An Overview of Kierkegaard’s Nachlass. Part One: the Materials

Abstract: Kierkegaard’s journals, notebooks and loose papers represent a generally neglected part of his vast corpus of writings. The present two-part article tells the story of this material from the time of Kierkegaard’s death until the creation of the new Danish edition, Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter. This first part explains the general nature of the surviving material. An account is further given of the long road that Kierkegaard’s Nachlass took from its discovery upon his death in 1855 to its current home at the Royal Library in Copenhagen. The goal is to provide little-known factual information about this large body of material and to encourage scholars to use it more frequently in their studies.

In the Anglophone world, Kierkegaard is best known as a religious and philosophical writer, the author of Either/Or, Fear and Trembling, Philosophical Fragments, the Concluding Unscientific Postscript, and The Sickness unto Death. The secondary literature has tended to focus rather selectively on these, his main published works. This is somewhat unfortunate since the result of this practice is that vast expanses of his massive authorship have thereby been neglected. One of these is his Nachlass. I use the German word here since it describes the heterogeneous body of material more accurately than the English expression “posthumous works.” The English expression tends to imply longer texts that are more or less finished and simply waiting for publication in the way Spinoza’s Ethics was complete and ready for publication when he died. By contrast, the German word “Nachlass” is far more differentiated. It means literally “that which has been left behind [sc. by an author].” This denotes a full range of material, including all sorts of scattered fragments, notes or aphoristic remarks and not just more or less complete manuscripts.¹ The expression “posthumous works” would be an accurate designation for a small part of the material, namely,
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texts such as *Johannes Climacus*, or *De Omnibus dubitandum est*, *The Book on Adler, Judge for Yourself!* or *The Point of View for My Work as an Author*. These works were all more or less finished works, which for whatever reason Kierkegaard himself never published. They have a different character from the rest of the material and may with some degree of accuracy be designated as his posthumous works.²

The size and importance of this body of writings from Kierkegaard’s hand is not well known. At his death, Kierkegaard left behind an enormous amount of unpublished material in various folders, journals, and notebooks and on loose pieces of paper. This material included observations and analyses on various topics, sketches and outlines for possible works, reading and lecture notes, as well as some autobiographical reflections. There are also Kierkegaard’s often numerous surviving drafts to his published works. This material has never been fully explored in the secondary literature. There are a number of reasons for this.

The sheer volume of the material constituting Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass* is forbidding. The old *Papirer* edition,³ contains 13 volumes (excluding the index) or, more accurately, 22 actual tomes (since there are double and multiple volumes). The new edition *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* presents this material also in 13 thick volumes (vols. 15 – 28).⁴ This would be much more if all of the drafts, fair copies and typeset proofs were also included. This vast volume of material has simply intimidated scholars through the years and discouraged them from pursuing this as an object of research. It has always been much more attractive to do research on a theme in one or more of Kierkegaard’s published works, many of which are of quite palatable size.

In addition to the intimidating volume of the *Nachlass*, there has traditionally been a problem with how to approach the subject matter. A large amount of material need not in itself be problematic since with discipline and diligence the truly interested scholar can work through it, provided that the material is organized in an accessible way. It is precisely here where the real problem lies. Previous editions of the journals and notebooks have not managed to find a way to
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² For this reason they are published separately from the journals and notebooks in the new Danish edition, *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*.


present the material such that discrete themes or topics can be readily identified. In the way in which the *Papirer* edition presented the *Nachlass*, very little thematic continuity was discernable. Each volume of text stood as a large, enigmatic block that potentially contained entries useful for one’s research project, but it was not clear how one could find them without reading every single volume.\(^5\) Other editions organized and presented the material as purely autobiographical, but this was no help if one was interested in specific philosophical or theological themes. Given all this, many scholars decided that it was not worth the considerable time and trouble to explore this part of the *corpus* since it was simply too inaccessible and the rewards too uncertain.

A final reason for the neglect of the *Nachlass* is the prejudice that this part of the authorship is somehow secondary to the published works. It is thought that the material found in the journals and notebooks is at best qualitatively inferior to that found in the published works and at worst of no value at all when taken on its own. Thus, many scholars had a dismissive view of this body of writings and did not see how it could be used either to illuminate material better known from the published works or as a source of interest and insight in its own right. This dismissive view was usually based on an ignorance of the actual content of the material contained in the *Nachlass*, which was at times portrayed as being merely a kind of diary, of interest only for Kierkegaard’s biography but not his thought, or as containing merely drafts of the published works, of interest only for philological investigations.

Although there has recently been a plethora of new introductory books about Kierkegaard, none of these treats the *Nachlass* in any detail. This double article is an attempt to make this rich and interesting material better known to international Kierkegaard research. In what follows I will describe more precisely what kind of material we are talking about when we refer to Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass* (Section I) and how this material has been preserved and passed on from Kierkegaard’s time to our own (Section II). In the second part of the article I will then explain how this material has been organized and presented in the different Danish editions. Apart from a few scattered studies, this information is not generally accessible to the international scholar.
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5 This was of course later remedied to a large extent by the publication of the three-volume index from 1975–78.
I. The General Nature of Kierkegaard’s Nachlass

A full appreciation of the nature and scope of the journals and notebooks is only possible when one is familiar with the way in which Kierkegaard worked and how he was accustomed to make use of this material. Kierkegaard was a voracious reader, particularly as a young man, and he often used his journals in different ways in connection with his reading. At times he used them simply to record information from works that he read, presumably with an eye towards possible later use; this included writing down individual ideas, insights, turns of phrase or quotations from his reading. He also tended to use his journals as a private forum in order to develop his own ideas based often on something that he had heard or read. He used his journals to meditate on his life and literary activities. Also included in the Nachlass are various notes that he took when he attended the lectures of famous philosophers and theologians such as Clau- sen, Marheineke, Werder, and Schelling. These notes served as a source of later inspiration for many of his published works. Further, Kierkegaard took his journals with him on trips in order to write down his impressions and ideas along the way. Thus, his Nachlass is tremendously heterogeneous in both content and form, and no short characterization can begin to do justice to it.

As is well known, Kierkegaard was a prolific writer. One of the reasons why he was able to publish so much so quickly was that he had a vast body of information in his journals that he could draw upon for his works. One frequently stumbles across ideas or formulations or even whole passages from the published works in an earlier form in the journals and notebooks. Thus, one can say that Kierkegaard used his journals and notebooks in much the same way that many of us today tend to use a computer. It was a way to gather information and further develop ideas that he could then later, so to speak, cut and paste into a document that he was working on. The journals thus constituted a kind of database from which he could constantly draw information.

However, in order for Kierkegaard to be able to make use of this material thus, he needed to organize it in a way that he could readily find individual entries when he wanted to use them later and refer to them when the need arose. Therefore, he kept this material meticulously organized in 61 journals and notebooks with different colors and labels. As physical entities, these were generally small bound notebooks with blank pages that he bought at the stationary store.6 This material included, first, ten journals labeled AA, BB,
CC, DD, EE, FF, GG, HH, JJ, and KK (from 1833–46);⁷ second, the notebooks labeled 1–15 (from 1833–49); third, the journals from the second half of the authorship, labeled NB, NB2, NB3 and so on until NB36 (from 1846–55); and finally there are a number of loose papers not belonging to any notebook or journal.⁸

This system of organization seems to have begun in 1842,⁹ when Kierkegaard was starting to make the overview of his authorship for The Point of View for My Work as an Author. It is also possible that the body of material increased to the point where a system was necessary. Whatever the immediate occasion might have been, he in any case needed the journals and notebooks clearly labeled so that he could make reference to them. Before this system he would simply refer to a passage with vague phrases such as, “cf. book two, no. 2”¹⁰ or “in one of my other books.”¹¹ After establishing his system, he could refer to the individual texts specifically by name.

It would be an overstatement to claim that these individual journals and notebooks each represent an absolutely discrete unit, containing material related exclusively to a single theme or project. However, it is clear that Kierkegaard’s organization of the material in this way was not random and that obvious thematic continuities do exist within these individual units of text. This is highly significant given the way in which later editors have disregarded these textual units and thereby the continuities contained in them.

The use of the two different terms, “journals” and “notebooks,” is not entirely arbitrary. With the textual units just noted, Kierkegaard had, so to speak, three different series of unpublished works. The first was comprised of the journals labeled with the letters AA to KK; the second was comprised of the notebooks
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7 There was no II since, as in the older Latin alphabet, the letters I and J were not distinguished.
9 Jette Knudsen, Kim Ravn and Steen Tullberg, “Tekstredegørelse” to Journal JJ, in SKS K18, 214 and 224 / KJN 2, 459 and 465f. According to this account, Kierkegaard’s organizational system began shortly after he began work on the Journal JJ.
labeled with numbers 1–15, and finally there were the NB journals. (Note that while Kierkegaard himself labeled the early journals AA to KK and the late journals NB, NB2.., etc. the designation of the notebooks as numbered 1 to 15 comes from the editors of *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter.*) In order to keep these units separate, *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* distinguishes between, on the one hand, the first and the last group, which are referred to with the term “journals,” and, on the other, the middle group, which are designated as “notebooks.”¹² It is an open question to what degree this distinction reflects an actual difference in content.

It should be noted that the designation “journals” in reference to the journals AA to KK is to some degree an editorial invention and is not something clearly found in Kierkegaard’s own texts.¹³ He does refer to the long *Journal JJ*, with the word “journal.”¹⁴ However, he tends to refer to the other journals in this series with the nondescript term “books.”¹⁵ Yet, it is clear from his numbering system that they belong to the same series and thus have something in common. In any case, it is ultimately of less importance what one chooses to call these groupings, but the main thing is that they be kept separate.

There is in any case a clear distinction between the character of, on the one hand, the early journals AA-KK and the notebooks 1–15, from the first half of the authorship and, on the other, the NB journals from the second half of the authorship. The former are much more heterogeneous, discussing any number of different topics and reflecting Kierkegaard’s enthusiastic reading of a number of different kinds of works. By contrast, the NB journals are much more self-meditations on his life, his family, his relation to Regine, and the reception of his numerous works, as is evinced by the frequently occurring heading, “About Myself”; in the last few years of his life they, naturally enough, concern his attack on the church. One might argue that these later journals are more introspective, while the journals and notebooks from the first half of the authorship are more outward-looking, in search of new ideas. In any case, it is important to keep in mind these two main distinctions when discussing Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass*: first that there is a distinction between *journals* and *notebooks*, and
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¹⁴ *Pap.* V B 58. See *SKS* K4, 339.

¹⁵ For example, *SKS* 17, 234, DD:36 / *KJN* 1, 225; *SKS* 17, 242, DD:61 / *KJN* 1, 233; *SKS* 18, 53, EE:151a / *KJN* 2, 48.
second that there is a distinction between the *early Nachlass*, i.e., the journals AA-KK and notebooks 1–15, and the *late Nachlass*, i.e., the NB journals.

With regard to the difference between the two series from the first half of the authorship, i.e., the journals AA-KK and notebooks 1–15, he tends to use the former to collect information, reflections, analyses and formulations for later use in his published works. This has been characterized by a number of metaphors, such as a workshop, a kitchen,¹⁶ or to use his own description, a backstage practice.¹⁷ By contrast, the notebooks contain primarily notes to lectures that Kierkegaard attended and excerpts from his reading. This characterization is, however, only partially true. There are ambiguities and points of overlap between these two series.

It should be further noted that in the earlier journals Kierkegaard did not write in one journal or notebook until it was filled up, then turning to the next. Instead, there is considerable overlap, and he worked on several journals and notebooks simultaneously. Moreover, he wrote in some of the journals both from the front and from the back. In other words, when he filled up the journal from the front, he sometimes simply turned the volume around and continued writing in it from the back. Thus, the relations among the various early journals and notebooks are quite varied and complex. It would therefore be an error to attempt to analyze individual journals and notebooks in complete isolation. By contrast, the NB journals are fairly straightforward. Kierkegaard worked on them one at a time. When he had filled up one, he then started another one.

Kierkegaard conscientiously kept his journals and notebooks throughout his life. His first journal entries begin already in 1833 when he was a young student at the University of Copenhagen. The last ones appear about 10 months before he was admitted to the hospital before his death in 1855. Journal writing was a life-long project that was intended to go hand-in-hand with his published works. This is illustrated by the fact that when Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass* was found in the days after his death, the journal that he was currently working on, NB36, was found on the left-hand side of the top drawer of his cupboard. On the right-hand side in the same drawer was found the printed manuscript to *The Moment*, no. 9, along with several drafts of works related to his attack on the Church. Thus, it seems that Kierkegaard worked on his published works and journals simultaneously and that the two were intended in some way to complement or supplement each other. This alone should be enough to begin to con-
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¹⁷ SKS 17, 230, DD:28 / *KJN* 1, 222.
vince skeptics of the value of the *Nachlass* for an understanding of the published works, even if they might remain dismissive about the value of this material in its own right.

Further, there are indications that Kierkegaard regarded his journals and notebooks as a part of his activity as an author.\(^{18}\) In other words, when he was describing something in his journals he was not attempting to give a strictly veridical picture of reality, but rather the description almost always had something of a poetic flair about it.\(^{19}\) Kierkegaard embroidered and colored what he wrote in his journals in various ways. In this respect it would be a mistake to think of his *Nachlass* as diaries in the usual sense; for even that part of the *Nachlass* which most resembles diaries, that is, the journals that he took with him on his journeys, exhibits profound signs of poetic and fictional elements and thus cannot be taken as straightforward reflections of his own thoughts or perceptions of the world. In any case, his journals and notebooks differ in this way from an objective piece of reporting and thus can be seen as constituting a part of his activity as a creative author. For this reason he could take individual passages from them *ad libitum* and insert them, often with minimal modification, into the published works, some of which were of course purportedly not his own but from the pen of his pseudonyms.

The importance of this matter is further testified by the fact that Kierkegaard seems at some level to have had in mind the publication of this material.\(^{20}\) This can be seen most obviously by the fact that at one point in 1848 he designated his then friend, the professor of philosophy, Rasmus Nielsen (1809–84) as the posthumous editor of his journals and papers.\(^{21}\) Whom he designated and why

\(^{18}\) This is one of the theses of Niels Jørgen Cappelørn’s “The Retrospective Understanding of Søren Kierkegaard’s Total Production,” in *Kierkegaard. Resources and Results*, ed. by Alastair McKinnon, Montreal: Wilfrid Laurier University Press 1982, pp. 18–38. See also his “Kierkegaard som bogkøber og bogsamler,” in *Tekstspejle. Om Søren Kierkegaard som bogstitlementager, boggiver og bogsamler*, by Niels Jørgen Cappelørn, Gert Posselt, and Bente Rohde, Esbjerg: Rosendahls Forlag 2002, p. [3].

\(^{19}\) See Cappelørn, “The Retrospective Understanding of Søren Kierkegaard’s Total Production,” pp. 25f.


\(^{21}\) See Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, pp. 30ff.; *Written Images*, pp. 30ff. This is clear from a note found later where Kierkegaard designates Nielsen as the one responsible for the publication of this material. Kierkegaard seems later to have changed his mind about this. See the picture of this note in *Skriftbilleder*, pp. 22–23; *Written Images*, pp. 22–23. See also *SKS* 21, 57, NB6:74 / *KJN* 5, 57; *SKS* 21, 57, NB6:75 / *KJN* 5, 57.
is less important for the moment than the fact that he had such thoughts while he was writing the journals and notebooks. This seems to imply that he always had his reading public in the back of his mind even when he was writing what some might otherwise regard as his private journals.²² In this sense his journals are no different from his published books since both were ultimately planned for publication in some form, and both were written with the idea that they would receive the careful scrutiny of the reading public. His intention to have the journals and notebooks published one day also comes to expression in an entry where he even gives the title for such a publication: “If, after my death, they publish my journals, they could do so under the title: The Book of the Judge.”²³

Kierkegaard did get his wish, and his journals and notebooks were ultimately published, but it took a considerable period of time, and the road was somewhat tortuous. Moreover, the way in which the material was eventually published was certainly not as he had imagined it. In what follows I will briefly recount the main stations along this road, from Kierkegaard’s death and the discovery of the papers to their present condition and home today.

II. The Story of Kierkegaard’s Nachlass

A. The Initial Discovery and Cataloging of the Material

Kierkegaard’s Nachlass was originally found by his nephew, the medical student Henrik Lund (1825–89).²⁴ He claimed that he should take the responsibility for publishing the journals and papers posthumously since Kierkegaard in some way had indicated that this was his wish (contrary to the aforementioned desig-
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²² See Cappelørn, “The Retrospective Understanding of Søren Kierkegaard’s Total Production,” pp. 28f.
²³ SKS 21, 335, NB10:158 / KJN 5, 346.
nation of Rasmus Nielsen, which at the time was not yet known). For this reason after Kierkegaard’s death on November 11, 1855, Lund went to his apartment in order to look through the material. He found countless notebooks, journals, loose sheets and scraps of paper in Kierkegaard’s writing desk, in drawers in a cabinet, in bags, etc. He made a detailed four-page overview of each unit of material indicating where he had found it, i.e., “in the desk,” “in the lower desk drawer,” rolled up “tied with a bowknot,” etc. He called this overview simply “The Order to the Papers.” He numbered each unit of material that he found from 1 to 389. From this overview it is clear that the most recent things that Kierkegaard was working on were understandably in the most obvious and prominent places on or around his desk, whereas the older material was buried somewhat deeper and kept in less accessible places. When Lund completed this overview, he started on a more extensive catalogue of the material, which he completed on January 17, 1856. This catalogue used the numbers from the overview as its point of departure and gave more precise information about each of the numbered units of text. He thus gave a brief account of the content of each individual journal or notebook, the date, the number of pages it contained and an indication of the format or size of the paper. He called this the “List of the Manuscripts of S. Kierkegaard, Recorded after his Death.”

When Lund received a position as doctor on the island of St. Jan in the West Indies (now a part of the Virgin Islands) and was thus to leave Denmark, it was clear that he would be unable to carry out the publication of the material and someone else would have to be found. First Kierkegaard’s lifelong friend Emil Boesen (1812–79) was asked, but he politely declined; in May of 1857 the material was eventually sent by Lund’s father, Johan Christian Lund (1799–1875), to Kierkegaard’s elder brother and only surviving sibling, Peter Christian Kierkegaard (1805–88), who was then bishop in Aalborg.²⁷ P.C. Kierkegaard himself published in 1859 what appeared to be a more or less complete text in the mass of posthumous material, that is, The Point of View for My Work as an Author.²⁸ After this, however, he seems not to have done much with the material for the next several years.

At the beginning of 1865, he delegated to Hans Peter Barfod (1834–92), a jurist and newspaper editor, the job of making an overview of the rest of his
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²⁵ Cappeløn et al., Skriftbilleder, p. 9; Written Images, p. 9.
²⁶ Cappeløn et al., Skriftbilleder, p. 12; Written Images, p. 12.
brother’s posthumous writings.²⁹ In the course of that year Barfod worked out an
eaborate and more or less exhaustive catalogue that contained 472 numbered
units, the first part of which followed Lund’s catalogue.³⁰ Barfod assigned num-
bers not just to individual journals and notebooks but also to loose sheets of
paper. In addition, he meticulously registered every single journal or notebook
entry by writing the date, the first few words of the entry or its heading if it
had one. The entries in bound journals or notebooks were also referenced by
means of page numbers. Entries especially relevant for Kierkegaard’s person
or biography were noted with a special double underlining. In all, this detailed
catalogue came to fill 223 pages.³¹

Barfod’s labor was clearly done with an eye toward the publication of the
material. Thus, he was startled when on March 9, 1865, while working on his
catalogue, he found a scrap of paper on which Kierkegaard clearlyindicates
his desire that Rasmus Nielsen publish his posthumous works: “It is my wish
that after my death Prof. Nielsen do whatever is necessary with respect to the
publication of the entirety of my literary remains, manuscripts, journals, etc.,
which are to be turned over to him.”³² Given the circumstances under which it
was found, it was not clear if this was to be regarded simply as a fleeting thought
that Kierkegaard had entertained during the period around 1848 when he was on
close terms with Nielsen, which could thus be safely ignored, or if it was to be
considered in a juristic sense as his final testament, which should be respected
at all costs. Barfod was quite vexed by the matter since if the latter were deemed
to be the case, then his own plans for editing and publishing the material would
be in danger. He was doubtless further troubled by the fact that Nielsen had in
fact edited a volume of Kierkegaard’s newspaper articles in 1857 and thus
seemed in principle to be a good candidate for the job of editing the Nachlass.³³
He discussed the matter in detail with P.C. Kierkegaard. After careful considera-
tion, it was decided that this could not have been Kierkegaard’s final wish given
that he ultimately became alienated from Nielsen. The winning argument was
provided by another passage from the Nachlass. In a sketch of an article “Ras-
mus Nielsen’s Relation to My Activity as an Author,” which Kierkegaard never
published, Barfod found, among many abusive comments about Nielsen, the fol-
lowing: “Now the point has been reached that if I were to die now, for example,

³⁰ Cappelørn et al., Skriftbilleder, pp. 42ff.; Written Images, pp. 42ff.
³¹ Neither Barfod’s nor Lund’s catalogue has ever been published.
³³ S. Kierkegaards Bladartikler med Bilag samlede efter Forfatteren Død, udgivne som Supple-
ment til hans øvrige Skrifter, ed. by Rasmus Nielsen, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel 1857.
Prof. N. would be the person whom I would least of all wish to be regarded as possessing the correct interpretation of my efforts.”³⁶ This provided the evidence that Barfod was looking for, seemingly showing that the scrap of paper was not Kierkegaard’s final wish and certainly could not be regarded as a legal testament with any binding force. Thus, P.C. Kierkegaard decided not to inform Rasmus Nielsen of the matter.

B. The First Publication of Kierkegaard’s Nachlass

After completing the task of cataloguing, Barfod asked if he could have permission to publish some of the material. In fall of 1867 P.C. Kierkegaard consented and gave Barfod free hand over the posthumous authorship.³⁵ Nielsen was ultimately informed of the scrap of paper that was found but only several years later in 1875, that is, after the first volumes of Barfod’s edition had already appeared and at a time when P.C. Kierkegaard’s health seemed to be failing. Nielsen was informed of the matter in a letter written jointly by P.C. Kierkegaard and Barfod. Needless to say, Nielsen was offended that he was not told when the note was found in 1865 and interpreted it as an authentic and binding document.³⁶

From 1869 to 1877 Barfod published the first three volumes of this material in an edition simply called Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer.³⁷ He edited the texts with his own hand on Kierkegaard’s manuscripts themselves, crossing out, writing arrows, changing punctuation, cutting out passages and pasting them together with others. He then sent Kierkegaard’s own manuscripts directly to the publisher without bothering to rewrite them in his own hand.³⁸ The publishers then typeset the text using Kierkegaard’s original manuscripts as edited by Barfod. Some of this material was not returned after the publication of the work, and as a result many of the manuscripts containing the material that appeared in Barfod’s original edition have been lost.

³⁴ Pap. X-6 B 102, p. 124. Cappelørn et al., Skrftbilleder, p. 36; Written Images, p. 36.
³⁶ Cappelørn et al., Skrftbilleder, pp. 64f.; Written Images, pp. 64f.
³⁸ Cappelørn et al., Skrftbilleder, p. 83 and pp. 97ff.; Written Images, p. 83 and pp. 97ff.
When the initial volumes of Barfod’s edition began to appear, the reading public in Denmark was scandalized by it. Due to the attack on the Church in the last year of his life, Kierkegaard was fixed in the public mind of the generation as one whose name was associated with scandal. It seemed to many embarrassing or lacking discretion to trot out all of his old animosities once again with renowned and respected Copenhagen figures such as Martensen, Mynster, Heiberg, Grundtvig, or Goldschmidt. Kierkegaard’s friend Emil Boesen had even requested ahead of time that Barfod not print some of this highly polemical material.³⁹ Although by no means a neutral party, Kierkegaard’s long-time rival, the theologian Hans Lassen Martensen (1808–84), makes a comment on this edition in passing, which seems to be characteristic of the general view at the time. Writing in the first volume his memoirs in 1882, he says,

The more [Kierkegaard] developed, the more his life and work developed into a union of sophistry and a profound, although unhealthy, sensibility. In the diaries he left behind (which have now been displayed to the public tactlessly and without consideration for the deceased), he himself has provided the most incontrovertible evidence of the sickly nature of his profound sensibility, which increasingly got the upper hand as the years passed."⁴⁰

In Martensen’s eyes, Barfod did Kierkegaard’s reputation no service by publishing the posthumous material, which presented a quite unflattering side of his personality that was best forgotten. Thus, the initial volumes of this edition did not enjoy a positive reception.⁴¹ This seems to be one of the reasons why Barfod decided not to continue with the work.⁴² Criticism of this kind also explains the somewhat defensive tone in the Foreword to the second volume⁴³ and in that
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⁴¹ See the overview given in Kabell, *Kierkegaardsstudiet i Norden*, pp. 124 ff. See also Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, pp. 53–56; *Written Images*, pp. 53–56.  
⁴² Hermann Gottsched, “Forord,” in *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1848*, ed. by Hermann Gottsched, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1880 (hereafter *EP, V*), p. vi. Although Barfod does not say so directly, he mentions his decision, in 1877, to discontinue his work on the edition in connection with the criticism that the initial volumes received.  
to the first volume published by Barfod’s successor Hermann Gottsched (1849–1916) in 1880.⁴⁴

A German philologist, Gottsched became interested in Kierkegaard as a student in Tübingen. Already by this time there were several German translations of Kierkegaard’s works,⁴⁵ including biographical selections based on the volumes edited by Barfod.⁴⁶ In Tübingen there was apparently a small circle of interest in Kierkegaard that was due to the work of the professor of theology Johann Tobias Beck (1804–78).⁴⁷ Gottsched belonged to this circle.⁴⁸ Motivated by this interest, he learned Danish and visited Denmark briefly. He met Barfod in the fall of 1878 in Germany,⁴⁹ when the latter was visiting the pastor Albert Bärthold, who was responsible for a number of the German Kierkegaard translations⁵⁰ and was previously also one of Beck’s students in Tübingen. After their meeting Gottsched developed an intense desire to work on Kierkegaard’s Nachlass.

⁴⁴ Gottsched, “Forord,” in EP, V, pp. v-ix. This first part of this “Forord” is by Barfod (pp. v-ix) and the second part by Gottsched (pp. x-xii). Both of them are marked by a rather apologetic tone.


⁴⁷ See Malik, Receiving Søren Kierkegaard, p. 220.


⁴⁹ Barfod indicates (EP, V, p. viii) that their first meeting took place in Harz and not in Copenhagen as Malik says. See Malik, Receiving Søren Kierkegaard, p. 271. See also the letter from Bärthold to Barfod dated September 1, 1878 (Ny Kongelige Samling 3866, 49).

When his post as a teacher in a secondary school in his hometown of Wernigerode (in Harz) expired, he moved to Aalborg in July 1879 in order to work on the edition.¹ He completed it with remarkable speed, publishing the last five volumes in just two years (1880–81).² Thus, in all, this initial edition contained nine volumes (the first of which was a double volume)—only a small part of the entire body of material. In contrast to Barfod, Gottsched was careful to preserve all of the original manuscripts.

While work on the Barfod-Gottsched edition was still going on in Aalborg, P.C. Kierkegaard fell ill in 1875 and, not wanting to continue to have the responsibility for his brother’s literary Nachlass, gave what was left of it to the University Library in Copenhagen. It is not known with certainty if he kept something for himself or destroyed things that he found particularly troubling or offensive. In the closing remarks to his catalogue, Barfod writes, “For the sake of completeness and to be on the safe side, it is noted that in storage and among his papers, Bishop Kierkegaard has at least a few lesser articles and letters, which, because I have not had an opportunity to inspect them, are excluded from this catalogue.”³ It should be noted that the relation between the two brothers had been strained to the point of more or less complete alienation due in part to Peter Christian’s close association with the Grundtvig movement.⁴ Clear testimony to the profundity of this alienation can be found in the fact that when Kierkegaard was on his deathbed he refused to see his brother, who came to visit him in the hospital.⁵ Peter Christian doubtless ran across the many journal entries in his brother’s Nachlass, which were highly critical of him.⁶ To his credit, he apparently did not remove this material.

54 The most complete work on the relation between the two brothers is Weltzer, Peter og Søren Kierkegaard.
55 See Kirmmse, Encounters with Kierkegaard, p. 119, p. 122, p. 127.
In 1876 P.C. Kierkegaard published his brother’s manuscript, *Judge for Yourself!,* almost 17 long years after he had published *The Point of View for My Work as an Author.* It was perhaps Peter Christian’s failing health that precipitated the publication, which he had possibly been planning for some time previously. He could presumably have done more, but he left the rest of the *Nachlass* to Barfod and Gottsched to publish as they wished. In 1875 P.C. Kierkegaard donated what remained of his brother’s *Nachlass* to the University Library, and after this time the materials had to be sent back and forth between the editors in Aalborg and the library in Copenhagen. The manuscripts were sent to the University Library not in their original form but rather reorganized in a more chronological order by Barfod.

**C. New Material is Added to the Nachlass and Further Publications**

An important addition to the *Nachlass* came in 1904 with the death of Kierkegaard’s former fiancée Regine Schlegel, née Olsen (1822–1904). In Kierkegaard’s will (written in 1851) which was found in a sealed envelope addressed to his brother, he named Regine Schlegel as his sole heir. P.C. Kierkegaard then dutifully wrote to her and her husband Johan Frederik Schlegel (1817–96), then the governor of the Danish West Indies, and informed them of this. The response he received was that Mrs. Schlegel was interested in receiving only those materials among Kierkegaard’s journals and papers that concerned herself directly. Thus, her entire correspondence with Kierkegaard as well as seven letters, which Kierkegaard had written in Berlin and sent to his confidant Emil Boesen concerning the dissolution of the engagement, were mailed to her in St. Croix. In addition, she was sent a notebook entitled, “My Relationship to Her.” Before her death she destroyed her side of the correspondence, that is, the letters that she as a young woman had written to Kierkegaard during their
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57 S. Kierkegaard, *Dømmer selv! Til Selvprøvelse Samtiden anbefalet,* Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel 1876.
58 Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder,* pp. 71–75; *Written Images,* pp. 71–75.
courtship and engagement.⁶¹ The rest of the material, however, was donated to the University Library and thus added to the collection in 1904.

Regine had entrusted Henriette Lund (1829–1909) with the manuscripts in 1893, which she used to create a semi-fictional novel about the broken engagement. When Regine saw the beginning of this work and was not pleased with it, she asked to have the materials back again in 1898, pretending that she was concerned about possible damage to the manuscripts which could take place in the event of fire or other disasters, with the manuscripts being kept in a private home without adequate security.⁶² Regine entrusted the material to the librarian and philologist Raphael Meyer (1869–1925), who published it upon her death in 1904 under the title, *Kierkegaardske Papirer. Forlovelsen. Udgivene for Fru Regine Schlegel.*⁶³ Henriette Lund ultimately published her version of the material in the same year under the title, *Mit Forhold til hende. Af Søren Kierkegaards efterladte Papirer.*⁶⁴

**D. The *Papirer* Edition and the Wave of Biographical Studies**

The next major event in the history of the *Nachlass* was a new edition. The pioneering efforts of Barfod and Gottsched were important steps in the publication of Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass.* Their edition effectively whetted the appetite of interested readers for more. With the growing interest in Kierkegaard studies, it was inevitable that there would be a demand for more of the posthumous material to be published. This need was felt acutely by the turn of the century, and thus the wheels were set into motion for a new edition. A new group of editors set to work with the ambition of producing the first more or less complete edition of Kierkegaard’s *Nachlass.* This appeared between the years 1909 and 1948 with the title, *Søren Kierkegaards Papirer,* under the care of the editors, Peter Andreas Heiberg (1864–1926) and Victor Kuhr (1882–1948).⁶⁵ The first collected edition of Kierke-
gaard’s published works, the *Samlede Værker*, had just been completed in 1906.\(^6^6\) Given that the published works were now generally available, it was logical that an attempt be made to publish his *Nachlass* in a complete edition as well.\(^6^7\) When working out the regulative principles for their edition, the editors of the *Papirer* edition consulted their colleagues who had worked on the *Samlede Værker*.\(^6^8\)

The *Papirer* was the idea and the ambition of Peter Andreas Heiberg, who was the driving force behind this edition. Heiberg, like Barfod before him, was intellectually drawn to Kierkegaard and thus selflessly dedicated himself to promoting him by means of the edition. Heiberg’s interest in the *Nachlass* seems to have come from his fascination with Kierkegaard’s biography, a fascination that he cultivated during his work on the edition. The time when Kierkegaard’s name was immediately associated with scandal was now past, and one could undertake this project with the hope of a more favorable reception than Barfod received. At the beginning of the work, P.A. Heiberg, like Barfod before him, registered all of the material.\(^6^9\) He then repacked it not according to Kierkegaard’s original notebooks and journals or according to Barfod’s chronology but according to the same principles used in the *Papirer* edition (described in the second part of this double article).\(^7^0\)

P.A. Heiberg and Kuhr worked on this edition jointly until Heiberg died in 1926; then a new editor, Einer Torsting (1893–1951), joined Kuhr, and the two of them completed the project. The completion of this edition was delayed during World War II when the two main editors had to go underground. The penultimate volume XI-2 was published in 1938, but the final volume XI-3 had to wait until after the war and the occupation, until 1948 to see the light of day.

---


\(^6^9\) Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, p. 76; *Written Images*, p. 76.

It should be noted that this edition did fulfill at least in part its function by spawning a series of biographical works on Kierkegaard. These include P.A. Heiberg’s *An Episode in Søren Kierkegaard’s Youth* from 1912,⁷¹ *A Segment of Søren Kierkegaard’s Religious Development* from 1918,⁷² *Søren Kierkegaard’s Religious Development* from 1925,⁷³ Valdemar Ammundsen’s (1875–1936) *Søren Kierkegaard’s Youth* from 1912,⁷⁴ Eduard Geismar’s (1871–1939) *Søren Kierkegaard: His Life and Authorship* from 1926–28,⁷⁵ Frithiof Brandt’s (1892–1968) *The Young Søren Kierkegaard* from 1929,⁷⁶ Hjalmar Helweg’s (1886–1960) *Søren Kierkegaard: A Psychiatric-Psychological Study* from 1933,⁷⁷ Sejer Kühle’s (1886–1957) “Some Information about Søren Kierkegaard from 1834–38,” published in five installments from 1931 to 1935,⁷⁸ and Johannes Hohlenberg’s (1881–1960) *Søren Kierkegaard* from 1940.⁷⁹ The *Papirer* thus opened the door to all manner of biography, including psychologizing and psychoanalyzing.
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E. The Kierkegaard Archive at the Royal Library

In 1938 Kierkegaard’s Nachlass was transferred to the Royal Library, which established the Kierkegaard Archive. The Archive included not just Kierkegaard’s manuscripts but also several of the books which he owned, some of which the library had bought at the auction immediately after his death and some of which it acquired later in the course of the years. It further included a number of biographical documents such as certificates for Kierkegaard’s baptism and confirmation, as well as a number of receipts for books and other expenditures. During World War II, from 1940 to 1945, Kierkegaard’s Nachlass was prudently hidden away in Esrum Monastery in North Zealand, where the material would be safe from the contingencies of the occupation. After the war it was returned to the Royal Library. Today Kierkegaard’s journals and notebooks are still to be found at the Kierkegaard Archive at the Royal Library in Copenhagen, where they are kept under tight security and with limited access. The Archive contains six different groups of items.

First, there are the numerous drafts of works that Kierkegaard published. This includes everything from first drafts, to fair copies, to typeset page proofs. For early texts such as From the Papers of One Still Living and The Concept of Irony, no drafts or proofs exist; by contrast, for later texts such as The Concept of Anxiety or The Sickness unto Death, there are drafts from every state of the composition right up until the fair copy and the typeset proofs.

Second, there are Kierkegaard’s journals and notebooks. These are not all in good condition. The journals AA-KK have been badly damaged or wholly lost primarily by Barfod. These were originally written in bound volumes, which Barfod proceeded to cut up for the publication of his edition. He apparently cut individual entries out and then pasted them onto another piece of paper in the order that he wanted to have them in his edition. He could then send these pasted pieces of paper to the typesetter. Unfortunately, of this group of journals, only KK survives intact. For five of the remaining ten all that is left is the binding with the cut out stumps of pages and a few loose sheets. The notebooks have suffered a mixed fate, with some of them coming down to us complete, while others
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81 The Royal Library bought 48 titles, in all 132 volumes, at the original auction. See Cappelørn, ”Kierkegaard som bogkøber og bogsamler,” in Tekstspejle, p. 110.
82 Cappelørn et al., Skriftbilleder, p. 75; Written Images, p. 75.
83 See the more extended overview in Cappelørn et al., Skriftbilleder, pp. 78–95; Written Images, pp. 78–95.
have suffered the loss of individual pages and entries. The NB journals, by contrast, come down to us in good condition. The journals and notebooks (as well as the loose papers mentioned below) are still organized according to the individual volumes of the Papirer edition.

Third, there is a collection of letters to and from Kierkegaard that was supplemented as the material came to light in the course of the years. What survives here is also fragmentary. Sometimes one can follow his correspondence fairly closely, while sometimes only his side of it remains (as with his correspondence with Regine).

Fourth, there are the aforementioned biographical documents that include not merely official things like his birth certificate and university diploma but also various bills for books, services and membership to clubs and societies.

Fifth, there are a number of loose papers, not belonging to any journal. This category is highly heterogeneous, containing at times quite cryptic snippets of text written on small scraps of paper. Finally, the archive contains some of the books in Kierkegaard’s private library, some of which contain his own marginal comments.

Curious Kierkegaard tourists are not encouraged to visit the library in order to have a look at the manuscripts themselves. It should be noted that these manuscripts are not accessible to the average Kierkegaard student or scholar since even if one knows Danish very well, Kierkegaard’s Gothic handwriting is completely unreadable to those without special training. Indeed, even educated Danes today must be trained to decipher them. Thus, while looking upon an original Kierkegaard manuscript might be a special experience for a faithful follower, such an act is more of a pious gesture of a pilgrim than one with any particular scholarly value. Such interested parties are better served by having at look at the Royal Library’s on-line presentation of the material.⁸⁴

Thus the material from Kierkegaard’s Nachlass that comes down to us today is far from complete. Moreover, that which does survive is rarely in its pristine condition since it often bears the marks of later editors. Nonetheless one can be thankful for the material that we do have and for the fact that it is recognized as a national treasure of Denmark to be carefully preserved and guarded for future generations. With regard to Kierkegaard research, the physical state of the manuscripts is in some sense less important than the way in which those manuscripts have been presented to the reading public. Thus, we must explore in more detail the different editions of Kierkegaard’s Nachlass in order to evalu-
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ate how well they reflect the actual manuscript material. This is done in the sequel to the present article.