Troldpak - Trolpak*, although this is the only occurrence of *ld* becoming *l* as early as this; it may therefore be an error), *gj - j* (*Gjenten - Jenten*, although the use of the *gj* form is used inconsistently in 1843; indeed *Jenten* seems to be preferred); finally the form *allene* appeared in the 1843/44 version substituted for *alene* in 1852 (again, this was not consistent in the 1843/44 text; both forms appear). There were two instances of revised capitalization, but they seem arbitrary as the one is a modernization (*Stort - stort*) and the other is a conservatism (*to - To*, although this to is the only occurrence of adjectival nominal *To* non-capitalized in 1843/44). Only one occurrence of the splitting of compound words was found (*paafærde - paa Færde*).

1852-1866: Clear Norwegianization with the substitution of single vowels for double vowels: *e* for *ee* (in 1852 *see*, *veed*, *snee*, *meente*, *seent* and *kanskee*) and *i* for *ii* (in *vis*), *e* for *je* (*Bjerg*), *æ* for *e* (*hæspe*). Also *oe* for *o'* (*Mo'r*) and *gj* for *j* (*jente*). Only in two cases has the capital letter for pronouns been changed (*Intet* and *Jer*); one compound contraction: *førend - før*.

1866-1874: Is on the whole conservative, sometimes even reverting to the 1852 edition such as *hespe* becoming *hæspe* and *Bro'r* becoming *Broder*; only in two cases is the orthography Norwegianized: *Ødt* becomes *Øde*, *ld* becomes *l* in *tilfalds*; in three cases only has the capital letter for adjectival nouns been abandoned: *Alt*, *To*, and *Anden*; contraction of compounds: *jasaa - ja saa*.

1874-1904: Clear Norwegianization: *Moder - More, æ* becomes *e* in *nægte - negte* and becomes *aa* in *græd - graad*; *nd* becomes *n* in *sindt - sint, Prinds - Prins, Prindsesse - Prinsesse*; *dt* becomes *dd* in *opredt - opredd*; single consonants in *vis - viss* and *vakkre - vakre*; *v* for *g* in *skogen - skoven*; *u* for *ue* in *duer - dur*; further, the omission of capital letters for: *Ingen, Nogen,* and the tendency towards contraction into compound words: *nok saa - noksaa, efter at - efterat, bort igjennem - bortigjennem* (but not consistent: e.g. *saameget - saa meget*) is another step in the same direction.

1904-1909: Capital letters for common nouns have been abandoned consistently. Other significant changes towards Norwegianization are simplification of infinitive verb forms: *sagde - sa* (also *lagde, tager*), *have - ha, give - gi, bede - be* and past tense forms *boede - bodde* and *spurgte - spurte*; also the omission of silent *d* in *klæder - klær* and *hundredevis - hundrevis*. Other Norwegianizations are substitution of plosives *d - t* (*lede*), and *b - p* (*eple*), of "soft" consonants *g - k* (*legte*), and the substitution of *æ* for *e* (*Flæk, stærkere*). Two other examples of orthographical Norwegianization were found: *Kammer - kammers, Moderen - moren*. In this revision, however, the trend towards separating compound words was in some cases reverted to (*noksaa - nok saa, fordi - for de*); on the whole the use of compound words seems to follow a development first towards integration and much later a re-division into two separate words.

1909-1914: A continuation of the previous orthographical Norwegianization: *g - k* (*rig, rigdom, forligt, knaget, brug, skreg, røg*), *d - t* (*mad, maade, ude, rude, sad, hede, draabe, did, vide, baade*) and *b - p* (*løb*); as well as new developments: *y - u* (*dyppet - duppe*), *dste - ste* (*vidste - viste*), *dd - dt* (*ludd - lydt*), *f - v* (*af, afsted*), *g - t, hv - kv* (*hvid*) and *ld - ll* (*trold*); also *kammer - kammers*.

1914-1982: The continuing and consistent implementation of the following linguistic modifications started in previous editions: *nd - nn* (*mand - mann, skulde - skulle, ind - inn, inde - inne, kunde - kunne, hende - henne, tænde - tænne, kjender - kjenne, end - enn, anden - annen, vandet - vannet, kvindfolk - kvinnfolk, indtat - inntat*); *ld - ll* (*fuld - full, guld - gull, vild - vill, vilde - ville*); *aa - å* consistently, *æ - e* (*vægg - vegg, læste - leste, færdig - ferdig, længe - lenge, længer - lenger, dækket - dekket, omhæng - omheng, forældre - foreldre, tændte - tente, næse - nese, tætte - tette, trætt - trette, nætter - netter, ræd - redd, vækket - vekket, ældst - eldst, sætte - sette, træ - tre, kjærring - kjerring*), *b - p* (*skibe - skipe*) and *dst - st* (*sidst, bedste*); further modifications not found in the previous editions are:

- the abandoning of the silent letters: *ig - i* (*aldrig - aldri*, but not *riktig*) *og - o* (*slog*), *ad - a* (*hvad - hva*) and *ed - e* (*stedmor - stemor*);
- the doubling of consonants: *k - kk* (*gik - gikk, fik - fikk, rok - rokk, skik - skikk, sprak - sprakk*), *p - pp* (*op- opp*), *s - ss* (*stuslig - stusslig, os - oss, tilpas - tilpass, des - dess*), *t - tt* (*sat - satt, hat - hatt, nat - natt, indtat - inntatt, tat - tatt*), *l - ll* (*altid - alltid, vil - vill*), *f - ff* (*Huf - Huff*) and *b - bb* (*stub - stubb*).

The following changes have also been implemented: *ig - eg* (*sig - seg*), *u - o* (*rum -*

rom, slukket - slokket), *ske - skje* (*kanske - kanskje*), *e - a* (*frem - fram*), *Øi - Øy* (*Øine - Øyne, Øieblikk - Øyeblikk, høit - høyt*) and *e - ei* (*skorstenspipen - skorsteinspipen*) as well as *g - k* (*rigdommen - rikdomme, rigtig - riktig, magt - makt*), *em - om* (*mellem - mellom*) and *ei - æ* (*veir - vær*); note also *noget - noe* and *endda - enda*; also *hjemmenifra - hjemmefra, faa laane - få låne, gammeltroll - gamletroll*. Capital letter for *Dere* has been abandoned for the modern *dere*. Most of the compound words are separated in modern Norwegian, such as those found in this text: *tilsidst - til sist, bortigjennem - bort igjennom, derop - der opp, tilpas - til pass* and *imorgen - i morgen*, but the word *Ja saa* is often, but not always, rendered *jassåa*.

Lexica

1843-1852: The only lexical change found was *Aften - Kveld*, which could be said to constitute a Norwegianization.

1852-1866: Here too the lexical development is towards Norwegianization, although in some instances they are simply synonyms; for example, although *sindt* here becomes *arg*, in the next edition the text reverts to *sindt*. Seven cases of lexical changes (near-synonymical) were found: *behøvde at - skulde* and *kan* (needed to - should-can), *Beskjed om - Rede paa* (notice/news about - heard about), *huskede at - mindtes* (remembered - remembered), *forelsket i - glad i* (in love with - fond of), *bestandigt - altid* (always - always), *eie - have* (own - have), *sindt - arg* (angry - angry).

1866-1874: 9 cases of lexical modifications which taken as a whole constitute a mild Norwegianization: *Oevrige - andre, agt - vogt, saaledes - saa, Ild - Varme, noget - nogen, Sovedrik - Svaledrik, saamegen - saameget, sikker - vis, arg - sindt*.

1874-1904: Only 7 cases of lexical changes, but they all signal a relevant Norwegianization of language: *Raad - Greie, hexet - troldet, saadan - slik, Fruentimmer - Kvindfolk, anden - andre, sortere - svartere, Skorten - Peis*.

1904-1909: Only two clear lexical changes, both in the directions of Norwegianization, were found in this revision (both near-synonyms): *prægtigt - gromt, Aftenen - kvelden* (beautiful and evening).

.

1909-1914: 11 cases of lexical substitutions, and virtually all the 1914 words are Norwegianized (near-synonymical) forms: *deilig - vakker, værelse - rum, hvorledes - hvordan, altid - støtt, forrige - andre, ligedan - like ens, friste - prøve, utmaset - utkjørt, Frempaa dagen - Om dagen* and *fragte - flytte* (beautiful, room, room, how, always, previous-other, similarly - just like, try, exhausted, further on in the day - during the day, move).

1914-1982: Lexical differences that have been found in these two texts are: *meget - mye* and *støtt - alltid* (much and always) which constitute (near-synonymical)

Norwegianizations; in addition, the following (near-synonymical) lexical changes appear: *brukte - pleide, til - som, til - dess,* and *efter - efterpå* (used to, as, the more, afterwards).

Adjectival / Verb endings

1843-1852: None. The only instance of any morphological modification was the omission of a double definite in 1852 (*den gamle Troldkjærring - den gamle Troldkjærringen*). Given that this is in all the other versions a progressive development in the later editions, it could be an oversight or may have been an experimental one-off. The definite article (plural) form *ene* appears in both the 1843/44 and 1852 editions (in the word *Bølgetpppene*), only to revert to the more conservative form *erne* (*Bølgetopperne*) in 1866 until it is modified again to the more "Norwegian" form *ene* in 1904.

1852-1866: Prudent Norwegianization with the following changes: *ede* becomes *et* in *sørgede, feilede* and *legede,* although other *ede-* forms have been maintained; *aae* becomes *aa* in *faae*, *gaae*, *slaae*, *staae*, *laae*; *oe* becomes *o* in *boede,* but not throughout and only in the present tense.

1866-1874: Very few changes; only one instance of *ede* becoming *ed* and the relative pronoun *der* becoming *som*.

1874-1904: Significant Norwegianizations in the verb forms in the 1904 edition with the substitution of *te* for *ede* (*ringede - ringte*). The substitution of the definite article plural form in *erne* for *ene* (*Bølgetopperne* becomes *Bølgetoppene*) although this is not consistent (e.g. *Gangerne*): it is also another development towards modern Norwegian. Surprisingly, both the 1843/44 and 1852 editions have the less conservative definite article form in the plural, but only in the word *Bølgetoppene*. Furthermore, in this edition the use of the nominative *dig* has in some instances (pp.54, 55 and 60) been exchanged for the accusative *du* and *hende* for *hun* (pp.55, 56 and 57), a strong indication of colloquiality and oral style; the effect is the same with the frequent use of the double definite, for example: *den andre Morgen - den andre Morgenen* (pp.57 and 58), *begge de forrige Ganger - begge de forrige Gangene* (p.50), *i det Kammer - i det Kammeret* (p.59), and *den gamle Troldkjærring - den gamle Troldkjærringen* (p.61); this is not an unusual feature in the NF revisions according to my analysis, but only in one instance have I found that the radical use of the accusative *dem* (them) in nominative position; i.e. instead of *de* (they).

1904-1909: Continuing the previous development towards Norwegianization of verb forms: *ede* verb-ending becomes *ed/te* (*skinnede - skinte*, *lovede - lovte*, *bankede - banket*, *snakkede - snakket*, *vaskede - vasket*, *pyntede - pyntet* and the irregular *gnedet - gnidd*); this trend is not completely consistent, however; other grammatical developments in this text, all constituting Norwegianizations, are: indefinite pronouns *hvor* becomes *det* and *der* becomes *det*; *er* is used consistently for the regular plural

form (*Dage - dager, Gange - ganger*) and irregular forms are also modernized (*Huse - hus*).

1909-1914: Continuation of developments in the previous edition: shortening past tense verb forms (the infinitive has already been Norwegianized in 1909): *taget - tatt, havde - hadde, give - gi, -ed* to *-et* in *kasted, pynted, sørged, banked, knaged, stunded*) and irregular forms *gned - gnudde*; definite article in the plural form *erne* to *ene* (*fillerne - fillene, vinduerne - vinduene*); impersonal pronoun (this development had begun in the previous edition, and here too is inconsistent) *der* to *det* or *som*; more cases of double definite, e.g. *næste torsdagskveld - næste torsdagskvelden* (p.169) and *datter din - datteren din* (p.169); in addition, on a few occasions in this edition (but not consistently), the accusative *ham* has been substituted for the grammatically incorrect nominative form *han* which is however very common in spoken language and therefore provides an effect of "oral style".

1914-1982: The past tense verb endings *ev* and *av* become *e* and *a* (*blev - ble* and *gav - ga*), *jagde - jaget* and *været - vært*. In some cases, the definite article ending *en* becomes *a* for feminine gender (*kjærringen - kjærringa, jenten - jenta, bygden - bygda*); the infinitive form at becomes consistently *å*; the impersonal pronoun *der* becomes consistently *det*; the modern edition retains the (inconsistent) use of the (grammatically incorrect) accusative for nominative forms (*han* for *ham* and *det er mig - det er jeg*) for "oral" effect.

Other

1843-1852: There were more additions in the 1852 edition vis-à-vis the 1843/44 than in any of the others. However, none of these additions or omissions actually seem to constitute any change in "content" or Norwegianization:

- *vaskede de Fillerne hun havde* (p.2) (washed her rags) is in 1852 *stelte istand Fillerne* (p.251) (arranged rags);
- *der er Ingen, som veed hvor langt der var* (p.2) (no one knows how far it was) is omitted in the 1852 edition (p.251);
- *og saaledes gik det hver Nat* (p.3) (and that is what happened every night) is in 1852 and in all subsequent editions provided with the explanatory phrase: *og dette var Hvidbjørnen, som kastede Hammen af sig om Natten* (p.251) (and this was the Whitebear who cast off his pelt at night);
- *det kan vi nok snakke om siden* (p.5) (we can talk about that later) in 1852 becomes *det kan vi altid snakke om* (p.253) (we can always talk about it);
- *til min nærmeste Grande* (p.7) (to the nearest neighbour) is in 1852 *til Grandekjærringen* (p.255) (to the neighbour's wife);
- the phrase *du kan kanskee faae Brug for det* (p.7) (you might find a use for it) has been omitted in 1852 (p.255); this may be an error because it appears a few lines later as the second of three phrases that accompany a sequence of three events, and again in the third occurrence;
- *og hun var ikke istand* (p.13) (and she wasn't able) is in 1852 *saa hun ikke var*

istand (p.259) (so that she wasn't able);

- *og sortere* (p.14) (and blacker) is missing in 1852 (p.261) to describe the stains on the Prince's shirt; this may also be an oversight as it does appear a few lines later in the same collocation as in the 1843/44 edition;
- the 1843/44 has a short one-sentence epilogue at the end of the tale which is missing in the 1852 edition and all the subsequent editions (although it is not an uncommon feature in the NF in other tales): *Hvorledes de kom afsted, og hvor de flyttede hen, det veed jeg ikke, men er det dem jeg mener, saa er de ikke saa langt borte endda* (p.15) (how they left and where they moved I do not know, but if it is the ones I am thinking about, they cannot be very far away yet);
- There were also additions or omissions of the following pronouns, prepositions and connectives in this sequence: *og*, *saa*, *han*, *nok*, *da*, *det*, *nei*, *den*, *alligevel*, *heller* (and, so, him, probably, then, it, no, it, still and rather); and on one occasion *i* was exchanged for *paa* (in for on). This revision constitutes a careful and still hesitant Norwegianization.

1852-1866: There are 13 cases of very slight modifications: additions / omissions / changes in position preposition / pronouns / connectives etc. (hereafter referred to as "idiom"). They do not seem to signal any relevant radicalization of language and certainly do not indicate any changes in terms of "content".

1866-1874: Only seven instances of changes in idiom; all negligible from the point of view of Norwegianization. In this version the winds have become animated ("him" rather than "it") although this is not yet done consistently; it adds a touch of "oral style" to the text and is followed through in the subsequent versions. On the whole, there are fewer changes here than from 1852 to 1866.

1874-1904: Here the winds and the White Bear have become consistently animated ("him" for "it"), strengthening the effect of an "oral style". As regards idiom, only three instances have been noted, but here (p.59) there is actually the addition of a short phrase *så de gav ham en sovedrikk* ("and they gave him a sleeping potion"). The 1874-1904 revision represents a significant Norwegianization.

1904-1909: Only four changes in idiom/syntax, have been found; none of them significant either in terms of Norwegianization or content. This revision constitutes on the whole a significant Norwegianization of the text, especially in terms of orthography.

1909-1914: Twelve cases of modifications in idiom/syntax have been found, as before, irrelevant to the Norwegianization programme. This revision constitutes a moderate Norwegianization.

1914-1982: Contraction is used to give an "oral effect": *hatt ham* becomes *hatt'n*; *om han* becomes *om'n* and *min - mi'*.