

Efter at have modtaget skr. af 24/1 1907 fra bestyrelsen for universitetets jub. samf. har jeg et par gange talt mod prof. Edv. Holm og vil efter hans anvisning i den nærmeste fremtid indgive et andragende til Carlsbergfondet om et muligt tilskud til trykningen af det omhandlede tillæg. Men da dette vist helst må beregnes til 25 ark, og trykkeriet begærer 94 kr. for ark (foruden korrekturgodtgørelse), vil udgiften gå op mod 3000 kr., hvis der skal medregnes nogen hjælp til korrektur. Det er vel tvivlsomt, om dette bevilges. Sker det ikke, vil jeg prøve på at tilvejebringe en renskrift til opbevaring i det kgl. bibliotek.

Med maskinskrivning er jeg meget lidt kendt, men vil den være nogenlunde let anvendelig her? Ikke alene mangler der vel i den de særlige isl. og andre afvigende bogstaver; de kunne til nød senere indføres. Men det vil vist ikke være let at finde nogen med tilstrækkelig øvelse i maskinskrivning foruden med den nødvendige sikkerhed over for den afvigende og stadig vekslede stavemåde.

Når ordbogen er afsluttet ved, at det sidste hæfte er udkommet, bør vel den, så vidt vides, tinglæste kontrakt også retslig ophæves.

Med venlig hilsen.

Deres ærbødige
Kalkar.

De fundne arkivalier, som nu befinder sig i Det kgl. Bibliotek (Ny kgl. Saml. 2728 fol.), indeholdt, hvad spec. Kalkar angår, også udkast til skrivelser af 26/9 1898 og 29/11 1906 fra UJDS til Carlsbergfondet (selve skrivelserne findes i Carlsbergfondets arkiv, jfr. min bog s. 76 og s. 89 øv.) samt forskellige korte meddelelser fra formanden for Carlsbergfondet, Edv. Holm, til UJDS. Desuden er der en skrivelse fra Dines Andersen til cirkulering blandt UJDS's bestyrelsesmedlemmer i anledning af Kalkars brev af 10/12 1906; den er forsynet med påtegning af medlemmerne, således med en hel side fra L. F. A. Wimmers hånd, hvor Wimmers uvilje mod det nævnte tillæg tydeligt kommer til udtryk (jfr. min bog s. 88).

De nævnte breve ændrer sagligt set ikke noget ved min fremstilling i bogen, men de underbygger den og udvider baggrunden for den. Det aftrykte brev er Kalkars let resignerede afskedshilsen til UJDS; godt en uge senere sendte han ansøgning til Carlsbergfondet om den støtte til udgivelse af tillægsbindet, som han til sin glæde fik bevilget.

Marie Bjerrum

A Case of Mistaken Identity

Scholars of Hans Egede Schack's *Phantasterne* have recently assumed that Clemens Petersen wrote *Fædrelandet's* enthusiastic review which appeared on January 9 and 11, 1858, and was signed "I." Schack himself was impressed with "I"'s astute analysis, referring to it in a letter to August Sohlman (January 15, 1858):

Bladenes Recensioner har Du formodentlig seet:

"Fædrelandet"'s er vistnok den solideste, og har for det Meste opfattet min Mening rigtig.¹

But was Clemens Petersen really the critic behind the signature "I"? There is substantial evidence to the contrary.

Petersen has often been linked to Schack, first by Vilhelm Andersen who drew a parallel less than complimentary to Petersen.

Hans [Petersens] Æstetik er en hjemmegjort Frembringelse, hans Forudsætninger er . . . i det Etske Egede-Schack, hvis "Phantaster" idelig spillede ham i Hovedet . . .²

Frederik Schyberg, in a spirit quite different from Andersen's, claimed that *Phantasterne* had a profound effect on Petersen, formulating much of what he thought and wrote.³ Most recently, Hans Hertel, in his introduction to *Omkring Phantasterne*, suggested that Petersen viewed his age through Schack's glasses.⁴

Assuming an even closer link between novelist and critic, Frederik Nielsen attributed *Fædrelandet's* review to Petersen,⁵ apparently disagreeing with K. Birket Smith who, in his unpublished continuation of Erslew's "forfatterleksikon," identified "I" as Rudolf Varberg. Hertel, too, supposed that the mystery reviewer was Petersen.

K. Birket Smith mener i sin utrykte fortsættelse til Erslews forfatterleksikon (på Det kgl. Bibliotek) at anmeldelsen er skrevet af Rudolf Varberg. Alt andet tyder på at Varberg . . . er forfatter til *Dagbladets* anmeldelse og at *Fædrelandets* er skrevet af Clemens Petersen, der kun 22 år gammel var begyndt at skrive litteratur- og teaterkritik her siden 1. november 1856 (under diverse mærker) og snart blev bladets -- og 60'ernes -- førende kritiker.⁶

The similarity between Schack's perception of the times and Petersen's is indeed striking. Both feared, yet were fascinated by, the profound disharmony of the age, focussing on the fantast as the ailing everyman struggling to come to terms with real vs. ideal existence. And both believed, ultimately, in the power of ethical action to bring about a meaningful synthesis of the ideal and the real in the life of the individual.

But the similarity between "I" and Petersen -- their perception, their approach to the art of reviewing, their understanding of the novel -- is far less apparent. Petersen could have agreed with many of "I"'s observations, but he would have had to take issue with others. "I"'s rather affected style might, upon first reading, suggest Petersen's own, although it soon becomes obvious that "I" writes much too dispassionately to be confused with Petersen. And not only the tone, but also the timing, the method, and much of the substance of the review suggest that Petersen was not "I."

Petersen began writing for *Fædrelandet* in the fall of 1856 under various pseudonyms, primarily "Zu-Zx" for literary reviews and "106" for theater reviews. Disliking pseudonyms, he dropped them completely in 1860. In 1858 he was making no secret of the fact that he was "Zu-Zx," the signature he appears to have been using for all his major literary reviews, among them H. C. Andersen's *At være eller ikke være* on July, 1857, and Goldschmidt's *Hjemløs* on

March 6, 1858. There is no logical reason for Petersen, suddenly in January of 1858, to adopt "I" for the review of a novel as important as *Phantasterne*, particularly when he was totally disinterested in concealing his identity.

Petersen did write a review for *Fædrelandet* on January 9, 1858, the day on which the first part of the *Phantasterne* appeared, but it was of Hertz's *Amors Genistreger*, signed "106." It is possible but highly improbable that Carl Ploug would have published two major reviews by Petersen on the same day. He was already an important contributor to *Fædrelandet* but not yet the paper's leading critic.

The most convincing evidence, however, is the review itself. Neither the style nor the tone, first of all, are Petersen's. "I" begins his discussion by puzzling over the problem of reviewing a novel that is nearly perfect. ". . . thi naar en Ting er, som den skal være, er der ikke meget at sige derom."⁷ He presumes to have the moderation that comes with age, assuming the stance of an older critic who finds enthusiastic outbursts offensive.

Dels er man ved at rose meget stærkt, udsat for at fremkalde en modstræbende Stemning hos Publicum, og endelig har man, naar man er komne til Skjelsaar og Alder, i Almindelighed en vis Sky for at bruge stærke Begejstringsudbrud, for at tale i "hastemte Toner", hvortil man heller ikke føler sig ret dygtig.

In 1861, Petersen referred to *Phantasterne* as "interesting" but "raw,"⁸ a characterization which is a far cry from "I"'s "as it should be." Petersen seldom used such a glowing expression about the works of any author, with one exception, those of Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson.⁹ But if Petersen had been as enthusiastic about *Phantasterne* as "I," he would not have shunned "hastemte Toner," hiding behind a disguise of "Skjelsaar og Alder." He may often have been guilty of posturing in his reviews, but he never pretended to be a man of advanced years.

In keeping with his image of an older, established critic, "I" refers to himself as "Forfatteren" or uses the royal "we."

Der staaer nu tilbage at gjøre Regnskab for vore Anker mod Værket . . .

Disse forskellige Anker tabe sig imidlertid ved Siden af Bogens store Fortrin, og vi skulle derfor slutte med at anbefale *Phantasterne* til Enhver . . .

In his reviews from 1857 and 1858 Clemens Petersen was using the first person singular pronoun, and when he referred to "Forfatteren" he meant the author of the novel. For example, from his review of *At være eller ikke være*:

Og hvad er Hensigten med alle de indstrøede, uvedkommende Bemærkninger om nulevende danske Digtere, hvormed Bogen er saa vel spækket? -- Ja, jeg veed det ikke, og selv om jeg vidste det, vilde jeg ikke sige det.

Or from his review of *Hjemløst*:

Imidlertid vil jeg dog hæve et enkelt Punkt frem for Læsernes Erindring, ikke blot fordi det synes mig i og for sig at være noget Smukt ved Otto, men ogsaa fordi jeg troer, at det i psykologisk Henseende er meget fint følt af Forfatteren.

"I," by the way, does not seem to be merely pretending to be a critic of some years in order to lend credibility to his review. He speaks of the time of the novel (pre 1848) as if from personal experience, mildly criticizing Schack for minor mistakes with costumes and the political situation, even enlightening him on the proper use of "reactionary" and "conservative." Petersen could hardly have made such first hand observations.

Petersen became famous (even infamous) for his colorful, flamboyant, often precious style, reminiscent of the journalistic writing of Herman Bang. He was, in fact, feared for his cutting wit and lack of restraint. "I"'s style is sober, his language slightly affected, but objective and reserved, at times even dull. The difference in style is quite obvious in the following descriptions of "Forfængelighed," the first "I"'s, the second Petersen's from his review of *Hjemlgs*.

Det er altsaa egentlig en Art Forfængelighed, der kommer til orde i disse Productioner, en Forfængelighed, som vel i Almindelighed er af en uskyldigere Art, men som ved at begunstiges af Forholdene og pleies af Eiermanden, kan antage overordenlige og truende Dimensioner.

... han Otto er i moralsk Forstand en Pjalt ... han er forfængelig. Forfængeligheden er hans Drivefjeder, men ogsaa hans Orm, og den har tilsidst udmarvet ham saa grundig, at man kunde fløite i hans Benpiber.

In his reviews of longer novels like *Phantasterne*, the "novels of education" such as *At være eller ikke være*, *Fra Piazza del Populo* by Bergsøe, Bjørnson's *Fiskerjenten*, Petersen invariably centered his discussion on two aspects of the works: first, what he called "Grundtanken," and second, the hero. In much the same spirit as Kierkegaard's criticism of H. C. Andersen in *Kun en Spillemand*, Petersen seldom let a chance go by to discuss the importance of a "Grundtanke" as the basis for every novel, berating the Danish novelists for failing to clearly formulate their idea before they sat down to write. On the other hand, he praised Bjørnson for *Fiskerjenten*¹⁰ where, for the first time, he said:

han er mødt frem til Skildringen af Virkeligheden med visse bestemte forudfattede Tanker og Anskuelser, der for ham personlig ere en Villiessag i Livet.

"I" operates with the same critical principle. Late in the review he refers to the novel's "original og dyb Plan . . . udført med en sjelden Sandhed, Skarpsindighed og Conseqvens," and, in fact, his main purpose is to illuminate *Phantasterne*'s "plan," showing that the fantasies of Conrad, Christian and Thomas constitute the action of the novel. But the tell-tale difference between "I" and Petersen is that, whereas "I" operates implicitly with the principle of a "Grundtanke,"

Petersen would discuss the principle itself and then demonstrate its presence or absence. The aesthetic discussions interspersed throughout Petersen's reviews are suspiciously absent from "I"'s.

"I" and Petersen also differ about the nature of ideal novel heroes. "I" is most impressed by Schack's nearly clinical treatment of the psychologically disturbed fantasists.

Handlingerne, det ydre Liv aabenbarer kun glimtvis hvad der gaacr for sig i en Saadans Indre, det maa man studere i Phantasierne selv. Denne Opgave, der som Studium overhovedet nærmest synes af videnskabelig Natur, bliver nu Gjenstand for Poesien, naar det forsøges at give Forskningens Resultater i enkelte concrete Individualiteter . . .

It is a curious and somewhat contradictory aspect of Petersen's criticism that he envisioned the modern drama's tragic hero as a divided soul, a complex character in which instincts, passions and obsessions fused together in strange and dangerous combinations; but he maintained throughout his years as a critic that the hero of the modern novel should be free of all internal conflict,

saa rigt begavet af Naturen og saa udviklet af Omstændighederne, at han kunde betragtes som en Menneskeheds Heros . . . en Lykkens Yndling.
(*At være . . .*)

Not until Bjørnson's *Fiskerjenten* in 1868 did Petersen find such a 'lucky' protagonist in Petra, the novel's heroine. Quite sarcastically, he remarked that a Danish novelist would have portrayed the conflict from within, delving deep into her embattled psyche, whereas Bjørnson made her strong and psychologically whole. "I"'s admiration for Schack's fantasists does not agree with Petersen's theory of the modern novel hero.

And finally, "I" and Petersen differ over the appropriateness of explicit erotic material in "good" literature. "I" approves of Schack's treatment of Conrad's fantasy life, blatantly masochistic-sadistic in nature and shockingly erotic for the time. Being a bit too delicate himself, "I" does not elaborate on Conrad's fantasies, but he does emphasize the correctness of them. Petersen, on the other hand, was too much a "biedermeier" man in taste to have been so broadminded. His description of *Phantasterne* as "raw" was undoubtedly an allusion to the erotic nature of the novel. In his review of *Hjemløst*, only three months after the *Phantasterne* review, he criticized Goldschmidt for the very innocent, and, when compared to *Phantasterne*, harmless scene in which Otto wanders through Nyhavn, vaguely longing for something which he never makes explicit.

Hvor delicat Skildringen end er, lægger den dog saa stærk Vægt paa det blot Naturlige, det Physiske i Mennesket, uden at medtage de aandelige Forhold, der staae i Forbindelse dermed, at det bliver noget ubehageligt at læse.

On the other hand, he was quite pleased with H. C. Andersen who, he felt, showed "excellent tact" in writing his romantic ballad, "Liden Kirsten".¹¹ In the original folk ballad Kirsten and her lover turn out to be brother and sister, but in Andersen's version the sibling relationship is removed and a happy, acceptable ending provided. Without the tasteful change "Liden Kirsten" would have remained outside the realm of poetry, according to Petersen.

Visen ender med en saa tung og skærende Dissonanse, at den ikke lader sig dække uden ved det Dunkle og Fjerne, hvori Romanzen holder sine Skikkelser; ført frem med dramatisk Styrke og Liv, vilde dette Slutningsbillede uden Redning være ene og alene uhyggeligt, og kaste den hele Digting udenfor Poesien.

Petersen's sensibilities would have been somewhat disturbed by a novel like *Phantasterne*. This is not to say that he was unimpressed by it. But he could not have written "I"'s enthusiastic review.

Hans Hertel agrees that Petersen and "I" were most likely not one and the same. So who was "I"? It is an important question because *Fædrelandet's* review was the best, most extensive discussion of *Phantasterne* in any Danish newspaper of the time. Had Petersen written it, it would have been a feather in his cap.

Footnotes

1. Quoted in Hans Hertel, ed., *Omkring Phantasterne* (Copenhagen: Reitzel, 1969), p. 89.
2. Vilhelm Andersen, *Illustreret dansk Litteraturhistorie: Den danske Litteraturs Historie i det nittende Aarhundrede* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1925), Vol. IV, p. 140.
3. Frederik Schyberg, *Dansk Teaterkritik indtil 1914* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1937), p. 243.
4. Hertel, *Omkring Phantasterne*, p. 44.
5. Frederik Nielsen, *Phantasterne* (Copenhagen: Reitzel, 1962 and 1965).
6. Hertel, *Omkring Phantasterne*, p. 71.
7. "I," "Phantasterne," *Fædrelandet*, January 9 and 11, 1858. Also reprinted in *Omkring Phantasterne*.
8. Clemens Petersen, "Deklaration. Af Chr. Richart," *Fædrelandet*, May 6, 1861.
9. Petersen said in letters to Bjørnson that he found it difficult to review his works because they were so good. In a review of *En Handske* written in America he said: "The scene between Alf and Svava is very easy to follow, on account of the magical charm it exercises. But, like everything perfect, it is very difficult to describe." ("*A Glove*," *Scandinavia*, September, 1883).
10. Petersen, "Fiskerjenten. Af B. Bjørnson," *Fædrelandet*, May 23, 1868.
11. Petersen, "Liden Kirsten. Af H. C. Andersen," *Fædrelandet*, December 14, 1861.

Mary Kay Norseng.