Zeitschrift: Beiträge zur nordischen Philologie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Skandinavische Studien

Band: 19 (1991)

Artikel: Henrich Steffens as Spoiler : Tracing a Philosophical Pretense from Germany to Denmark

Autor: Hanson, Kathryn S.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-858303

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 17.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Joachim Lelewels *Edda*-översättning hade en stor betydelse under den polska romantiken. Man kan tillägga att till 1986 var det den enda *Edda*-översättningen till polska. Först 1986 fick vi en översättning av den äldre *Eddan* av Apolonia Załuska-Strömberg. Intresset för Nordeuropa inom den polska romantiken var djupt knutet till den fascination för Skandinavien som fanns i hela Europa. Men de polska romantikerna anpassade den mytologiska bilden av Fornnorden som existerade i Europa till sina egna ideella, estetiska och politiska behov. Till följd av detta hade den polska receptionen av den germanska mytologin under romantiken en annan karaktär och betydelse.

KATHRYN S. HANSON, VANCOUVER, CANADA

Henrich Steffens as Spoiler: Tracing a Philosophical Pretense from Germany to Denmark

When Henrich Steffens was faced with the choice in 1802 of either resettling in Denmark or taking up a university appointment in Dublin,[1] he could never have suspected the immense implications of his decision, either for himself personally, or – more important to us today – for the development of literary Romanticism in Scandinavia.

Regardless of whether one subscribes to the *gennembrud*-theory that attributes the birth of Danish Romanticism to a 15-hour conversation between Steffens and Adam Oehlenschläger (which I do not)[2] or whether one dismisses Steffens' ideas as scientifically worthless and hence of no intrinsic value (which I am not competent to judge),[3] one fact remains unimpeachable: his Copenhagen lectures of 1802–03 caused considerable public controversy and the audience at these lectures included an impressive sampling of Denmark's budding intellectual elite: Grundtvig, Oehlenschläger, Sibbern, the Mynster brothers, Heiberg . . . to name a few.

In addition, the immediate response to his ideas and particularly to his personality was a varied as it was intense. In his *Erindringer*, Oehlenschläger described Steffens as «en ny Ansgarius, [som] havde foresat sig at omvende vore skiønne Aander og Philosopher i Norden fra Vantroen,» just as Grundtvig later likened Steffens' sudden appearance to a fata morgana.[5] J. P. Mynster recalled

[1] Biographical data from PAUL (1973b) and HULTBERG (1973).
[2] Cf. HANSON (1986).
[3] PAUL (1973b: 15) states this categorically and no one has yet disagreed with him.
[4] OEHLENSCHLÄGER (1850: I/187).
[5] GRUNDTVIG (1877: 268); see also HANSEN (BRANDES) (1872: 476–81).

> af hvor uberegnelig og velgiørende Indflydelse hans Ophold her har været for Danmark, ikke blot ved de Forelæsninger, han holdt den følgende Vinter . . . men endnu mere ved hans personlige Omgang. Han var en Sædemand, som havde Frø af mange Slags, og udstrøede dem rigelig trindt omkring; og, skiøndt han selv var mindre skikket til at pleie den fremvoxende Spire, saa havde dog mangt et Sædekorn fundet god Jord, hvor det skød Rod og bar Frugt.[6]

In short, Steffens' sensational arrival and enthusiastic preaching of the philosophical and aesthetic tenets of the German New School left a lasting impression on his students and an indelible mark on Danish life and letters.

What must capture our attention at this point, however, is not the personal ebullience and egotism of the man, but the content of his lectures. Here is where our concern with Steffens, the spoiler, the corruptor, comes to the fore, because what he delivered to his illustrious students in the guise of New School philosophy was a fundamentally modified vision of Fichte and Schelling's metaphysical systems. And this may well have contributed to the development of a distinctively Scandinavian Romanticism.

Although both Fritz Paul and Helge Hultberg articulated this view (albeit from vastly differing perspectives) in their respective 1973 studies on Steffens, it has scarcely been acknowledged by scholars of European Romanticism. This is not in itself surprising. However, in light of recent work in this area, particularly the reevaluation of German Romanticism both in terms of its delineation as a discrete literary epoch (i.e., in relation to Enlightenment, Storm & Stress, Classicism and Biedermeier) and in terms of its position within the European Romantic movement, Steffens' role as «spoiler» assumes a new significance.

One of the most provocative contributions to the current debate, Klaus Peter's essay on the distinction between German Romanticism and the French and English, «Der spekulative Anspruch,»[7] draws attention to the contradiction between the widely held view that romanticism was a manifestation of the German character and hence of German national history, on the one hand, and the view espoused – especially in North American comparative literary studies – that romanticism was a pan-European phenomenon, on the other. Peter argues that although there is sufficient evidence to justify discussion of a unified pan-European romanticism, we must appeal to criteria other than the strictly aesthetic ones proposed by, e.g., René Wellek and Henry Remak,[8] because they are simply not delimitating enough when applied to 18th and 19th century Europe. Instead, he suggests historical qualifiers (social-, political-, and philosophical-), specifically relating to the Frensh Revolution.

It was Madame de Staël who offered the observation that, «L'amour de la liberté n'est point développé chez les Allemands.»[9] Nevertheless, Johann Gott-

[6] MYNSTER (1854: 135).
[7] PETER (1985).
[8] WELLEK (1963) and REMAK (1972).
[9] DE STAEL (1958: I, 158).

lieb Fichte viewed his chief philosophical work, *Wissenschaftslehre*, as spiritually, if not causally, linked to the French Revolution. In a letter to Jens Baggesen from 1795, Fichte described the relationship:

> Mein System ist das erste System der Freiheit; wie jene Nation [Frankreich] von den äussern Ketten den Menschen losreis't, reis't mein System ihn von den Fesseln der Dinge an sich . . . Es ist in den Jahren, da sie mit äusserer Kraft die politische Freiheit erkämpfte, durch innern Kampf mit mir selbst, mit allen eingewurzelten Vorurtheilen entstanden; nicht ohne ihr Zuthun . . . Indem ich über ihre Revolution schrieb, kamen mir gleichsam zur Belohnung die ersten Winke u. Ahndungen dieses Systems.[10]

The upshot of all this was that, in Germany, revolutionary fervor initially found expression in the *Wissenschaftslehre*, that is, in the way of a philosophical rather than a political pretense («Anspruch»). The appearance of this work, Peter contends, marked German Romanticism's true hour of birth, and only those philosopher-natural scientist-historian-poets who responded intuitively to Fichte's thought and who consciously developed it further should truly be regarded as «German Romanticists,» as opposed to romanticists (even if German) of the more generally European variety.

Several other recent studies or collections concerned with European Romanticism,[11] have also expressed perplexity with the contradictions between North American and European views on the subject and taken a fresh look at the entire eighteenth century. But they have limited their purview almost exclusively to the three major European countries, Germany, France, and England. Largely uninvestigated still today is the romantic literature of the «little» European countries. Both Wellek and Remak suggested long ago that herein lies the necessary corroboration of any pan-European theory of romanticism. By the same token, herein also may be found a fertile testing ground for Peter's thesis.

Certainly the Scandinavian countries may be counted among the neglected, although more by virtue of focus than research quantity. Indeed, in spite of the numerous volumes and articles dedicated to the study of romanticism in the North, we still do not know whether the Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and Swedish-Finnish movements shared Wellek's oft-cited unities, or whether the great poets in Scandinavia, among themselves, held any creed in common. Scandinavia's susceptibility to a large measure of influence from abroad has been well documented, nevertheless the actual extent of that influence remains to be fully investigated. As Lilian Furst has pointed out, «the mere existence of even a considerable number of translations and personal links need not inevitably result in any profound reciprocal effect.»[12]

Steffens' multiple roles as Schelling's disciple (and hence Fichte's philosophical grandchild), as a peripheral contributor to the New School, and as a «ny Ans-

[10] FICHTE (1970: III, 2, 298).
[11] E.g., PETER (1980), ENGELL (1981), VIETTA (1983), and PIPKIN (1985).
[12] FURST (1969: 15).

garius» to Scandinavia's future poetic elite lend a certain legitimacy to his writings or at the very least render invalid the notion that his work is intrinsically worthless. The question of what happened to Fichte's «spekulativer Anspruch» (as defind by Peter) in the course of Steffens' development of his own «Naturphilosophie» and what impact, if any, that development had on Danish (or Scandinavian) Romanticism is compelling and, indeed, relevant both to defining the relationship of Danish Romanticism to the German and to identifying the distinguishing features of a pan-European Romantic movement.

The methodology utilized to answer this compelling question is a key issue. The current body of Steffens' research is neither large nor comprehensive, and much of it gets bogged down in a registration of «influences» based on personal relationships – no doubt, at least in part, due to the fact that Steffens is best known to students of Romanticism for the anecdotal portraits of prominent literary figures contained in his monumental ten-volume memoirs, *Was ich erlebte.*

Paul's 1973 study, on the other hand, provides us with a good account of Steffens' life and intellectual growth up to 1804, as well as with an extensive discussion of the reception of his ideas in Scandinavia. In arguing that Steffens' profound «Wirkungsgeschichte» in the North attained the stature of a «Wirkungsaesthetik,» Paul appeals to Leopold Magon's 1927 concept of «Verengung»[13] and identifies two such tendencies. The first may be viewed as a consequence of Steffens' opinion that Schelling, rather than Friedrich Schlegel, was the definitive theoretician of the period:

> Schelling nimmt in der Dichtungstheorie und Philosophie der gesamten nordischen Romantik eine so zentrale Stelle ein, wie er sie vergleichsweise in der vielfältiger strukturierten deutschen nie hatte.[14]

A second, parallel «Verengung» relates to what Paul calls the central categories of universal romanticism:

> Die das Wesen des Romantischen recht eigentlich kennzeichnenden Polaritäten von Irrationalismus und intendiertem Universalismus auf der einen, Spekulation und Geschichtlichkeit auf der anderen Seite, wurden in ihren Extrembereichen schon von Steffens variiert und ‹gebrochen,› und die Romantik dadurch nicht mehr in ihrer ganzen ursprünglichen Vielfalt deutlich.[15]

Although there may be some substance to these tendencies, it must be understood that they are identified as the result of a strictly Steffens-oriented study, and, as such, are formulated to emphasize the variant aspects traceable to Steffens and not necessarily the outstanding features of Scandinavian romanticism. Even if we accept Steffens as a crucial figure in the dissemination and growth of romantic thought throughout Scandinavia, and as particularly influential in the

[13] MAGON (1927).
[14] PAUL (1973b: 202).
[15] PAUL (1973b: 202).

case of Adam Oehlenschläger's poetic development, it does not necessarily follow, as Paul contends, that Oehlenschläger's early writings must be viewed as «dichterische Kommentare zu Steffens' naturphilosophische Aesthetik»[16] or that Steffens served as chief theoretician of early Scandinavian romanticism. We have a way to go before we can draw these conclusions.

In contrast to Paul, Helge Hultberg's study of the young Steffens is narrower in scope and avoids discussion of the Steffens-Oehlenschläger relationship or of Steffens' influence on Scandinavian literature in general. He does, however, question the long-standing presumption of Steffens' close philosophic affinity to German idealism and provides the groundwork for further investigation.

What we do not yet possess is a detailed account of Steffens' works, in particular the *Beyträge zur innren Naturgeschichte der Erde* and the important *Indledning til philosophiske Forelæsninger*, which is, of course, an essential prerequisite to comparing his thought to Fichte and Schelling. Another thing we do not yet possess, as noted above, is consensus concerning the leading characteristics of Scandinavian Romanticism. Until we have at least the former and some indication of the latter, the role of Fichte's «spekulativer Anspruch» in Scandinavian literature will remain strictly a matter of speculation.

[16] PAUL (1973b: 205).

NIELS LYHNE JENSEN, AARHUS

Romantik i Grundtvigs *Nordens Mytologi* 1808

Den unge N. F. S. Grundtvigs *Nordens Mytologi* 1808 er blandt de centrale tekster fra romantikkens gennembrud i Danmark. Den omstændighed, at Grundtvig her i sit første større værk fører sig frem inden for et lærdomsfelt, studiet af den nordiske oldtid, som fra midten af 1700-tallet havde tiltrukket sig videnskabsmænds, digteres og sågar billedkunstneres opmærksomhed både i Norden og i Europa, gør hans bog til et så meget mere markant vidnesbyrd om det paradigmeskift, som romantikken betyder.

Grundtvigs kærlighed til den nordiske oldtid går efter hans eget udsagn tilbage til hans tidlige år. Som pebling og student, samt i tiden umiddelbart efter sin attestats, læste han ivrigt i værker som Schønings og Suhms fremstillinger af Norges og Danmarks oldhistorie, ligesom han forsøger sig i den skønlitterære genre, man kalder den nordiske fortælling. Men hans forskerinteresse og digten er helt i den rationalistiske oldgransknings og sentimentalismens ånd. Et vigtigt