

6. Jacob Fellman's Introduction to Saami Indigenous Religion: A Source Critical Dilemma

Konsta Kaikkonen

Introducing the Problem

In this chapter, it is my intention to take a source-critical look at what the vicar Jacob Fellman (1795–1875) wrote about Saami indigenous religion¹ in his posthumously published works. According to observations made in a previous text, I had come to the hypothesis that Fellman's text is, such as many others in the genre, a compilation of previously published texts.² Here I have taken the task of exploring this hypothesis further. In order to achieve this goal, I will especially take a closer look at a passage about the ritual specialists of the Saami, most often called *noaidis* in North Saami.

In the first part of the chapter, I will look at the context and history surrounding Fellman's manuscripts before they were published in 1906. After exploring the context of the passage about ritual specialists, I turn to look at its content, comparing it to several other texts, especially descriptions of Saami indigenous religion written by Lars Levi Laestadius, Knud Leem, and Erik Jessen-Schardebøll. The results of a simplified content analysis are then related to archival work done in the Fellman family collections in Helsinki. I will conclude with some findings and by introducing further questions about Fellman's texts that remain unsolved.

Jacob Fellman was a clergyman in northernmost Finland at the beginning of the nineteenth century, at a time when Finland had become a grand duchy of Tsarist Russia. His written works, published in four volumes in 1906 under the title *Anteckningar*

How to cite this book chapter:

Kaikkonen, K. 2022. Jacob Fellman's Introduction to Saami Indigenous Religion: A Source Critical Dilemma. In: Rydving, H. and Kaikkonen, K. (eds.) *Religions around the Arctic: Source Criticism and Comparisons*. Pp. 161–203. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16993/bbu.g>. License: CC BY 4.0

under min vistelse i Lappmarken ('Notes on My Sojourn in Lapland'), have been important sources for everyone interested in the history of northernmost Finland and Sápmi.³ This is also true for the Study of Religions: Church historians and historians of Saami indigenous religion have often used Fellman's writings as sources, although his collections of yoiks have often overshadowed his more general descriptions of Saami indigenous religion.

Even though there are some important remarks about Saami indigenous religion in all the four volumes, for example in the travel descriptions found in the first and third volumes, as well as in the correspondences found in the fourth, the most important volume concerning Saami religion is the second one. It opens with a section titled *Ur Lappisk Mytologi och Lappländsk Säger* ('From Lappish mythology and Lapland legends'). This section is preceded by a short preface written by the editor Isak Fellman (1841–1919), who was Jacob's son and responsible for publishing his late father's works in 1906 after Isak had retired from his position as a lawyer.

In this preface of the second volume, Isak Fellman describes the editing process and the history concerning the two different manuscripts that comprise the first part of the volume (pp. 13–190). The first of these manuscripts was (1) a 'general introduction' to Saami religion, which is referred to as the General Part (Swe. *allmänna delen*) by the editor (pp. 13–74, hereafter referred to as GP) and the second (2) an 'alphabetically organized part', which is referred to as the Lexical Part (Swe. *lexikaliska delen*) by the editor (pp. 74–190, hereafter referred to as LP). After these parts, the volume continues with J. Fellman's collections of yoiks and stories (*Lappska sånger och sagor*, pp. 191–340), followed by previously published and unpublished translations, newspaper pieces, and other texts he authored that fall out of the present scope.

As I noted in the previously mentioned article, a part of Fellman's text appears suspiciously similar to a text by Lars Levi Laestadius (1800–61), written almost simultaneously in the mid-nineteenth century.⁴ If this is the case and Fellman's text turns out to be a loan or a compilation, as my hypothesis suspects, it would mean that Fellman's information mostly originated from previous texts written in other Saami areas than where Fellman himself was stationed. This would pose a serious problem for using the text

directly as a source to Saami indigenous religion in the North and Inari Saami areas.

As modern Saami studies emphasise the variety of cultural patterns within Sápmi instead of seeing Saami culture as a monolith with no regional or historical variation, these source-critical examinations are of great importance.⁵ Therefore, identifying Fellman's manuscript as a compilation of texts originating in different areas and time periods would make it deeply problematic if taken as a source to Saami indigenous religion 'collected' in Northern Finland in the nineteenth century, as the title of Fellman's posthumously published works would suggest at first glance.

I will begin my inquiry by introducing the history of the two manuscripts which Fellman's published text was based on, after which I will turn the spotlight on the general part, and more specifically on the subchapter called *Troll- eller Nâidekonster* (pp. 26–40). Freely translated as 'Witch- or Nâidecraft', this part mainly deals with Saami ritual specialists, called *noaidi* (sg.) in North Saami. In this text, I will use the North Saami word *noaidevuohta* as an analytical term to refer to the *noaidi*'s trade first documented in the missionary era of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁶ In order to enlighten some aspects of the complicated history of Fellman's manuscript, I compare the part about *noaidevuohta* with some other texts that deal with the same topic.

One of the hypotheses and starting points for the analysis is that the history of Fellman's manuscript – as well as its content – is even more closely intertwined with Lars Levi Laestadius's *Fragmenter i Lappska mythologien* ('Fragments of Lappish Mythology', hereafter referred to as *Fragments*) than previous scholarship has realised.⁷ This premise originates from the previously noted similarities between these texts.⁸ Laestadius's text was written between 1838 and 1845 and remained unpublished – and for the most part unknown – before the re-emergence and publication of its different parts between 1959 and 2003.⁹

The History of Fellman's Manuscript(s)

Jacob Fellman was a vicar of the Ohcejohka and Aanaar districts in the northernmost parts of the grand duchy of Finland from 1819 until 1832. He moved to Lappajärvi located in Ostrobothnia

in 1832 as he accepted a position there after a long period of seeking a more southern post. He probably began to write the manuscripts about Saami mythology around that time, even though he had apparently mentioned writing about Saami mythology to the Finnish politician and historian A. I. Arwidsson (1791–1858) already in January 1828. Arwidsson writes in a response letter to Fellman dated 14 February: ‘I wait eagerly to receive, as promised, excerpt from your notes on Lappish [Saami] mythology’.¹⁰ This is the first mention of a mythological work authored by Fellman I have been able to find.

By the end of the 1830s, Fellman had compiled a lexically organised manuscript with information about Saami mythology and tried to publish it. He was probably inspired by Christfrid Ganander’s (1741–1790) *Mythologica Fennica* which had been published in 1789. The manuscript was first sent for evaluation to the Finnish Literature Society (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, hereafter referred to as SKS) on 3 October 1838.¹¹ Fellman also mentioned in a letter draft – intended to be sent to the Norwegian clergyman and linguist Nils Vibe Stockfleth (1787–1866) in 1838 – that he would try to publish Saami ‘national songs, as well as mythological notes’.¹² These ‘mythological notes’ were presumably the lexical part (LP) in almost the same form as the one printed in 1906, excluding the parts that Isak Fellman took from that part and added to the general part (GP) as he explains in the introduction.¹³

In their board meeting held 6 February, SKS decided to set a committee to evaluate whether Fellman’s (LP) manuscript should be published or not.¹⁴ On 1 May, the board read through the committee report, written by the recently promoted professor of Philosophy Germund Aminoff (1796–1876). The committee deemed that ‘the Lappish Mythological Lexicon contains a not unimportant contribution to knowledge about the doctrine of the deities of the Lapps’,¹⁵ but criticised Fellman for a lack of differentiation between Saami and Finnish traditions as well as between historical and present traditions.¹⁶ According to the committee, the manuscript included important information that could be used elsewhere, but they added that it was not printable in its present form.¹⁷ SKS thus decided to propose to use the manuscript

elsewhere, but Fellman declined the offer.¹⁸ The Finnish national-poet-to-be J.L. Runeberg (1804–1877) sent the manuscript back to its author on behalf of SKS in March 1841.¹⁹

Despite this rejection, it seems that Fellman did not give up, but made some changes to the LP manuscript and again tried to get it published. In 1842, Fellman wrote in a letter draft, probably intended to be sent to Runeberg, that he would continue working with the Saami mythology when he had time.²⁰ The historian Gabriel Rein (1800–67) was interested in publishing the manuscript in 1848, but wrote that the handwriting was at times unreadable and that he therefore could not follow the Saami words properly. Rein suggested that Fellman should make some changes and improve the handwriting.²¹ According to Isak Fellman, the LP manuscript was probably not changed by his father after this letter.²² After this mention by Rein, the history of the manuscripts is unclear before the LP and the GP manuscripts were edited by Isak Fellman and finally published by SKS in 1906. I found no mention of the GP manuscript before this, other than that its alleged author J. Fellman presumably only started working on it later in his life.

The Laestadius Connection

What then was the connection between Jacob Fellman and Lars Levi Laestadius? Unbeknownst to Fellman, Laestadius had also begun to write a mythological work about the Saami almost simultaneously in the late 1830s. Laestadius's manuscript on Saami mythology was to be delivered to the French zoologist Joseph Paul Gaimard (1793–1858) in order to be included in the publications of the royal *La Recherche* Expedition, of which Gaimard was the leader and Laestadius a local guide.²³ Fellman and Laestadius first became aware of each other's work in 1839 through C.A. Gottlund (1796–1875) – Laestadius's study comrade from Uppsala and Fellman's schoolmate from Turku.²⁴ This happened when Laestadius learned in a letter from Gottlund, dated August 1839, that Fellman was working on a similar project as his.²⁵ Laestadius then asked Fellman to borrow his manuscript in a letter dated 15 December 1839.²⁶

Fellman had not received his manuscript back from SKS yet, so he created a short version of the LP manuscript (hereafter referred to as the '1840 manuscript'),²⁷ which he sent to Laestadius via an Estonian student from Tartu named Friedrich Heller. Heller's itinerary included visits to both Fellman's pastorate in Lappajärvi and Laestadius's in Gárasavvon.²⁸ It seems that in his response letter, sent along with the 1840 manuscript, Fellman also proposed working on a mythological overview together with Laestadius.²⁹ In a letter sent to Fellman 31 July 1840, Laestadius wrote that he had gotten possession of the 1840 manuscript only one day before and that he was going to send it back with Heller along with a few comments.³⁰ He sent these comments and a note dated 1 August 1840. The note stated, for example, that the works would not be on a collision course with each other and included a criticism of Fellman for not using the Danish historian and topographer Erik Johan Jessen-Schardebøll's (1705–1783) and the Norwegian missionary Knud Leem's (1697–1774) works as sources.³¹ Laestadius also mentioned that he had not had the time to make a transcript of the 1840 manuscript.³²

A few years later – in 1845 according to Isak Fellman – Laestadius got hold of parts of Jacob Fellman's manuscript again and this time made more extensive comments on it. Isak Fellman wrote about it thus:

In the year 1845, it seems that Laestadius – probably while his wish that the author's [J. Fellman's] work would be soon published, expressed in a previous letter, was not completed – had again requested to receive a part of the manuscript. There was also, among other documents, included a transcript of the Literature society's [i.e. SKS's] above mentioned protocol excerpt, sent to him in the winter 1845, now in the condition, in which it was submitted.³³

If I interpret Isak Fellman's slightly obscure passage correctly, a transcript of the LP manuscript – which had been under evaluation by SKS in 1840 and sent back to Jacob Fellman in 1841 – was sent to Laestadius in the winter of 1845, along with some other documents. These 'other documents'³⁴ included at least an article about graves in Vähänkyrö,³⁵ which Laestadius points to in his *Fragments*,³⁶ and a collection of songs and stories, yet another manuscript published in the second volume of *Anteckningar*.³⁷

These were apparently the 'many Lappish and Finnish sorcerers' songs'³⁸ Laestadius mentions in his book.

According to Isak Fellman, this transcript sent to Laestadius was the version of LP that included most of Laestadius's marginal notes that were published in 1906 as footnotes alongside Fellman's text. Jacob Fellman received the transcript back from Laestadius in December 1845 with the aforementioned margin comments.³⁹ Meanwhile, Laestadius's more extensive comments to Fellman – which he dated 1 May 1845 and included as the last part of his manuscript to his *Fragments* – were sent to France in June to be published.⁴⁰ Laestadius wrote in the end of his *Fragments'* fourth part that 'The author has gotten so far in November 1844, and were it not so that vicar Fellman's manuscript was to be expected, I would have finished my work here and sent it off [to publication].'⁴¹ The comments Laestadius made on Fellman's text in his *Fragments* were not the same ones that were included in the margins of J. Fellman's *Anteckningar*.⁴² These more extensive comments made by Laestadius were not published before 1997, and as such they probably remained unknown to Fellman himself. I, at least, have not found a mention of them by either Jacob or Isak Fellman.

The Norwegian Detour

It seems that, so far, the fate of Fellman's manuscript and the connection between Laestadius and Fellman is somewhat traceable, but there is a new twist in the plot: a reference to J. Fellman's *Anteckningar* suddenly appeared in the folklorist and linguist J.A. Friis's (1821–1896) well known work *Lappisk mytologi* from 1871.⁴³ Friis's book included a description of Kola Saami beliefs and practices related to a mythological being called *Kovre* or *Kevre*, a description originally found in Fellman's LP.⁴⁴ Friis's book also included some of Laestadius's more extensive comments to Fellman from the fifth part of *Fragments*, i.e. the comments which were not included in LP upon its publications. There is no question of the origin of these passages, as one of the books Friis had used as background material was the following: 'Lars Levi Læstadius. Defect manuscript, including some "Fragments in the Lappish Mythology", written down in 1840 and left to the author for use by Pastor Stockfleth in his time'.⁴⁵

In Stockfleth's autobiography there is no reference to visiting Gárasavvon or meeting Laestadius in 1840,⁴⁶ but he mentions staying as Laestadius's guest in 1844 on the first days of December:

the clergyman had prepared fragments in the Finnish-Lappish mythology; of the first part, doctrine of the gods with therein belonging mythological articles, then printed among the Society's [probably referring to the French expedition] writings, the clergyman gave me the manuscript.⁴⁷

Furthermore, Laestadius mentioned in a letter dated 7 February 1845 that he had given a copy of the first part of his book to Stockfleth to be published in Norwegian.⁴⁸ However, as the editor of the first part of Laestadius's *Fragments, Gudalära* ('The doctrine of the gods'), Per Posti has noticed,⁴⁹ Friis's book contains references to not only the first, but also the second, third, and fourth parts of *Fragments*. They were not completed by Laestadius before November 1844. As mentioned, though, the part that originated from Fellman's LP and found its way to Friis's book was not finished by Laestadius before May 1845.⁵⁰

The passage could not have been copied from Laestadius in 1840 as Friis states, nor could they have originated upon Stockfleth's 1844 visit, but were of a later date. For one reason or the other, the chronological paradox had escaped the attention of both Isak Fellman and Just Qvigstad (1853–1957), who was a student of Friis and the person who informed Isak Fellman of the manuscript held in Oslo.⁵¹

The National Library in Oslo actually houses a part of the manuscript. It was donated there as a part of Friis's personal belongings. This fragmented transcript contains 26 pages of the last part of Laestadius's comments to Fellman (§30 to §40), written on old letters received by Laestadius.⁵² I could not find any further references to this document or Stockfleth's copy of Laestadius's book before it was mentioned by Isak Fellman in 1906. This presents us with two further problems: (1) how did the parts that were not included in the first part of *Fragments* end up in Friis's book, and (2) how did the notes made by Laestadius upon Fellman's manuscript – which he did not have before the winter of 1845 – end up in Friis's book?

It is easy to follow Posti's deduction that Laestadius most probably gave the first part of the transcript of his *Fragments* to

Table 6.1. The history of Fellman's manuscript. Abbreviations: EJ = Jessen-Schardeboell; JF = Jacob Fellman; KL = Leem; LLL = Lars Levi Laestadius; LP = the Lexical Part of Fellman's text; SKS = Finnish Literature Society.

1828	1838–39	Feb 1839	May 1839	August 1839	Dec. 1839
JF mentions to Arwidsson that he is working on a manuscript about Saami mythology.	JF sends the LP manuscript to SKS.	SKS sets a committee to evaluate the LP manuscript.	SKS decides not to publish the manuscript.	Gottlund informs LLL about JF's manuscript.	LLL asks JF for the manuscript.
30 July 1840	1 August 1840	March 1841	1842	Nov. 1844	Dec. 1844
LLL receives the 1840 manuscript and a suggestion of cooperation via Heller. He refuses cooperation in a letter sent on the 31 st .	LLL sends the 1840 manuscript back to JF, along with short comments and a suggestion to use EJ and KL.	Runeberg sends the LP manuscript back to JF on behalf of SKS.	JF mentions to Runeberg that he will continue to work with Saami mythology.	LLL finishes the fourth part of his Fragments.	Stockfleth visits LLL and gets hold of a manuscript of Gudalära for translation to Norwegian.
Winter 1845	Feb 1845	April 1845	May 1845	Dec. 1845	1846
LLL borrows the LP manuscript from JF (who suggests cooperation again).	LLL mentions in a letter to Vahl that he has given Stockfleth the manuscript for Gudalära.	LLL refuses cooperation in a letter to JF and says his attention is taken by religious matters.	LLL finishes the comments on JF which becomes the fifth part of Fragments. He sends them to France in June.	LLL returns the LP manuscript he borrowed, along with the margin comments printed in 1906.	G. Rein is interested in publishing JF's manuscript but complains about the handwriting.
1860	1871	1906	1933	1946	2001
Stockfleth mentions about visiting LLL in his autobiography.	J. A. Friis publishes <i>Lappisk Mythologi</i>	Isak Fellman publishes his father's works in four volumes.	Gudalära is found in France	The rest of Fragments, along with comments to Fellman, found in the US.	The last part of Gudalära is found in France.

Stockfleth in 1844 and sent the rest for publication in Norwegian at some point after the summer of 1845 (and before Laestadius's death in 1861).⁵³ This probably happened after Laestadius realised that his work was never going to be published by the French – a realisation which becomes clear from the letters quoted by Posti.⁵⁴ This transcript of *Fragments* was the one that ended up in Friis's possession via Stockfleth, the very last pages finally ending up in the National Library of Norway in Oslo.

It is however clear that only a fragment of the manuscript in Friis's possession remains extant there: the top margins of the documents include page numbers ending in 697, which indicates that the transcript given to Stockfleth included nearly 700 pages.⁵⁵ As a point of comparison, the manuscript sent by Laestadius to Gaimard in 1845, which does not include the first part of *Fragments*, comprises 355 handwritten pages.⁵⁶ Given the fact that the transcript in Oslo is written on old letters, Laestadius could only fit circa half the amount of text on each page compared to blank paper. Therefore, the extant part in Oslo comprises of 26 pages, whereas the same text takes about half the amount in Laestadius's original manuscript.⁵⁷ It therefore seems plausible that the c. 700 pages given to Stockfleth included the same text (2nd, 3rd, and 4th parts as well as comments to Fellman) as the 355 pages handed to Gaimard in 1845. The number of pages thus also supports Posti's deduction that the first part and the rest of the transcripts were handed to Stockfleth separately (cf. Table 6.1).

Rethinking the Problem: From Context to Content

What became of Fellman's General Part? Its known history is summarised in a much more compact manner because there is so little to be learnt. It seems that it was not written before 1845, most probably closer to the 1850s (or later). It can be said with confidence that it was never sent out to Laestadius or the SKS: of Rein we cannot be sure, but it does not seem probable. According to Isak Fellman, GP was written in a different handwriting than the lexically organised part, and the numbering in the manuscript was different. In the introduction, he suggests that it was probably intended to be published separately.⁵⁸ Isak Fellman notes that

headings and a title were added to GP in his editing process, and some parts were moved from the lexically organised part to the general introduction:

However, the editor has now combined both of these complementary manuscripts into one composition. Therefore, the general part, which apparently had not been completely finished, has still undergone a partly not unimportant transformation with respect to the disposition of the material, which is additionally divided under different headlines, although they are not present in the author's manuscript.⁵⁹

This is about all I have been able to find out by digging into archives, letters, documents, and biographies. I have not been able to locate any of the three original manuscripts written by Fellman. This supports the suggestion made by the Finnish church historian and clergyman Tuomo Itkonen (1894–1984) that according to his brother, the historian T.I. Itkonen (1891–1968), Isak Fellman had burned the manuscripts and most of his father's letters after finishing his editorial task.⁶⁰ This lack of information pushes the inquiry into a new direction: if the history of the manuscripts is not traceable any further, its contents might reveal something interesting about the manuscript's fate.

I have briefly written about Fellman's text in an article about translations, where I compared a passage from his text to Laestadius's, Erik Jessen-Schardebøll's, and Hans Skanke's texts. It led me to conclude that it seems plausible that Fellman somehow had access to Laestadius's manuscripts, because of the similarity of the translation of the chosen passage from Danish to Swedish, and because Laestadius had criticised Fellman for not having used Jessen-Schardebøll's text in their correspondence.⁶¹ This is the source of the mentioned passage, so I became interested in how it ended up in Fellman's book.

In the following subsection, it is my intention to compare Fellman's and Laestadius's texts on a wider scope, extending the comparison to cover the whole of Fellman's subchapter about *noaidevuohta*. I chose this topic because it is the one that I am most familiar with, and additionally, one of the most covered themes in written descriptions of Saami indigenous religion. Fellman's text is used as a basis for the inquiry, and by comparing

it to other texts I will try to find out which parts of it seem original to Fellman and which have in turn been paraphrased from others. The approach will be similar to how the historian of religions Håkan Rydving has made source-critical remarks about Norwegian and Swedish manuscripts from the eighteenth century.⁶² After pointing to which parts are based on Fellman's own remarks, I will try to contextualise his text by looking at how it relates to contemporary theories and paradigmatic developments.

Simplified Content Analysis

To help me with this survey, I have first decided to employ a simplified quantitative form of content analysis as a method⁶³ to help me evaluate which parts of Fellman's text are common with Laestadius's, and which parts correspond with other texts. I will use the syntactical method of content analysis⁶⁴ by counting the amount of words that originate from previous texts. To illustrate this, I have copied Fellman's text from a digitised version of his book⁶⁵ to a text file and colour coded the parts that I have found out to originate from other texts (Fig. 6.1–6.4). Instead of a full synopsis, I will introduce samples from different texts to the reader for evaluation as a supplement (Tables 6.2–6.9).

The content analysis reveals that more than half of Fellman's text contains the same information as Laestadius's: an approximate analysis of the word count shows that out of the 4 147 words in Fellman's text about *noaidevuohhta*, as many as c. 2 500 contained the same information as some parts of Laestadius's *Fragments* (Fig. 6.1). The parts that are similar to Fellman's text are mostly from the second and third parts of *Fragments*, but also include passages from the first.⁶⁶

A closer look at these parts of Laestadius's text reveals that none of the passages that are common to Fellman and Laestadius were original to Laestadius, except for two: a mention of an insect 'Furia Infernalis' in very similar terms,⁶⁷ and a translation of a Saami word in Leem's text into Swedish.⁶⁸ A further analysis of Laestadius's sources of information sheds light on the origins of these passages: they include for example translations of the Danish texts by Jessen-Schardebøll and Knud Leem, the same texts which Laestadius criticised Fellman for not using. However, the passages



Figure 6.1. The parts that are similar in Fellman's and Laestadius's texts highlighted in green.

originating from Jessen-Schardebøll and Leem constitute an even larger part of Fellman's text, 2 808 words altogether (Fig. 6.2).

In fact, these were not the only sources of information that were used by Fellman. A closer look reveals that the text about *noaidevuohta* in addition includes parts from Johannes Schefferus's,⁶⁹ Lindahl & Öhrling's,⁷⁰ and Johannes Tornaeus's⁷¹ texts (Fig. 6.3), and that only about 1 100 words were original to Fellman or from a source not listed here. This comparison also reveals that the sources used in the text about *noaidevuohta* extend beyond the similarities between Fellman and Laestadius (Fig. 6.4): there are parts of these texts that Laestadius did not use in his *Fragments*, but Fellman did. This would speak for the conclusion that these texts were independent. However, there are certain qualities in the texts pointing to another direction. These common characteristics are revealed by a more thorough comparison of the wordings and translations in these texts.

A comparison of the Texts and a Catalogue of Books in the Fellman Collection

A comparison of Fellman's and Laestadius's translations of Jessen-Schardebøll's and Leem's texts (Tables 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4) from Danish into Swedish reveal a striking similarity. For example, certain words used neither by Jessen-Schardebøll nor Leem appear in both Fellman's and Laestadius's translations. Some of the abbreviations of longer texts by Fellman and Laestadius ended up being almost too similar to be made by different persons. A good example of this is a translation of Leem's text about the use of a Saami drum (SaaN. *goavddis*) in Table 6.4. The South Saami deity *Raerie* (spelled *Radien* by both Fellman and Laestadius) was not mentioned in the original, but both Fellman and Laestadius included this deity in their translations.⁷²

However, as mentioned, Fellman's text includes parts that are not found in Laestadius's *Fragments*. One of these is a passage about learning 'sorcery', taken from Schefferus almost directly, where Schefferus refers to Olaus Magnus and Peder Claussøn Friis (Table 6.5). Furthermore, some parts from Jessen-Schardebøll used by Fellman were significantly abbreviated in Laestadius's text, which would indicate that these translations were made by different persons (Table 6.6).

A passage about the different figures painted on the *goavddis* indicates an even more complicated history (Table 6.7): a description of the Lule Saami drum originally written down by Samuel Rheen was first quoted by Schefferus and then paraphrased by Leem who added some of his own remarks to Schefferus's text. Laestadius then referred to Schefferus's text, while Fellman added a part inspired by Leem's text to his description of the drum.⁷³ While this passage refers to something that can be considered 'common knowledge' about the Saami drum, and could have been written independently, it serves as a good reminder of the complexities of the origin of information about Saami indigenous religion, and *noaidevuohta* in particular. It also verifies on its part that we cannot simply deem the GP manuscript a copy of Laestadius's *Fragments*, even though the similarities of certain passages are significant.

Some more light on the matter could be shed by an investigation of the books Fellman had in his possession. Sophie Capdeville has catalogued the Fellman family's Lapponica collection, which was inherited by the Finno-Ugric society from Isak Fellman and his son Arno in the first part of the twentieth century. The collection is stored in the Finnish National library.⁷⁴ From Capdeville's catalogue one can see that the collection includes at least the following works: Leem's *Beskrivelse* from 1767 (includes Jessen's description) and a German translation from 1771 (does not include Jessen's description); Lindahl & Öhrling's *Lexicon Lapponicum* from 1780; Schefferus's *Lapponia* from 1673 as well as a German translation from 1675; Tornaeus's *Beskrifning* from 1772 (with handwritten comments).⁷⁵

The question then becomes: which of these books did Jacob have, and which were obtained by his son? It seems that the only one of these books that we can certainly say Jacob Fellman possessed was the German translation of Knud Leem's *Beskrivelse*: it has Jacob Fellman's signature on it. The other books only contain Isak's signature, and this – together with the documents of their history of ownership (documented by Capdeville) – speaks for the interpretation that the rest of these books were added to the family collection by Isak Fellman.⁷⁶ It is, however, most probable that Fellman had access to *Lapponia* at one point or another because

he explicitly refers to it.⁷⁷ Additionally, it was a standard work already since its publication in 1673.

With a superficial comparison, I could not identify the handwriting on the notes found next to Tornaeus's book in the *Laponica* collection to belong to either Isak or Jacob Fellman, so a graphological explanation about the book's history of ownership could not be given without more thorough studies, either.

One can, however, find evidence of which books Jacob had access to at the time of writing the GP manuscript when comparing Fellman's, Laestadius's, and Tornaeus's texts (Table 6.8), if one keeps in mind that the parts originating from Tornaeus were paraphrased by Schefferus as well. The clumsy translation of one passage from Latin into Swedish by Fellman (italicised in Table 6.8) reveals that he only had access to either Schefferus's or Laestadius's text, and not Tornaeus's. Laestadius, however, probably had access to Tornaeus's Swedish text published in 1772 because of the remarkable similarity in the wordings. A further comparison of Fellman's and Laestadius's texts with the parts which originate from the Swedish text written by Tornaeus – and that were translated into Latin by Schefferus – indicates that Fellman's translation is either a direct translation back from *Laponia*'s Latin into Swedish or a heavily edited version of Laestadius's text (Table 6.9).

Contextualising Jacob Fellman's Input

What about the circa 1100 words that were *not* based on previous information? It seems that most of it is a general discussion about *noidevuohhta* and can partly be linked to wider developments of the time. An interesting passage is found right at the beginning, after an introduction of the words related to *noaidevuohhta* (which originates from Lindahl & Öhrling) on page 26:

Although this craft is an expression of confused concepts of the order of things, it denotes a developmental stage for humans in pursuit of higher learning; for it includes an appeal to the spirit world. How the Lapps have obtained this, and when it has come to their use, is unknown. It must though be mentioned, that some of it has been appropriated, because they, like other peoples in Scandinavia, learnt it from Odin, who would have brought it with him to the Nordic countries, although it had previously come to be used

by other peoples, as a result of the earlier spread of Christianity among them. Even among the Lapps such obscured notions can be traced that aim towards such an influence. But that the Lapps would have obtained the craft of sorcery from the Swedes, I do not believe. It can be that they have included several artifices from there, but the craft itself is evidently ancient among the Lapps and has been carried among them through the ages, not only in the borderlands towards Sweden, but also on the coasts of Ter and Murmansk [located on the Kola peninsula], where they, although in secrecy, are in full exercise.⁷⁸

One could analyse the premises of this paragraph in many ways, but the most important feature is the clear comparative attitude, and the way in which ideas related to the theories of diffusion and cultural evolution are present. Even though certain early evolutionistic tendencies can be found in Fellman's and his contemporaries' thinking,⁷⁹ the theory of cultural evolution was not applied to the studies of Saami culture before closer to Fellman's death in 1875, and more extensively later. Referring to the 'craft of sorcery' still practiced among the Eastern Saami groups as an argument for it being 'ancient among the Lapps' and the influence of Christianity upon their understanding of the 'spirit world' are very close to the basic premises of the theories that were formalised by Kaarle Krohn and the 'Finnish school' at the turn of the century.⁸⁰ Similarly, the idea of Scandinavian loans in Saami religion – which Fellman rejects – was not introduced on a wider scale before Fellman's death.⁸¹

Another interesting notion related to the comparison between Saami and Norse indigenous religions is the understanding of the Norse deity Odin as a historical sorcerer. Even though the idea of the historical sorcerer Odin teaching 'witchcraft' to the Saami was nothing new, as it was already expressed in the eighteenth century,⁸² it also resonates with the historical interpretation of mythology by for example E. Lönnrot in the mid-nineteenth century.⁸³ Lönnrot's and *Kalevala's* influence might have also been behind the following comparison by Fellman: 'Just as faithfully as the Pohjola hostess protected Sampo, so did the Lapp keep his magic drum.'⁸⁴ Comparisons between the mythological device Sampo in Finnish folk tales and the Saami *goavddis* were not

commonplace before J.A. Friis made this connection very close to Jacob Fellman's death in the late 1860s.⁸⁵

Could it be that these parts of the text, which seem more analytical and creative than the passages based on previous texts, simultaneously suggesting an inception no earlier than the 1870s, could have been authored by Isak Fellman? This would explain the diffusionistic and evolutionistic conclusions and references to the claimed Swedish origin of *noaidevuohhta* which were the most prevalent theories in 1906. As mentioned, he writes that the GP manuscript had 'apparently [...] not been completely finished' when he got hold of it. Could Isak have then added these more theoretical parts to his father's text to make it more flowing, 'modern', and credible? At least he admits to adding the headlines and to other considerable editorial tasks.

In general, the rest of the contents not paraphrased from other texts are less interesting for the current research question. Some parts were moved from the LP manuscript during the editing process, as Isak states in the introduction. One of these is a part about different qualities and skills of different *noaidis*, originally in the LP manuscript under the word 'Náide', referred to and commented by Laestadius in the fifth part of his *Fragments*.⁸⁶ This is one of the few parts about *noaidevuohhta* that seem to be based on Fellman's own experiences as a vicar in Sápmi.

Conclusions and Further Questions

It is difficult to make any definite conclusions based on the information I have presented. Rather, one is left with even more questions than at the beginning. Based on the evidence presented in this chapter it cannot be said for certain when the General Part of the second volume of Jacob Fellman's *Anteckningar* was written, but there are indications that it was done at a relatively late point. Furthermore, it cannot be said for certain that Jacob Fellman had a transcript of Laestadius's *Fragments* in his use, but there are indications that he might have had at least parts of it at his disposal.

Perhaps Laestadius finally agreed to work together with Jacob Fellman when he lost interest in working with mythological materials, as he famously wrote in 1845?⁸⁷ In this case, Laestadius

could have sent a transcript of his work not only to Stockfleth but also to Jacob Fellman, and Fellman could have used it as a reference when writing his General Part. Perhaps this was in the form of translations or notes Laestadius had made based on Jessen-Schardebøll's and Leem's texts, sent over to help Fellman to improve his text. The latter explanation seems appealing, since the translations are so similar, but partly divergent in their contents (see Tables 6.6–6.8). In addition, the parts that originate from Schefferus and/or Tornaeus are different in both authors' texts, which would indicate that Laestadius worked with Tornaeus's Swedish text and Fellman with Schefferus's Latin translation. The investigation of the Fellman book collection would support this conclusion, as it indicates that Jacob Fellman did not have access to any of these texts other than Leem's German translation, which does not include the appendix written by Jessen-Schardebøll.

Many interesting and difficult questions remain, though. Why did Laestadius reassure Fellman that their works would not be on a collision course twice, both in 1840 and in 1845?⁸⁸ What happened to the correspondence between Fellman and Laestadius? What happened to the three manuscripts written by Fellman? Did Isak Fellman burn them, and if so, why? Why is there a reference to the Kalevala, a comparison to Norse culture, and to evolution and diffusion theories, which were mostly products of a later time (around 1900)? Could it be that Isak not only edited, but also *wrote* parts of the introduction? These are questions that could be interesting to look at in the future. Some of them could be answered with the help of thorough archival work and by compiling a longer synopsis of Jacob Fellman's 'general introduction'. I hope to have paved the way for further studies on Fellman's work with this chapter.

So far, my opinion based on a careful study of Fellman's work is that Isak Fellman compiled the general part from a variety of sources. Some of these parts were moved to the GP from the LP manuscript, with some of them plausibly based on notes or translations of Leem and Jessen-Schardebøll made by Laestadius and some of them probably based on notes or translations made on Schefferus's *Lapponia* by Jacob Fellman, while some were plausibly authored by Isak Fellman in order to make the text more coherent and 'modern'.

How did the act of compilation then take place? Isak Fellman wrote that his father, 'who lived in a distant corner of the country, without the necessary access to literary aids, never even wanted to delve into any deeper critical studies'⁸⁹ of Saami mythology. It therefore seems that he did not recognise the different mythological notes in his father's collection as being similar to previously published (or, indeed, unpublished) texts. Isak then plausibly compiled a series of notes, accompanied by his own passages, to make a coherent whole without even realising that he was making a compilation. Therefore, the question of the identity of the *compiler* would be solved by pointing to the editor Isak, whereas the *collection* of texts would have been done by his father Jacob, and plausibly Laestadius. However, this remains a hypothesis before further evidence on the topic is hopefully presented in the future.

Consequences of Identifying the Text as a Compilation

Whatever the history of the GP manuscript might be, there is one definite conclusion with direct consequences for the study of Saami indigenous religion to be made here. Fellman's General Part belongs – such as many others in this genre – to the bulk of texts which have been proven to be compilations of previous texts, containing very little information originating in the North and Inari Saami areas where Fellman was a vicar. This tells of a general standard relating to copyright and originality in the mid-19th century that was different from our current standards. Whereas Laestadius and Schefferus often stated their sources of information, this was more of an exception to the rule than common practice before the late 19th century.⁹⁰

As I mentioned in the introduction, modern Saami studies emphasise the importance of variation within Saami cultures: instead of one monoculture, there are and have been numerous different Saami groups. There is great variation, both linguistically and ecologically (livelihood, natural surroundings), in the Sápmi area stretching from central Scandinavia to the Kola Peninsula. As such, the source material originating in the early eighteenth century in the South Saami area in northern Trøndelag (in this case the text by Jessen-Schardebøll) can hardly tell much about the indigenous traditions in Ohcejohka in the nineteenth century. To give an example of the said variation, South Saami and North

Saami speakers in the seventeenth century would have had severe communication problems in their indigenous languages, and South Saami reindeer herders or sea fishermen in the seventeenth century had a different relation to their surroundings than those in nineteenth-century Ohcejohka mixed economy (fishing, cattle breeding, reindeer herding) over a 1 000-kilometre beeline to the northeast. Even the deities and their areas of influence were different in the South Saami and North Saami areas.

In addition to the geographical distances, the texts that were compiled to form Fellman's GP were written during several centuries. An example is the part about the wind knot,⁹¹ which was to my knowledge first mentioned by Bartholomeus Anglicus in the thirteenth century⁹² and ended up in Fellman's book via at least Schefferus, who paraphrased P.C. Friis (from the late sixteenth century), who in turn probably paraphrased Olaus Magnus (from the middle of the sixteenth century).⁹³ In addition to that, Fellman's text includes passages originating from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, but without knowledge of the origins of these different sources the reader might take Fellman to describe Ohcejohka and Aanaar in the nineteenth century. The authority based on personal experience of living in Sápmi – which the title of the book (actually added by Isak Fellman) claims – is a false one.

In Saami studies, it is crucial to keep historical and geographical factors in mind. Otherwise one risks seeing Saami culture as one unchanged monolith from prehistoric times to ours. This point of view easily leads to a problematic and uninformed 'othering' attitude towards the Saami, something scholars of Saami culture have been trying to battle since at least the 1970s, if not earlier.⁹⁴ Therefore, great caution should be taken when using not only the part about *noaidevuohta*, but also the rest of Fellman's text about Saami indigenous religion as source materials.

Notes

1. Saami indigenous religion is used here as a technical term to refer to a part of traditional Saami culture considered by scholars to belong to the sphere of 'religion', but which is in reality inseparable from the rest of Saami life. I use the relational category to denote a

type of religion contingent on time and space, in contrast to universal religions such as Christianity. For a more detailed discussion on uses of the term 'indigenous religion', see for example Tafjord 2017. For a discussion on the term 'Saami indigenous religion', see Kaikkonen 2020a.

2. Kaikkonen 2019: 545–548.

3. Sápmi (North Saami): the areas traditionally inhabited by the Saami. In this chapter, I will use the place names in the local Saami languages when available.

4. Kaikkonen 2019: 545–548.

5. Seurujärvi-Kari 2005: 356; Rydving 2010: 65 f.; see also Porsanger 2007.

6. On using the indigenous North Saami term *noaidevuohta* as an analytical category, see Kaikkonen 2019: 558–563; Kaikkonen 2020b: 27–30.

7. Already when editing his father's work, Isak Fellman (1906: 1) noted the intertwined history of these manuscripts, even though Laestadius's text was unknown to him as it was not found until several years later. Brita Pollan ((1993) 1998: 37) wrote in 1993 that 'Fellman's books [...] were partly based on his own experiences, partly on [...] Laestadius's records' ('Fellmans bøker [...] var dels bygget på hans egne opplevelser, dels på [...] Læstadius' opptegnelser'), but she does not give any references or background information to back her claim or discuss it any further. In a telephone discussion 29 Jan. 2019 Pollan did not remember how she came to this conclusion but suspected that she must have noticed a similarity when reading Fellman's and Laestadius's texts. Based on the fact that J.A. Friis had a copy of Laestadius's manuscript, she had concluded that Laestadius's texts were in circulation at the time.

8. Kaikkonen 2018: 83.

9. Pentikäinen 2005: 125–128; Pentikäinen & Pulkkinen 2011: 7–15. The only complete version of Laestadius's *Fragments* so far was published as a Finnish translation in 2011.

10. 'Jag väntar otåligt att erhålla, efter löfte, del af dina anteckningar i Lappska mythologien.' Arwidsson to Fellman 14 Febr. 1828. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 3. All translations into English in the chapter are mine.

11. Minutes from the meeting of the board of SKS, 6 Febr. 1839 §5. B 1611, SKS KIA.
12. J. Fellman [1830s–1860s?] 1906b: 448.
13. I. Fellman 1906: 8 f.
14. Minutes from the meeting of the board of SKS, 6 Febr. 1839 §5. B 1611, SKS KIA.
15. ‘Lappska Mythologiska Lexicon väl innehåller icke obetydliga bidrag till kännedom om Lapparnes gudalära’ Minutes from the meeting of the board of SKS, 1 May 1839 §4. B 1611, SKS KIA. Reprinted in I. Fellman 1906: 2.
16. A similar critical note was also made by Laestadius ([1840–45] 1997: 215). This also applies to one of Fellman’s greatest inspirations, Christfrid Ganander’s *Mythologia Fennica*, which was the first book to systematically compare Finnish and Saami traditions (see, for example, Kaikkonen 2020b: 259–268).
17. Minutes from the meeting of the board of SKS, 1 May 1839 §4. B 1611, SKS KIA.
18. I. Fellman 1906: 2.
19. Runeberg to Fellman 27 March 1841. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 3. Reprinted in J. Fellman [1830s–1860s?] 1906b: 488 f.
20. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 15. In the letter draft dated 25 Sept. 1842 Fellman refers to a letter he received 27 March 1841 from the person he is writing to; this was the date of Runeberg’s rejection letter.
21. Rein to Fellman 16 Oct. 1848. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 3. Reprinted in J. Fellman [1830s–1860s?] 1906b: 476 f., where incorrectly dated 16 Oct. 1846.
22. I. Fellman 1906: 8.
23. Pentikäinen & Pulkkinen 2011: 8–10.
24. Itkonen 1977; Pulkkinen 2003: 60.
25. Gottlund to Laestadius August 1839. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 15.
26. I. Fellman 1906: 2 f.

27. I. Fellman (1906: 4) wrote in 1906 that he held possession of parts of the '1840 manuscript' along with some notes made to it by Laestadius. Per Posti (2003: 23) has another view of the situation: he claims that Fellman wanted the manuscript back quickly in order to send it to SKS. This does not seem to be a correct interpretation of the chronology: cf. endnote 28.

28. Heller to Fellman 19 Oct. 1840. KA, Fellman family collection, folder 3. Reprinted in J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906b: 454–456. It seems that Fellman had sent the manuscript to Laestadius with Heller, who was then supposed to send it back on his return trip. This would explain the hurry Laestadius had in making his comments to the 1840 manuscript.

29. I. Fellman 1906: 4.

30. Heller's letter to Fellman, however, shows that he did not make it to Lappajärvi a second time but left the manuscript and Laestadius's letter to the postal office in Vaasa (Heller to Fellman 19 Oct. 1840, KA, Fellman family collection, folder 3. Reprinted in J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906b: 454–456).

31. Jessen-Schardebøll's work was published as an appendix to Leem's book in 1767.

32. I. Fellman 1906: 5 f.

33. 'År 1845 synes Laestadius – troligen emedan hans i ett tidigare bref uttalade förhoppning, att förf: s arbete snart blefve publiceradt, ej gått i fullbordan – åter hafva anhållit att få del af manuskriptet. Detta blef ock, jemte en del andra handlingar, bland dem en afskrift af Litteratursällskapets förenämnda prot.utdrag, under vintern 1845 till honom öfversänt, nu i det skick, hvori det till Litteratursällskapet öfverlemnats' (I. Fellman 1906: 6).

34. These 'other documents' have been pointed to by at least Pentikäinen & Pulkkinen (2011: 376) and Posti (2003: 38).

35. J. Fellman [1830s–1860s?] 1906b: 318–324.

36. Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 220.

37. This part called 'Lappska Sånger och Sagor' (Lappish songs and sagas) was published in the same volume as GP and LP, pp. 191–340 of J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a.

38. ‘många Lappska og Finska Trollsånger’ (Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 224). Laestadius ([1840–45] 1997: 225–228) only transcribed and commented one of these songs, a song about how the Saami land was found (also in J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a: 239–243) but mentions at the end of his work that there were more of these stories in the manuscript sent to him (Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 229). The songs sent to Laestadius probably included the ‘national songs’ mentioned in Fellman’s letter draft to Stockfleth (J. Fellman [1830s–1860s?] 1906b: 448). This collection of songs was also mentioned by, for example, Elias Lönnrot in a letter to Abraham Kellgren (Lönnrot to Kellgren 26 Sept. 1845). Ritva Kylli (2005: 447) has written that Fellman tried to get these songs published via Lönnrot, but apparently in vain.

39. I. Fellman 1906: 6.

40. Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 200; Posti 2003: 32.

41. ‘Så långt har Författaren hunnit i November 1844, och derest icke Kyrkoherden Fellmans manuscript varit att förvänta, skulle Jag hafva afslutat arbetet här och afskickat det samma’ (Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 199).

42. This was noted already by Grundström (1959) in the first publication of *Fragments*, where he, however, decided not to publish Laestadius’s ‘additions’ to Fellman because of the comments published as footnotes in J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a.

43. Friis 1871: 143–145.

44. J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a: 113.

45. ‘Lars Levi Læstadius. Defekt Manuskrift, indeholdende nogle “Fragmenter i lappske Mythologien”, nedskrevet 1840 og i sin Tid af Pastor Stockfleth overladt Forfatteren til Afbenyttelse’ (Friis 1871: xi). On the communication of mythographers and linguists (among these Laestadius, Fellman and Stockfleth) between the borders of Sweden-Norway and Russian Finland, see Kaikkonen 2018.

46. At least there is no mention of a visit after the summer, when Laestadius received the 1840 manuscript from Fellman.

47. ‘For den franske videnskabelige Expedition havde Præsten udarbejdet Fragmenter i den finske-lappiske Mythologi; af første Del, Gudelæren med dertil hørende mythologiske Gjenstande, da trykt blandt Selskabets Skrifter, overlod Præsten mig Manuscriptet’ (Stockfleth 1860: 163).

48. Laestadius to Vahl, 7 Dec. 1845, also referred to in Posti 2003: 36.
49. Posti 2003: 37.
50. A closer look at the defect 26 pages in Oslo reveals that the notes were not made before 1843. Because the pages are written on old letters, one can look for dates on these letters. Already the first page includes a date: 12 Sept. 1843. Therefore, the notes must have been made on the LP manuscript delivered to Laestadius in the winter of 1845 and not on the 1840 manuscript.
51. I. Fellman 1906: 10 f.
52. Håndskriftsamlingen, NB: Optegnelser af Lars Levi Læstadius om Lappernes Mythologi. Fragmentert.
53. Posti 2003: 37.
54. Posti 2003: 33–36.
55. In a correspondence with the National library in Oslo (25 Jan. 2019), the librarian Nina Korbu wrote that she was quite sure that the numberings were made before the document arrived in the library, but that there were no records of it.
56. Laestadius 1844: *Fragmenter* [2nd part]
57. Laestadius 1845: *Fragmenter* [Comments to Fellman]
58. I. Fellman 1906: 8 f.
59. 'Utgifvaren har nu emedlertid till en uppsats sammanfört dessa begge, hvarandra kompletterande manuskript. Dervid har dock den allmänna delen, som synbarligen ej blifvit slutligen utarbetad, undergått en delvis icke obetydlig omgestaltning i afseende å dispositionen af materialet, som derjemte fördelats under skilda rubriker, ehuru sådana ej förekomma i författarens manuskript' (I. Fellman 1906: 8 f.).
60. Itkonen 1977: 277.
61. Kaikkonen 2019: 545–548.
62. Rydving 1995.
63. Nelson & Woods 2011: 109–121.
64. Nelson & Woods 2011: 113.
65. <http://kirjasto.rovaniemi.fi/digi/lappmarkenz.htm> (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

66. Interestingly, these were all from the end of the first part, which was not found before 2001.

67. Laestadius [1840] 2003: 147 f.; I. Fellman 1906: 32, footnote.

68. Leem did not translate the phrase 'Vuolet Zaabme', but both Laestadius ([1840-45] 1997: 147) and J. Fellman ([1830s-1870s?] 1906a: 39) relate it to whispering.

69. Schefferus 1673.

70. Lindahl & Öhrling 1780.

71. Tornaeus [1672] 1772.

72. J. Fellman [1830s-1870s?] 1906a: 36; Laestadius [1840-45] 1997: 101; Leem 1767: 466.

73. Rheen [1671] 1983: 31; Schefferus 1673: 124; Leem 1767: 465; J. Fellman [1830s-1870s?] 1906a: 34; Laestadius [1840-45] 1997: 96.

74. Capdeville 2001: i-iv.

75. Capdeville 2001: 57-59, 95, 110.

76. Kansalliskirjasto, H Laponica; Capdeville 2001: 57-59, 95, 110.

77. J. Fellman [1830s-1870s?] 1906a: 34.

78. 'Ehuru denna konst är ett uttryck af förvirrade begrepp om tingens ordning, betecknar den dock ett utvecklingsskede hos menniskan till en högre lära; ty den innefattar ett vädjande till andeverlden. Huru Lapparne inhemtat densamma, och när den hos dem kommit i bruk, är obekant. Omnämnas må dock, att en del antagit, det de, liksom andra Skandinaviens folk, lärt sig den af Odin, som skulle hafva fört den med sig till norden ehuru den hos de öfriga folken derstädes tidigare kommit ur bruk, i följd af den christna lärans tidigare utbredning till dem. Vål spåras äfven hos Lapparne dunkla föreställningar, syftande på ett sådant inflytande. Men att Lapparne skulle inhemtat trolldomskonsten af Svenskarne, det tror jag icke. Må så vara, att de äfven af dem upptagit åtskilliga konstgrepp härutinnan, men sjelfva konsten är påtagligen hos Lapparne urgammal och har hos dem af ålder idkats, ej allenast i gränstrakterna mot Sverge, utan äfven vid de Terska och Murmanska kusterna, der den ännu, ehuru i hemlighet, är i full utöfning' (J. Fellman [1830s-1870s?] 1906a: 26).

79. Kylli 2005: 442-444.

80. Kylli 2005: 442–444; Anttonen 1987: 39, 42–46; Pentikäinen (1989) 1999: 8–11.
81. Rydving 2010: 15 f.
82. Willumsen & Skjelmo 2017: 67–72; Leem 1767: 450.
83. Pentikäinen (1989) 1999: 8–11.
84. 'Lika troget som Pohjola värdinnan vårdade Sampo, lika omsorgsfullt förvarade Lappen sin trolltrumma' (J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a: 33).
85. Friis 1871: 47–52; Europaeus 1869: 2 f.
86. Laestadius [1840–45] 1997: 210.
87. I. Fellman 1906: 7.
88. I. Fellman 1906: 6.
89. I. Fellman 1906: 10.
90. On paraphrasing, compiling, and copying texts about Saami indigenous religion before 1871, see Kaikkonen 2020b.
91. J. Fellman [1830s–1870s?] 1906a: 27.
92. Page 1963: 225.
93. [Friis] [1599] 1632; Olaus Magnus 1555.
94. Seurujärvi-Kari 2005.

References

Archival sources

Helsinki

Kansallisarkisto (KA) (Finnish National Archives), Helsinki

Fellman-suvun kokoelma (Fellman family collection)

Folder 3: Jacob Fellmanin saamia kirjeitä.

Folder 15: Lappia koskevia alkuperäisiä asiakirjoja sekä jäljennöksiä ja muistiinpanoja.

Kansalliskirjasto (Finnish National Library), Helsinki

H Laponica

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Kirjallisuusarkisto (SKS KIA)

(Finnish Literature Society's Literature collection), Helsinki

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran pöytäkirjat 1838–41 (B 1611)

Oslo

Nasjonalbiblioteket (NB) (National Library)

Håndskriftsamlingen (Manuscript department)

Optegnelser af Lars Levi Læstadius om Lappernes Mythologi. Fragmentert.

Web sources

Håndskriftsamlingen, Nasjonalbiblioteket (NB) (Manuscript collection, Norwegian National Library)

Manuscript folder 637. J.A. Friis: Materiale vedrørende samisk språk og kultur. Optegnelser af Lars Levi Læstadius om Lappernes Mythologi. Fragmentert. http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digimanus_110403 (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

Laestadius to Vahl 7th December 1845. Laestadiusarkivet. http://www.laestadiusdokument.se/1845-02-07_LLL_Vahl_BILD.pdf (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

Laestadius, Lars Levi. 1844. *Fragmenter i Lappska Mythologien* [2nd part]. Laestadiusarkivet. http://www.laestadiusdokument.se/MYTHOLOGIEN_1-77.pdf (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

Laestadius, Lars Levi. 1845. *Fragmenter i Lappska Mythologien* [Comments to Fellman]. Laestadiusarkivet. http://www.laestadiusdokument.se/MYTHOLOGIEN_300-364.pdf (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

Lönnrot to Kellgren 26th September 1845. SKS: Elias Lönnrotin kirjeenvaihto <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-lon-002613> (accessed 31 Jan. 2019).

Published sources

Fellman, Jacob. [1830s–1870s?] 1906a. *Anteckningar under min vistelse i Lappmarken*. 2. [Ed.] I. Fellman. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

——— [1830s–1860s?] 1906b. *Anteckningar under min vistelse i Lappmarken*. 4. [Ed.] I. Fellman. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

[Friis], Peder Claussøn. [1599] 1632. *Norriges oc omliggende Øers sandfærdige Bescriffuelse* [...]. Kiøbenhaffn: hos Melchior Martzan.

- Jessen-Schardebøll, Erich Johan. 1767. Afhandling om de Norske Finners og Lappers Hedenske Religion, med en Tegning af en Rune-Bomme. Appendix to *Leem* 1767.
- Laestadius, Lars Levi. [1840–45] 1959. *Fragmenter i lappska mytologien* (Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv. B 61). [Ed.] H. Grundström. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- [1840] 2003. *Fragmenter i Lappska Mythologien: Gudalära*. Tromsø: Angelica.
- [1840–45] 2011. *Lappalaisten mytologian katkelmia* (Tietolipas 231). [Transl. & eds.] J. Pentikäinen & R. Pulkkinen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- [1840–45] 1997. *Fragmenter i Lappska Mythologien* (NIF Publications 37). [Ed.] R. Kvideland. Åbo: NIF.
- Leem, Knud. 1767. *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper, deres Tungemaal, Levemaade og forrige Afgudsdyrkelse [...]*. Kiøbenhavn: G.G. Salikath.
- 1771. *Nachrichten von den Lappen in Finmarken [...]* Leipzig: Dyckischen Buchhandlung.
- Olaus Magnus. 1555. *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus [...]*. Roma: Johannes Maria de Viottis.
- Rheen, Samuel. [1671] 1983. En kortt Relation [...]. *Berättelser om samerna i 1600-talets Sverige [...]* (Kungl. Skytteanska samfundets handlingar 27), pp. 9–64. [Ed.] K.B. Wiklund. Umeå: KSSH.
- Schefferus, Johannes. 1673. *Lapponia. Id est, Regionis Lapponum et Gentis Nova et Verissima Descriptio [...]*. Francofurti: Christian Wolff.
- (1673) 1675. *Lappland. Das ist: Neue und wahrhaftt-ige Beschreibung von Lappland und dessen Einwohnern [...]*. Frankfurt am Mayn & Leipzig: Martin Hallervorden.
- (1673) 1956. *Lappland* (Acta Lapponica 8). Uppsala: Gebers.
- Tornaeus, Johannes. [1672] 1772. *Beskrifning, Öfwer Tornå och Kemi Lappmarker*. [Ed.] S.S. Loenbom. Stockholm: Joh. Arv. Carlbohm.

Secondary literature

- Anttonen, Veikko. 1987. *Uno Harva ja suomalainen uskontotiede* (Suomi 138). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- Capdeville, Sophie. 2001. *Le fonds Laponica des Fellman: catalogue raisonné* (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia 239). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- Europaeus, D.E.D. 1869. Nya bekräftelser på professor Friis' förklaring af 'Sampo'. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning* 15/1869, pp. 2–3.
- Fellman, Isak. 1906. [Introduction]. *Anteckningar under min vistelse i Lappmarken*. 2, pp. 1–11. [By] J. Fellman. [Ed.] I. Fellman. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Friis, Jens Andreas. 1871. *Lappisk mynologi, eventyr og folkesagn*. Christiania: Cammermeyer.
- Grundström, Harald. 1959. Inledning. *Fragmenter i lappska mytologien* (Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv. B 61), pp. 5–17. [By] L.L. Laestadius. [Ed.] H. Grundström. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Itkonen, Tuomo. 1977. *Nuori Jaakko Fellman ja hänen ystävänsä Carl Gustaf Mannerheim*. [Rovaniemi]: [Väinö Pekkala: Suomen kulttuurirahaston Lapin rahasto].
- Kaikkonen, Konsta. 2018. Brødrene uten grenser: Kontakt mellom mytologer i russisk Finland og Sverige-Norge på midten av 1800-tallet. *Din: Tidsskrift for religion og kultur* 2018:2, pp. 80–87.
- . 2019. From, into, and back: translations of the Sami words *noaidi* and *noaidevuohta* in context. *Religion* 49:4, pp. 539–570.
- . 2020a. Sámi indigenous(?) religion(s)(?) – some observations and suggestions concerning term use. *Religions* 11 (9), 432.
- . 2020b. Contextualising Descriptions of *Noaidevuohta*: Saami Ritual Specialists in Texts Written until 1871. Doctoral thesis in the Study of Religions. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Kylli, Ritva. 2005. *Kirkon ja saamelaisten kohtaaminen Utsjoella ja Inarissa 1742–1886* (Studia historica septentrionalia 47). Rovaniemi: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys.
- Lindahl, Erik & Johan Öhrling. 1780. *Lexicon Laponicum, cum interpretatione vocabulorum sveco-latina et indice svecano lapponico [...]*. Holmiae: Joh. Georg Lange. H Laponica.
- Nelson, Chad & Robert H. Woods, Jr. 2011. Content analysis. *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of*

- Religion* (Routledge Handbooks in Religion), pp. 109–121. Eds. M. Stausberg & S. Engler. London: Routledge.
- Page R. I. 1963. Lapland sorcerers. *Saga book of the Viking Society* 16 (1962–65), pp. 215–232.
- Pentikäinen, Juha. (1989) 1999. *Kalevala Mythology* (Folklore Studies in Translation). Transl. and ed. R. Poom. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 2005. Fragments of Lappish Mythology. *The Saami: A Cultural Encyclopaedia*, pp. 125–128. Eds. U.-M. Kulonen & I. Seurujärvi-Kari & R. Pulkkinen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pentikäinen, Juha & Risto Pulkkinen 2011. Esipuhe. *Lappalaisten mytologian katkelmia* (Tietolipas 231), pp. 7–23. [By] L.L. Laestadius. [Transl. & eds. by] J. Pentikäinen & R. Pulkkinen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pollan, Brita. (1993) 1998. *Samiske sjamaner: Religion og helbredelse*. Gyldendal.
- Porsanger, Jelena. 2007. *Bassejoga čáhci: gáldut nuortasámiid eamioskkoldaga birra álgoálbmotmetodologiijaid olis*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Posti, Per. 2003. Lars Levi Læstadius' samiske mytologi – manuskriptets tilblivelse og dets forunderlige historie. *Fragmenter i Lappska Mythologien: Gudalära*, pp. 9–49. [By] L.L. Laestadius. Tromsø: Angelica.
- Pulkkinen, Risto. 2003. *Vastavirtaan: C. A. Gottlund 1800-luvun suomalaisena toisinajattelijana: psykobiografinen tutkimus*. Helsinki: Helsinki University. [http://urn.fi/URN: ISBN:952-10-1236-6](http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-10-1236-6) (accessed 31 jan. 2019).
- Rydving, Håkan. 1995. *Samisk religionshistoria: några källkritiska problem* (Religionshistoriska forskningsrapporter från Uppsala 4). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- 2010. *Tracing Sami Traditions: In Search of the Indigenous Religion among the Western Sami during the 17th and 18th Centuries* (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B, Skrifter 135). Oslo: Novus forlag.

Seurujärvi-Kari, Irja. 2005. Sami Studies. *The Saami: A Cultural Encyclopaedia*, pp. 356–357. Eds. U.-M. Kulonen & I. Seurujärvi-Kari & R. Pulkkinen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Skjelmo, Randi Hege & Liv Helene Willumsen. 2017. Isaac Olsen – lærer og forkynner. *Heimen* 54:1, pp. 62–85.

Stockfleth, Nils Vibe. 1860. *Dagbog over mine Missionsreiser i Finnmarken*. Christiania: Tønsberg.

Tafjord, Bjørn Ola. 2017. Towards a typology of academic uses of ‘indigenous religion(s)’, or, eight (or nine) language games that scholars play with this phrase. *Handbook of Indigenous Religion(s)* (Brill Handbooks on Contemporary Religion 15), pp. 25–51. Eds. G. Johnson and S.E. Kraft. Leiden: Brill.

Supplement (tables 6.2–6.9)

Table 6.2. Translations of Jessen-Schardebøll's text by Fellman and Laestadius (my italics).

Fellman 1906a: 29.	Laestadius 1997: 157.	Jessen 1767: 54.
<p>De unge män, som voro qualificerade för nåideembetet, <i>fingo uppenbarelser af gudomen</i>, antingen genom någon <i>Saivogadze</i> eller i drömmen,</p>	<p>De unga män, som voro Candidater till sådane (Nåide) Embeten <i>fingo formliga Uppenbarelser af Gudarna</i>, än under form af <i>Saiwo-Gadse</i>, än i sömnen o.s.v.</p>	<p>De unge Karle, der i deres første Manddoms Aar lode kiende noget Spor hos sig af Tilbønelighed og Beqvemhed til dette saa meget vigtigt Embede, bleve dertil af Tonto, d.e. den onde Aand, umiddelbar kaldede, dog paa forskellige Maader: thi for nogle aabenbarede han sig synligen i en Saiwo-Gadzes Person; for andre har han ladet sig til syne, naar de efter en sterk Ruus ere faldne i en dyb Søvn; men atter for andre, naar han haver truffet dem allene paa Marken: ved hvilke Leiligheder han haver holdt Underhandlinger med dem og antaget dem i sin Tieneste.</p>
<p>eller ock beledsagades de af sin läromästare <i>ned till Saiwo</i>, der de <i>fingo undervisning af afsomnade nåider</i>.</p>	<p>Saiwo-Gadse plögade sjelf undervisa sådane Candidater, och stundom nedföra dem <i>till Saiwo</i>, för att der få <i>undervisning af de afsomnade Nåider</i>.</p>	<p>Saa snart det var kommet saavidt, har Saiwo-Gadze selv taget dem i Skole og underviist dem ved idelige Samtaler, Underretning, Raadførelse og Øvelse i hans Videnskaber; snart allene paa Marken; snart og ved Omgang med og Anførsel af Noaaiderne i Saiwo, til hvilke han haver nedført ham.</p>

Table 6.3. Translations of Jessen-Schardebøll's text by Fellman and Laestadius (my italics).

Fellman 1906a: 29.	Laestadius 2003: 147.	Jessen 1767: 56.
Det var likväl icke oeftergiftigt att nåiden skulle få sina Gan af Vuokko; ty nåidegadzek kunde förse honom med Ganstaf i stället för Ganask. Denna staf hade <i>formen af en yxe</i> , och äfven den var giftig. Slog nåiden med den antingen <i>meniskor eller kreatur</i> , blefvo de strax sjuka och kunde icke återfå helsan, om ej en <i>annan nåide genom trolldom botade det onda</i> .	Det var icke alltid nödvändigt, att Nåiden fick sin Gan utaf Vuoko, ty Nåide Gadse kunde i stället skaffa honom en Ganstaf, <i>i form af en yxa</i> , som var ganska giftig; och hvan Nåiden slog dermed, antingen <i>kreatur eller menniskor</i> , blef strax sjukt och kunde icke komma till hälsan, för än en <i>annan Nåide</i> gjort igen, eller <i>botat skadan med motande Trollen</i> .	Det var endeligen ikke aldeles fornöden, at Noaaiden fik sin Gan af Wuoko; thi Noaaide-Gadzen kunde i Steden herfor skaffe gam en Gan-Stav, dannet som en Øxe, og sterkt forgiftet, og hvad Noaaiden eller en anden slog dermed, være sig Mennesker eller Dyr, blev strax sygt, og kunde ikke komme sig igien, før end Noaaiden var stillet tilfreds, og formaet til, selv at helbrede Skaden.

Table 6.4. Translations of Leem's text by Fellman and Laestadius (my italics).

Fellman 1906a: 36.	Laestadius 1997: 101.	Leem 1767: 466.
Gick ringen nu med solen, var det ett lyckligt förebud, och stannade den snart på den figur man önskade, så skulle allt gå väl. Men kom ringen ej dit, eller gick den mot solen, var ondt på färde, och önskningsmålen skulle derföre ej uppfyllas.	gick ringen mot Solen var det elakt märke; gick ringen med Solen, var det ett godt märke.	Fulgte Ringen ved Trold-Mesterens Slag paa Ruune-Bommen Solens Gang, agtede han samme at være et Tegn til sit Forehavendes lykkelige Udfald; men gik den imod Solens Gang, tvivlede han om, at hans Forsæt skulde lykkes.
Såsom lyckligt förebud ansågs härvid äfven det, <i>om ringen kom på Radien eller andra tecken, som utmärkte goda gudomligheter</i> ; såsom dåligt deremot, om den stannade på onda väsendens.	<i>Kom Ringen på Radien, Junker eller andra Gudomligheter</i> så var äfven det ett godt tekn; men om ringen föll på de onda varelsernas hieroglyfer; så var det ett ondt tekn.	Eftersom da Ringen ved saadan Banken gik af sig selv, enten til lykkeligere eller ulykkelige Characterer, gjorde de sig Gisning, om deres Forehavende skulde vel lykkes eller ey.

Table 6.5. One of the passages in *Lapponia* only found in Fellman's text, but not in Laestadius's.

Fellman 1906a: 26.	Schefferus (Swedish transl.) 1956: 151 f.
Lapparne ansågos emedlertid fordom vara så skickliga häri, anmärker Scheffer, såsom om de skulle haft sjelfva Zoroaster till läromästare.	Dessa sen yttersta Nordens invånare, nämligen Finlands och Lapplands bebyggare, voro under hedendomens tid så bevandrade, som om de haft själve den persiske Zoroaster til lärömästare i denna fördömda lära. (cit. Olaus Magnus)
Till och med andra folkslag sägas hafva sändt sina barn till dem för att lära sig trolla. Så läser man hos Snorre Sturlason, att Åssur Tote ifrån Helgeland skickat sin dotter Gunhild till Finnmarken för att inhemta 'finnekonster'.	Peder Claussøn oppgiver: 'De sætte deris Børn til Lære hos Lapperne', nämligen för att undervisas i denna konst. Så berättar Sturlauson, att jungfrun Gunhild skickades av sin fader Assur Hvite, som bodde i Hålogaland, till konung Motle i Finnmarken, dvs. det finnlapska Norge, 'at læra Finnekonst'.

Table 6.6. One of the passages from Jessen-Schardebøll's text not found in Laestadius's.

Fellman 1906a: 37.	Laestadius 1997: 158.	Jessen 1767: 59.
I särdeles svåra fall hände det ock, att flere nåider samarbetade. De församlades då i en kåta för att utröna trummans utslag. Utföll detta illa, måste det utforskas, hvilken af gudarne var vredgad och hvilka offer äskades Om ej heller dessa medförde hjälp, då måste den af de församlade nåiderna resa till Jabme aimo, som hade de starkaste Tilles, Dilles eller Dirri, något visst djur t. ex. varg, björn eller korp eller något annat, hvaraf nåiden betjenade sig såväl för att hjälpa sig sjelf eller andra som ock för att göra skada.	När en <i>Jaabma aimo</i> resa företogs, kom det an på hvilken hade den starkaste Dielle eller Dirri.	Var Sagen av Betydenhed, forsamlede sig nogle Noaaiden i den fornemmeste Juoigs Kuate eller Telt, hvor de paa Knæ myrede og juoigede, for at raadføre sig med Rune-Bommen, for at see hvilken Gud der vilde forsones, og hvilket Offer samme forlangede. Vilde Offeret heller ikke hielpe; da maatte en Saiwo- og Jabme-aimo Reyse foretages, hvor det kom an paa, hvilken Noaaid der havde de sterkeste Noaaiden-Dielles eller Dirri.

Table 6.7. Fellman's, Laestadius's, Schefferus's, and Leem's texts in comparison (my italics).

Fellman 1906a: 34.	Laestadius 1997: 96.	Schefferus 1673: 124.	Leem 1767: 465.
Med af albark tillredd röd färg målades derefter på skinnnet en hel mängd figurer och bilder,	Med decoct af alder-bark, målades nu på det utspända trumskinnnet allehanda figurer	Trumban oefuer drage the med skin, hvaruppao the maohla med ahlbark, aothskillige figurer	Tegnet med Elle-Bark adskillige Characterer,
föreställande <i>gudar</i> , genier (<i>nåide gadzek</i>), <i>solen</i> , månen, <i>morgonstjernen</i> , <i>lappkota</i> , <i>stolpbodar</i> , <i>allehanda djur</i> m. m.			af hvilke een betyder <i>Gud</i> , een <i>Radien</i> , der haver været Lappernes Jupiter, eller høyeste Gud, een Engel, een Diævel, een <i>Noaaiide-Gadze</i> , een <i>Solen</i> , een <i>Morgen- Stiernen</i> , een <i>Aften-Stiernen</i> , een Kirke, een Norske- Folkes-Boepæl, een et helligt Bierg, eller saa kaldet Passe-Vare, hvor Lapperne pleyede ofre, een <i>Lappernes Boelig</i> , een <i>deres Stolpe-Bod</i> med Støtter under, hvorudi de have Kiød og andet deslige forvaret, een det Gierde, hvorinden for de om Sommeren drive sine Rensdyr, naar de vil malke dem, een <i>Fugl</i> , een <i>Fisk</i> , een <i>Biørn</i> , een <i>Ulv</i> , een <i>Ræv</i> etc. een det, en andet det.

Table 6.8. A comparison of the texts by Fellman, Laestadius and Tornaeus (my italics).

Fellman 1906a: 34.	Laestadius 1997: 97.	Tornaeus 1772: 17.
<p>Bland bilderna kunde man sålunda på en del trummor se angifna äfven olika länder, hvarvid Lappland alltid intog midtelpartiet och det största utrymmet.</p>	<p>[...] midt på är Lappmarken, som största regio är, och har uti instrumentet största spatium.</p>	<p>[...] midt på är Lappmark, som största Regio är, och har uti Instrumentet största spatium.</p>
<p>Med sådana trummor sökte man utröna, hvilka resande man hade att vänta och hvarifrån de kommo. <i>Om de voro välvilliga eller elaka menniskor, om de medförde goda eller onda tidningar,</i> när besök af fogden, presten eller någon annan mera betydande person var att emotse, och annat dylikt.</p>	<p>[D]jerpå se de och spå, hvad der händer, huru snart Presten och Fogden eller någon annan vyrdig till dem skickad vorder. <i>Et hi vocant se beneficos, utpote qui mala non tentant, aut sinistri quid ominantur.</i></p>	<p>därpå se de och spå hvad där händer, huru snart Prästen och Fogden eller någon annan vyrdig [footnote: 'eller myndig'] till dem skickad warder. Et hi vocant se beneficos, utpote qui mala non tentant, aut sinistri quid ominantur. [footnote: 'D. ä. Desse kalla sig wälgjörande, efter de icke försöka något ondt, eller spå något olyckligt.']</p>

Table 6.9. Fellman's, Laestadius's, Schefferus's, and Tornaeus's texts in comparison.

Fellman 1906a: 27.	Laestadius 1997: 156 f.	Schefferus 1673: 122.	Tornaeus 1772: 20 f.
De, hvilka voro födde med särdeles fallenhet för yrket, lärde sig detsamma omedelbart af andarne. Detta skedde genom och under sjukdomar. Den första sjukdomen inträffade i barnåren, och det sjuka barnet hade redan då uppenbarelsen i trollkonsten. Vid den andra sjukdomen tillväxte visdomen, men först vid den tredje, som inföll under mannaåldern, blef trollkarlen fullt färdig i yrket.	Men somliga blifva sådane af Naturen, somliga ex informatione et usu (genom lära och praktik). De som af Naturen blifva sjuke in pueritia, tå lærer han något i sin svaghet begynna att phantiserä; blifwer han andra gången hårdare sjuk, då får han se och lära mer; men blifwer han tredje resan betagen, det är svårast och går på lifvet: då får han se alla djefvulka syner, och blifwer i Trollkonst perfect lärd.	Sunt nonnulli, qai artem magicam ab ipsa quasi habeant natura, id quod est horrendum. Quandoquidem, quos diabolus idoneos sibi futuros intellexit ministros, eos in ipsa infantia corripit morbo, quo simul eis multas repræsentat imagines & visiones, è quibus pro ratione annorum ætatis discutunt, quod ad artem illam pertinet. Quod qui secunda vice corripantur morbo longe adhuc plures eis offeruntur visiones, è quibus quoque capiunt plus artis, quam prima vice. Sin vero corripantur vice tertia, quod sit difficultate tanta, ut in periculum simul incidant ommitenda vita, tum eis manifestantur visiones at que apparitiones diabolica omnes, è quibus capiunt, quantum pertinent ad perfectionem artis magica.	Men somlige blifwa sådane af naturen, somlige ex informatione, et usu [footnote: efter underwisning och sedwana]. De som af naturen blifwa sjuke in pueritia, tå lærer han något i sin svaghet begynna at phantiserä; blifwer han andra gången hårdare sjuk, då får han se och lära mer; men blifwer han tredje resan betagen, det är swårast og går på lifwet: då får han se alla djefvulka syner och blifwer i trollkonst perfect lärd.

Contd.

Table 6.9. Continued.

Fellman 1906a: 27.	Laestadius 1997: 156 f.	Schefferus 1673: 122.	Tornaeus 1772: 20 f.
För utöfvandet af konsten behöfde en sålunda utbildad trollkarl ej ens skilda trollredskap. Han hörde och såg allt som passerade i vida världen. Men detta tillstånd skänkte honom ingen glädje, ty hans själ plågades oupphörligt deraf.	Det hafva de sjelfve, sådane incantatores för mig bekänt, de som hafva lefvererat sina trummor ifrån sig, och lofvat öfvergifva sådan ochristelig konst. Men derhos säga de, att de, som af Naturen och genom sjukdom sådan konst hafva fått, att de likväl utan Trumma se frånvarande ting, ehvad de vilja eller icke.	Suntque hitam eruditi, ut & sine tympano possint prospicere res longe dissitas, sicque occupati à Diabolo, ut cernant eas, sive velint, sive nolint. Sicante tempus aliquod Lappo quidam, qui adhuc superstes est, tympanum mihi offerebat suum, de quo sæpe ante fueram conquestus, fatebaturque mæstus, licet id à se submoveat, nec sibi fabricet aliud, nihilominus se visurum diffita omnia deinceps, sicut ante viderit; Dabatque me ipsum exemplum, memerabatq verissime specialissimeq, quicquid acciderat mihi in itinere in Lapponiam. Querebatur quoque simul, nescire se quid facere cum oculis suis debeat, quiaisthæc sibi omnia invitissimo offerantur.	Det hafva de sjelfve, sådane incantatores, för mig bekänt, de som hafva lefvererat sina trummor ifrån sig, och låfwat öfvergifwa sådan ochristelig konst. Men därhös säga de, at de som af naturen och sjukdom sådan konst hafwa fått, att de likväl utan trumma, se frånvarande ting ehvad de vilja eller icke.