

# What Kind of Love Is *Elskov*?

*A lexical stress test for an AI-assisted translation of Kierkegaard's Works of Love*

**Series:** A Corrigible Kierkegaard, Essay 4 **Status:** public scholarly working paper; open for correction **Version:** 0.5, 20 August 2026

## Abstract

English translations of Søren Kierkegaard's *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger* often render *Elskov* as “erotic love,” distinguishing it from *Kjerlighed*, ordinarily translated as “love.” Our working translation adopted “erotic love” as a cross-chapter default. This essay argues that the policy is too rigid. Kierkegaard's own contrasts among *Elskov*, *Kjerlighed*, *Forkjerlighed*, and *erotisk*; the historical Danish dictionary record; and recent scholarship all resist a stable equation of *Elskov* with sexual or strictly erotic love and *Kjerlighed* with Christian agape. A local corpus audit strengthens the case for contextual rather than mechanical consistency, although it cannot settle the meaning of any occurrence. Four passages show that “romantic love,” “love of the beloved,” “passionate love,” “conjugal love,” “preferential love,” and unqualified “love” may each be justified in particular settings, while each also loses something. The proper editorial response is therefore not to install a new universal equivalent, but to suspend the old default, classify every occurrence, preserve lexical relations in the notes, and make interpretive variation auditable. The case also supplies a practical standard for AI-assisted translation: computational concordance may reveal a problem, but only source-led interpretation and accountable human review can decide it.

**Keywords:** Kierkegaard; Works of Love; *Elskov*; *Kjerlighed*; *Forkjerlighed*; literary translation; artificial intelligence; lexicography; eros; agape

## 1. The danger of a tidy distinction

Few things are more attractive to a translator than a distinction that appears simultaneously lexical, conceptual, and theological. In *Works of Love*, *Elskov* seems to offer just such a case. Translate it as “erotic love”; translate *Kjerlighed* as “love” or, in explanatory prose, Christian love; translate *Forkjerlighed* as “preference.” English readers can then see an intelligible architecture: eros selects the beloved, preference excludes others, and Christian love extends equally to the neighbour.

The architecture illuminates part of Kierkegaard's argument. It also threatens to decide too much in advance. “Erotic love” now commonly suggests sexual desire or a relationship centrally defined by sexuality. *Elskov* can bear that sense, but it can also designate passionate, romantic, beloved-centred, or otherwise preferential love. *Kjerlighed*, meanwhile, is not confined to an agapic substance insulated from desire and special attachment. Kierkegaard can describe the love of drive and inclination as *Kjerlighed*. The vocabulary overlaps even when the argument distinguishes.

Our Consolidated Glossary currently instructs the translator to keep “erotic love” as the cross-chapter default for *Elskov*, while explaining that the word is not reducible to sexual desire. That instruction is intelligible and was adopted openly. It is nevertheless vulnerable in precisely the way a rigorous critic of translation should identify: the explanatory note asks readers to subtract from the English phrase an implication that the English phrase repeatedly supplies.

The appropriate response is correction, not defence. This essay recommends suspending that default until every occurrence has been classified in context. It does not recommend replacing “erotic love” everywhere, still less erasing eros from Kierkegaard. It argues for a more difficult consistency: fidelity to relationships among words, images, and claims rather than automatic recurrence of a single English label.

## 2. Why this test matters

M. G. Piety's recent discussion of the Swenson and Hong translations provides a useful model of criticism because it moves from general preference to falsifiable particulars.<sup>[1]</sup> A translator may prefer the Swensons' style and still acknowledge that the Hongs correctly distinguish *Christenhed* from *Christendom*, correctly construe a Danish definite form, correctly determine the scope of a small grammatical phrase, and correctly render *Mennesker* inclusively. The moral is not that literal translation always wins. It is that style cannot repair a lexical or grammatical distinction after the translation has erased it.

Our draft fares well on those four particular tests. It distinguishes "Christendom" from "Christianity"; treats spelling as an ordinary activity rather than a special kind; attaches "it is" to the correct infinitival phrase in the passage on certainty of being loved; and titles the discourse "Our Duty to Love the People We See." Yet success on a critic's chosen examples establishes no presumption of reliability elsewhere. *Elskov* is a more searching test because the problem is not a dictionary mistake. It is an interpretive over-systematisation supported by a respectable translation tradition.

This distinction matters especially in an AI-assisted project. A language model is very good at maintaining an instruction such as "always translate X as Y." That ability can look like scholarly consistency even when the instruction itself is wrong. Mechanical regularity may then reproduce an error more comprehensively than an inconsistent human translator would. A responsible method must therefore expose its global rules to local attempts at disconfirmation.

## 3. Four words, not two substances

The central vocabulary is better approached as an intersecting field than as a bilingual code.

*Kjerlighed* is Kierkegaard's broad noun for love. It can name divine love, neighbour-love, human love, the inward ground of loving, and kinds of love governed by drive and inclination. Its breadth makes English "love" both necessary and dangerous: necessary because no narrower term will cover the field, dangerous because English cannot reproduce every relation among Kierkegaard's nouns and the verb *at elske*.

*Elskov* ordinarily marks love directed towards a beloved: passionate or romantic love, often with erotic and conjugal dimensions. Yet its boundaries are not identical with those of modern English "erotic love." The historical *Ordbog over det danske Sprog* records strong and passionate love, gives sexually or sensuously determined senses, and also records warm love without a sensual component and religious uses.<sup>[2]</sup> Historical lexicography therefore establishes semantic range, not a replacement rule.

*Forkjerlighed* names preference, partiality, or a special attachment that favours one object over others. ODS describes a marked liking or attachment that may overshadow competing objects and includes a Kierkegaardian example.<sup>[3]</sup> In *Works of Love* it often identifies the structure shared by love of the beloved and friendship: each singles out "this one" over "all others." Translating both *Elskov* and *Forkjerlighed* as "preferential love" would disclose a conceptual connection by destroying a lexical distinction. The relation must instead be made in syntax or annotation.

Finally, *erotisk* was available to Kierkegaard. ODS records it as a love- and sexuality-related adjective and includes nineteenth-century evidence.<sup>[4]</sup> Hanson and Kaftanski note that it does not occur in *Works of Love*, even though Kierkegaard uses it elsewhere.<sup>[5]</sup> This absence does not prove that *Elskov* lacks erotic content. It does show why *Elskov* and "erotic love" cannot be treated as unexamined cognates.

The grammar complicates the nouns further. Danish has the verb *at elske*, morphologically associated with *Elskov*, whereas no equivalent verb is formed from *Kjerlighed*. English "to love" must therefore serve verbal contexts across distinctions that the nouns can partially mark. A translation cannot maintain a clean *Elskov/Kjerlighed* binary because the source language itself does not organise every act of loving through that binary.

Recent scholarship has accordingly moved away from treating eros and agape as sealed opposites in this work. Hanson argues for the oneness and interpenetration of forms of love rather than their segregation.<sup>[6]</sup> Hughes challenges readings that make Kierkegaard simply hostile to erotic desire and instead studies how worldly love may be transformed within a theological account of desire.<sup>[7]</sup> Hanson and Kaftanski bring the lexical problem directly to translation: they question the established "erotic love" default and emphasise that *Elskov* often concerns spontaneous or preferential love without being

narrowly sexual.<sup>[5]</sup> These arguments do not compel one English wording in every sentence. They do remove the scholarly warrant for a universal one.

## 4. What the local corpus can-and cannot-show

A small concordance audit was run over the Danish columns of the assembled First Series working texts. Seven sections currently contain complete Danish-facing tables: I, II.A, II.B, III.A, III.B, IV, and V. Section II.C, represented by Chapter 4 in the project files, does not yet have a complete Danish-facing table and was excluded. Across 229 aligned source rows, the audit found:

| Morphological string family | Tokens |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| <i>Kjerlighed</i>           | 875    |
| <i>Elskov</i>               | 93     |
| <i>Forkjerlighed</i>        | 35     |
| <i>erotisk</i>              | 0      |

The reproducible script is preserved with the series materials.<sup>[8]</sup> These are string-family counts: inflected and compound forms beginning with the specified stem. They are not lemmatised semantic judgements. A token count cannot tell us whether an occurrence is sexual, romantic, poetic, conjugal, preferential, ironic, or metalinguistic. Nor can the local zero for *erotisk* prove absence from the uncounted section or the entire book; the whole-work claim rests on the cited scholarly examination, not this partial corpus.

The counts nevertheless matter. They show that the problem is neither marginal nor safely handled by a handful of famous passages. Ninety-three locally aligned *Elskov*-family tokens create ninety-three occasions on which a global instruction can clarify or distort. They also show the asymmetry of the vocabulary. *Kjerlighed* is far more frequent and functionally broader. Any English policy that makes it the name of a separate, uniformly Christian species risks mistaking distribution for taxonomy.

The audit thus performs a limited but useful computational function: it defines the scale of the review, locates every candidate, and prevents selective citation. It does not translate a single token.

## 5. The decisive sentence at SKS 9, 51

One sentence concentrates the problem because Kierkegaard deploys three members of the field in rapid succession:

*Christendommen har stødt Elskov og Venskab fra Thronen, Driftens og Tilbøielighedens Kjerlighed, Forkjerligheden, for da at sætte Aandens Kjerlighed isteden, den til "Næsten" ...*<sup>[9]</sup>

Our present readable text says that Christianity has thrust “erotic love and friendship” from the throne—“the love of drive and inclination, preference”—and has set “the love of spirit” in their place. This is lucid English. It is also more taxonomic than the Danish.

First, Kierkegaard identifies *Elskov* and friendship through an appositional sequence with “the *Kjerlighed* of drive and inclination” and *Forkjerligheden*. *Kjerlighed* therefore operates on both sides of the contrast: drive and inclination have their *Kjerlighed*; spirit has its *Kjerlighed*. The difference cannot be mapped as *Elskov* versus *Kjerlighed* without remainder.

Second, *Forkjerligheden* explains a formal feature of the dethroned loves—their preference—not a third object lying beside them. Bare “preference” keeps the lexical distinction but weakens the apposition in English. “Preferential love” makes the relation clear but risks collapsing *Forkjerlighed* into *Elskov*. “Partiality” sharpens the ethical criticism but may make every special attachment sound culpably biased before the argument has established that conclusion.

Third, “erotic love” encourages a modern reader to hear Christianity dethroning sexual love. The surrounding passage is broader. It discusses the beloved, friendship, passion, the poet, pagan praise, union, and solidarity. Sexuality belongs within that constellation, but it does not exhaust it.

A maximally close diagnostic rendering could therefore retain the crucial nouns temporarily:

Christianity has thrust *Elskov* and friendship from the throne-the *Kjerlighed* of drive and inclination, preferential love-in order to set the spirit’s *Kjerlighed* in their place, love for the neighbour ...

This is not satisfactory final English. Its purpose is to stop the translator from solving the conceptual relation too early. A readable candidate might say:

Christianity has dethroned love of the beloved and friendship-the love governed by drive, inclination, and preference-in order to set the love of spirit in their place: love for the neighbour ...

“Love of the beloved” preserves direction and avoids reducing the relation to sex, but it is clumsy under repetition. “Romantic love” is more fluent, but can sound culturally modern and may understate bodily passion. “Passionate love” catches intensity but fails to identify the beloved relation. “Erotic love” remains defensible when its wider philosophical sense is made active, but ordinary English will often hear it more narrowly than the argument allows.

No candidate wins without loss. The editorial task is to identify the loss, not to hide it beneath consistency.

## 6. Four contexts, four pressures

### 6.1 “Unhappy *Elskov*”

In the first discourse Kierkegaard addresses the “silent martyrs” of an unhappy *Elskov*, people whose concealed suffering nevertheless bears fruits of love. The present draft has “silent martyrs of unhappy erotic love.”<sup>[10]</sup> Nothing in the immediate phrase requires a sexual emphasis. In English literary idiom, “unhappy love” or “doomed love” more naturally names the concealed beloved-relation. “Romantic love” would distinguish it from the encompassing *Kjerlighed* of the paragraph but would add an analytical label to a lyrical address.

Here the plainest rendering may be the most exact: “O silent martyrs of unhappy love.” A note can identify the source word as *Elskov* and explain its recurrence. Lexical visibility need not be purchased by conspicuous English every time.

### 6.2 The poet’s vertigo

In “You Shall Love,” Kierkegaard says that *Elskov* is not yet the eternal but the beautiful vertigo of infinity. He then aligns friendship with it insofar as both lie within *Forkjerlighed*: each loves one person before and in contrast with others.<sup>[11]</sup> “Erotic love” captures the passion celebrated by the poet, but it may make the ensuing parallel with friendship seem like a comparison between sexual and non-sexual relations. “Passionate love” better prepares the common relation to preference, while “romantic love” better identifies the beloved.

The sentence does not ask the translator to decide whether passion or beloved-direction is the essence of *Elskov*. It makes both active. A readable version may therefore vary from nearby contexts if the note records the common Danish term.

### 6.3 Dethronement without annihilation

The throne passage is easy to read as a declaration that Christianity abolishes erotic and friendly love in favour of neighbour-love. Yet later scholarship has emphasised a more complex relation in which special loves may be ethically reordered or infused by neighbour-love rather than simply deleted.<sup>[6]</sup> The translation must not settle that interpretive debate by choosing a narrower English noun than Kierkegaard wrote.

This does not mean softening the violence of “dethroned.” Kierkegaard really does displace the sovereignty of drive, inclination, and exclusion. A context-sensitive rendering should preserve the dethronement while leaving open what becomes of the relationship once it no longer occupies the throne.

## 6.4 Marriage and conscience

In the discourse “Love Is a Matter of Conscience,” *Elskov* appears in explicit relation to men and women, marriage, the beloved woman, and *Forelskelsen*, falling in love. Kierkegaard denies that Christianity merely took a special interest in getting people married; Christianity begins from God and the neighbour and from that ground makes every expression of love a matter of conscience. Neighbour-love, he adds, is not a pensioned-off *Elskov* but must be present at the highest first moment of falling in love.<sup>[12]</sup>

Here “romantic love” and “conjugal love” each become plausible, although the latter is too narrow when the argument reaches the first moment of falling in love. “Erotic love” is not false: bodily and sexual life forms part of what marriage brings under conscience. Yet the argument concerns the entire beloved-relation, not sexuality alone. The best wording may change within the passage because the contextual specification changes, provided the apparatus shows that the Danish noun recurs.

## 7. A revised translation protocol

The correction should not be a free licence for stylistic variation. Context-sensitive translation becomes arbitrary unless its decisions are constrained and recorded. The following protocol is therefore proposed.

### Rule 1: suspend the universal default

“Erotic love” should cease to be the presumed rendering that alternatives must overcome. It remains one candidate among several.

### Rule 2: classify every occurrence before revising prose

Each *Elskov*-family token should receive an occurrence ID and be classified by textual features, not by intuition alone:

- named beloved, suitor, woman, man, couple, marriage, or falling in love;
- poet, song, passion, paganism, or idealisation;
- drive, inclination, sensuality, sexuality, or bodily union;
- preference, exclusion, friendship, neighbour, or equality;
- idiomatic or lyrical phrase in which an analytical label would be intrusive;
- metalinguistic discussion of the word or category itself.

More than one feature may apply. The classification records pressure; it does not generate an answer automatically.

### Rule 3: preserve conceptual contrasts, not merely word counts

Where *Elskov*, *Kjerlighed*, and *Forkjerlighed* occur together, the English must keep their functions distinguishable. If natural English cannot do so lexically, a note or temporary Danish retention is preferable to a false equivalence.

### Rule 4: use a controlled range

The readable layer may draw from a bounded set—“romantic love,” “love of the beloved,” “passionate love,” “conjugal love,” “preferential love,” “erotic love,” or simply “love”—but every deviation from the chapter’s prevailing choice must have a recorded contextual reason. “Preferential love” requires particular caution because it can obscure *Forkjerlighed*.

### Rule 5: let “erotic” mean something

Use “erotic love” where sexual or sensual meaning is active, where the philosophical tradition of eros is explicitly relevant, or where surrounding explanation makes the broader sense unmistakable. Do not use it merely because a glossary once designated it the default.

### Rule 6: make the close layer diagnostically useful

At conceptually dense first occurrences, the close layer may retain *Elskov* in italics or give “love of the beloved [*Elskov*].” It should not leave every occurrence untranslated. The goal is to expose the difficulty at the points where an English choice would otherwise determine the argument.

### Rule 7: validate across the complete work

The current local count excludes one incomplete Danish-facing section and covers only the First Series materials presently assembled. No final glossary rule should be adopted until the complete Danish work has been searched and the occurrence table reviewed.

### Rule 8: make the review status and invitation visible

This classification has not received external Danish-specialist or Kierkegaard-specialist review. That absence should accompany the recommendation wherever it is circulated. Public criticism from readers with relevant knowledge is invited and should be entered into the decision record, but no scholar is represented as a participant or validator without their express involvement. Where disagreement cannot be resolved by evidence available to the project, it should remain open.

## 8. Accuracy, style, and possible scholarly reception

How might a critic such as Piety view the translation after this correction? Any answer must remain hypothetical because Piety has not reviewed the project. The more defensible question is how the revised text fares when tested by the standards stated in her published critique.

A reader applying those tests could examine the source-facing apparatus, the distinction between *Christenhed* and *Christendom*, the inclusive rendering of *Mennesker*, the refusal to make a definite suffix carry a spurious conceptual distinction, and the willingness to correct a global lexical policy publicly. These features are intended to answer the principle that progress comes through meticulous reading and mutual accountability.<sup>[1]</sup> They should not be taken as evidence that Piety has reviewed or endorsed the project.

The same critic could still object to the English style. Our readable draft sometimes clarifies relations that Kierkegaard leaves syntactically tense, redistributes long sentences into paragraphs, and chooses explanatory phrases where a more literary translator might preserve strangeness. In the *Elskov* passages, replacing every “erotic love” with an ungainly formula would satisfy neither style nor accuracy. Conversely, leaving the current default untouched for the sake of visible consistency would privilege editorial neatness over semantic range.

A defensible assessment is therefore local: note where the current translation preserves a distinction, and correct it where it makes one too rigid. That is the standard Piety applies to earlier translators, and an AI-assisted edition has no claim to an easier one.

## 9. What this case says about AI-assisted translation

The case supplies neither a vindication nor a refutation of AI translation in general. It shows a division of labour and a corresponding division of risk.

Computational assistance was useful for searching hundreds of thousands of Danish characters, counting morphological families, locating co-occurrences, preserving a repeatable query, and comparing a glossary rule against every aligned chapter rather than a few remembered examples. It was also useful for discovering recent scholarship and organising an objection register.

Those operations did not determine what *Elskov* means. A model can fluently rationalise “erotic love,” “romantic love,” or “passionate love.” It can also fabricate a consensus or overgeneralise from a dictionary definition. The safeguards are external to fluency: inspect the source; cite the historical evidence; read the scholarship; separate verified material from leads; disclose excluded corpus sections; preserve alternatives; require a responsible human decision.

Research on machine literary translation offers reason for caution. One recent bounded comparison found strong machine fluency alongside lower accuracy and unwanted additions relative to human translation.<sup>[13]</sup> Translation ethicists have also

raised questions of professional responsibility, training data, and authorship.<sup>[14]</sup> Venuti's argument that translation is an interpretive inscription rather than the recovery of invariant meaning is especially relevant: a machine output becomes responsible translation only within a human act that selects, revises, and owns an interpretation.<sup>[15]</sup> None of these sources licenses a universal ranking of human and machine texts. Together they make one point difficult to evade: fluent output is not evidence of accountable interpretation.

This project should consequently be judged not by whether its prose "sounds AI-generated," an unstable and often prejudicial test, but by whether the edition can answer concrete questions. Which Danish witness controls? Why does the English vary here? What recurrence was preserved? Which alternative was rejected? Who checked the claim? What remains uncertain? Where is the correction recorded?

## 10. Limitations

This working paper has four material limits.

First, the local concordance is incomplete. It covers seven complete Danish-facing First Series sections and excludes Chapter 4/II.C; it is not yet a whole-book lemmatised corpus.

Second, historical dictionary range cannot determine contextual meaning. ODS supplies attested possibilities and useful counterexamples to a one-to-one rule, not an automatic translation.

Third, several important scholarly books and chapters have so far been verified bibliographically but not examined page by page for this paper. The argument relies most heavily on the sources inspected directly and marks further reading in the accompanying evidence register.

Fourth, this draft has not yet received external Danish-specialist or Kierkegaard-specialist review. It is an academically structured working argument, not a peer-reviewed finding.

## Conclusion

The answer to the title question is not that *Elskov* means something other than erotic love. It is that it names a field of beloved-centred, passionate, preferential, often romantic and sometimes explicitly sensual love whose relevant feature changes with Kierkegaard's sentence. "Erotic love" sometimes belongs in the translation. It should not govern the translation before the context is read.

This conclusion entails a definite editorial action. The present cross-chapter default should be suspended; all occurrences should be classified; the complete work should be audited; conceptually dense passages should expose the Danish relationship; and the resulting policy should be exposed to public correction with its lack of specialist review stated plainly. The glossary should then be revised through a visible change record rather than silently overwritten.

The value of the exercise lies partly in the correction itself. An AI-assisted edition will not gain scholarly trust by claiming immunity from the errors of human predecessors. It may earn consideration if it can show exactly where it was vulnerable, what evidence disclosed the vulnerability, how the text will change, and who remains responsible for deciding that the change is right.

## AI-use and responsibility statement

This working paper was produced in a human-directed, AI-assisted workflow using OpenAI Codex. The human project editor commissioned the inquiry, supplied and approved the governing translation method, and will decide whether any recommendation enters the edition. Codex assisted with source discovery, corpus counting, comparative analysis, and drafting. The corpus script does not interpret meanings; search results were not treated as citations where the underlying source could be inspected. AI is not an author and bears no scholarly responsibility. Before public release under a human byline, the project editor must verify the citations and source passages, approve the argument, and state plainly that no Danish or Kierkegaard specialist has reviewed it.

## Bibliography

- Davenport, John J. "The Integration of Neighbor-Love and Special Loves in Kierkegaard and von Hildebrand." In *Kierkegaard's God and the Good Life*, edited by Stephen Minister, J. Aaron Simmons, and Michael Strawser, 46-77. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1zxxxq2.8>.
- Hannay, Alastair. "Translating Kierkegaard." In *The Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 385-401. Oxford University Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199601301.013.0021>.
- Hanson, Jeffrey. "The Oneness of Love in *Works of Love*." *Religions* 14, no. 12 (2023): 1517. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14121517>.
- Hanson, Jeffrey, and Wojciech Kaftanski. "Introduction." In *Kierkegaard's Works of Love: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge University Press, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009416504.001>.
- Hughes, Carl S. *Kierkegaard and the Staging of Desire: Rhetoric and Performance in a Theology of Eros*. Fordham University Press, 2014.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*. SKS 9. Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter. Copenhagen: Gads Forlag, 2004. Electronic text via the Royal Danish Library.
- Li, Bo. "Ethical Issues for Literary Translation in the Era of Artificial Intelligence." *Babel* 69, no. 4 (2023): 529-545. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00334.li>.
- Ordbog over det danske Sprog*. Entries "Elskov," "erotisk," "Forkærlighed," and "Kærlighed." Ordnet.dk. Accessed 19 August 2026.
- Piety, M. G. "Some Praise for the Hongs as Translators." *Piety on Kierkegaard*, 12 May 2026. <https://pietyonkierkegaard.com/2026/05/12/some-praise-for-the-hongs-as-translators/>.
- Venuti, Lawrence. "The Human Translator versus the Machine: Algorithms of Interpretation." *Critical Inquiry* 52, no. 3 (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1086/739756>.

## Notes

- [1] M. G. Piety, "Some Praise for the Hongs as Translators," *Piety on Kierkegaard*, 12 May 2026, <https://pietyonkierkegaard.com/2026/05/12/some-praise-for-the-hongs-as-translators/>.
- [2] *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, "Elskov," <https://ordnet.dk/ods/ordbog?query=Elskov>.
- [3] *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, "Forkærlighed," <https://ordnet.dk/ods/ordbog?query=Fork%C3%A6rlighed>.
- [4] *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, "erotisk," <https://ordnet.dk/ods/ordbog?query=erotisk>.
- [5] Jeffrey Hanson and Wojciech Kaftanski, "Introduction," in *Kierkegaard's Works of Love: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge University Press, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009416504.001>.
- [6] Jeffrey Hanson, "The Oneness of Love in *Works of Love*," *Religions* 14, no. 12 (2023): 1517, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14121517>. See also John J. Davenport, "The Integration of Neighbor-Love and Special Loves in Kierkegaard's *Works of Love*" (2017), which remains on the full-reading list recorded in the evidence register.
- [7] Carl S. Hughes, *Kierkegaard and the Staging of Desire* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), publisher record at [Fordham University Press](https://www.fordham.edu/publisher).
- [8] Local corpus-audit script. The audit parsed Danish cells in seven complete facing-text tables and counted case-insensitive word forms beginning with the relevant stems. Chapter 4/II.C was excluded because its complete Danish-facing table has not yet been assembled.
- [9] Søren Kierkegaard, *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, SKS 9, 51. See the project's aligned Chapter 3 row.
- [10] Søren Kierkegaard, *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, SKS 9, 19; see the Chapter 1 assembled working text, paragraph beginning "Yet this hidden life of love."
- [11] Søren Kierkegaard, *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, SKS 9, 27; see the Chapter 2 assembled working text, paragraph beginning "But is this also the highest?"

- [12] Søren Kierkegaard, *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, SKS 9, 142; see Chapter 6 assembled working text, source unit 10.
- [13] Rafat Al Rousan, Raghad Jaradat, and Mona Malkawi, "ChatGPT Translation vs. Human Translation: An Examination of a Literary Text," *Cogent Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (2025): 2472916, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2472916>. The study's Arabic-English design does not justify generalisation to Danish-English translation.
- [14] Bo Li, "Ethical Issues for Literary Translation in the Era of Artificial Intelligence," *Babel* 69, no. 4 (2023): 529-545, <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00334.li>.
- [15] Lawrence Venuti, "The Human Translator versus the Machine: Algorithms of Interpretation," *Critical Inquiry* 52, no. 3 (2026), <https://doi.org/10.1086/739756>.

## Correction history

- **0.5 - 20 August 2026:** replaced presumptive reception language with an explicitly hypothetical assessment and verified the three previously provisional SKS page references.
- **0.4 - 19 August 2026:** recast the paper for open public correction without implying that unavailable commissioned specialist review has occurred or is a condition of working-paper circulation; moderated the hypothetical account of scholarly reception.
- **0.3 - 19 August 2026:** corrected the Davenport chapter title and host volume against the official Indiana University Press record.
- **0.2 - 19 August 2026:** corrected the Hannay DOI and completed the bibliographic details for the Al Rousan, Jaradat, and Malkawi study.
- **0.1 - 19 August 2026:** initial working-paper draft; recommends suspension rather than immediate silent replacement of the current glossary default.