Jon Stewart

An Overview of Kierkegaard's *Nachlass*. Part Two: the Editions

Abstract: The present article explains the principles behind the different Danish editions of Kierkegaard's *Nachlass*. Particular attention is given to the new Danish edition, *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter.* An attempt is made to evaluate critically each of these editions and the way in which they present the materials from the *Nachlass* to the reader. It is argued that while *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* makes some very significant contributions, there still remain problems to be solved.

In some ways it is not surprising that there has been little scholarly work done on the *Nachlass* when one considers the early editions in which the material appeared. Indeed, instead of promoting research on this material, the Barfod-Gottsched edition and the *Papirer* edition have in a sense hindered it. In order to understand this admittedly provocative claim, we must examine briefly the editorial and philological principles informing these two Danish editions.

Any edition that publishes a part of a larger body of material is inevitably characterized by its criteria for selection. What the editors choose to include and to omit determines the very essence of the edition. No selection is completely neutral with regard to the interpretive possibilities that it offers its readers. Given the mass of material from which selections can be made, ideologically invested editors can present most any picture of Kierkegaard that they wish to put forth. Thus, it is important to have a close look at what the criteria for selection for a given edition have been in order to get a sense for which of Kierkegaard's many faces the editor is interested in presenting to the reader.

I. The Edition of Barfod and Gottsched

We begin with the first edition of the *Nachlass*, that is, *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer*, edited by Hans Peter Barfod and Hermann Gottsched.[1] Barfod

1 I would like to express my deep gratitude to Tonny Aagaard Olesen, Johnny Kondrup, Finn

Jon Stewart, Søren Kierkegaard Research Centre, University of Copenhagen, Farvergade 27D, 1463 København K, Denmark, js@sk.ku.dk

explains in his editor's Preface that his goal was to present material that could ultimately form the basis for a kind of intellectual biography for Kierkegaard. Thus, he was careful to select material that he considered to be autobiographical and to put it into an order so that it would tell a more or less continuous story. He explains his plan thus:

> Right from the beginning it was my goal to collect from these papers everything that could in any way, even in the widest sense, fit under the concept "the biographical frame," which could serve to cast light on or explain Søren Kierkegaard's life and development, his relation to people, his view of general attitudes and conditions.[2]

Barfod conceived of this project as a complement to the published works, which, to his mind, did not adequately reveal Kierkegaard's personal side.[3] With this said, he was moved by a sense of discretion *not* to publish things which he regarded as too personal; these included primarily Kierkegaard's statements about his family and his relation with Regine. Finally, he hoped to indicate the way in which Kierkegaard's life, as reflected in the *Nachlass*, overlapped with his authorship. He thus indicates, although certainly not exhaustively, passages in the journals and notebooks that are later taken up and used in the published works.

Given this goal, it was logical for him to organize his edition in a chronological fashion. Each volume thus covers a determinate period of time in Kierkegaard's life and literary development.[4] Barfod indicates that he sought natural

Gredal Jensen, Karsten Kynde and Heiko Schulz for their invaluable feedback and suggestions on a previous version of this work.

H.P. Barfod (ed.), *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1833–1843*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1869. *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1844–1846*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1872 (hereafter *EP*, III). *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1847*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1877 (hereafter *EP*, IV). Hermann Gottsched (ed.), *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1848*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1880 (hereafter *EP*, V). *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1849*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1880. *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1850*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1880. *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1851–53*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1881. *Af Søren Kierkegaards Efterladte Papirer. 1854–55*, Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag 1881. For an account of this edition, see Steen Tullberg, "Denmark: The Permanent Reception—150 Years of Reading Kierkegaard," in *Kierkegaard's International Reception*, Tome I, *Northern and Western Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2008 (*Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception and Resources*, vol. 8), pp. 9–12.

2 See H.P. Barfod, "Udgiverens Forord," in *EP*, I-II, p. x.

3 Ibid., p. vi.

4 Ibid., p. xi.

breaks in Kierkegaard's life for the beginning and end of individual volumes.[5] He further divides each volume into individual chapter units usually covering single years. Among the journal entries themselves, Barfod also included individual letters or unpublished articles, thus regarding the *Nachlass* in a sense as a single, homogeneous unit of material.

The biographical look of this edition is enhanced by Barfod's "Introductory Notes" in his first volume. These "notes," despite their nondescript title, are essentially biographical. In this section Barfod gives information about both Kierkegaard's family[6] and his biography,[7] with special emphasis on his youth and early students days (which is natural given the content of the first volume). Here he quotes extensively from letters and first-hand testimony from people who knew Kierkegaard. This is one of the first attempts at a Kierkegaard biography.

When judged by modern standards, Barfod, as philologist, was particularly heavy-handed in a number of respects. While he mentions some of his editorial principles in his Preface, he fails to note all of the ways in which he altered the text of the original manuscripts. In other words, he gives the impression of being less intrusive than he actually is. The following can be regarded as a cursory list of his dubious editorial practices.

(1) Orthography. First, while Barfod gives the impression that he respects Kierkegaard's orthography, saying that "as a rule" he followed the spelling that was in the original manuscripts, in fact he makes orthographical changes without scruples. He does so with the argument that Kierkegaard's orthography is inconsistent, with individual words being spelled in different ways at different places and points in time.[8] Thus, Barfod as editor feels justified in bringing this into harmony. He further notes that there are straightforward spelling errors, primarily in the early journals, which he has simply corrected. He takes these corrections to be wholly uncontroversial.

(2) Punctuation. Further, Barfod changes Kierkegaard's punctuation throughout. He claims that Kierkegaard's use of punctuation marks is wholly chaotic and once again feels justified in bringing it into harmony with what

5 Ibid., p. xii.

6 See Barfod, "Indledende Notiser," in *EP*, I-II, pp. xxvii – xxxiv.

7 Ibid., pp. xl-lv.

8 See Barfod, "Udgiverens Forord," in *EP*, I-II, p. xiv and p. xiv footnote. See also his "Forord," in *EP*, III, pp. xiv. See also Gottsched's statement about orthography: Gottsched, "Forord," in *EP*, V, p. xii. See the discussion in Søren Bruun and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse" to *Journal AA*, in *SKS* K17, 12.

he takes to be the conventions of the day.[9] This seems particularly noteworthy given Kierkegaard's own explicit and apparently quite fixed views about punctuation, which seem to evidence that his use of punctuation marks is anything but arbitrary.[10]

(3) Italics. One thing not mentioned by Barfod is his treatment of Kierkegaard's use of underlining for emphasis. Perhaps the reason that he does not mention it is that he does not follow any consistent rule in his handling of it. In some cases when Kierkegaard has underlined something, Barfod has failed to reproduce it with extra spacing of w o r d s, which was the way in which emphasis was indicated at the time (instead of with the use of italics). However, elsewhere he inserts his own emphasis into the text where there is no underlining from Kierkegaard's own hand.[11]

(4) Abbreviations. Since he was often writing very quickly, Kierkegaard tended to use a number of abbreviations in his journals. Instead of writing out "*Menneske*" (human being) every time, he would abbreviate it with "*Msk*"; similarly, instead of always writing out "*Christendom*" (Christianity), he would write "*Xstdom*" or "*Xstd*."[12] Abbreviations of this kind tend to give the text the look of something unfinished. Doubtless in order to make his edition more readable, Barfod eliminates Kierkegaard's abbreviations and writes out the whole word,[13] thus presenting a text that gives the impression of something more polished than was actually the case.

(5) Insertions. Barfod tries to convey to the reader that he is philologically careful in the places where he adds something to the text. He says that all cases of editorial supplements to the text have been indicated with square brackets.[14] However, a closer comparison of Kierkegaard's manuscripts and Barfod's edition reveals that this is not always the case. In fact, when Barfod judges that Kierkegaard's sentence is either incomprehensible or grammatically inade-

9 See Barfod, "Udgiverens Forord," in *EP*, I-II, p. xv. See also Gottsched's statement about punctuation: Gottsched, "Forord," in *EP*, V, p. xii.

10 See *SKS* 20, 98–101, NB:146–150 / *KJN* 4, 98–101. Interestingly enough Gottsched explicitly notes this passage: Gottsched, "Forord," in *EP*, V, p. xii.

11 See the discussion in Søren Bruun and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse" to *Journal AA*, in *SKS* K17, 14.

12 A list of these abbreviations appears at the end of the *SKS* edition's commentary volumes to the journals and notebooks; see, for example, *SKS* K17, 509–510.

13 Niels Jørgen Cappelørn, Joakim Garff, Johnny Kondrup, *Skriftbilleder. Søren Kierkegaards journaler, notesbøger, hæfter, ark, lapper og strimler*, Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad 1996, p. 97. In English: *Written Images: Søren Kierkegaard's Journals, Notebooks, Booklets, Sheets, Scraps, and Slips of Paper*, trans. by Bruce H. Kirmmse, Princeton: Princeton University Press 2003, p. 97.

14 See Barfod, "Udgiverens Forord," in *EP*, I-II, p. xv.

quate, he goes ahead and adds individual words or punctuation marks without putting these additions in brackets in order to indicate that they come from his hand and are not actually in Kierkegaard's manuscript.

(6) Omissions. Conversely, Barfod has often deleted words or phrases in Kierkegaard's texts, thus changing the wording in many passages. His reason for doing so was presumably the desire to make Kierkegaard's text more readable or stylistically elegant, which once again loses sight of the fact that these texts were often quite rough and represented work-in-progress. He does nothing to indicate these deletions in his edition.[15] Words and phrases are thus omitted from Kierkegaard's text apparently for no other reason than the particular literary taste of the editor. This practice of crossing out material directly on the manuscripts is particularly pernicious since today it is not easy to see what Kierkegaard actually wrote underneath Barfod's deletions, and this has been the cause of later misreadings.

(7) Formatting and Layout. The appearance of individual pages of Kierkegaard's journals is often quite complex. He rarely wrote in a single block starting at the beginning of the page and finishing at the end. Rather, he tended to write in two columns, folding the paper in half vertically in order to divide the page into two equal halves. The inner column he would use for the main text and the outer column for later corrections or additions.[16] This would occasionally result in a number of individual marginal entries. Kierkegaard does not always clearly indicate where these should be inserted into the main text. Barfod himself makes decisions of this kind on Kierkegaard's behalf, although Kierkegaard himself in many cases left the matter ambiguous. In such cases Barfod inserts the marginal entry into the main text with an editorial note, "added in the margin," in brackets. There is, however, no indication where in the margin precisely it originally appeared vis-à-vis the other material on the page.

(8) The Addition of Editorial Notes. Throughout his text Barfod added short notes to indicate the origin or context of an entry. All of these appear in square brackets. The result is that the reader is never able to read Kierkegaard's own text for very long without being interrupted by the constant editorial commentary. Although these have been indicated by square brackets, they are clearly a foreign element in Kierkegaard's texts. It is in a sense odd that Barfod, who with regard to orthography, grammar and punctuation, was so interested in readability, seems indifferent to it with regard to this matter.

15 Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, p. 103; *Written Images*, p. 103.
16 Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, pp. 164 f.; *Written Images*, pp. 164 f.

One can perhaps best summarize Barfod's way of working by saying that instead of treating Kierkegaard's text as an object for philological work, he in effect copyedits it in the way that editors of academic journals today do with articles that are to appear in their journals. The reason for this is doubtless Barfod's own education and experience. Barfod was not a trained philologist but rather a journalist. His journalistic background presumably gave him the model for his treatment of texts. Copyediting texts was what he was used to doing as editor of the newspaper *Aalborgposten*. But genuine philological work seems to have been rather foreign to him.

The main tragedy of this edition is without doubt the loss of manuscript material, which disappeared after the publication of each of Barfod's initial volumes. This is an irretrievable loss for Kierkegaard studies. In Barfod's defense, it could be argued that, while classical philology was in full bloom at the end of the 19th century, modern philology was still in its infancy. There was thus not the same degree of reverence for handwritten manuscripts of modern authors as there was for medieval copies of works from the ancients. For Barfod, once the manuscripts were published, they were no longer of any use, and it was thus superfluous to keep them. The degree of his disregard for the manuscript material itself can be seen in the fact that he cut out some individual journal entries that he used for mementos or postcards to send to his friends.[17] Moreover, Kierkegaard at the time was by no means a major international figure as he is regarded today, and the importance of the material was not fully realized. Thus, while the loss of manuscript material is sad and unforgivable, it is in some ways understandable given the academic sensibilities of the day.

When judged from a philological perspective by the standards of today, this edition can only be regarded as a disaster.[18] This is hardly surprising given that Barfod was not a philologist and, despite all of his apologetics on Kierkegaard's behalf, seems not to have regarded Kierkegaard's texts to be worthy of genuine philological treatment. To be sure, Gottsched's contribution was an improvement over Barfod's, but it was inevitable that the standard set by their edition would in time be surpassed.

17 Cappelørn et al., *Skriftbilleder*, p. 107; *Written Images*, p. 107.

18 See A.B. Drachmann's evaluation in his article, "Søren Kierkegaards Papirer," *Tilskueren*, 1910, pp. 143f. For a surprisingly positive assessment, see Henning Fenger's criticisms in his *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, trans. by George C. Schoolfield, New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1980, pp. 40–47.

II. The *Papirer* Edition

The edition that most scholars used prior to *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* was, of course, *Søren Kierkegaards Papirer*. The original editors of this work, Peter Andreas Heiberg and Victor Kuhr, explain that the goal of their edition is to be as complete as possible. They thus proposed to find and publish as many of Kierkegaard's manuscripts as absolutely possible, including not just those in public libraries and archives but also those in private hands. This included Kierkegaard's journals, notebooks and loose papers, along with letters, biographical documents and even "manuscripts from another hand, insofar as they refer to Kierkegaard,"[19] by which they presumably mean contemporary second-hand accounts of Kierkegaard.[20] Right from the beginning it was clear that this ambitious goal would have to allow some exceptions. These included the notes that Kierkegaard took as a student at the University of Copenhagen and as a guest auditor in Berlin. Also among the exceptions are some of his longer excerpts from works that he was reading.[21] Later as it turned out, another exception had to be made with Kierkegaard's letters and biographical documents, which ultimately were not included in this edition but were published separately.[22] Despite these exceptions, the *Papirer* edition is nonetheless impressive in its size and in any case represents a vast improvement over the Barfod-Gottsched edition.

The editors of this edition regarded Kierkegaard's *Nachlass* as being inherently chaotic and discontinuous. Therefore, they saw it as their task to bring some kind of order to it for the sake of making the material accessible and usable by the reader. Thus, the main editor Peter Andreas Heiberg, after a careful study of the vast material, developed the organizational principles of this edition.[23] The main principle was twofold: thematic and chronological.

19 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. vii. For an account of this edition, see Steen Tullberg, "Denmark: The Permanent Reception—150 Years of Reading Kierkegaard," pp. 26 – 31. See also his "Søren Kierkegaards Papirer (1909 – 48 og 1968 – 78)—mellem recension og reception," *Danske Studier*, 2003, pp. 132 – 172.

20 See Fenger's discussion in his *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, p. 48.

21 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. xiv.

22 *Breve og Aktstykker vedrørende Søren Kierkegaard*, vols. 1 – 2, ed. by Niels Thulstrup, Copenhagen: Munksgaard 1953 – 54. In English as *Kierkegaard: Letters and Documents*, trans. by Henrik Rosenmeier, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1978.

23 See Victor Kuhr, "Peter Andreas Heiberg og Udgaven af *Søren Kierkegaards Papirer*," in *Pap.* X-3, p. viii.

(1) With regard to the thematic principle, the editors claim that the vast mass of material falls naturally into three categories, which they designate by the letters "A," "B," and "C."[24] These were defined as follows: "A" was reserved for entries that could be understood as a part of a diary in the normal sense of the word. "B" included outlines and drafts of published and unpublished material, and "C" contained Kierkegaard's reading notes connected with his studies along with his lecture notes. They further subdivided the category "C" into sections called "Theologica," "Philosophica," and "Aesthetica." This categorization of entries belonging to theology, philosophy and aesthetics, Kierkegaard's main areas of interest, is in their view also merely a natural reflection of the material itself. Moreover, Kierkegaard himself made use of these headings for some of his own notebooks.[25] Further, he kept three envelopes of loose papers from the period from 1834–36 which were labeled, "Theologica, older," "Philosophica, older" and "Aesthetica, older."[26]

When using this edition, reference was made to volume number in Roman numerals (I-XI), plus the designation of the category or group with Latin letters (A-C) and finally the individual entry numbers which were sequential and given in Arabic numbers. Thus, a complete entry would be, for example, I A 25 or X-5 B 61.[27] These reference numbers were written by the editors on the actual manuscripts themselves in pencil.

(2) Chronology. The editors also used a chronological principle in their organization of the material. In the aforementioned thematic units for the specific span of time that the individual volume of the edition was to cover, the editors organized the material according to date, a practice that was of course aided by the fact that many of the entries were dated by Kierkegaard himself. These dates were then printed in the margin of the text. However, when the date was unknown, the editors had to speculate about where individual entries belonged in the chronology. These entries without a date are accompanied by the marginal abbreviation "u.d." ("*uden dato*" or "without date") to indicate that the placement of the entry in the given chronological sequence is the decision of the editors and not the result of a dating given by Kierkegaard himself.[28]

24 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. x.
25 See *Notebook 12*, entitled "Aesthetica" (*SKS* 19, 371, Not12.1 / *KJN* 3, 369) and *Notebook 13*, entitled "Philosophica" (*SKS* 19, 383, Not13.1 / *KJN* 3, 381).
26 See Niels Jørgen Cappelørn and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse," to *Journalen FF*, in *SKS* K18, 109.
27 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. xi.
28 Ibid., in *Pap.* I, pp. xii-xiii.

While this edition had important merits above all in its completeness, it also had some serious problems.[29] With regard to the thematic principle, the editors of this edition were heavy-handed in their rather arbitrary organization of the material into the three aforementioned categories. With these divisions they imposed a structure on Kierkegaard's papers that was foreign to the material itself. As was noted above, Kierkegaard kept his journals and notebooks carefully organized and labeled. They represented more or less discrete units often corresponding to the different projects or topics that he happened to be working on. The editors of the *Papirer*, then using their own topical categories, were obliged, as it were, to take the material out of these various folders, where they were arranged by Kierkegaard, and reorganize them according to entirely new criteria. As a result, different projects were rather arbitrarily mixed together, and all semblance of continuity was destroyed.

The chronological principle, which seems reasonable enough when considered in the abstract, becomes somewhat more dubious when one looks at the matter more closely. A pure chronology does not reflect the way in which Kierkegaard worked and developed his ideas. He often worked on different journals and notebooks simultaneously. This means that individual entries from different journals treating quite different themes could well be written on the same day, although they have absolutely nothing to do with one another thematically. Moreover, some entries in individual journals and notebooks are highly complicated since after writing the original entry, Kierkegaard often returned to it later and added another thought or reflection on the issue.[30] Sometimes he would return to an entry to add a quotation or key words from a text he happened to be reading that referred to the topic treated in the entry. Thus the nature of the material only lends itself to a limited degree to a strict chronological organization.

With regard to the chronological principle, it should also be noted that the editors of the *Papirer* have inserted undated entries into the chronological scheme, which they have created without sufficient evidence for their dating.[31] Although the editors of the *Papirer* are forthcoming about this in their Preface, where they say that their assignments of these dates should not be regarded as final,[32] nonetheless for the many readers the inclusion of the undated entries

29 See Fenger's criticisms in his *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, pp. 47–53, pp. 86 f., pp. 93 ff.

30 See, for example, Søren Bruun and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse" to *Journal AA*, in *SKS* K17, 16n.

31 See Fenger's criticism in his *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, pp. 50 f.

32 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. xiif.

in the places where they appear cannot help but have an air of authority about it and thus comes to be accepted uncritically by many students and scholars.

Moreover, the formatting of the material was distorted in this edition. As was noted above, Kierkegaard tended to write his journals and notebooks using two separate margins, one for the main text and one for later additions and corrections. The editors of his papers blended these two texts together, thus eliminating the distinction between the main text and the marginal notes. As in the Barfod-Gottsched edition, the marginal notes appear in the same continuous text with the main entries accompanied by a note saying "in the margin." However, there is no way for the reader to know exactly where in the margin the note appears. Moreover, by following this practice, the editors were (like the previous ones) obliged to make often rather questionable philological decisions about which marginal note goes with which passage in the main text of the page.

Since many of the original manuscripts were lost during the publication of Barfod's edition and were thus not at their disposal, the editors of the *Papirer* edition were obliged to use Barfod's text for those entries for which there were no longer manuscripts. But this meant that they had two different textual bases: 1) the preserved manuscripts for the majority of the entries and 2) Barfod's text for the entries where the manuscripts had been lost. This is of course highly significant from a philological perspective since, in the one case, one has Kierkegaard's own manuscript as a point of departure, while, in the other, one has only an (apparently heavily edited) printed copy. However, in the *Papirer* edition the textual basis is not immediately clear in the text itself, and the reader must seek this information for every individual entry in the text-critical apparatus.

Further, the editors of this edition elected to put their text-critical apparatus not at the foot of the page but rather in an appendix at the end of each volume.[33] In addition to information about the textual basis, this apparatus includes an account of Kierkegaard's own changes in the text, that is, when he later crossed something out or added something. But some of these changes are also indicated in Kierkegaard's text itself. The fact that the apparatus appears at the end of each volume makes it difficult to use since the reader is obliged to constantly flip back and forth between the text and the apparatus. As noted, this is particularly cumbersome, when one is interested in finding out from entry to entry what the textual basis is. (Indeed, many readers are completely unaware of the existence of this apparatus.)

33 Ibid., p. xx.

This edition has a very minimal commentary apparatus.[34] Brief commentaries are given at the foot of the page and referred to as "editors' notes." These commentaries have as their goal primarily to give complete bibliographical references to works that Kierkegaard quotes, paraphrases or alludes to in the text. These are occasionally helpful when taken on their own, but they are so few in number that they are of little use when taken as a whole since the reader is left without an enormous amount of information that would be necessary for truly understanding individual entries. It is not clear that the editors had a consistent principle with regard to identifying passages that required commentaries of this kind. The textual references that they give to Kierkegaard's readings seem rather arbitrary when one sees the enormous number of places where they fail to provide this information. The curious fact should also be noted that while the editors decided to put Kierkegaard's own changes and internal variants in the text-critical apparatus at the end of the volume, they decided to put their own notes or commentaries at the foot of the page of the text itself, even though they are clearly a foreign element to Kierkegaard's text.

Probably the main problem with the text of this edition for the average reader with no particular interest in philology was the utter lack of continuity in the material as it was presented. As one critic contends, by means of their organizing the material according to the three categories A, B, and C, and the three subcategories "Theologica," "Philosophica," and "Aesthetica," "the editors have succeeded in creating a perfect and absolute chaos."[35] Each of the thousands of journal entries stands on its own as an individual isolated unit, with no connection to the other entries. This meant that the study of this material was particularly tedious. One could not simply look up the entries that were relevant for one's own interest since there was no way of finding them, given that they were often spread out through several volumes. The material was not organized like a normal book with an informative table of contents or a transparent structure so that one could quickly find the passages or sections relevant for one's interests. Thus, the editors of this edition unwittingly made it difficult for students and scholars to approach this part of Kierkegaard's authorship. This is particularly problematic since the goal of reorganizing the *Nachlass* into the categories "A," "B," and "C" was precisely to render the otherwise chaotic mass of material into comprehensible units. However, this organizational structure clearly did not fulfill its intended function of making the material more accessible. The editors of the *Papirer* effectively made the study of Kierkegaard's *Nachlass*

34 Ibid., p. xxi.

35 Fenger, *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, p. 50.

into an all or nothing proposition: either one was willing to invest the considerable time and energy necessary to read through everything and gain an overview of the whole, or one could simply forget trying to make use of this large part of the authorship since it was of little help to study individual entries, sections or even volumes of the *Papirer* edition, given that one always ran the risk of neglecting significant entries relevant for one's research, which one had not yet discovered and noted. After the completion of this edition in 1948, there were in the 1950's, '60's and into the '70's a handful of primarily Danish scholars, such as Johannes Sløk, Henning Fenger, P.G. Lindhardt and Gregor Malantschuk, who knew the *Nachlass* very well after years of diligent study. However, at that time the majority of Danish Kierkegaard scholars, and virtually all of the Kierkegaard scholars outside Denmark, simply neglected this part of the authorship.

III. Thulstrup's Supplemented Reprint of the *Papirer* Edition

The original *Papirer* edition was hailed as a monument in Danish philological publications and a major landmark in Kierkegaard studies. In time it went out of print and was subsequently published again by Niels Thulstrup in a photomechanical reproduction from 1968–69 under the auspices of The Society for Danish Language and Literature.[36] Thulstrup used the opportunity to supplement it with two more volumes (XII–XIII, published in 1969 and 1970). He thus continued to pursue the spirit of the original editors to publish as much of Kierkegaard's *Nachlass* as possible. Further, an extensive three-volume index (XIV–X-XVI, published from 1975 to 1978) was added with this reprint. Since this was a photomechanical reproduction of the old edition, there was no new philological work done on the texts of the old edition. However, the supplemental volumes (which did involve new philological work) together with the index did make a very significant impact on Kierkegaard research.

All of the entries (except for one)[37] that were published for the first time in Thulstrup's supplement volumes come from the "C" group, that is, material related to Kierkegaard's reading and studies. Thulstrup notes that in the first three

36 *Søren Kierkegaards Papirer*, vols. I–XI.3, ed. by P.A. Heiberg, V. Kuhr and E. Torsting, second supplemented edition by Niels Thulstrup, vols. XII–XIII, Copenhagen: Gyldendal 1968–70.
37 That is, the notes from Kierkegaard's own copy of Thomasine Gyllembourg's *Two Ages* (which he reviewed in *A Literary Review*), which appears in vol. XIII, pp. 356–357 as *Pap.* VII-1 B 93–135 A.

volumes of the *Papirer* edition, this material was generally omitted and its presence simply indicated with a number and a title as a kind of placeholder.[38] Only with the fourth volume did the editors of that edition begin to include the material from the "C" group more systematically. But they never went back to publish the extensive material that they had already left out in volumes I-III. This was unfortunate since that material was crucial for research on the development of the young Kierkegaard during his student years and immediately thereafter. This material thus constitutes the main body of Thulstrup's supplement volumes.[39] They made available for the first time (1) a number of somewhat longer excerpts from Kierkegaard's readings of, for example, Schleiermacher, Franz von Baader and various works on the Faust legend, (2) his often detailed notes to Clausen's lectures on dogmatics, Martensen's lectures on speculative dogmatics, Marheineke's lectures, *Die Christliche Dogmengeschichte*, Schelling's lectures, *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, and Werder's lectures, *Logik und Metaphysik*, (3) Kierkegaard's translations of the New Testament, and (4) a number of materials on Biblical exegesis. The latter two categories were clearly related to Kierkegaard's studies for his degree in theology.[40]

The publication of this material was significant since it made possible for the first time a careful examination of Kierkegaard's sources and the early development of his thought. While Thulstrup is to be praised for his attempts to make more of this material available, his supplement volumes were flawed with regard to (1) their editorial selection, (2) their philological work, and (3) their apparatus of commentaries.

(1) With regard to selection, Thulstrup, in a rather misleading fashion, includes a text that is in fact not Kierkegaard's. He prints as *Pap.* II C 25 a detailed set of lecture notes to Martensen's lectures, *The History of Philosophy from Kant to Hegel*, which were given at the University of Copenhagen in Winter Semester 1838 – 39.[41] While these notes might be interesting on their own, there is a significant disparity between this text and the others that Thulstrup publishes:

---

38 See P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* III, p. xx.

39 See Niels Thulstrup, "Forord," in *Pap.* XII, p. xi.

40 See Niels W. Bruun and Finn Gredal Jensen, "Kierkegaard's Latin Translations of the New Testament: A Constant Dialogue with the Vulgate," in *Kierkegaard and the Bible*, Tome II, *The New Testament*, ed. by Lee C. Barrett and Jon Stewart, Aldershot: Ashgate 2010 (*Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception and Resources*, vol. 1), pp. 221–236. In German as "Die lateinischen Übersetzungen Søren Kierkegaards aus dem Neuen Testament," *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch*, vol. 4, 2002, pp. 17–30. Kalle Sorainen, "Einige Beobachtungen im Bezug auf die lateinischen Übersetzungen Søren Kierkegaards aus dem griechischen Neuen Testament," *Kierkegaardiana*, vol. 9, 1976, pp. 56–74.

41 *Pap.* II C 25 in *Pap.* XII, pp. 280–331.

this one is not written in Kierkegaard's hand. (These notes seem merely to have been found among Kierkegaard's things.) Nothing speaks against publishing these notes separately, but given that they are not notes that Kierkegaard himself took, it is not clear why they should be included in an edition of his *Nachlass*.

One can also ask why Thulstrup did not include Kierkegaard's letters and biographical documents as one of the supplement volumes since this was clearly the intention of the original editors.[42] The only reason for this seems to be that he already had published them with the publishing house Munksgaard by the time he had the idea for a supplemented second edition of the *Papirer*.[43] Since the *Papirer* edition appeared with Gyldendal publishing house, it would have led to a copyright conflict, had he attempted to republish the letters and documents in the reprinted edition of the *Papirer*.

(2) It can also be said that the philological work in these supplement volumes is highly inadequate. Thulstrup makes a number of significant misreadings of the manuscripts. For example, in his lectures, *Die Christliche Dogmengeschichte*,[44] Marheineke discusses the issue of suffering and even dying for one's faith and argues that supernaturalism denies the voluntary suffering or as he says "*mors voluntaria*," i.e., the voluntary death. Kierkegaard then writes this in his notes to Marheineke's lectures, which span Notebooks 9–10.[45] Thulstrup misreads this and writes "*mors voluptaria*," i.e., a pleasurable death.[46] The context of this passage, which explicitly concerns free action and voluntary suffering for the truth, should have tipped him off that there was something amiss with this reading if indeed the oxymoron of a pleasurable death did not.

(3) Finally, the commentaries that Thulstrup writes to the texts in the supplement volumes are quite arbitrary and full of errors. For example, in the same lectures just mentioned Marheineke, somewhat oddly, attributes a Latin saying to Kant as follows: "Kant said: *mutato nomine de te narratur fabula* [change the

42 P.A. Heiberg and V. Kuhr, "Fortale," in *Pap.* I, p. vii.

43 *Breve og Aktstykker vedrørende Søren Kierkegaard*, vols. 1–2, ed. by Niels Thulstrup. In English as *Kierkegaard: Letters and Documents*, trans. by Henrik Rosenmeier. See Fenger's criticism of Thulstrup's edition in his *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, pp. 34 f.

44 That this is the correct title has been challenged by Heiko Schulz in his excellent article, "Die spekulative Verflüchtigung des Christentums. Philipp Marheinekes System der Dogmatik und seine Rezeption bei Søren Kierkegaard," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 2003, pp. 20–47.

45 See *SKS* 19, 291, line 41, Not10:8 / *KJN* 3, 289, line 10. *SKS* K19, 398, commentary to line 40. See Philipp Marheineke, *System der christlichen Dogmatik*, Berlin: Verlag von Duncker und Humblot 1847, p. 379 (vol. 2 of *Philipp Marheineke's theologische Vorlesungen*, vols. 1–4, ed. by Stephan Matthies and W. Vatke, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot 1847–49).

46 *Pap.* III C 26 in *Pap.* XIII, p. 240.

name, and the story is about you]."[47] To this passage Thulstrup, with great authority, writes the following commentary: "The quotation is from Horace, *Sat.*[-*ires*] I.1.69–70 and is not used by Kant."[48] In other words, Thulstrup takes the reference to Kant to be an error either on the part of Marheineke, who said it, or on the part of Kierkegaard, who heard incorrectly and wrote down "Kant" in error. However, as it turns out this quotation from Horace is in fact found in Kant's *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*.[49] Thulstrup would have done better simply to say that he had not been able to locate the passage in Kant, instead of categorically denying that it was there at all.

Another example of a similar kind can be found earlier in the same lectures where Marheineke makes a reference which Kierkegaard writes as follows: "Freedom in the creation of the world has been made valid by Strauss in his *Rechtsphilosophie*...."[50] To this Thulstrup writes, "*Rechtsphilosophie*," i.e., a book on political philosophy or philosophy of law is "presumably an error for '*Religionsphilosophie*,' i.e., S.[trauss]' *Die christliche Glaubenslehre* (§ 47)."[51] Thulstrup cannot reconcile himself with the idea that Marheineke, in his account of the creation of the world in these deeply theological lectures, could give a reference to a work on political philosophy. He thus assumes that either Marheineke misspoke or Kierkegaard misunderstood him since what was meant was a reference to the clearly theological work of the German theologian David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74) entitled, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*.[52] Thulstrup seems to decide the issue definitively by giving a specific textual reference to § 47. However, when one looks up this passage, one is disappointed to find that it does not fit the context of what Marheineke is saying in his lectures at all. However, when one looks up the passage in Marheineke's posthumously published lectures, *System der christlichen Dogmatik*, which correspond section for section and virtually line for line with Kierkegaard's lecture notes,[53] one discovers that the reference is not made to Strauss at all but to a book by the philosopher of law Friedrich Julius Stahl (1802–61), entitled *Die Philosophie des Rechts nach*

47 *SKS* 19, 260, lines 19–20, Not9:1 / *KJN* 3, 255, line 33.
48 *Pap.* III C 26 in *Pap.* XIII, p. 213 note.
49 See *SKS* K19, 356, commentary to line 19. See the English translation: Immanuel Kant, *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, trans. by Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson, New York: Harper & Row 1960, p. 37.
50 *SKS* 19, 252f., lines 38ff., Not9:1 / *KJN* 3, 247, line 15.
51 *Pap.* III C 26 in *Pap.* XIII, p. 204 note.
52 David Friedrich Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, vols. 1–2, Tübingen: C.F. Osiander and Stuttgart: F.M. Köhler 1840–41.
53 See "Kommentarer til Notesbog 9" in *SKS* K19, 331f.

geschichtlicher Ansicht.[54] Here Marheineke presumably said “Stahl,” a name not entirely familiar to Kierkegaard, who instead heard and wrote down “Strauss.” Thus, there was in fact an error but not the one that Thulstrup thought that he had found.

One might argue that anyone can make the odd mistake of this kind in the inexact science of commentary writing, and this is certainly true enough; however, the real problem in Thulstrup’s commentaries to this text is not that he fails to identify certain individual references properly but that he apparently did not even bother to look to see if Marheineke’s lectures had ever been published. If he had, he would have discovered that in fact a whole series of his theological lectures had in fact appeared posthumously in the 1840s, edited by Stephan Matthies (1807–56) and Wilhelm Vatke (1806–82),[55] and among these he would have discovered the very lecture that Kierkegaard attended. As was mentioned, these lectures, published under the title, *System der christlichen Dogmatik*, correspond closely with Kierkegaard’s lecture notes and are thus an invaluable guide for the commentator. The fact that Thulstrup never found his way to the published version of these lectures says something about the research effort that went into his commentary apparatus.

While the *Papirer* edition had become more complete in Thulstrup’s reprint, it still remained notoriously difficult to use. As was noted above, it was not easy to find one’s way around the text since there was such a large mass of material with no apparent structure or organization. This changed when Thulstrup’s edition was supplemented, from 1975–78, with a three-volume index (XIV–XVI) by Niels Jørgen Cappelørn. This extensive index includes general concepts, names of people, places, as well as titles of books and articles.[56] Textual references are given with brief excerpts so that the reader can see immediately if the passages are relevant for his or her purposes, without having to look up every single reference and read every single passage. An extensive Bible index is also included which contains all of the biblical passages that Kierkegaard refers to or comments upon.[57]

This index marked a major step in the accessibility of the journals and papers since it for the first time opened the door to this material, then more

54 Friedrich Julius Stahl, *Die Philosophie des Rechts nach geschichtlicher Ansicht*, vols. 1–2, Heidelberg: J.C.B Mohr 1830–33. *SKS* K19, 342, commentary to line 38. See also Philipp Marheineke, *System der christlichen Dogmatik*, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot 1847, p. 166.

55 *Philipp Marheineke’s theologische Vorlesungen*.

56 For the principles behind this index, see Niels Jørgen Cappelørn, “Indledning,” in *Pap.* XIV, pp. VII-XI.

57 “Bibelindex,” in *Pap.* XVI, pp. 365–413.

than 25 years after the completion of the original edition. This invaluable tool made it possible for anyone to make strategic use of the *Papirer* in connection with research on specific themes. If one was interested in Kierkegaard's views on a given topic, one needed merely to look it up in the index. One was saved the impossible task of poring through every volume in search of the handful of entries that were relevant to one's research project. This index thus made research into the *Nachlass* more feasible than it had ever been before. It was used assiduously by students and researchers as well as translators interested in selecting material for a foreign language edition. Although there are other similar resources, most of which have appeared in the interim,[58] this index has never been surpassed and remains to this day an important tool for every serious Kierkegaard scholar.

While this index greatly facilitated work on the *Papirer* edition, this still meant that scholars tended to use the *Nachlass* in an *ad hoc* fashion and did not treat the material as an object of research on its own terms. The index made it easy to find passages relevant for individual themes or topics, but it could not on its own encourage a more systematic study of the journals and notebooks as such. Thus, while the index was probably the best thing that could have happened to this edition, it could not compensate for the editorial and philological shortcomings inherent in it.

IV. Rohde's Editions

There are other Danish editions of the *Nachlass* that are smaller and less significant than the ones mentioned above. The editors of these editions did no new philological work on the texts and used as their textual basis the *Papirer* edition and not the original manuscripts. Moreover, these other editions have not had the same degree of influence on Kierkegaard studies due to the fact that their selection was generally rather limited.

58 E.g. *Index and Composite Collation*, vol. 7, by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press 1978, that is, the index to *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*, vols. 1–6, ed. and trans. by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press 1967–78. For Kierkegaard's published works see *Cumulative Index to Kierkegaard's Writings*, by Nathaniel J. Hong, Kathryn Hong, Regine Prenzel-Guthrie, Princeton: Princeton University Press 2000. Alastair McKinnon, *The Kierkegaard Indices*, vols. 1–4, Leiden: Brill 1970–1975.

In 1953 Peter P. Rohde (1902–78), the later editor of the third edition of Kierkegaard's collected works,[59] published a one-volume selection of the *Nachlass*, entitled *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger.*[60] The selection proved to be very popular and was reprinted three times with the third edition appearing in 1973. One can see this edition in a sense as trying to respond to the discontinuities of the *Papirer* edition and to present a more continuous selection of texts that is easier for the reader to use. As is indicated by the title, the editor rather unapologetically selects various passages from Kierkegaard's journals that he takes to be autobiographical. These are then put together and ordered into eight chapters in such a way that they tell a more or less continuous story. But this does not mean that the entries appear in a strictly chronological order. Instead, often entries written at a much later period are inserted into a place where they illuminate earlier events.[61] This edition also contains a minimal commentary apparatus at the end of the work.

Perhaps the most egregious aspect about this edition is the way that it misleads the reader into thinking that what it is presenting is actually Kierkegaard's diary. The reader is not adequately informed or forewarned that what he or she is reading is in fact an artificial construct of the editor. An attempt is made to justify this heavy-handed editing in the Preface, where Rohde writes, the journals

> confront us with the thinker as he existed, and etch a life in glimpses which, though fragmentary, constitute something unique in world literature. It is precisely their fragmentary character that relieves us of the obligation which the finished works place upon us, viz. to respect their wholeness—for it is non-existent. However, from their 8,000 to 10,000 pages it is possible to distil some one hundred and fifty pages that contain the true essence.[62]

Thus, Rohde entirely gives up on any notion of continuity in the journals at all. He then takes this as giving him editorial license to do what he wishes with the journals and to put them together in any way that he likes. Moreover, he seems to understand this to be an argument for him to assign a title or genre to the *Nachlass*, that is, as a diary.

---

59 *Samlede Værker*, vols. 1–19, ed. by Peter P. Rohde, Copenhagen: Gyldendal 1962–64 (vol. 20, *Terminologisk Ordbog* by Jens Himmelstrup and *Sammenlignende Register*).
60 *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*, ed. by Peter P. Rohde, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag 1953. Translated into English as *The Diary of Søren Kierkegaard*, ed. by Peter P. Rohde, trans. by Gerda M. Andersen, New York: Philosophical Library 1960.
61 *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*, p. 9; *The Diary of Søren Kierkegaard*, p. 11.
62 *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*, pp. 7 f.; *The Diary of Søren Kierkegaard*, p. 8. Translation slightly modified.

Rohde presupposes that the journals and notebooks are in fact autobiographical. But this presupposition completely overlooks a number of interpretive difficulties associated with the richness and diversity of the material. There is a tremendous amount of material that has nothing *per se* to do with Kierkegaard's biography. Moreover, as was noted above, even most of the passages that lend themselves to an autobiographical interpretation are highly poetical, suggesting at least some fictional element.[63]

The real absurdity of Rohde's position lies in the claim that there is no "wholeness" in Kierkegaard's journals and papers. (It will be noted that this is the claim that makes possible the heavy-handed principle of selection that he employs.) It might well be that there is no "wholeness" in the *Papirer* edition, but this is because the editors have reorganized the material according to their own whim. But there is a "wholeness" in Kierkegaard's own organization and ordering of the journals and notebooks into discrete units under the headings AA, BB, CC, etc., and NB, NB2, NB3, etc. In other words, there has always been an obvious continuity in the journals and notebooks, but this was not respected by the early editors. Thus, Rohde seems to blame Kierkegaard for the fact that later editors have put together his journals in a confusing fashion. Moreover, he justifies his own editorial principle based on the shortcomings of the earlier editions.

Given the success of this initial edition, Rohde then made an expanded selection that he published from 1961–64 in four volumes under the same title, *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*.[64] This edition was also organized chronologically with volume 1 covering the period from 1834–42, volume 2 that from 1844–48, volume 3 that from 1848–50, and volume 4 that from 1851–55. As with the one-volume edition, this selection is based on the *Papirer* edition, and most of the featured texts come from the "A" category. There is a minimal commentary apparatus at the end of each volume similar to that of the one-volume edition, as well as a concordance of the featured entries with the *Papirer* edition. Finally, at the end of the fourth volume there is an index of persons and concepts.

In his foreword, Rohde once again shoots over the mark with respect to his ambition with his edition. He writes, the edition "tries to give such a representative and full selection of excerpts that one could with justice say that here one has the entire Kierkegaard just as one finds him in his private entries."[65] He says further that the goal of his edition is "to establish an edition which can sat-

63 See Fenger, *Kierkegaard: The Myths and their Origins*, pp. 81–131.
64 *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*, vols. 1–4, ed. by Peter P. Rohde, Copenhagen: Thaning & Appels Forlag 1961–64.
65 "Forord," in *Søren Kierkegaards Dagbøger*, vol. 1, p. 5.

isfy all interested Kierkegaard readers....By contrast, the selection is not meant for the handful of people doing scholarly work on Kierkegaard."[66] Thus, while he tries to be careful by indicating that his is not a scholarly edition intended for academic use, he nonetheless naively ventures to claim that his prudent selection has captured "the entire Kierkegaard" in the private sphere. Oddly enough, Rohde does not mention his earlier edition, which he seems to build on with this new one. In principle, this edition is very similar to the first one, with the only real difference being that it is considerably longer. In this regard, this edition falls victim to all of the shortcomings mentioned above as the previous one. Given this, there is no need to discuss these problems again.

V. The Edition *Dagbøger i udvalg 1834–1846*

There is a more recent edition from 1992, which, like Rohde's editions, misleadingly purports to present Kierkegaard's diaries. This selection, under the title *Dagbøger i udvalg 1834–1846*, was edited by Jørgen Dehs together with Niels Jørgen Cappelørn.[67] This work appeared as a part of the series of "Danish Classics" produced by The Society for Danish Language and Literature, and this generally determined its goals. As the title indicates, the primary objective of the series is to publish and keep in print classic works of Danish literature and culture. It aims to present texts that are accessible to students and generally educated readers, and thus it would be a mistake to look to this series for new scholarly editions aimed at researchers. Prior to the publication of this work, editions of *Fear and Trembling*, *The Sickness unto Death* (along with some edifying discourses) and *The Concept of Anxiety* had appeared in the series,[68] and the idea of producing a volume with Kierkegaard's journals presumably seemed a natural supplement to the works that had already been produced.

Dagbøger i udvalg concentrates on Kierkegaard's development during the period which corresponds to the first half of the authorship, that is, up through

66 Ibid., p. 7.
67 *Dagbøger i udvalg 1834–1846*, ed. by Jørgen Dehs, in cooperation with Niels Jørgen Cappelørn, Copenhagen: The Society for Danish Language and Literature 1992 (*Danske Klassikere*). See Johnny Kondrup's review, "Søren Kierkegaards dagbøger i udvalg," *Bogens Verden* , vol. 75, no. 3, 1993, pp. 193–195.
68 *Frygt og bæven, Sygdommen til døden, Taler*, ed. by Lars Petersen and Merete Jørgensen, Copenhagen: The Society for Danish Language and Literature 1989 (*Danske Klassikere*). *Begrebet Angest*, ed. by Lars Petersen and Merete Jørgensen, Copenhagen: The Society for Danish Language and Literature 1991 (*Danske Klassikere*).

1846 and the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, after which Kierkegaard considered putting down the pen and becoming a pastor. Thus what is reproduced is material from the early journals, and there is nothing from the NB journals. This edition presents texts from the "A" section of the first seven volumes of the *Papirer* edition, which is used as its textual basis.[69] As with the *Papirer*, the individual entries are presented in a chronological manner in keeping with the idea of a diary. So there is no claim made for new philological work with this edition. *Dagbøger i udvalg* does, however, supply more than fifty pages of commentaries to the texts presented, many of which have been borrowed from the *Papirer*. Given that this edition aims to be a popular introduction to Kierkegaard, it has limited academic pretensions especially with regard to its commentary apparatus.

Given the diversity and ambiguity of the *Nachlass*, the objection can be raised to this edition and those of Rohde that by presenting the material as straightforwardly autobiographical and designating it "diaries," they end up not presenting Kierkegaard himself or his life but rather some odd mixture containing in part fictional elements, some of which may well have been quite different from Kierkegaard's own life and person. This designation "diaries" oversimplifies the diverse nature of the material from the *Nachlass* and risks giving the reader a misleading picture of it. In fairness, it should be noted that in the afterword to *Dagbøger i udvalg* Jørgen Dehs makes it clear that he too is skeptical about the use of these materials as autobiographical and draws attention to Kierkegaard's complex communication strategies.[70]

VI. The *Nachlass* in the New Danish Edition: *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*

In the Kierkegaard jubilee year 2013, the Søren Kierkegaard Research Centre at the University of Copenhagen completed a new critical edition of all of Kierkegaard's works, under the title *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* (hereafter *SKS*).[71] This new edition comprises 55 volumes, including extensive volumes of commenta-

69 "Efterskrift" in *Dagbøger i udvalg 1834–1846*, pp. 476f.

70 Ibid., pp. 466–472.

71 *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, vols. 1–28, K1-K28, ed. by Niels Jørgen Cappelørn, Joakim Garff, Jette Knudsen, Johnny Kondrup, Alastair McKinnon and Finn Hauberg Mortensen, Copenhagen: Gads Forlag 1997–2013. See Johnny Kondrup, " 'Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter' 1993–2012: Versuch einer Bilanz," in *Existenz und Reflexion. Aktuelle Aspekte der Kierkegaard-Rezeption*, ed. by Matthias Bauer and Markus Pohlmeyer, Hamburg: Igel-Verlag 2012, pp. 10–31.

ries to all of Kierkegaard's texts. Thus, *SKS* includes Kierkegaard's journals and notebooks, and is the first unified edition to contain both the *Nachlass* and the published works. In short, this work is an attempt at a complete edition of everything by Kierkegaard's hand: (1) the works which he himself published, (2) the more or less finished texts found among his journals and papers but which he never published in his lifetime, (3) the various journals, notebooks, and loose papers, and (4) the letters and biographical documents. This edition appears in both a book and an electronic version. Here I will speak only of this edition's treatment of the *Nachlass* and not the published works. This edition organizes the material from the *Nachlass* according to three main principles: an archival one, a chronological one and a systematic one.[72]

(1) The main principle is the archival one, according to which each individual or archival unit of text is respected and published as a whole.[73] The goal is of course to preserve Kierkegaard's own organization of the material. This means that the integrity of Kierkegaard's journals and notebooks is maintained, with each of them being treated as an independent text in its own right and being reproduced in its original form. *SKS* thus tries to present the individual entries in precisely the sequence in which they originally appeared in the journals and notebooks. In other words, it attempts to recreate the individual texts as Henrik Lund found them in Kierkegaard's apartment at the end of November 1855.

This might seem at first glance to be an impossible task given that so much of the material has been lost and what survives has been hopelessly mixed up in the course of the years due primarily to the editorial work on the different editions of it. Despite these formidable obstacles, the original material in its original form can be reconstructed based on the catalogues of the material made by Henrik Lund and, most importantly, by Barfod in 1865. On the basis of this information, it is possible, so to speak, to put back into the folders, journals and notebooks the material that earlier editors have removed and reorganized. With

72 For an overview of the philological principles for the establishment of the text of the *Nachlaß* in this edition, see Jette Knudsen, Johnny Kondrup, et al., "Tekstkritiske retningslinier for *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter.* Journaler, notesbøger og papirer," *SKS* 17, 299–343. See also the earlier version: Johnny Kondrup and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstkritiske retningslinier for *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, med særligt henblik på journaler og papirer," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1997, pp. 306–335. German translation: "Textkritische Richtlinien für *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Journale und Aufzeichnungen," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1997, pp. 336–370.

73 Jette Knudsen, Johnny Kondrup, et al., "Tekstkritiske retningslinier for *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter.* Journaler, notesbøger og papirer," *SKS* 17, 303 f.

regard to the lost manuscripts, at least a version of the text of most of these has been preserved in the Barfod-Gottsched edition. This text is then used for the places in Kierkegaard's journals and notebooks where there is no other extant textual basis. Thus, this is the first edition ever that reproduces the journals AA-KK, the notebooks 1–15 and the NB journals in the form in which Kierkegaard wrote them and kept them. One is thus able to follow the development of Kierkegaard's own thoughts in a more organic fashion than has ever been possible before.

(2) The second principle is a chronological one.[74] When one speaks of "chronology" here, this refers *not* to individual journal entries (since often the chronological sequence is broken within individual journals) but to the time when the journals and notebooks generally were written. Thus, the journals AA-KK appear in their sequential order, as do the notebooks 1–15 and the NB journals. The chronological principle applies also and indeed primarily to the loose papers where the individual entries do not appear in any journal or notebook. Thus, in the absence of any genuine archival unit, these loose papers are ordered chronologically, where it is possible to date them.

(3) The third principle is the systematic one.[75] This means that an attempt is made to preserve Kierkegaard's own system of organization. Thus, the three "series" are published as individual units—the journals AA-KK (*SKS*, vols. 17–18), the notebooks 1–15 (*SKS*, vol. 19), the NB journals (*SKS*, vols. 20–26)—as are the loose papers (*SKS*, vol. 27) and letters (*SKS*, vol. 28).

A significant improvement can be found in the formatting and layout of the journals and notebooks in *SKS*.[76] The new edition is formatted in two columns so as more closely to mirror Kierkegaard's own text. Thus the editors are spared the problems of having to decide exactly where any given insert or addition is intended to go and can leave it to the reader to interpret this in the individual contexts. The reader can thus see on the page a spatial relation between the entries that accurately mirrors that in Kierkegaard's own manuscripts, but which was totally destroyed in the previous editions, where the material was simply presented as a single continuous text.

A further improvement in this new edition with regard to formatting concerns the use of justified and unjustified margins. In order to reflect the character of the journals and notebooks as work in progress, the texts are, as a rule, presented without a justified right margin. This holds for the presentation of the

74 Ibid., 304 f.
75 Ibid., 305 f.
76 Ibid., 307 ff.

texts where the manuscripts are preserved and therefore used as the textual basis. However, when the manuscripts are no longer extant and the textual basis is Barfod's edition, then this is signaled in the text itself by a justified right margin, indicating, as it were, that the textual basis is in fact a published text. Moreover, diacritical marks in the form of small arrowheads indicate where the text taken from Barfod's edition begins and ends. Further, the actual textual reference to the place in that edition where the given text is found is also provided in the text-critical apparatus at the foot of the page. Thus, by means of this, in principle, simple formatting feature, this new edition is able to clearly distinguish between the two different textual bases that it uses in a way that the *Papirer* edition did not.

Each individual entry is accompanied by an Arabic numeral for all of the main entries, that is, the ones that appear in the inner margins. By contrast, marginal entries are given lower case Latin letters. Thus reference is made to the journal or notebook plus the entry number, that is, Journal AA:25 or Journal BB:19. Further, there are running line numbers (as well as the customary page numbers) to facilitate more exact references, for example, to individual words. In addition to these features added by the editors, Kierkegaard's own original pagination in the journals and notebooks is, when preserved, given in the margin with a vertical line in the text to indicate a page break. At the top of the page there appears the name of the journal, the running entry number and the year, all of which help to quickly orient the reader.

A significant improvement over the *Papirer* edition is found in the text-critical apparatus in *SKS*.[77] Instead of distracting the reader by putting Kierkegaard's own changes in the text itself with different typographical variations or making it inconvenient to use by putting them at the end of the volume, *SKS* puts these textual variants at the foot of the page. Thus, the readers who are not particularly interested in the philological questions can simply concentrate on the main text and be assured that they are reading Kierkegaard's own corrected text. However, those who are interested in studying questions about the genesis of the text need simply look down at the apparatus and see what changes Kierkegaard made and what the earlier variants were. These notes also include the editors' emendations, that is, their corrections of corrupt text.[78] Although these are few in number, they can be valuable.

For each of the individual journals and notebooks there is (in the corresponding commentary volume) a short "Critical Account of the Text" (*Tekst-*

77 Ibid., 312ff.
78 See ibid., 312–315.

redegørelse). Here an account is given of the state of the actual manuscripts for the given text and thus the textual sources employed in the edition. One can read how much of any given manuscript has been preserved, what it looks like, and what condition it is in. Further, an attempt is made to date the individual texts as precisely as possible and further to explain their genesis. Finally, a brief overview of the content of the text is given.

As was mentioned above, *SKS* also appears in an electronic version.[79] This electronic edition, which was the work of Karsten Kynde, is freely available on-line, and this open access makes Kierkegaard's texts available for the first time to readers all around the world. The electronic edition allows users to make the usual word searches for key concepts or themes or to identify quotations. But it also has a number of other useful features that are a great help to scholars. With a simple click one can see the pagination of the first edition, the previous Danish edition (that is, the third edition *SV3*)[80] and book edition of *SKS*. One can also read the primary text side by side with the commentaries or click back and forth between them. The electronic edition further contains a useful set of resource files including an invaluable concordance that allows one using *SKS* to locate quickly specific pages or journal entries as they appear in the old *Papirer* edition or, vice versa, to find the corresponding passage in *SKS* when one only has a reference to that edition.

The original plan was that the material included in the *Papirer* edition under the category "B," that is, Kierkegaard's various drafts to his works, would appear in the electronic version.[81] In other words, if one were interested in tracing the development of Kierkegaard's thought in *The Concept of Anxiety*, it would be pos-

79 See http://www.sks.dk (3/10/2015). See Karsten Kynde, "Digitale smuler – Kierkegaard på nettet," in *At være sig selv nærværende. Festskrift til Niels Jørgen Cappelørn*, ed. by Joakim Garff, Ettore Rocca and Pia Søltoft, Copenhagen: Kristeligt Dagblads Forlag 2010, pp. 527–543. See also Kynde's "Kierkegaard Normal Format 1," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 2003, pp. 453–505; "Appearance, Rendering, and the Abstract Intention of the Text," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1996, pp. 546–556; "Interconnecting Textual Layers," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1998, pp. 379–385. See also Krista Stinne Greve Rasmussen, "Bytes, bøger og læsere. En editionshistorisk analyse af medieskiftet fra trykte til digitale videnskabelige udgaver med udgangspunkt i *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Copenhagen 2014.
80 Kierkegaard, *Samlede Værker*, vols. 1–20, ed. by Peter P. Rohde, 3rd ed., Copenhagen: Gyldendal 1962–1964.
81 Jette Knudsen, Johnny Kondrup, et al., "Tekstkritiske retningslinier for *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*. Journaler, notesbøger og papirer," *SKS* 17, 306. However, the best known things from "B," such as *Johannes Climacus or De Omnibus dubitandum est*, *The Book on Adler*, and *The Point of View for My Activity as an Author*, all appear in the book edition under a separate category.

sible to trace it from its original sketch, to the first draft, to the numerous subsequent drafts, to the fair copy, to the typeset manuscript, and finally to the published text. This would have been a great tool, but unfortunately due to financial constraints it had to be dropped. It is possible, however, to read the critical accounts of the text (in both the book and electronic editions), which contain a section describing the genesis of the text and thus the different drafts.

As was noted, Barfod wrote directly on Kierkegaard's manuscripts. At times, he crossed out individual words or even whole sentences or passages. This creates two problems: first and most obviously it often renders the text simply unreadable as was the intention, and second since Barfod's ink was quite similar to Kierkegaard's own, it is not always clear which of these changes come from Kierkegaard's hand and which are the result of later editorial intervention. The editors of *SKS* were able to resolve a few of these problems by means of a newly developed electron microscope. With this tool the different kinds of ink can be magnified and analyzed so that in some cases it is possible to distinguish them. Further, individual letters or punctuation marks can be enlarged to the point that the handwriting itself can be distinguished. Thus in some cases it is possible, so to speak, to wipe off Barfod's additions and thereby restore the original text by Kierkegaard.[82] The results of the use of the electron microscope have often been quite surprising. For example, the capital letter "R" (for Regine Olsen), which appears above an entry in *Notebook 7*, which was always assumed to be from Kierkegaard,[83] in fact proves to be from Barfod.[84] Another example is found in the subtitle of *Notebook 8*, "*Digteriske Forsøg*" ("Poetic Experiments"), which was crossed out by Barfod and read erroneously by the editors of the *Papirer* as "*Damskibs-Kahyt*" (a cabin on a steamship).[85] This misreading was presumably caused by the influence of the next entry, which speaks of "*en Kahyt rystet af et Dampskibs Dobbeltbevægelser*" (a cabin rocked by the pitching and rolling of a steamship).[86]

An important feature of this new edition is the commentary volumes. These are provided both for the published works and for the individual texts of the

82 See Pia Wahlberg and Leif Højslet Christensen, "Søren Kierkegaard på overfladen: scanning elektronmikroskopi—kemi på overfladen: fra Søren Kierkegaard til korrosionsfænomener i kraftvarmeværker," *dansk kemi*, vol. 80, no. 9, 1999, pp. 6–11.

83 *SKS* 19, 240, Not 7:45 / *KJN* 3, 212.

84 See Leon Jaurnow and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse," to *Notesbog 7*, in *SKS* K19, 279.

85 *Pap.* III A 146 (see the editors' note 146 at the foot of the page). This corresponds to *SKS* 19, 223, Not8:1 / *KJN* 3, 219. See Leon Jaurnow and Jette Knudsen, "Tekstredegørelse" to *Notesbog 8*, in *SKS* K19, 302 and n.

86 *SKS* 3, 225, Not8:2 / *KJN* 3, 221.

Nachlass. The commentaries for the journals and notebooks follow, generally speaking, the same principles as the commentaries for the published works.[87] In order not to disturb the reader's own original experience with Kierkegaard's text, no markers appear in the text volumes to indicate the presence of commentaries. In the commentary volumes reference to the passages commented upon is made to page and line number. The commentaries are "point commentaries," usually translated as "explanatory notes," that is, they attempt to provide information to clearly delimited words, sentences or passages in the text, without entering into a general discussion of the work. Further, each of the journals and notebooks is treated, for the purposes of the commentary apparatus, as an independent unit, and thus there are rarely cross-references between two different journals, unless they are made explicitly by Kierkegaard himself. With regard to typology, the commentaries can be characterized by three main categories.

(1) The first category is "linguistic commentaries." Since Kierkegaard's nineteenth-century Danish deviates often significantly from current usage, individual antiquated words, expressions, and spellings are noted and explained. These linguistic commentaries are a particular help for the Kierkegaard translator or for the non-native speaker, still trying to master Kierkegaard's Danish. Translations are provided for all material quoted in Latin and Greek. Specialized or technical terms from academic fields, for example, philosophy or theology are explained briefly.

(2) The second kind of category can be described with the German word "*Realkommentar.*" These are, so to speak, factual commentaries, which provide factual information about specific persons, topographical references, contemporary events, etc. When Kierkegaard refers to paintings or engravings or other pictures he has seen, then these are reproduced with the commentary. Further, for places Kierkegaard mentions in Copenhagen and in Denmark, maps are provided as a part of the commentary apparatus.

(3) The third type of commentary can be simply designated "textual references." Complete references are given to all quoted material, when possible from the editions which Kierkegaard himself is known to have owned or actually used. As a rule, reference is made primarily to the books found on the list

87 For an overview of the principles for the commentary in this edition, see "Introduktion til kommentering," *SKS* K1, pp. 50–61. See also Joakim Garff, "Regulativ for udarbejdelse af realkommentarer til *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1996, pp. 486–504. German translation: "Regulativ für [die] Ausarbeitung von Realkommentaren zu *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook*, 1996, pp. 505–526.

that was made at the auction of his library after his death,[88] but also to surviving receipts from the bookstores where he bought books.[89] Vague allusions to contemporary works and authors have been identified, explained and referenced. Kierkegaard's frequent use of quotations of or allusions to the Bible are meticulously noted.

The general goal of these commentaries is to provide the readers with the necessary information that they need in order to understand the text, without any further interpretation added. The commentary volumes attempt to recreate the situation of a contemporary reader of Kierkegaard and to make the texts accessible—with all of the allusions, references, wordplays, etc.—to the reader today in the same way they were accessible to Kierkegaard's contemporaries. Thus, great care is taken to avoid anachronisms. In other words, since the perspective taken is one of a contemporary who would not have knowledge of Kierkegaard's future works or of future social or political events, reference is not made to works published later, either Kierkegaard's own or secondary literature or reference works. The goal is to supply the modern reader with factual information that is needed to fully understand the text, but then, as much as possible, to leave the actual task of interpretation to the reader himself. This is of course an ideal desideratum, and the separation between factual information and interpretation is itself a matter of interpretation. But nonetheless the principle of avoiding interpretation is a sound one since commentaries reflecting a specific interpretative bias or trend will date very quickly and in the course of time ultimately render the entire apparatus irrelevant. By contrast, commentaries that stick to explaining factual information will be as true tomorrow as they are today and thus will continue to be useful to readers well into the future. These commentaries for *SKS*, taken as a whole, are the most extensive ever to appear in any Kierkegaard edition. They represent an enormous help both to the general reader, students, scholars and translators.

Given all this, there can be no doubt that the presentation of the *Nachlass* in *SKS* represents a major event in Kierkegaard research with regard to this body of material. This edition has finally opened up the *Nachlass* for future research in a way that the previous editions failed to do. This is the first edition ever which attempts to reestablish the journals and notebooks in their original form to the degree to which this is possible today. This edition is of course limited in its endeavor by the fact that some manuscripts have been irretrievably lost

88 Reprinted as *Auktionsprotokol over Søren Kierkegaards Bogsamling*, ed. by H.P. Rohde, Copenhagen: The Royal Library 1967.

89 See Hermann Peter Rohde, "Om Søren Kierkegaard som bogsamler. Studier i hans efterladte papirer og bøger paa Det kongelige Bibliotek," *Fund og Forskning*, vol. 8, 1961, pp. 79–127.

and in some cases not even the text is preserved in Barfod's edition. Thus, for these cases *SKS* can do nothing more than simply print the first words or sentence of the lost entry as they appear in Barfod's catalogue of the manuscripts.[90] But there is nothing that *SKS* or any edition can do about this. But although *SKS* cannot retrieve material long since destroyed, it has done everything possible to recreate Kierkegaard's own texts. This is the guiding principle behind this edition's presentation of the *Nachlass*, and it is this that is arguably its most important merit.

It might be argued by way of criticism that this new edition does not ultimately solve the problem of inaccessibility that plagued the *Papirer* edition. Although *SKS* does restore the journals and notebooks to their original units, those units themselves bear quite nondescript titles, for example, *Journal AA*, or *Notebook 1*, which do not help the interested reader to become quickly oriented in the material. Thus, it seems that the reader is, as with the *Papirer* edition, consigned to reading the whole thing in order to find the passages relevant for his or her own interests or research. On this point *SKS* seems at first glance not to have made any significant improvement over the older edition, and since *SKS* contains no index, it can even be said to have made the material less accessible than the *Papirer* edition.

This criticism can be met with two counterarguments. First, as was noted, the new edition is also freely available in electronic form. Thus, with the entire text and commentary accessible online, the reader has in fact a better resource than a simple index. One can quickly do word searches in order to identify the places where Kierkegaard discusses specific themes. Second, as was also noted, each of the journals and notebooks is accompanied by a "Critical Account of the Text," which always contains a section on the content of the individual text. Thus, the interested reader can quickly gain at least a general overview of a given journal or notebook simply by reading these brief descriptions.

Some readers will be disappointed not to be able to find in the new edition some entries that were printed in the *Papirer* edition under the section "B" for drafts of the published and unpublished works. As noted, the original plan was for this material to appear in the electronic edition, but due to the massive amount of material involved and constraints of financing and time this idea was never realized. Thus, this material appears in neither the book nor the electronic version of *SKS*. Given this, it can be said that the old *Papirer* edition was ultimately more complete with respect to its "B" section, where such material was

90 E.g. *SKS* 17, 52, AA:48 / *KJN* 1, 45; *SKS* 17, 52, AA:49 / *KJN* 1, 45; *SKS* 17, 122, BB:33 / *KJN* 1, 115; *SKS* 17, 122, BB:35 / *KJN* 1, 116.

printed, although that edition too is ultimately incomplete and selective in the material from this category that it chose to publish.

The stubborn critic might press the point that *SKS* should nonetheless have published in book or electronic form at least a selection of some of the most important drafts to the most important works. Simply because there is no perfect solution, given the large mass of material, this is not to say that there cannot be a perfectly functional compromise solution with a prudent selection. In this respect, it could be argued, the old *Papirer* edition surpasses *SKS* since it at least gives a useful selection of these drafts.

The problem with a selection is that there is ultimately always a degree of subjectivity and arbitrariness in it. How does one decide which are the "most important" drafts to include and which are less significant? The *Papirer* edition is in fact misleading in its presentation of this material since it gives the impression that it is more or less complete. In other words, the reader receives the impression that only a few minor things have been omitted but nothing very long and nothing very substantive. What the editors of the *Papirer* fail to tell the reader is that there is still an enormous number of manuscripts that they have not published, indeed far more than they did publish. Thus, the readers are misled into thinking that they have exhausted the material by reading the "B" section of the *Papirer* edition and that the information gleaned from this is all that there is which is relevant for their topic of interest, whereas in fact they are made familiar with only a small percentage of them through this edition.[91] Thus, anyone doing statistical analyses of individual terms or constellations of concepts based on this edition will reach results which are potentially highly misleading since the material analyzed is only a small part of the whole, which may or may not be representative for the concept or term being investigated. Here one can see the dangers of printing only a selection.

It might also be argued that *SKS* in fact does print a selection of the *Nachlass* in the third rubric called unpublished works (distinguished by the green label at the top), published in *SKS* volumes 15 and 16. The argument here was that these works such as *Johannes Climacus, or De Omnibus dubitandum est* and *The Book on Adler* were more or less finished works that Kierkegaard never published.

91 It will be noted that this mistaken impression is in part passed on in the standard English translation *Kierkegaard's Writings* (vols. 1–26, trans. and ed. by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1978–2000), each volume of which contains a "Supplement" section, including in part preliminary drafts to the featured work. While the incomplete nature of this material is indicated by the heading "Selected Entries from Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers Pertaining to [the featured work]," the reader has no idea of how much other material exists, which is also relevant but not featured.

Thus, they differ from both the published works and the journals and notebooks, and are therefore given their own category. But by creating this special third rubric and selecting which texts belong to it, *SKS*, it might be argued, makes itself guilty to the charge of arbitrariness. In volume 15 it publishes, for example, the brief "One Moment, Mr. Andersen!" presumably because Hans Christian Andersen is a well-known figure today and this work will be of interest to many readers. However, *SKS*, by contrast, does not publish a vast amount of draft material of around 60 (!) articles that were written in connection with the attack on the Church but never used.[92] In the *Papirer* edition this covers some 300 pages, but only a small fraction of this material is printed as loose papers in *SKS* volume 27. Here one might argue that this should have been included since it also seems to constitute more or less finished works that remained unpublished. It does not take too much imagination to see that arguments like this can go back and forth for a long time with a number of examples from the *Nachlass*. Suffice it to say that there is no ideal solution here with such a large mass of material.

One possibility for the future might be to digitalize the entire *Nachlass* and make it available on-line. The technology today certainly makes this possible, but it would of course represent a major project. But even this would not serve everyone's purpose since, as noted, Kierkegaard's handwritten manuscripts are generally unreadable except by trained specialists. So even if they were freely available to everyone on-line in high resolution digital images, they would be useful only to a small cadre of readers. To serve the purposes of the broader Kierkegaard community, one would have to make this material available in a text-critical edition in the way that *SKS* currently does for the material that it publishes.

There can be no doubt that the presentation of the *Nachlass* in *SKS* will set the standard for future research into this topic for many years to come. However, *SKS* cannot be said to render the old *Papirer* edition obsolete due primarily to the fact that the latter published such a large amount of material in the "B" section. It is to be hoped that *SKS* will become better known internationally by means of translations and will thus come to change the shape of Kierkegaard research. It is also a desideratum that this neglected part of Kierkegaard's authorship become better known in the international research community.

92 See *Pap.* XI-3 B 15–200.