



Cuadernos de Ilustración y Romanticismo

Revista Digital del Grupo de Estudios del Siglo XVIII

Universidad de Cádiz / ISSN: 2173-0687

nº 31 (2025)

INTERVENTIONS ON THE TEXT OF NOVALIS' *JOURNAL* IN THE ORIGINAL 1846 EDITION¹

Miguel ALBERTI

(Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4276-2770>

Recibido: 9-7-2024 / *Revisado:* 2-6-2025

Aceptado: 28-5-2025 / *Publicado:* 10-9-2025

ABSTRACT: The text of Novalis's private diary from mid-1797 was first published in 1846 with significant modifications made by the editor, Eduard von Bülow. This article examines these modifications and aims to provide some evidence that they were generally intended to shape the text in such a way as to present Novalis as a poet incapable of experiencing not only improper emotions or sensations but also tranquility or relief during his grieving process over the death of his fiancée, Sophie von Kühn. The analysis considers the full range of editorial operations carried out by Bülow, with particular focus on two aspects: first, the passages in which a deliberate effort to remove specific information from the diary can be observed, and second, the treatment of the enigmatic «determination» to which Novalis refers—an element that has given rise to various interpretations and remains a subject of debate today.

KEYWORDS: Novalis, *Journal*, Sophie von Kühn, *Entschluß*, Eduard von Bülow

INTERVENCIONES SOBRE EL TEXTO DEL *JOURNAL* DE NOVALIS EN LA EDICIÓN ORIGINAL DE 1846

RESUMEN: El texto del diario íntimo de Novalis de mediados de 1797 fue publicado por primera vez en 1846 con significativas modificaciones hechas por el editor, Eduard von Bülow. En este artículo se revisan dichas modificaciones y se aspira a brindar algo de evidencia de que con ellas se trató, en general, de moldear el texto de manera tal que ofreciera al lector una imagen de Novalis como un poeta incapaz de sentir no solo emociones o sensaciones indecorosas sino también tranquilidad o alivio durante su proceso de duelo por la muerte de su prometida Sophie von Kühn. Se analiza todo el conjunto de operaciones llevadas a cabo por Bülow, en particular dos asuntos: en primer lugar, los pasajes en los que puede advertirse un propósito concreto de sustraer determinada infor-

¹ I would like to thank Paula González for her inestimable help in drafting the English text.

mación del diario y, en segundo lugar, el tratamiento de la intrigante «determinación» a la que hace referencia Novalis y sobre la cual se han propuesto distintas interpretaciones, aún hoy en discusión.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Novalis, *Journal*, Sophie von Kühn, *Entschluß*, Eduard von Bülow

INTRODUCTION

We know that the first edition of Friedrich von Hardenberg's works made possible (and even promoted) a lasting distortion of the author's figure. Today, it is quite common among specialists to allude to the lax, arbitrary and even disloyal or malicious nature of the two-volume edition of the *Schriften* prepared by Friedrich Schlegel and Ludwig Tieck in 1802, republished with modifications on four occasions (1805; 1815; 1826; 1837) and augmented in 1846 with a third volume by Tieck and (mainly) Eduard von Bülow.²

Some of these criticisms to the decisions made by the first editors are very well founded and have already been developed in different degrees of detail.³ Others could still benefit from a thorough review.⁴ Here we will deal with the editorial decisions regarding one specific text, the *Journal* of 1797, which, as far as I know, has not yet been sufficiently approached from this perspective.⁵ Since this is a diary (written between April 18 and July

² Here we will deal exclusively with this third volume of 1846, which will be referred to as *S*. The remaining quotations correspond to the historical-critical edition of Novalis' works (*HKA*) mentioned in the bibliography (the volume is indicated in Roman numerals and the page in Arabic; the line is sometimes added in square brackets).

³ In the prologue to volumes II and III of the *HKA* (II: v-vii), Richard Samuel gives some examples of how arbitrary and invasive Schlegel and Tieck's interventions on Hardenberg's text were, and briefly reviews the history of the following editions. He returns to the subject in v: 191-195. Hans-Joachim Mähl traces and describes the consequences of these interventions on the reception of Novalis (especially but not exclusively in Goethe) in «Goethes Urteil über Novalis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kritik an der deutschen Romantik» from 1967. A recent reconstruction of the ways in which the operations of Tieck, Schlegel and Bülow contributed to the creation of the «Novalis myth» is to be found in O'Brien (1992 and 1995). An area of Hardenberg's works that suffered much from the publishers' interventions is that of philosophical notes, and it is the interventions on this area of Novalis' works that were analysed most closely. However, Schlegel and Tieck also made decisions that had an impact on the edition of the literary work, even if they were, in some cases, minor interventions at first sight, such as the transformation of «Afterdingen» into «Ofterdingen», cf. in this regard Pfefferkorn (1988: 261-262), O'Brien (1992: 166), Viator (2001: 151-152) and Knopf (2015: 261-263). With regard to the amendments to the journal text, I am not aware of any study that addresses the issue in detail.

⁴ This is a matter that would merit some important specifications, since often, when it comes to charging against the interventions of Schlegel and Tieck (and Bülow), several relevant issues are ignored. Firstly, limitations imposed by the time and the conditions in which the editing had to be carried out (a restriction on space established by the person responsible for the publishing house; the need to carry out the task in a very short time, etc.). Schlegel's successive (unsuccessful) attempts to improve the first edition by extending the selection of fragments, trying to reconstruct a chronological order, incorporating texts left out such as *Christendom or Europe*, recovering Novalis' original name, etc., are also often overlooked. And in general, the fact that this edition never presented itself as an all-encompassing critical edition is also overlooked: rather, it is an anthology of what was considered the most valuable of what Hardenberg had come to write. Of course, this does not mean that it is false or exaggerated that the first edition of Novalis' writings contains infinite arbitrariness and tendentious and unjustified selections, modifications, additions and subtractions. But it does imply, however, the need to review with the greatest possible critical awareness this point which ended up joining the commonplaces that reappear abundantly in Novalis research. For a detail of the history of the editions of the work by Schlegel and Tieck and the history of the manuscripts up to 1970, see the reconstruction of Samuel (1973); Viator (2001) offers a complete and succinct description of all the first editions of Novalis texts.

⁵ Several of the issues examined in this article were previously addressed in my chapter (2019) of *La actualidad del romanticismo alemán*, edited by Naím Garnica. There, I sought to outline Bülow's editorial approach to Novalis's diary and, above all, to provide evidence that these interventions were guided by a genuine intent to «romanticize» Novalis's figure. In this article, my aim is to offer a systematic and comprehensive account of all the information I have gathered regarding Bülow's interventions, analyzing each type of intervention in as much detail as possible and presenting all the existing evidence found in the text of the *Journal* itself. Additionally, I explore certain specific aspects that I was unable to examine in such depth in the aforementioned chapter, particularly concerning the

6, 1797) in which Novalis not only recorded his daily activities but also his mood and the evolution of the grieving process he was undergoing since the death of his fiancée Sophie von Kühn (on March 19 of the same year), the management of the information contained in this *Journal* was a particularly delicate matter. On the other hand, any interventions made on the manuscript could particularly affect, for the same reasons, the future image of its author.

The subtraction of three elements by Bülow will be considered in the greatest detail. Firstly, the general erasure of all those passages in which Hardenberg expressed erotic impulses (the *Lüsternheit* to which he often refers) or attitudes towards different kinds of appetites in general will be dealt with: this erasure can be attributed partly to respect for a certain decorum in the presentation of Hardenberg's image and partly perhaps also to the search for a «spiritualized» vision of the writer. Secondly, we shall deal with Bülow's persistent subtraction of Hardenberg's statements in which he reveals a joyful, active and optimistic state of mind, subtractions that cannot be attributed to any other purpose than that of paying tribute to the idea, favoured throughout the original edition of his writings, of Novalis as a tormented poet in the deepest anguish because of the death of his young beloved. Finally, the most complex subject will be dealt with: the partial subtraction of the statements on Hardenberg's mysterious «determination» (the *Entschluß*), a particularly unclear subject that has already generated some debate.

In concrete terms, I aim to shed some light on the points detailed below. Firstly, that the most unjustified and far-reaching intervention of Bülow's edition of the journal is not so much the subtraction, already highlighted —and rightly so— by the critics (O'Brien, 1992, 1995; Vietor, 2001), of the passages on the *Lüsternheit* or the *Entschluß*, but the subtraction of the passages that display a happy and self-satisfied mood. Secondly, the treatment of the *Entschluß* issue will be dealt with in some detail in order, on the one hand, to relativize the idea according to which Bülow aimed at the general settlement of this issue and, on the other hand, to offer a proposal for the interpretation of the criteria that could have guided his actions on this point.

GENERAL TENDENCIES IN BÜLOW'S INTERVENTIONS

The first publication of the notes made by Hardenberg between April and July 1798 can be found on pages 49 to 69 of the third volume of the *Schriften*, by Tieck and Bülow. The main responsible for this volume was Bülow, to whom Tieck entrusted the selection of new materials to incorporate those already gathered in the two volumes of the original edition. Bülow had the difficult task (as he himself said in the foreword, *S*: viii) of selecting interesting fragments or annotations that had not yet appeared among the abundant manuscripts preserved.⁶ At the end of his foreword (*S*: xiv) Bülow assures the authenticity of the texts he is giving for publication, on which he made only «corrections». As broad and supportive as our understanding of the term «correction» may be, this is far

notion of «determination», to which Novalis repeatedly refers in his diary, a concept that remains one of the most challenging to decipher among those offered to scholarly inquiry by the *Journal*. A central objective of this article is to contribute to the discussion by providing some material on this issue, along with proposals for its analysis.

6 Although Bülow was the most responsible for the new volume of 1846, it cannot be ruled out that Tieck (who had the text of the diary in his hands before it went to press) intervened directly, nor can it be ruled out that Bülow's selection was more or less oriented, guided or conditioned by criteria outlined by Tieck. The fact that he had the diary in his hands immediately before it was sent to the editor, G. E. Reimer, can be deduced from the letter he wrote to the latter in November 1845: «Tomorrow I am sending you the diary» (cf. the entire letter in Tieck [1973: 500] or the relevant passage in *HKA V*: 180).

from being the case.⁷ Several decisions were made that were considerably more far-reaching than mere corrections: decisions that were definitive for the establishment of the text (which would not be published in full until the 1901 Heilborn edition of Hardenberg's works)⁸ and that affected the reception of Novalis' image in a very marked way. We will review them here in some detail.

First, it should be made clear that the edition of the journal is presented as a selection itself, so that one would expect reductions, rearrangements and minor modifications, which are otherwise characteristic of any compilation. The title of the section in which the *Journal* itself is found is «Aus Novalis Tagebüche seiner letzten Lebensjahre», i. e. «From Novalis' diary of his last years». Despite the warning that these are extracts, these pages contain most of the material preserved. Few (by comparison) and rather brief entries in the diary were left out entirely. On the other hand, there are quite a few and important subtractions within the entries themselves. As we shall see, these are generally subtractions that do not obey the requirements of a «selection» (in principle, to preserve what is important and leave aside what is irrelevant) but are oriented, in many cases, by other purposes. The consideration of these interventions led specialists to strongly disapprove of the journal's editing procedures. O'Brien, for example, pointed out that

Bülow's interventions in the editorial staff contributed to the strengthening of the Novalis-myth, above all because of the violence with which he handled the intimate 'Journal' with the duel between the spring and summer of 1797. Bülow not only expanded Novalis' succinct and concise, almost clinical, self-observations in a tedious and bombastic way (distorting them), but also excluded in the best puritanical style all passages of the «Journal» that could have undermined Tieck's presentation of the Sophie-legend, in particular Novalis' explicit mentions of his oscillating sexual desires and his attempts to liberate them through hallucinations and onanism (1992: 179),

an opinion that reappears, cut from the last part, in his book *Signs of Revolution* (1995: 25). In her reconstruction of the first editions of Novalis' texts until this 1846 volume, Sophia Vietor refers to O'Brien's 1992 article for further discussion and notes that «Bülow modified the Journal by reformulating concise expressions and leaving out many mentions of 'lust' [*Lüsterheit*] and 'determination' [*Entschluß*] to follow Sophie in death» (2001: 80).

Both indications point to aspects of importance and highlight an element which, in my opinion, considered in context, could be taken rather as secondary. It is true that on some occasions sentences separated by a hyphen or a strong punctuation are joined by an «und» («and») so that loose expressions (characteristic of Novalis, not only in the diary) are articulated in a less «concise» way than in the manuscript, which in turn has some effect on the reader's understanding of Hardenberg's state of mind. Nevertheless, it is only one of many «stylistic» correction mechanisms that the early Novalis editors generally implemented as part of the process of «active revision» of Hardenberg's text —mechanisms that are observed in the edition of the journal as well as in other parts of the complete work.⁹ In contrast to the rest of the interventions (which include, among

⁷ Samuel states (v: 194-195) that Bülow sometimes proceeded in an even more arbitrary manner than Schlegel and Tieck, an opinion that O'Brien takes up and reinforces in his 1992 article and at the beginning of the 1995 book (cf. p. 16 and 25).

⁸ Heilborn's edition (I: 267-289) contains some generally small errors that Minor (another Novalis editor) already pointed out in his review of 1802, but in principle it includes the entire newspaper.

⁹ The standardization of spelling, punctuation and to a lesser extent syntax is not characteristic of the original

several other modifications, the replacement of terms by others, abundant reworking of syntax, very frequent subtractions and even some not always minor additions), the simplification of the reading through the harmonization of syntax seems to be a minor issue (although it certainly is more or less relevant). It is worth mentioning, by the way, that on some occasions the opposite phenomenon to that of the meeting of two sentences in one also occurs, that is, the separation of a single sentence in two (the subtraction, for example, of a «and».¹⁰ Operations of this kind, that is, of «normalization» of discourse and in general «of form» we find several, some of which are more questionable than the unification of syntagmas. Let us quickly review, first, these interventions of a rather stylistic order.

FORMAL ISSUES

1. Paragraphs are merged: there is a consistent attempt to ensure that each journal entry corresponds to a single paragraph, so that when this does not happen the text is unified.

2. Missing information is added: the most obvious example is at the beginning, where a key piece of information is provided: the second cipher in the date of the diary entry indicates the number of days since Sophie's death.

3. Repetitions are avoided, and this in two different ways: either a repeated item is removed or it is replaced by an «equivalent» item. For example, in the entry for 31 May (S: 62 / IV: 42 [26]) «gieng» (which had appeared shortly before)¹¹ is replaced by «wanderte».

4. Equivalent expressions are also replaced for purely stylistic purposes: e.g. «einiges» is replaced by «manches» (S: 57 / IV: 37 [25]), «dann» is replaced by «zuletzt» (S: 58 / IV: 39 [6]), etc.

5. Spelling is normalized: «bey» is replaced by «bei», «seyn» by «sein», «gieng» by «ging», «giebt» by «gibt», «Fantasie» by «Phantasie», «bessres» by «besseres», «geschwanckt» by «geschwankt», etc.

6. Punctuation is corrected and normalized: some orthographic signs forgotten or ignored by Hardenberg are reinstated and the punctuation of the sentences is brought to a common style; the use, very characteristic of Hardenberg, of the hyphen is considerably reduced and replaced by more conventional symbols.

7. The syntax is rearranged, either as a consequence of a subtraction that imposes a modification in the structure of the sentence or for purely stylistic purposes. An example of the former is the following: Bülow withdraws the beginning of the sentence «Gegen Abend dachte ich auf dem Spaziergange und vorher, auf der Stube, einiges Gute» (IV: 37 [23-25]), he subtracts «Gegen Abend»; in order to preserve grammatical correctness he needs to alter the sequence of the remaining parts of the sentence: «Auf einem Spaziergange

edition of his writings only; rather it was a constant in later Novalis editions (and translations) and still often remains so. His use of the hyphen, above all, is so particular that it is very often replaced, in order to simplify reading, by more common signs. To expect from Bülow's edition of an anthology of Hardenberg's texts in 1846 a practice more faithful to the original text than that found in current editions seems excessive and unrealistic. By pointing this out, I do not intend to diminish the importance of Bülow's interventions, but rather the opposite: to highlight those interventions that are *not justified in any way*.

¹⁰ The objective, also in these cases, is to «improve» the wording. For example, Bülow replaces «In Widerstedt fand ich alle munter und wohl — und vergnügt» (IV: 43 [2-3]) with «In Widerstedt fand' ich Alle munter, wohl und veegnügt [sic]» (S: 63).

¹¹ Let us clarify by the way that the proximity of this «gieng» with the previous one is a consequence of a cut by Bülow in the text of the entry: that is to say, that Bülow was led, here as in other occasions, to «correct» a text that only deserved an improvement because he himself had modified it.

und vorher auf der Stube dachte ich manches Gute» (S: 57). An example, in contrast, of an «unforced» alteration: «In einer gleichgültigen, mithin für die Gesellschaft ziemlich aufgelegten Stimmung blieb ich den ganzen Tag» (IV: 30 [5-6]) becomes «Ich blieb den ganzen Tag in einer gleichgültigen, mithin für die Gesellschaft ziemlich aufgelegten Stimmung» (S: 50).

8. The entry of a «vacant» day is subtracted: on April 22 Hardenberg had noted only «22. 35. Vacat.» Bülow dispenses this information.

9. Some element that became absent is recovered (after a subtraction) and the syntax is readjusted: when the result of the disappearance of a phrase (subject that will be dealt with later) produces the loss of some information more or less relevant to the rest of the entry, that information is recovered, and if the syntax is incorrect or unclear, it is normalised. Replacements of information and reformulations try to «respect» (to this extent) the original. In other words, if it is possible to keep Hardenberg's expressions, they are kept. For example, from «Sonntag war ich recht gut. Bericht und Meister. Nach Tisch kriegt ich Briefe von Hause — von Zillbach, Hurtensburg und Manteuffeln. Ich bat den Herrn Kreisamtmann mir das Geld zu verschaffen — dann gieng ich nach Grüningen» (IV: 32 [8-II]) Bülow conserves «Sonntag nach Tische ging ich nach Grüningen» (S: 52).

These modifications are undoubtedly not very rigorous from a critical-philological point of view (a point of view that we could not demand from Bülow without incurring in an anachronism). It is also true that they are unfortunate, not only because they do not allow transparent access to the Novalis text, but also because in some cases they prevent its authentic state of mind from being properly reflected. However, it would be difficult and impertinent to argue that there is an unfair, opportunistic or even tendentious intention in them: none of them seems to be intended to favour a particular image of Novalis; none of them seems even capable of affecting to a sensitive degree the image that the reader might form of Hardenberg. Moreover, none of them seems to exceed the freedoms taken by the person responsible for a first edition that is not thought to be complete, much less critical. Different and more problematic is the case of other interventions on the original, which we will comment on below.

MAJOR INTERVENTIONS

With a much greater degree of «seriousness» and «impact» we find operations that directly affect the meaning of the text and/or the nature of the journal.

1. Different entries are brought together: this is one of the most striking operations in the editing of the diary, consisting of unifying some different entries as if they were texts written on a single day. This, in turn, leads to the addition or modification of some information to give coherence to the text.¹² The entries corresponding to 14 and 15 May, for example, are gathered into a single one, supposedly corresponding to 14 (cf. S: 57 / IV: 36 [8]), for which reason an expression like «beyde Tage» («the two days») must fall, and is replaced with a non-existent «heute» («today»); «Gestern Abend» («yesterday's evening») is replaced by «Abends» («in the evening»), etc. Moreover, when Bülow finds the diary entry too long, he divides it into separate entries without a clear criterion (cf. S: 66-69 / IV: 46-48).

I fail to see the purpose of these unifications. They are not too short entries nor is it easy to think of an effect that could be produced or avoided by the unification of these

¹² It also leads Bülow himself to make mistakes in counting the days and in some references. An example: the information that Hardenberg gives regarding the days of 8, 9 and 10 May appears condensed as if it were a single day, the 10th; at the beginning of the entry (S: 55) it appears «Heute früh übersetzte ich aus Horaz»; but in Hardenberg's text «ich übersezte aus Horaz» corresponds to what is said regarding «yesterday», that is, the 9th of May (cf. IV: 34 [20-21]).

particular days. It seems rather part of the movements made to offer a «compact» reproduction of the diary. However, the consequence is regrettable, because it intervenes on one of the most proper elements of a diary, which is the reproduction of moods whose curves extend between waking and going to sleep. The fact that Hardenberg himself condenses a few times the information corresponding to two or more days in a single entry should not be an excuse in any sense and, moreover, even Hardenberg, when he does so, is careful to distinguish what corresponds to one day from what corresponds to another. This intervention by Bülow directly affects the very meaning of the diary format.

2. Additions are introduced to the text: there are two additions that go far beyond the replacement of some term that is indispensable for understanding or the introduction of some organizing element of the syntax.

One of these rather large additions is found near the end of the newspaper. Bülow writes (S: 66): «I have decided, from now on, in order to get rid of my bad body condition, to make frequent physical efforts». Hardenberg's text, on the other hand, was «I decided, from now on, to make frequent physical efforts and to prevent myself against laziness» (IV: 46). In the *Journal*, the phrase comes after what seems to be an ejaculation in sleep: «I woke up suddenly after a release of my fantastic desire. *Vis et robur*. I decided [...]». The real cause of Hardenberg's desire to exercise does not seem so much to be a bad body condition but rather the will to discharge energies in this way.

Another very striking addition is found in the annotation corresponding to 7 May (S: 55), in which a non-existent phrase appears as a closure (cf. IV: 34 [17]): «Why do I have to do everything in a painful way and not quietly, calmly, relaxed» («Warum muß ich nur alles peinlich treiben, nichts ruhig, mit Muße, gelassen»). The context of the entry makes the appropriateness of the added phrase as high as the level of the arbitrariness of Bülow's operation.¹³ Otherwise, as we will see later, the insertion of this phrase in this precise context does not seem unintentional. We will return to the point once we have reviewed which elements were removed and which were highlighted.

3. Subtractions are made: if we leave aside the subtraction of some adverb or modifier and other interventions that exclusively affect the style and not the content and we analyse the subtractions of information as a whole, we can see two very marked and important trends repeated:

3.1. The strong reduction of references to excessive or «sinful» attitudes, so to speak. The mentions of erotic desires are kept to a minimum and in general also all the allusions to the physical, to the world of the body.

3.2. The minimization of references to positive states of mind. With particular insistence, almost all the phrases that indicate a moment of happiness, tranquillity and satisfaction are removed.

In the following we will deal with both in detail. Then we will also consider a possible third, much more complex case: the reduction of references to the *Entschluß*.

THE SUBTRACTIONS

It should be made clear from the beginning that in all cases these are *trends* and not complete deletions (none of the elements that tend to be subtracted is completely

¹³ I fail to identify the source of this sentence. It appears for the first time in Bülow's edition (p. 55) and is already absent in the Heilborn edition of 1801 (p. 272). In Minor's review of this edition (1802) he seems to suggest that it should be added (p. 88) but five years later, in the same Minor's edition of the complete works of Novalis (1907), it does not appear (p. 80). The *HKA* editors do not record it. Kamnitzer (1929) incorporates it as fragment number 34 in a section on «moral life» («*Moralisches Leben*»).

absent). These are, however, very noticeable trends. The existence of a *willingness* to set this information aside becomes most evident when the phrase that addresses these points, however brief, is *punctually* subtracted from a complete entry. Let us look at the matter in more detail.

1. *Against expressions of sexual excitement*

Hardenberg very often refers to feelings of excitement. It is a constant in the newspaper, and even more: it is one of the central elements, one of the points to which Hardenberg pays more attention. Over and over again, he refers with trepidation to these feelings, over which he tries to gain control. Again and again, too, this information was subtracted from the diary. Mentions of sensual or erotic desires (Hardenberg feels «*sinnlich*» or «*lüstern*») are directly and specifically combated by Bülow, as in the April 21 entry: «*Früh sinnliche Fantasieen*» («early, sensual fantasies») is transformed into «*Früh Phantasien*» («early, fantasies»). Only two comments fall from the long entry of 25 May: the reference to a walk and the beautiful weather and the sentence, highlighted by Hardenberg, «I gave myself completely to lust» (IV: 40 [23-24]: «*überließ mich gänzlich der Lüsternheit*»).

This trend is repeated throughout the newspaper. There are a few cases, however, where it is not confirmed. «*Sinnlich*» is preserved on one occasion (S: 55 = IV: 34 [12]), where Hardenberg sees himself as «a bit voluptuous» («*etwas sinnlich*»), and «*lüstern*» on two occasions (S: 51 = IV: 30 [21]; S: 55 = IV: 35 [30]): in the first one, very soft, Hardenberg points out that «Although my fantasy at times was a little lascivious, today I was quite good» («*Meine Fantasie war zwar zu weilen ein wenig lüstern — doch war ich heute ziemlich gut*»); the second is in the context of the «*Graberlebnis*» in a completely isolated phrase «—*sehr lüstern*—» in which it is not even clear that «*lüstern*» has an erotic undertone (especially if we bear in mind that almost all the remaining appearances of «*lüstern*», much less dubious, are absent).

In short, the few times the reference to a state of arousal has been retained are «harmless», easy to incorporate. By subtracting the remaining mentions, however, it is possible to avoid giving an image of Novalis surrendered to «basic instincts», an image that would have affected his figure in a way that his editors preferred to avoid. But it was not only a matter of not showing Hardenberg devoted to erotic impulses, but also of generally minimizing as much as possible any mention of elementary physical desires such as sleep or hunger. Statements such as «I was very sleepy» (IV: 38 [3]: «*Ich fand mich sehr schläfrig*») or «I ate a lot at night» (IV: 33 [18]: «*Abends viel gegessen*») or some more indecorous physical notes such as «Today, early, some colic» (IV: 38 [2]: «*Heute früh etwas Kolick*»), etc., often disappeared.

2. *Against manifestations of emotional well-being*

A subtraction that is as clear and marked as that of the allusions to states of erotic excitement (but which, however, is much more difficult to justify) is that of the repeated mentions of happy or pleasant moods. Bülow's discarding of the whole vocabulary of well-being is so obvious that it leaves no room for doubt regarding the desire to prevent the fact that Hardenberg's mourning was accompanied by repeated moments of joy from being conveyed in the edition of the diary.

Sentences in which he claims to have felt «*zufrieden*» («happy», «satisfied»), «*vergnügt*» («cheerful», «entertained»), «*gut*» («good», referring to mood), «*wohl*» («at ease», «good»)

or «*glücklich*» («happy») are almost completely eradicated from the *Journal*. The exceptions are very few. In many cases, the subtraction is done in a *targeted* manner: the sentence alone is removed from an undisturbed context, which gives a strong argument for assuming that the aim is *specifically* to avoid the expression of well-being.

At the beginning of the diary is very noticeable the fall of «*zufrieden*», a term with which Hardenberg often refers to the gratification that the state of mind or the feelings he had throughout the day brought him: in particular, he notes the satisfaction he feels for having felt serene and in communion with the memory of Sophie, without frights, with control over himself. In the process of Hardenberg's mourning recorded in the *Journal*, this is a key element: the *Journal* insists, more than anything else, on the analysis of his own behaviour, of his degree of self-control, of his capacity (or not) to sustain states of serenity, etc. Subtracting Hardenberg's comments in which he expresses himself as being happy with himself, Bülow removed a whole side of this self-analysis. Let's see some examples of the first subtractions, all corresponding to very close days.

Hardenberg's entry for April 23rd closed as follows: «In the evening, I leafed through Young's *Nocturnal Thoughts* — I thought a lot about the *Meister* — otherwise in the usual social mood. Generally speaking, I feel much more satisfied with myself than I did yesterday» (IV: 30 [16-18]). In Bülow's edition, everything that follows the thoughts about the *Meister* disappears. Novalis thus goes to sleep thinking about literature, accompanied by the masterpiece of his compatriot and the gloomy thoughts about the death of the English «graveyard poet».

The April 25 entry ended with: «In the evening, an intense feeling of her death. In general terms, I can be quite satisfied today. My head was clear and I felt mostly firm and virile» (IV: 31 [5-7]). In the 1846 edition, he closes with «In the evening, an intense feeling of her death» and the rest falls, producing, of course, a very different effect on the reading: the mood that we will reconstruct from a text that ends by speaking of an intense feeling of death will no doubt be very different from that which we will reconstruct from a text that then alludes to a state of mental clarity and satisfaction.

From the beginning of the notation of the next day, everything is preserved except «In general terms I can be satisfied» (IV: 31 [10]) without it being easy to explain why. And so Hardenberg's references to a state of self-satisfaction fall again and again.

The subtraction in the entry of May 5th also leads to a deviant reading. Hardenberg's text said: «In the evening, in general, *I thought about her very intimately*. Today I have reason to be satisfied with everything. God has guided me *lovingly* up to now — he will certainly continue to do so in the future» (IV: 33 [22-24]). Bülow subtracted «Today I have reason to be satisfied with everything» and with this not only was an essential element of the entry lost, but the subtraction in turn resulted in an obstacle to the general understanding of the process that Hardenberg records in the diary. Here, as on other occasions, Hardenberg is satisfied with his thoughts about Sophie because he is happy to have her present and because his memory of her is vivid, intense but calm, and this is a constant need until the end of the diary: Hardenberg does not tolerate that the image of Sophie loses strength, that her memory dissipates or becomes more infrequent. By subtracting here the phrase about the mood being satisfied by the intimate memory of Sophie, the entry becomes *ipso facto* something quite different, an expression of need for support that (we would assume) derives from the inability to feel rest or (much less) satisfaction: «In the evening, in general, I thought about her very intimately. God has guided me lovingly up to now — he will certainly continue to do so in the future».

In the following day's entry, 6 May, which Bülow completely removed, there is yet another sentence that insists on the well-being of the day before: «I did not go to bed

as cheerfully today as I did last night». The fact that this complete note falls should not surprise us if we see that, in addition to the reference to the joy of the previous day, there was also talk of having been «in a very clear and free spirit» and it was stated that «I can be satisfied with my fidelity, with my memory [of Sophie]» (IV: 33 [28-30]).

We have only one appearance of «*zufrieden*» at the end of the diary, when the mourning is almost complete. Judging by the results transmitted by Bülow, we should conclude, in complete opposition to the textual evidence, that Hardenberg did not know the satisfaction until 103 days after Sophie's death (IV: 48 [22]).

Positive moods in general are combated with the same decision. The whole end of April contains phrases of the type of «today I felt good» (or «very good») that fall, together with their contexts or just them, *in all occasions*: the 27th of April (IV: 31 [22]: «Otherwise I was really good today,» taken in isolation), the 28th (IV: 31 [28]: «[I was] good and manly»), the 29th (IV: 32 [5]: «Otherwise I was really good,» taken in isolation), and the 30th (IV: 32 [8]: «On Sunday I was really good»).

One case in which the subtraction results in a tendentious reading is that of the entry for the 8th, 9th and 10th of May, quite reduced by Bülow. At the beginning it falls, together with several notes, «I felt really good» (IV: 34 [23]); shortly afterwards Bülow subtracts an almost identical sentence, but this time in an isolated manner, so that the meaning of the text becomes completely different. Bülow's text is «The weather was excellent, [I had] a vivid memory of her, I gathered some flowers and went to her grave. Although I was cold, I still cried» (S: 55). The full text, on the other hand, was as follows: «The weather was excellent — [I had] a vivid memory of her — then I worked a little — I went for a walk — I gathered some flowers and went to her grave. I felt very good — even though I was cold — I still cried.» In other words, Hardenberg thought about Sophie for a moment, then went about his daily business, went for a walk and at one point picked some flowers and went to the grave, where he felt very good, as he had done earlier. In the text as conveyed by Bülow the memory of Sophie is followed by an immediate journey to the grave where Hardenberg mourned his dead beloved. He was never well, neither in the morning nor by the grave.

The entry for the next day is missing completely. In it we found once again gathered a visit to Sophie's grave and a state of happiness, in this case very marked: «I gathered some flowers — I put them on the grave — I was intimate with her — during this half hour I was very happy, very calm, very animated by her memory» (IV: 35 [7-9]). The entrance for the next day also disappears, bringing with it another expression of well-being (IV: 35 [17] «The weather was excellent and my head was in a very good mood»).

And then there is the *Journal's* best-known entry, which contains what is pompously known as «*Graberlebnis*» (the «grave experience»). A decisive importance was assigned to this event, so much so that the complete meaning of the *Hymns to the Night* was derived from what happened that evening, based on some evident textual coincidences between the third hymn and the entry of May 13, 1797. Today, there is quite a consensus among specialists in rejecting such a simplistic and deterministic reading of Hardenberg's work. A reading, however, that Bülow favored with his usual interventions here as well.

I transcribe first the whole entry:

I got up early, at 5. The morning passed without me doing much. Captain Rockentien came with his sister-in-law and children. I received a letter from Schlegel with the first part of the new translations of Shakespeare. After lunch I went for a walk — then coffee — the weather got worse — first a storm, then cloudy and stormy — very voluptuous — I began to read Shakespeare — I gave myself completely to reading. In the evening, I went to Sophie. There I was indescribably

happy — flashing moments of enthusiasm — I blew the tomb before me like dust — Centuries were like moments — one could feel her nearness — I constantly believed that she was about to appear — Once I returned home — I had some excitement in conversation with *ma chère*.¹⁴ Otherwise, I was very cheerful all day. In the afternoon came Niebekker. In the evening, I still had some good ideas. Shakespeare gave me a lot to think about (IV: 35-36).

From the whole long entry Bülow only subtracted two very short sections. First, «After lunch I went for a walk — then coffee», which interrupts the contact between the arrival of Shakespeare's works and the birth of the storm that accompanies the reading of Shakespeare that in turn precedes the going to the grave. The other sentence that has been subtracted, as it could not be any other way, is «Otherwise, I was very cheerful all day». In accordance with the general tendency of Bülow's edition of the diary to subtract the manifestations of joy, this phrase could not but disappear. Especially since it is a manifestation of pleasant rejoicing in the context of a visit to the beloved's grave...

The «explanatory» power of the mythologized *Graberlebnis* is so high and compelling in itself that we cannot think that if the entry had been kept intact we would have been spared more than a century of simplifications on Novalis.¹⁵ However, if we consider the overabundant amount of deletions of information about any form of welfare in Hardenberg, we can at least think that the reception of his work would have enjoyed more justice if Bülow had opted for a less tendentious approach. Tendentious in a strong sense: what other reason could there be for separating a sentence like «Otherwise, I was very cheerful all day» from a personal diary if not to *orient* the image of the diary's author in a desired direction, *which does not coincide with that which the diary's author himself shows*? The choice was made to transmit to posterity a torn Novalis of unrelenting sadness. This Novalis has passed into history and has been reproduced —with corrections that as a rule do not go beyond the realm of academic research— until today.¹⁶

THE TREATMENT OF THE «DETERMINATION»

As far as the *Entschluß* is concerned, the matter is much more complicated, and it seems inappropriate to draw any firm conclusions. Viator points out, as we have seen,

¹⁴ This is Jeannette Louise Danscour, the French governess who worked since 1787 in the house of Rockenthien (Sophie's stepfather) in Grüningen.

¹⁵ The tendency to quote this entry of 13 May in a partial manner continues to this day, even though we have had the full text for more than a century. It reproduces what coincides with the reading that we want to encourage: in general, the passage on the «*Graberlebnis*», to show its link with the third hymn and, consequently, the interdependence between the life and work of Novalis. Or in other cases other points. Friedrich Hiebel, for example, wants to demonstrate the relevance of Shakespeare's readings to Hardenberg's thoughts in this context, and he reproduces the entry as follows (with suspension points where the text is crossed out here): «Früh um 5 Uhr stand ich auf. Es war sehr schön Wetter. Der Morgen verging; ohne, daß ich viel that. Der Hauptmann Rockenthien und seine Schwägerin und Kinder kamen. Ich kriegte einen Brief von Schlegel mit dem 1sten Theil der neuen Shakespeareschen Übersetzungen. Nach Tisch gieng ich spazieren — dann Kaffee — das Wetter trübte sich — erst Gewitter dann wolbig und stürmisch — sehr lüßern — ich fieng an in Shakespeare zu lesen — ich las mich recht hinein. Abends gieng ich zu Sophie. Dort war ich unbeschreiblich freudig — aufblitzende Enthusiasmus Momente — Das Grab blies ich wie Staub, vor mir hin — Jahrhunderte waren wie Momente — ihre Nähe war fühlbar — ich glaubte sie solle immer vortreten — Wie ich nach Hause kam — hatte ich einige Rührungen im Gespräch mit Machere. Sonst war ich den ganzen Tag sehr vergnügt. Niebekker war Nachmittags da. Abends hatte ich noch einige gute Ideen. Shakespeare gab mir viel zu denken.» (1951: 52). It is clear that the link between Shakespeare and the *Graberlebnis* is much stronger if it is presented in this way than if the entire entry is observed.

¹⁶ We find more subtractions of «positive» passages (or subtractions that include «positive» passages) in IV: 40 [11-15], IV: 41 [26-30], IV: 44 [2-5], IV: 44 [16], IV: 45 [11-13]. Some isolated passages escaped Bülow's cutting, but they are very rare (cf. IV: 31 [2], IV: 39 [32] and IV: 44 [1-2]).

that «many demonstrations» about the «determination» to follow Sophie in death were subtracted. This is correct as it is said: a majority of the «*Entschluß*» appearances in the newspaper are absent from the Bülow edition. It could be assumed, from there, that he consciously set out to make any reference to this determination of Hardenberg disappear. This would in principle be striking, since in general terms the editors' intentions were to *emphasize* as much as possible the tearful aspects of the Novalis-Sophie bond and to hyper-romanticize Hardenberg's mourning. And yet it is true that the «determination» falls victim to Bülow's cutback on such a number of occasions that it arouses suspicion.

However, the analysis of the individual cases in which the mention of the «determination» was subtracted (and the analysis of the cases in which it was not subtracted) does not allow us to see a trend as clear as we would like. Most probably, Bülow has chosen to subtract this recurrent motif from the *Journal*, perhaps to avoid it being misinterpreted as a suicidal desire or in another undesirable sense: as we shall see, there is a certain tendency (although not a constant one) to omit mentions of the *Entschluß* that are in close proximity to Sophie's grave or that more or less clearly allude to the death of Hardenberg himself. In any case, the matter is not clear. Let us look at the concrete evidence of the various trends that can be noticed.

First, let's look at the strongest arguments in favor of the idea that there was a real aim to move the «determination» away from the diary:

1. Most of the mentions of the *Entschluß* fall: out of a total of nineteen appearances in the manuscript, eleven disappeared in the 1846 edition. Enough to notice a trend; insufficient to infer that Bülow wanted to eradicate this «determination» from the diary.

2. Mentions of the *Entschluß* fall in an isolated manner: on two occasions we find that the phrase referring to the «determination» is *specifically* subtracted from a larger context that remains, in general terms, unchanged. This constitutes a fairly strong argument in the direction of proving that there was an attempt to combat the presence of the *Entschluß* itself (i.e., that references to it do not fall only as part of larger sets that are dispensed with: the «determination» is attacked in a targeted manner). It is not minor, on the other hand, that this occurs on only two occasions, there being nineteen occurrences of «*Entschluß*».

Secondly, some arguments are against this, the first of which are the reverse of those just mentioned:

1. That eleven out of nineteen occurrences have fallen means that eight were preserved. No less than eight, in a text that in Bülow's edition has barely twenty-one pages.

2. That only two of the subtractions specifically point to the *Entschluß* suggests that at least a percentage of the remaining disappearances may have been due to another purpose (and that the fall of the *Entschluß* may have been no more than a side effect of a different purpose).

- 2.1. There are cases, for instance, where the subtraction of the section in which — among other things — there was a mention of the «determination» seems to obey stylistic criteria.

- 2.2. There are cases in which it appears to be merely a matter of cutting out secondary information: a whole sector that is considered to be dispensable is removed from the entry and with it falls a passing mention of the «determination».

- 2.3. Finally, there are cases in which the removal of an entire section seems to be linked to a desire to remove *other* information (e.g. a reference to the «*Lüsternheit*» which, as we have seen, is combated systematically).

Let's look at the detail of these points, which sometimes intersect. The cases in which the elimination of the «determination» is part of a major subtraction are the following

nine: (1) IV: 30 [24-26]; (2) IV: 32 [29-31]; (3) IV: 34 [31-33]; (4) IV: 36 [20-25]; (5) IV: 37 [8-10]; (6) IV: 37 [16-18]; (7) IV: 37 [25-26]; (8) IV: 44 [2-5] and (9) IV: 44-45 [25-17].

Of these nine cases, several are easily explained by what has just been mentioned, that is, as a search for aesthetic order, as an intention to produce a certain effect on the reading, or also as a general intention to save space or to avoid other unwanted references. Let's see a little bit the context of all of them:

1. In the entry for April 24 (IV: 30), it could be that what was intended to be avoided was not so much the mention of the *Entschluß* as, rather, the reference to the immoderation of having talked too much (let us remember that the version of the diary of 1846 insistently avoids showing Hardenberg incontinent in any sense). On the other hand, the subtraction of the entire section of which the mention of the *Entschluß* is a part ends up giving the entry a much greater unity: dispensing with the prayers set aside by Bülow we read «My love for Sophie was shown to me in a new light. Sophie will get better and better», while in the full text these two sentences about Sophie were interrupted by the following ones: «In the evening I spoke again really a lot — even though in the middle of it I thought, on one occasion, about my intentions in this respect. The determination remained very courageously firm».

2. One of the various subtractions in the entry that recovers the information of the days between April 30 and May 4 (IV: 32-33) concerns, firstly, the mention of an intense thought about Sophie and then a «sombre», «sad» or «gloomy» («*düster*») consideration about the «determination»; and then, a couple of everyday things (a time spent reading the *Meister*; a letter taken to the post). Bülow may have chosen to dispense with these notes (as he dispenses with several others to shorten this long entry) because of their reference to overloaded thoughts about Sophie or because of lack of interest in their content. Or, perhaps, because of the disturbing nuance added by the reference to the *Entschluß* seen as something sad and gloomy (we will return to this interpretation later).

3. The entry for 8, 9 and 10 May (IV: 34) is largely intervened by Bülow. There are abundant subtractions and rearrangements of syntax, with the consequent modifications to articulate the *collage* resulting from these operations. Bülow conserves a good percentage of the information contained in the entry, although he avoids consigning secondary or undesired information (for example, that Hardenberg claims to have felt very well), and he faithfully transmits, above all, what concerns Hardenberg's visit of Sophie's grave. The entry, as preserved by Bülow, closes with the sentence «After lunch I was again very moved and cried intensely on the square». The text followed about three more lines: a couple of inconsequential phrases («I talked to *ma chère*. In the evening with the captain about this and that») and finally one of the typical hesitations about the «determination» («Early on the determination was very distant — in the evening, closer»). Bülow could have dispensed with these lines just to keep the power of the closure with Novalis in tears.

4. In the entry for 14 and 15 May (IV: 36) something similar happens. It is a very mutilated entry in the 1846 edition, in which fall several unwanted statements (references to excitement and well-being), ordinary things of secondary importance and some more significant issues. Bülow decided to leave as a closure a moving image in which Hardenberg and Mandelsloh sing together, softly, the popular religious song, of funeral content, «How beautifully they rest...». Again, a few more comments should have followed, one of which was about the «determination»: Hardenberg points out that his parents and «the method» (for implementing his determination) still concern him. Bülow opts for a very emotionally satisfying closure and decides to avoid these last sentences, including an obvious reference by Hardenberg to his own disappearance (we will return to this).

5. The entry of 16 May (iv: 36-37) is cut, especially at the beginning and end. At the beginning, information about the departure of some people to another place is given and the entry in the Bülow edition begins «Today was beautiful». At the end it says, «The day was beautiful — the night was not for my head — but the determination was given new life — new strength. We know that Bülow avoided the repetitions in the newspaper and that could have led to the subtraction of «The day was very beautiful»; perhaps dragged by that subtraction the rest of the closing of the entry also fell, chained with that phrase. This is, however, an unclear case.

6 y 7. The entry for 17 and 18 May (iv: 37) contained two mentions of the *Entschluß* (one in the description of 17; the other in the description of 18): Bülow's subtractions in this entry affect both. The second one is very striking. Bülow only subtracts «By the grave I was not moved — the determination was vivid». If it were not for the immediacy of the reference to Sophie's grave (which also occurs in the first case), one would not see any «need» or usefulness in leaving out such a brief phrase (we will return to this point).

8. This entry for 3 to 5 June is heavily mutilated and simplified. Among the many questions that fall, there is a brief reference to the *Entschluß* in a long closure ignored by Bülow altogether.

9. In the long subtraction concerning 8, 9 and 10 June, in which the «determination» only falls as part of a much larger whole (quite a lot of information of little relevance is lost, but also others of considerable importance), there are statements that must have been avoided with more interest than those concerning the «determination», such as, for example, that «the sensual fantasy of the morning led to an explosion in the afternoon» (iv: 45 [3-4]). The section in which the mention of the *Entschluß* was found is, generally speaking, the most irrelevant. Bülow could have dispensed with it for several reasons independent of any particular purpose of punctually setting the *Entschluß* aside.

In general terms, then, almost all these subtractions from major passages that include mentions of the «determination» are explained in a satisfactory manner without any need to assume an intention to remove the *Entschluß* as such from the text. There are some dubious cases which we will deal with later. The argument in this direction, however, has a greater obstacle than that of these dubious cases, which is the existence of two occasions on which the reference to the «determination» is specifically subtracted. We will deal with them below.

These cases do not, of course, tolerate an «external» explanation, so that an argument that would like to claim that there was no deliberate intention against the *Entschluß* on Bülow's part should be able to account for them in some other way. They are as follows:

1. In the entry of 21 May, the sentence «There was much deliberation about the determination» (iv: 39 [5]: «*Der Entschluß ward sehr beraisonnirt*») falls.
2. In the entry of 29 and 30 May, the sentence «The determination was firm» (iv: 42 [14-15]: «*Der Entschluß stand fest*») falls.

As far as I can see, the only elements present in these entries linked to these phrases that seem relevant when trying to explain convincingly the decision to set them aside, as already anticipated, are: a repeated mention of Sophie's grave, a predominance of a gloomy tone and the possibility that the *Entschluß* was interpreted, as it would be in some cases indeed, in a suicidal key. Let us look at the contexts. The most obvious case is the later one, that of the May 30th notation, which ended as follows:

In the afternoon, everything went a little better than when it was time to write and think — the desire was gone, too. In the evening, by the time I went to my beloved grave — the thought had become distressing. This, too, distracted me and

prevented me from having a quiet and sad enjoyment of his death. The determination remained strong — Von Ende spoke to me today about the complexity of researching whether one can die from plant poisons. The day was not unproductive but lacking in feeling (IV: 42 [11-17]).

In other words, in the context of a visit to Sophie's grave, Hardenberg's mood becomes sombre, the calm he had experienced earlier is gone and replaced by a state of restlessness and bitterness. Disturbed, he remains resolute. And after writing this down, the conversation he had that very day about the possibility of dying of plant poisoning is recorded. The interpretations that a reader might make of the «determination» from passages like this could indeed point in the direction of a desperate and even suicidal Hardenberg.

Let us also clarify those phrases almost identical to this one «the determination remained firm» are indeed retained on some other occasions by Bülow. For example, in the longest entry in the diary, where, after two weeks without making any notes, what happened between 16 and 29 June is taken up again. Close to the conclusion, already in the description of what corresponds to 29 June, he notes the following:

My head was very clear tonight. I feel that in general I have made some progress. My memory, my observation skills and my expression also improve. But *my calm* must still be greatly enhanced. There are still endless gaps. My determination remains completely unaltered. Since the trip to the Rosstrapp I am again quite cheerful — but it must continue to get better — *calm* and quiet are the main thing (IV: 48 [17-23]).

This sentence is in a context that deserves to be described. As we approach to the end of the diary, we can see how the mourning process is already coming to an end. Hardenberg uses a new notebook starting from this entry, to which he adds a new heading («*Tagebuch*» instead of «*Journal*»). In this entry, he omits information about the number of days that have passed since Sophie's death. All symptoms presage the end of the mourning and of the *Journal* (shortly after Hardenberg abandons the diary notes for a period of almost three years). Throughout this final section the mood is much brighter and more optimistic. Hardenberg is more active and less distressed. The emergence of the «determination» in this context as something that remained completely firm rules out any self-destructive reading and poses instead a more positive understanding of the meaning of the *Entschluß*.

If we analyze the context of the only other opportunity where a phrase about the «determination» is removed individually, we come across one of the various subtractions of the *Entschluß* in the vicinity of a visit to Sophie's grave. From the corresponding entry of 21 May, Bülow removes almost nothing: a sentence about the *Lüsterheit* (IV: 38 [30-31]), a passing reference to an acquaintance who gave them a good time (IV: 39 [6]) and very shortly before that the sentence about the «determination»: «There was much deliberation about determination» (IV: 39 [5]). Let's see the context, the complete closure:

I was internally active — I walked for a long time in the corridor in front of my door back and forth — I made notes — Mamsell arrived — I talked at length with her about me. Later I went to the grave — where I reflected a lot and experienced an indescribable peace. There was much deliberation about the determination. In

the evening, we were very cheerful — Günther amused us — then I went for a walk alone and sang, completely lost in the memory of Sophie (IV: 39 [I-8]).

On another occasion there was a reference to the fact that he had been deliberating «rationally» («*beraisonnirt*») on the *Entschluß* (IV: 44 [28-29]) but no trend can be established from there, since in the entry of 23 May (IV: 40 [4]) Bülow did keep «I must not babble [*raisonnieren*] any more about determination» and in the previous day's entry «I must only avoid starting to give myself airs of a reasoner [*vernünfteln*] about my determination» (IV: 39 [25]). In other words, there is no confirmation of any intention to set aside (for whatever reason) the phrases that deal with the subject, more or less present in the diary, about a tendency in Hardenberg to show himself as an expert, an overachiever, a pedant or a charlatan with regard to the «determination». On the other hand, the only one of these reflections that is directly removed from a more or less intact environment is precisely the one that appears immediately after a visit to the grave.

This same connection between the exclusion of certain phrases about the *Entschluß* and Sophie's tomb is repeated in two of the most difficult cases to explain among those we considered at the beginning of this overview: the subtractions (numbered 6 and 7) at the entrance for the 17th and 18th of May (IV: 37). The first subtraction occurs in this context: «Noon was wonderfully beautiful. Under the linden trees we ate, listening to music and the song of nightingales. I was very entertained until the evening. The determination was thought about with joy — about Sophie very often. In the grave quite fervently. I began to babble [*raisonnieren*] a little more than desirable». The second occurs in the following passage:

At nightfall I had, during the walk and before, in the living room, some good ideas. By the grave I was not moved — the determination was vivid. I must live more and more out of consideration for her — only for her I am — not for me or anyone else. She is the highest — the only one. *If only I could be worthy of her at all times* — my main task should be — to put everything in connection with the idea of her.

From this last quotation Bülow subtracts the visit to the tomb and the mention of the «determination». Once again, the justification could point in the direction of avoiding a link of suicidal sonorities.

The phrases (2) and (4) also avoid passages in which the mention of the *Entschluß* is in close proximity to dark feelings (in the first case, the «determination» was spoken of as «*düster*») or which could be interpreted in a suicidal way: «At night everyone went to bed early and I still talked to Mandelsloh alone about Sophie and myself. There was a lot of talk about the determination these days. My mother, my father and the method still worry me. Sophie was often thought of; but there is still no lack of foolish ideas» (IV: 36 [20-25]).

The mention, in this context, of Hardenberg's concern about his parents and the «method» is very suggestive. The reference to «foolish», «imprudent», «reckless» («*leichtsin-nig*») ideas also arouses suspicions in its connection with a «determination».¹⁷ Everything points to a desire to «follow in death» (*nachzusterben*) Sophie and it could well be that in the 1846 edition an attempt was made to remove some weight from the references to the *Entschluß* that would imply that the way to put into practice this decision to «follow

¹⁷ For Hiebel, for example, «The “determination” and the “foolish ideas” undoubtedly refer to his suicidal thoughts» (1951: 53).

in death» Sophie was to actively attempt against his own life. Let us also say that none of the *Entschluß* mentions that Bülow does keep are present in the grave, and these are generally more cheerful, less obscure contexts than those that the editor puts aside. Let us look at this in a little more detail.

The first apparitions of the *Entschluß* in the newspaper, among those preserved in the 1846 edition, are passing apparitions and in entries that show Hardenberg serene and in good spirits. In the first one (April 19), he expresses some hesitation about his determination: «Early on, [I thought] in various ways about the determination — I hesitated and doubted» (S: 49 / IV: 29 [17]). In the second (April 23), very serene, it is mentioned in passing: «I often thought of Sophie and of the determination» (S: 50 / IV: 30 [14-15]).

The next appearance occurs at the entrance of May 7 and in a context that has more interest. Hardenberg mentions that he detected within himself a striking fear of falling mortally ill; then it is noted that he felt that «she» (Sophie) seemed to «be there»; then «I must not yet be able to get completely used to my determination. Although it seems to be firm, from time to time I am suspicious of the fact that it is so far away from me, that it appears *so alien* to me» (S: 55 / IV: 34 [14-17]). That is to say, again hesitations that worry Hardenberg; he worries that the path to fulfill his determination ends up being too long. In any case, it is discarded that it is a suicidal desire, but it is also inferred that the discomfort that generates to Hardenberg having felt fear before the perspective of falling mortally ill supposes that he thinks about death as something to which he *should want to aim*. Surprisingly, in the 1846 text, the phrase already mentioned appears below, which softens this reading: «Why do I have to do everything in a painful way and not quietly, calmly, relaxed» The introduction of this phrase reinforces the idea that the implementation of determination is laborious but necessary, but it suggests a determination more «of life» than «of death».

Afterwards there are two mentions in consecutive entries, in which Hardenberg asks himself not to appear too sure about the «determination» (S: 59 / IV: 39 [25] and S: 60 / IV: 40 [4]). Hardenberg is often concerned (not only in these two entries) about the possibility, already mentioned, of beginning to «vernünfteln», «raisonnieren» or «beraisonnieren» on the *Entschluß*. These are mentions that do not, in the end, speak of the nature of the «determination» but of the way in which Novalis wishes to express itself in relation to it.

In addition, there is an occurrence in which it is stated that the «determination» was revalidated and sworn again on 31 May (S: 62 / IV: 42 [28-29]), something in line with what is expressed in one of the last entries of the diary (S: 68 / IV: 48 [20-21]): «My determination remains completely unchanged», in which the tone, as already noted, is positive and optimistic.

To these apparitions one can perhaps also add that of June 6 (S: 64 / IV: 44 [13]) about the desire to preserve, among other things, «virile determination», but it is not clear that it refers to the same *Entschluß* that is generally spoken of in the diary.

There are so many occurrences, and the nature of the «*Entschluß*» itself is so debatable, that it is difficult to draw conclusions. The question that arises is obvious: if in Bülow's (or Tieck's) opinion the «determination» was something that should be removed from the image of Novalis that it was intended to favour, it is not understood, in principle, why so many mentions remain (as we saw, out of 19 total appearances Bülow maintained no less than eight, and of several of those that fell it can be thought that they are absent because of mere selection procedures proper to any anthology); if it was interpreted as something of little importance, however, it is not explained that on more than one occasion references to it have been *specifically* subtracted. The only way out would be to find a trend that would indicate that it is mentions *of some particular kind* that were avoided.

Here we are trying to point out a tendency to push aside mentions that suggest or could suggest a suicidal desire.

It cannot be thought, though, that Bülow tried to make Hardenberg's manifestations that exhibit a desire to die disappear in general, since he retains more than one evident testimony, including the mention, at the beginning of the *Journal* (IV: 29), of the «*Zielgedanke*», the guiding idea that we commonly identify with the *Entschluß*, and several other manifestations of pain, of strangeness before the world and life, the desire to die in a certain way, and the conviction that he will not be missed too much by his relatives when he is no longer there.

However, Bülow might want to rule out the proximity, which occurs on several occasions, between the *Entschluß* and voluntary death. The concept is confusing enough to make it «relevant» (always according to editorial criteria that are not those of the present day, of course) to avoid readings that point in the wrong or undesired direction. The constant references to a «determination» that is often linked to obscure feelings and mortuary contexts could imply a desire by Hardenberg to take his own life that publishers could have preferred to avoid for various reasons.

In the volume that appeared in 1846, Hardenberg's biography, written four decades earlier and published in 1805 by Just, reappeared. In it, it is said (cf. IV: 543) that in the context of his mourning, Hardenberg became convinced that he would be reunited with his recently deceased loved ones within a year. In his remembered essay of 1865, Dilthey (who by then only knew the 1846 edition of the newspaper) connects this idea with that of the «determination», which he reads as a project of Hardenberg to take himself to death (in the term of a year) in a «natural» way, «by the force of the desire to be reunited with her» (2005: 82). This reading seems to have been the most successful, although some attempts to see in the *Entschluß* something closer to a suicidal desire¹⁸ justified the appearance already in 1961 of a chapter in which Hans Wolfgang Kuhn (1961: 51-61) analyses Hardenberg's words (mainly the letters, but also the diary and other notes) to try to add arguments against such a suicidal hypothesis.¹⁹ According to Kuhn, what Hardenberg wanted was to keep his conviction in a future reunion, in the existence of a life after death and, therefore, in the possibility of not having completely lost his beloved. In 1975 Richard Samuel insists on this reading in his introduction to volume IV of the *HKA* (IV: 42*). Until much later it was insisted (Donehower in Novalis, 2007: 32-33) that, although certain suicidal thoughts were present in the mind of Hardenberg, the objective pursued throughout the period of writing the newspaper is not so much his own death but rather to accede to a lasting *Besonnenheit*: «calmness», «serenity».²⁰ It remains clear, with all the evidence in sight, that the desire to die in some way linked to Sophie is present and is

¹⁸ Hiebel (1951: 51-54) speaks expressly of suicidal thoughts, as already noted. There also seems to be something of this in the presentation of Kluckhohn himself as an introduction to the *HKA*: cf. I: 15. A much quoted letter from F. Schlegel to Schleiermacher also supports this theory (IV: 620: «That Hardenberg kills himself I do not believe it only because he firmly desires it»), although it is worth noting that the letter is a year after the time of the diary (it is from mid-July 1798).

¹⁹ Kuhn (1961: 53) begins his exposition by saying that «First, a common misunderstanding must be cleared up. The guiding idea [*Der Zielgedanke*] that appears again and again in the diary after Sophie's death has been interpreted as implying that Novalis had the desire to voluntarily withdraw from life and that he wanted to commit suicide». It should be noted that «*Zielgedanke*» only appears once, at the beginning of the diary (IV: 29 [7]). We assume, however, that the *Entschluß* refers to the same purpose.

²⁰ Donehower also draws attention (p. 144) to the pietistic background of several recurring terms in the *Journal* and refers to August Langen's *Der Wortschatz des deutschen Pietismus* (1968). Here (p. 192) the possibility is raised that the «decision» to «die afterwards» is a secularization of the «*Nachsterben*» already found in Zinzendorf referring to a desire to follow «the lamb» in death. Several mystical and pious legacies of Romanticism in general and of Novalis in particular are detailed on pp. 471-476.

manifest in the diary (cf. IV: 41 [9-10], IV: 38 [11-13], etc.). Ultimately, as another Novalis editor, Gerhard Schulz (2011: 93), says, what we see in Hardenberg is a desire to «realize love for the deceased by dying himself, in a way that cannot be clearly distinguished, but certainly in a messianic perspective», as we see in passages of the *Journal* such as the one Schulz recalls there: «At the grave it occurred to me — that with my death I demonstrate before humanity such a fidelity to death — that it is as if a similar love becomes possible» (IV: 38).

CONCLUSION

What the reception of Hardenberg's *Journal* might have been if Bülow had edited it without intervention we cannot know. As far as the *Entschluß* is concerned, there does not seem to be any real intention to leave it out. In total, there are few occasions when this «determination» is *specifically* sought to be removed. In many of the cases in which Bülow avoided mentioning the *Entschluß*, his decision is better (or just as well) explained for other reasons; in the few cases in which it seems clear that the aim is not to keep the phrase specifically concerning the «determination», it is difficult to establish the reason: here an attempt was made to defend a link between these occasions and the presence in them of Sophie's grave or other elements that could lead to a reading of the diary as the expression of a Hardenberg wanting to take his own life. Ultimately, according to the reading that was encouraged throughout the first edition of Hardenberg's writings by Schlegel, Tieck and Bülow, Sophie's tomb should be a place of inspiration and confidence in the existence of the afterlife, a confidence that should be the basis and the germ of the *Hymns to the Night*, particularly the third in the series, and also of the *Spiritual Songs*. The fact that the visits to Sophie's tomb were linked to a mysterious decision of possible suicidal resonances endangered one of the elements most favoured by the editors' interventions.

We saw two other interventions that were very repeated and much more defined than the ones concerning the *Entschluß*. Firstly, those referring to Hardenberg's erotic impulses (and in general to his corporeality and various types of poorly contained appetites), evident subtractions that can be attributed above all to an imposition of decorum that fits naturally with the times, to the fact that the person most responsible for publishing Novalis' works was his close friend, and also perhaps to a desire to avoid showing Hardenberg exposed to impulses as «unspiritual» or to concerns as pedestrian as having eaten a lot.

The other intervention that stands out very much in the 1846 edition of the diary is the subtraction of the passages that show Hardenberg happy, enjoying the day, in good spirits, active and hopeful. This intervention seems to be the most tendentious of all. From this operation (to which, as far as I know, no particular attention has yet been paid) depends, at least partially, one of the most important factors that caused that Hardenberg's mourning was later seen as the period of suffering of a poet tortured by the death of his young beloved and not, instead, as that of a person who oscillates between an inevitable melancholy and the desire to get ahead and enjoy life as much as possible, as seems to have been the case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mentioned editions of Novalis' work:

- NOVALIS (1802-1846), *Schriften*. Vols. I-II (eds. Friedrich Schlegel y Ludwig Tieck). Berlin. Georg Reimer, 1802 (1805²; 1815³; 1826⁴; 1837⁵). Vol. III (eds. Ludwig Tieck y Eduard von Bülow), Berlin, Georg Reimer.
- NOVALIS (1901), *Schriften. Kritische Neuausgabe auf Grund des handschriftlichen Nachlasses* (ed. Ernst Heilborn), Berlin, Georg Reimer.
- NOVALIS (1907), *Schriften* (ed. Jacob Minor), Jena, Eugen Diederichs.
- NOVALIS (1929), *Fragmente. Erste vollständige, geordnete Ausgabe* (ed. Ernst Kamnitzer), Dresden, Wolfgang Hess.
- NOVALIS (1960-), *Schriften. Die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs* (ed. Richard Samuel *et al.*): historisch-kritische Ausgabe [HKA], Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
- NOVALIS (2007), *The Birth of Novalis (Journal of 1797, With Selected Letters and Documents)* (trad. y ed. Bruce Donehower), Albany, SUNY.

General bibliography cited:

- ALBERTI, Miguel (2019), «“Por lo demás, estuve muy alegre todo el día”. Intervenciones romantizantes en la edición original de la obra de Novalis», in Naím Garnica (ed.), *La actualidad del primer romanticismo alemán: Modernidad, filosofía y literatura*, Catamarca, Editorial Científica Universitaria de la Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, pp. 309-336.
- BÜLOW, Eduard von (1846), «Vorwort», in Novalis: *Schriften* (ed. Schlegel-Tieck-Bülow), vol III, pp. VII-XIV.
- DILTHEY, Wilhelm (2005), *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*, in *Gesammelte Schriften XXVI*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- HIEBEL, Friedrich (1951), *Novalis: Der Dichter der blauen Blume*, Bern, Francke.
- KLUCKHOHN, Paul (1977) [1929], «Friedrich von Hardenbergs Entwicklung und Dichtung», in *HKA* I, pp. 1-67.
- KNOPF, Alexander (2015), «Editorischer Bericht», in Novalis: *Heinrich von Aferdingen* (tektrische Edition), Frankfurt/Main, Stroempfeld, pp. 249-289.
- KUHN, Hans Wolfgang (1961), *Der Apokalyptiker und die Politik. Studien zur Staatsphilosophie des Novalis*, Freiburg, Rombach.
- JUST, August Cölestin (1975) [1805], «Friedrich von Hardenberg», in *HKA* IV, pp. 536-550.
- LANGEN, August (1968), *Der Wortschatz des deutschen Pietismus*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer.
- MÄHL, Hans-Joachim (1967), «Goethes Urteil über Novalis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kritik an der deutschen Romantik», *Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts*, pp. 130-270.
- MINOR, Jakob (1902), review of *Novalis Schriften* (ed. Ernst Heilborn) and *Novalis, der Romantiker*, by Ernst Heilborn. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, n° 46, pp. 82-122.
- O'BRIEN, William Arctander (1992), «Herstellung eines Mythos: Novalis' "Schriften"» in des redaktionellen Bearbeitung von Tieck und Schlegel», *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, III, 2, pp. 161-180.
- O'BRIEN, William Arctander (1995), *Novalis, Signs of Revolution*, Durham / London, Duke University Press.
- PFEFFERKORN, Kristin (1988), *Novalis. A Romantic Theory of Language and Poetry*, New Haven – London, Yale University Press.

-
- SAMUEL, Richard (1973), *Novalis (Friedrich Freiherr von Hardenberg) 2. 5. 1772 - 25. 3. 1801. Der handschriftliche Nachlaß des Dichters. Zur Geschichte des Nachlasses von Novalis*, Hildesheim, Gerstenberg.
- SAMUEL, Richard (1975), «Einleitung des Herausgebers», in *HKA* IV, pp. 1^{*}-47^{*}.
- SAMUEL, Richard (1981), «Vorwort», in *HKA* II, pp. v-xiii.
- SAMUEL, Richard (1988), «Einleitung», in *HKA* V, pp. 191-195.
- SCHULZ, Gerhard (2011), *Novalis: Leben und Werk Friedrich von Hardenbergs*, München, C. H. Beck.
- TIECK, Ludwig (1973) [1937], *Letters of Ludwig Tieck. Hitherto Unpublished. 1792-1853* (recoll. and ed. Edwin H. Zeydel, Percy Matenko y Robert Herndon Fife), New York, Millwood.
- VIETOR, Sophia (2001): «Die Erstdrucke und die Erstausgabe der Schriften von Novalis und ihre Herausgeber», in Gabriele Rommel (ed.), *Novalis. Das Werk und seine Editoren*, Wiederstedt, Forschungsstätte für Frühromantik und Novalis-Museum Schloß Oberwiederstedt, pp. 65-85.

