



UDC 811.113.4+1(091)

Alexandra Ekrogulsкая

Independent researcher

**LINGUISTIC ASPECT OF SØREN KIERKEGAARD'S
"INDIRECT COMMUNICATION" WITH CONTINUAL REFERENCE
TO ROMANTIC IRONY**

For citation: Ekrogulsкая A. Linguistic aspect of Søren Kierkegaard's "Indirect communication" with continual reference to romantic irony. *Scandinavian Philology*, 2021, vol. 19, issue 1, pp. 85–100.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2021.106>

The subject of this article is the language of Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard. The article presents a classification (based on the material of the treatise *Repetition*) of rhetorical devices specific for this author. This classification relies on the thesis that Romanticism was the cultural and historical context of Kierkegaard's background which influenced his language and style, and that Kierkegaard's method of indirect communication became in a certain sense a legacy of romantic irony defined by Friedrich Schlegel as "the form of paradox". Categorizing Kierkegaard as a descendant of Romanticism makes it possible to classify his main stylistic techniques under the term "contradiction", which means a conscious and even intentional use of different stylistic and conceptual oppositions in the collision of which the author's thought is revealed. Three types of contradictions can be distinguished in the text of *Repetition*. (1) The first one is intertextual contradiction between two works. Publishing his books under different pseudonyms, Kierkegaard creates such a situation as though two authors argue with each other. (2) The second one is conceptual contradiction within one work. Kierkegaard confronts in the treatise two opposite characters and two opposite concepts of repetition. (3) And the last type of contradiction are linguistic contradictions consisting of all the stylistic devices that Kierkegaard uses to activate his method of indirect communication and which can be defined as "wordplay" in the most general sense: as playful and witty use of words. Kierkegaard uses puns, different figures of repetition and parallelism, and these stylistic devices take form of contradiction in order to express the fundamental contradictory of life in an ironic and witty form. In such a "struggle" of oppositions, not only an ironic intonation is created, but also the meaning of concepts is revealed in their true-life fullness.

Keywords: Danish language, Søren Kierkegaard, philosophy, indirect communication, romantic irony, wordplay.

The name of the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard is closely related to the concept of indirect communication. It was with this phrase that he himself characterized his method of philosophizing. Generally speaking, indirect communication means that Kierkegaard for some reason did not want to correspond his thoughts by any classical direct manners accepted in the philosophy contemporary to him i. e. by giving clear definitions and creating a strict consistent system of knowledge. Indirect communication is rooted in Socrates' midwifery method, according to which truth cannot be imparted directly, but should be born in one's head on one's own, whereas the task of the philosopher is just to help the birth. Indirect communication is the topic of numerous studies conducted around the world. Basically, this phenomenon is studied by philosophers and considered from the philosophical point of view. This article presents a linguistic approach to the method of indirect communication, namely a classification of those specific rhetorical devices that activate Kierkegaard's method of indirect communication.

The classification in question is based on the presumption that the philosophical style of Kierkegaard was caused by two factors. The first one is that Kierkegaard was an implacable antagonist to such a systematic philosophy, which had as its subject an idealistic knowledge of the world and the most prominent representative of which was Hegel. It is quite significant that Kierkegaard did not call himself a philosopher, but rather a religious thinker. What Kierkegaard called "philosophy", or sometimes "modern science" (and that always with an ironic intonation), was the philosophy that we now call "German idealism". In his *The Sickness unto Death* Kierkegaard compares a philosopher who creates a system with a man who builds a building, but does not live in it preferring to stay "in a barn alongside of it" [Kierkegaard, 1941, p. 68]. Such a builder seems to Kierkegaard deeply ridiculous. He criticizes and even sneers at the attempts to construct a fully thought-out system of knowledge. It is ridiculous because these attempts take a person infinitely far from his own life. They do not live in what they build. Why construct a building and live in a barn? Why create a system that has nothing to do with life? Kierkegaard's deep conviction is that it is personal life that should be the subject of thought and philosophy.

The second reason of Kierkegaard's indirect method of philosophizing was an influence of another phenomenon contemporary to Kierkegaard, namely Romanticism. Ideologically Kierkegaard was an equally implacable opponent to Romanticism as to Hegelianism, but being a man of his time, he had experienced its all-round influence, and his method of indirect communication was nothing else, but a peculiar legacy of romantic irony. To prove this thesis, I would like to refer to the book *Søren Kierkegaard and Romantics* by Danish philosophers Kjeld Holm, Malthe Jakosen and Bjarne Troelsen. K. Holm states that the foundation stone of all romantic art is an irrational experience of the gap between two worlds: the real one — the world that is given to us in our everyday life, and the ideal one — the true, sublime, but unattainable world. A vivid experience of fragmentation, of separation from the ideal lies at the heart of the romantic worldview in all its manifestations. According to Holm, Kierkegaard is a follower of the romantic tradition, which considers human as a “dual being” [Holm, 1974, p. 57], belonging to both worlds — material and spiritual. What is important is that the romantics do not try to reconcile this contradiction. Knowing that reconciliation is impossible, they just seek to get closer to the true world by expressing this never-to-be-achieved ideal in an artistic form. But since they realize that this ideal world and this feeling of fragmentation are irrational, almost mystical experiences, they look for some new forms for expression, different from the forms of classical art and philosophy. Irony becomes nothing more than this new way of expressing the inexpressible. And Kierkegaard's indirect communication fully corresponds to this new goal of philosophizing.

Irony as a romantic method of expressing thoughts uses many different rhetorical devices, pursuing one goal: to express thought in such a way as to convey the dual essence of being and the deep inner personal experiences of this contradiction. Precisely because romantics know about the duality of the human world, they do not strive to remove contradictions from their philosophical and poetical texts, but on the contrary, they show the many-sided completeness of the world with the help of different stylistic devices, among which contradictions occupy an important place. Jena romantics openly declared that one should philosophize not in the classical rational way, but rather using some poetic means, and that a completely finished system is not the goal of philosophy. “It's equally fatal to the mind to have a system and to

have none. It will simply have to decide to combine the two” [Schlegel, 1998, p. 24], wrote Friedrich Schlegel long before Søren Kierkegaard in his *Fragments*¹. In contrast to the systematic philosophy, romantics offered their own original way of speaking — irony, in which “everything should be playful and serious, guilelessly open and deeply hidden”² [Schlegel, 1998, p. 13]. If “philosophy is the real homeland of irony”³ [Schlegel, 1998, p. 5] and “irony is the form of paradox”⁴ [Schlegel, 1998, p. 6], so there is nothing contradictory in philosophizing by using contradictions.

As already mentioned, ideologically Kierkegaard was an opponent to the romantic worldview, and hardly considered himself a representative of romantic school. However, the romantic way of expression as well as romantic artistic language definitely was closer to him than logical syllogisms of systematic philosophy, and definitely much closer to his concept of indirect communication, the purpose of which was not to express everything directly, but to bring the reader to his own understanding. Kierkegaard inherited romantic irony as a style of expression in the same way as any person inherits the culture of his time. As he himself assured, the style of the work was the last thing he worried about, the content had always been in the first place⁵. But being an unusually talented author, who had both artistic and linguistic gifts, as well as undoubted advantage of a deep philosophical theme, he managed to raise the romantic way of expression to the height of a literary and philosophical masterpiece⁶.

Irony as a paradox, as a play of contradictions, formed the basis of the method of indirect communication, and in a certain sense Søren Kierkegaard can be called an heir of Romanticism. The purpose of this article is to prove this statement with specific examples. To do so I would like to take the treatise *Repetition* as a material for classification of those stylistic devices of Søren Kierkegaard, which can be combined under

¹ So called “Athenaums”-Fragmente, fragment 53.

² Critical Fragments or “Lyceums”-Fragmente, fragment 108.

³ “Lyceums”-Fragmente, fragment 42.

⁴ “Lyceums”-Fragmente, fragment 48.

⁵ He wrote in one of his journals: “Taking care of style really came later... since anyone with genuine thoughts has form from the start (SKS25/KJN7:NB30:41/Kierkegaard 1996: 559)” [Hannay, 2013, p. 391].

⁶ For example, German philosopher Robert Heiss called Kierkegaard’s *Either-Or* “a masterpiece of romantic poetry” [Heiss, 1963, p. 231].

the general term “contradiction”. “Contradiction” in this context means conscious and even intentional use of different stylistic and conceptual oppositions in the collision of which the author’s thought is revealed.

Analysis of the text of *Repetition* shows that three types of contradictions can be distinguished in it:

1. The first one is intertextual contradiction between two works. By publishing his books under different pseudonyms, Kierkegaard creates such a situation as though two authors argue with each other: in one work he asserts something that he will refute in another. For example, in *Repetition* he writes:

Erindringens Kjærlighed er den ene lykkelige, har en Forfatter sagt. Deri har han ogsaa fuldkommen Ret, naar man blot erindrer, at den først gjør et Menneske ulykkeligt. Gjengangelsens Kjærlighed er i Sandhed den ene lykkelige.

‘Recollection’s love, an author has said, is the only happy love. He is perfectly right in that, of course, provided one recalls that initially it makes a person unhappy. Repetition’s love is in truth the only happy love’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 131].

The irony of the phrase lies in the fact that by “an author” Kierkegaard means himself, namely, his work *Either/Or*, published the same year shortly before *Repetition* (1843). In the first part of this book he wrote:

Det er min Ulykke; ved Siden af mig gaaer altid en Morderengel, og det er ikke de Udvalgte Dør jeg besprænger med Blod til Tegn paa, at han skal gaae den forbi, nei det er deres Dør han netop træder ind ad; thi først Erindringens Kjærlighed er lykkelig.

‘My misfortune is this: an angel of death always walks at my side, and it is not the doors of the chosen ones that I sprinkle with blood as a sign that he is to pass by — no, it is precisely their doors that he enters — for only recollection’s love is happy’ [Kierkegaard, 1987, p. 41].

The first part of *Either/Or* was written by Kierkegaard on behalf of an esthetician. In *Repetition* he argues against the esthetic point of view. In such an obvious contradiction Kierkegaard creates a living situation of dispute between two persons with different worldviews.

2. The second contradiction is conceptual contradiction within one work. In order to present the topic in all its vital completeness, Kier-

kegaard confronts in the treatise two opposite characters and two opposite concepts of repetition. If in *Either/Or* the contradiction is vivid and obvious (the work is divided into two equal parts, representing opposite life positions), then in *Repetition* we read about a development, a change of characters and worldviews taking place under the influence of certain events. There are two opposite characters in the treatise: Constantin Constantius, a cold and rational man in his thirties, and his younger friend, a passionate and sensitive poet. They are connected by the phenomenon of repetition — they both seek and wait for repetition in their material and spiritual life. What is essential is that both characters are Kierkegaard's alter ego; it was he himself who experienced a painful break with his beloved, he himself made shrewd, but unsuccessful plans to break off the engagement, and he himself eventually left for Berlin; it was his beloved Regina Olsen who suddenly got engaged to another man. He seemed to divide these events of his life between the two characters in order to show in such a confrontation the development of an idea and to reveal the concept of repetition in its living contradiction. Kierkegaard is interested in the question: is repetition possible? And in order to answer it, he opposes two characters, two stories, but most importantly — two opposing understandings of repetition, two ideas: repetition in the material world and repetition in the spiritual world.

3. The third type of contradictions are linguistic contradictions. These are the stylistic devices that Kierkegaard uses to activate his method of indirect communication, and that can be combined under the term “wordplay”, which should be understood in the most general sense as playful and witty use of words. Wordplay seems to be the most appropriate definition of those stylistic devices of Kierkegaard that takes form of contradiction in order to express the fundamental contradiction of life in an ironic and witty form. In such a “struggle” of opposites, not only an ironic intonation is created, but also the meaning of concepts is revealed in their true-life fullness.

It should be noted that classification presented below was drawn up within the framework of translation studies, and this explains its specificity. The task was not just to select well-known rhetorical devices in Kierkegaard's text and to divide them into groups (in this case, the classification might have been different), but to identify the stylistic touch specific to this author, which, if possible, must be transmitted when translated into another language (it does not matter into which one,

since the classification is based solely on the features of the original text, and in this sense it is universally applicable). Nevertheless, this article will not discuss translation problems, firstly, because these problems go beyond the chosen topic, and secondly, because translation solutions depend on the target language and, for this reason, are left entirely to the discretion of the reader. Only small comments regarding successful or unsuccessful (in my opinion) translation solutions will be provided in some instances.

There are three types of wordplay in the text of *Repetition*: pun (based on polysemy), repetition (figures of addition of different types) and parallelism (antithesis and antimetabole).

1) The first wordplay typical for Kierkegaard is pun, an ironic effect of which is based on polysemy of a word. For example:

Vel kastede man ikke hinanden Støv i Øinene med de Ord: memento o homo! quod cinis es et in cinerem revertaris; men desuagtet stod den hele By i eet Støv.

‘To be sure, they did not throw **ashes** into one another’s eyes with the words: Memento o homo! quod cinis es et in cinerem revertaris⁷. But all the same, the whole city lay in one cloud of **dust**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 153].

The irony of the fragment consists of the polysemy of the Danish noun *Støv*, which means both *ash* and *dust*. The Latin quote “Memento o homo!...” refers to the Catholic rite held on Ash Wednesday (the first day of Lent). During the ceremony, the priest sprinkles the blessed ashes on the heads of believers and pronounces this phrase, which is a cite of the Book of Genesis (3:19): “for dust you are and to dust you will return”. To this biblical *dust* refers the first *Støv* of the phrase, so the second *Støv*, used by Kierkegaard in a literary sense, closes the sentence with a witty comparison.

This first type of wordplay is built on the contradiction of two senses of one word, and its main goal is to create a light and ironic intonation of the text.

2) The second type of wordplay, specific for Kierkegaard’s language, is a rhetorical device called repetition (in terms of classical rhetoric — figures of addition), which in Kierkegaard’s case has two main forms: repetition of lexeme and repetition of root.

⁷ (lat.) Remember, O man! that you are dust and to dust you will return.

A) Repetition of lexeme is repeating of the same word or repeating of a word in a modified form. Like puns, they are intended to create an ironic intonation, but they have one more purpose. Being a common poetic technique, repetitions create a special rhythm, which is an important element of Kierkegaard's texts⁸.

*Det var aldeles **det Samme**, **de samme** Vittigheder, **de samme** Høfligheder, **den samme** Deeltagelse, Localet aldeles **det samme** — kort **det Samme i det Samme**.*

‘It was just **the same**, **the same** witticisms, **the same** civilities, **the same** patronage; the place was absolutely **the same** — in short, **the same sameness**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 170].

There are four types of repetition in this short sentence: anadiplosis (*Det var aldeles **det Samme**, **de samme** Vittigheder*), anaphora (***de samme** Vittigheder, **de samme** Høfligheder, **den samme** Deeltagelse*), epistrophe (*Det var **aldeles det Samme**, ... Localet **aldeles det samme***) and polyptoton (***det Samme i det Samme***). Kierkegaard clearly uses these tropes in order to give the description an ironic intonation. Constantin Constantius looks for repetition, and he indeed finds something completely unchanged. This experience is ironically sad though: “*det Samme i det Samme*” is surprisingly not the same as a true repetition. Kierkegaard uses contradiction of different meanings of concept “repetition” in several sentences, for example:

*Hvad Betydningen angaaer, som **Gjentagelsen** har for en Ting, saa lader der sig sige Meget uden at gjøre sig skyldig i **en Gjentagelse**.*

‘With regard to the meaning that **repetition** has for something, much can be said without making oneself guilty of **a repetition**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 150].

The trope, used in this sentence, is antanaclasis — a repetition of the word in two different senses. Unlike pun based on polysemy, antanacla-

⁸ Alaster Hannay writes that the rhythm of his prose was very important for Kierkegaard: “Kierkegaard was clearly sensitive to the sound of spoken Danish. He was sensitive to the need for a reader to catch the text’s rhythm. He confessed that although ‘bow[ing] unconditionally to authority’ in matters of spelling, when it comes to punctuation, having in mind the needs of a reader who ‘reads aloud’ he makes his own rules (SKS20/KJN4: NB146/Kierkegaard 1996: 257). Kierkegaard also records that before penning his words it was his practice to rehearse his lines to himself: ‘Most of what I have written was spoken aloud many, many times, and often heard perhaps a score of times before being written down’ (SKS23/KJN7: NB30:41/Kierkegaard 1996: 588)” [Hannay, 2013, p. 389].

sis contains a subtle and not so obvious difference in meanings. In the above example the difference is indicated by the fact that in the first case Kierkegaard uses a definite form of the noun, and in the second — an indefinite one. *Gjentagelsen* is the philosophical concept that is the topic of the book. And *en Gjentagelse* is used in the ordinary sense: something that happens more than once. The opposition of these meanings — philosophical and ordinary — lies at the heart of this wordplay.

A large number of repetition devices are found in the part of the book which is written by the young poet. These tropes no longer have an ironic intonation, but are used as classical poetic devices to enhance the emotional impact.

Eller er det ikke en Art af Sindssvaghed, i den Grad at have underlagt enhver Lidenskab, enhver Hjertets Rørelse, enhver Stemning under Reflexionens kolde Regimente! Er det ikke Sindssvaghed saaledes at være normal, blot Idee, ikke Menneske <...>! Er det ikke Sindssvaghed saaledes altid at være vaagen, altid bevidst!

'**Is it not**, in fact, **a kind of mental disorder** to have subjugated to such a degree **every** passion, **every** emotion, **every** mood under the cold regimentation of reflection! **Is it not mental disorder** to be normal in this way — pure idea, not a human being <...>! **Is it not mental disorder always** to be alert like this, **always** conscious!' [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 189]

Thus, stylistic devices, united in this section under the name of repetition of lexeme, have two main functions: to create a special rhythm and a certain intonation (ironical or emotional) and to oppose two meanings of repeated words. The same trope can fulfil only one function or both of them.

B) The same functions are performed by the second type of the repetition devices, namely the repetition of root: the use of several one-root words in the same sentence. The two terms close to this concept are etymological figure and polyptoton, but I will use this unacceptable term — repetition of a root — to avoid terminological confusion⁹.

⁹ Etymological figure and polyptoton can be understood in different ways in different languages. In inflected languages polyptoton is understood in a narrow sense as a repetition of the same word in different cases, in analytic languages — in a broader sense as a repetition of one-root words. Since, as already mentioned, this classification tends to be universal, it was decided to use the concept "repetition of root", which in-

There are three types of repetition of root in the text of *Repetition*:

- a) One-root words of different parts of speech. Like in one of the previous examples, this kind of figures is often used by Kierkegaard to underline the difference between the two senses of the term “repetition” — philosophical and ordinary.

*Da dette havde **gjenta**get sig nogle Dage, blev jeg saa forbittret, saa kjed af **Gjenta**gelsen, at jeg besluttede at reise hjem igjen. Min Opdagelse var ikke betydelig og dog var den besynderlig; thi jeg havde opdaget, at **Gjenta**gelsen slet ikke var til, og det havde jeg forvisset mig om, ved paa alle mulige Maader at faae det **gjenta**get.*

‘When this had **repeated** itself several days, I became so furious, so weary of the **repetition**, that I decided to return home. My discovery was not significant, and yet it was curious, for I had discovered that there simply is no **repetition** and had verified it by having it **repeated** in every possible way’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 171].

In other cases, this figure intends only to create a certain intonation:

*Possens **Naivetet** er dog saa illusorisk, at det er umuligt for den Dannede at forholde sig **naiv** til den.*

‘The **naiveté** of the farce is so illusory that it is impossible for the cultured person to relate **naively** to it’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 160].

- b) Repetition of words of the same part of speech but with different prefixes is the second type of repetition of root. Most of them are to make the ironical effect, based on different senses of the words:

*Jeg blev ganske **forstemt**, eller om man saa vil, **stemt** netop som Dagen fordrede det.*

‘I became completely **out of tune**, or, if you please, precisely **in tune** with the day’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 152].

But in some cases, Kierkegaard resorts to this figure to make some emphasis on his philosophical ideas:

*Undtagelsen **tænker** tillige det Almene, idet den **gjennemtænker** sig selv, den **virker** for det Almene, idet den **gjennemvirker** sig selv, den forklarer det Almene, idet den forklarer sig selv.*

cludes both terms (etymological figure and polyptoton) without distinction.

‘The exception also **thinks** the universal in that he **thinks** himself **through**; he **works** for the universal in that he **works** himself **through**; he explains the universal in that he explains himself’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 227].

c) The last type of repetition of root is antithesis created with a negative prefix.

*At være nogenlunde **tilfreds**, er ikke Umagen værd, saa er det bedre at være aldeles **utilfreds**.*

‘To be more or less **satisfied** is not worth the trouble, so it is better to be completely **dissatisfied**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 172].

*Og dog hvor consequent er ikke enhver endog **abnorm** sjælelig Tilstand, naar den er **normal** tilsted.*

‘And yet, how consistent even an **abnormal** mental state is if it is **normally** present’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 136].

*Jeg sidder og beklipper mig selv, tager alt det **Incommensurable** bort, for at blive **commensurabel**.*

‘I sit and clip myself, take away everything that is **incommensurable** in order to become **commensurable**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 214].

In conclusion it should be said that repetition devices represent such a wordplay that is constructed either on the repetition of the same word or on the use of words of the same root in one sentence. Unlike pun, repetition is not based on polysemy, although it also sometimes contains a change in meaning: a small nuance of meanings (different meanings of concept “repetition”; repetition of root with different prefixes) or a sharp contradiction (antithesis). Repetition serves to create a certain rhythm and intonation of the text and to contrast the meanings of repeated words, and that is why it is definitely a kind of contradiction which is a specific feature of Kierkegaard’s indirect communication. It is important that Kierkegaard uses figures of repetition not only with an ironic tone, but often to express his philosophical ideas.

3) The last type of wordplay, specific for Kierkegaard’s texts, is parallelism, namely antithesis and antimetabole.

A) This kind of antithesis differs from the previous because contradiction here is not created by antonyms, which are antithesis in and of themselves, regardless of context (like ‘commensurable/incommensurable’), but by syntactical parallelism, which with the help of parallel construction contrasts words that in another context

might not have been antonyms. The previous one can be called lexical antithesis and this one — syntactical antithesis. To demonstrate how Kierkegaard uses this trope, we will quote two abstracts from that part of the book where a peculiar definition of the concept of repetition is given. Kierkegaard creates opposition of hope, recollection and repetition, and with the help of comparisons enumerates its essential characteristics. Through such a description he represents a certain image of a concept.

Erindringens Kjærlighed er den ene lykkelige, har en Forfatter sagt. <...> Gjentagelsens Kjærlighed er i Sandhed den ene lykkelige.

‘**Recollection’s love**, an author has said, is the only **happy** love. <...> **Repetition’s love** is in truth the only **happy** love’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 131].

The antithesis of recollection’s love and repetition’s love is carried out in this abstract by using syntactical parallelism:

Recollection’s love is the only happy love.
Repetition’s love is the only happy love.

And then follows a whole series of comparisons, united by the antithesis of hope, recollection and repetition. For example:

Haabet er en ny Klædning, stiv og stram og glimrende, dog har man aldrig havt den paa, og veed derfor ikke, hvorledes den vil klæde En, eller hvorledes den sidder. Erindringen er en aflagt Klædning, som, hvor skjøn den end er, dog ikke passer, da man er voxet fra den. Gjentagelsen er en uopslidelig Klædning.

‘**Hope** is a **new garment**, stiff and starched and lustrous, but it has never been tried on, and therefore one does not know how becoming it will be or how it will fit. **Recollection** is a **discarded garment** that does not fit, however beautiful it is, for one has outgrown it. **Repetition** is an **indestructible garment** that fits closely and tenderly, neither binds nor sags’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 132].

This unusual definition of the concept is the clearest example of indirect communication. Instead of the classical definition “repetition is ...”, Kierkegaard uses the method by contradiction. He uses artistic devices instead of scientific ones, oppositions instead of definitions.

B) The last type of wordplay that will be considered within the framework of this classification is antimetabole. Antimetabole is a complex construction which includes the previous types of wordplay. It is a syntactical parallelism with repetition of words in transposed order, and sometimes it is intensified by lexical antithesis. The brightest example is the following phrase:

*Gjentagelse og Erindring er den samme Bevægelse, kun i modsat Retning; thi hvad der erindres, har været, **gjentages baglænds**; hvorimod den egentlige **Gjentagelse erindres forlænds**.*

‘Repetition and recollection are the same movement, except in opposite directions, for what is **recollected** has been, is **repeated backward**, whereas genuine **repetition** is **recollected forward**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 131].

There is a threefold contradiction in this sentence, and this stylistic figure is an antimetabole:

what is recollected is repeated backward
repetition is recollected forward

We can see here a repetition of lexeme (‘recollected’) and repetition of root (‘repeated/repetition’) in transposed order, plus the antithesis ‘backward/forward’. Fortunately, all these nuances can be conveyed in the English language quit accurately. The following example presents a bigger difficulty for the translator:

*Naar Grækerne sagde, at al Erkjenden er Erindren, saa sagde de, hele **Tilværelsen**, som **er til, har været til**, naar man siger, at Livet er en Gjentagelse, saa siger man: **Tilværelsen, som har været til, bliver nu til**.*

‘When the Greeks said that all knowing is recollecting, they said that all **existence**, which **is, has been**; when one says that life is a repetition, one says: **actuality**, which **has been**, now **comes into existence**’ [Kierkegaard, 1983, p. 149].

This English translation does not convey the wordplay of Kierkegaard’s text. Kierkegaard plays on the repetition of the verb *være til* (‘to be, to exist’) in different forms and the noun of the same root *tilværelse* (‘existence, being’). In English translation should also be used the words of the same root: *to be/being*, or *to exist/existence*. In such

a way the wordplay would be conveyed closer to the original. Anyway, this figure is an antimetabole because it contains repetition of words in transposed order:

Tilværelsen, som er til, har været til
Tilværelsen, som har været til, bliver nu til¹⁰.

To conclude this section it should be said that syntactical parallelism performs the same functions as the above-described tropes: on the one hand, it creates a certain intonation and rhythm, adds irony and lightness to the text, and on the other hand, such complex figures as antithesis and antimetabole are a vivid example of Kierkegaard's indirect communication — the method which task is to convey a thought to a reader in a way unusual for philosophy: with the help of contradictions, comparisons and different rhetorical devices.

The main objective of the article was to consider the linguistic aspect of Søren Kierkegaard's indirect communication. Presupposition of the analysis was that the language of the Danish philosopher belonged to the romantic tradition and that his indirect communication has become a legacy of romantic irony, which manifested itself in a variety of conceptual and stylistic contradictions. The article presented a classification of these contradictions, based on the material of the treatise *Repetition*. Of course, within the framework of one article it was possible to provide only a small number of examples that can illustrate the given classification. In fact, there are more than fifty figures of speech in the *Repetition* that fit one of the listed types of wordplay. In this article, I only pointed out the fundamental role of these devices in Kierkegaard's language, and their relationship to romantic irony, which also revealed itself in a play of contradictions. This classification can be used not only for further study of Kierkegaard's language and for translating his texts into various languages, but also as a material for philosophical studies, which aim is to determine the place of Søren Kierkegaard in the history of European thought.

¹⁰ An appropriate translation could be: “The being, which is, has been / The being, which has been, now comes into being”.

REFERENCES

- Hannay A. Translating Kierkegaard. *The Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*. Oxford University Press, 2013. P. 385–402.
- Heiß R. *Die Großen Dialektiker des XIX Jahrhunderts. Hegel, Kierkegaard, Marx*. Köln, 1963. 437 s.
- Holm K., Jakosen M., Troelsen B. *Søren Kierkegaard og Romantikerne*. København, 1974. 159 s.
- Kierkegaard S. *Either/Or. Part I*. Princeton university press, 1987. 728 p.
- Kierkegaard S. *Enten — Eller*. Søren Kierkegaard Forskningscenteret, 1997. Available at: <http://sks.dk/EE1/txt.xml> (accessed: 06.04.2021).
- Kierkegaard S. *Gjentagelsen*. Søren Kierkegaard Forskningscenteret, 1997. Available at: <http://sks.dk/G/txt.xml> (accessed: 06.04.2021).
- Kierkegaard S. Repetition. *Fear and Trembling. Repetition*. Princeton university press, 1983. P. 125–231.
- Kierkegaard S. *The Sickness unto Death*. Princeton University Press, 1941. 231 p.
- Schlegel F. *Philosophical Fragments*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998. 144 p.

Александра Экрогульская
Независимый исследователь

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ «НЕПРЯМОГО СООБЩЕНИЯ» СЁРЕНА КИРКЕГОРА С ПОСТОЯННОЙ ОТСЫЛКОЙ К РОМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ ИРОНИИ

Для цитирования: *Ekrogulskaia A. Linguistic aspect of Søren Kierkegaard's "Indirect communication" with continual reference to romantic irony // Скандинавская филология. 2021. Т. 19. Вып. 1. С. 85–100.*

<https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2021.106>

Тема данной статьи — язык датского философа Сёрена Киркегора. В статью представлена классификация (созданная на материале трактата «Повторение») риторических приемов, характерных для этого автора. В основу классификации лег тезис о том, что романтизм был тем культурным и историческим контекстом, который повлиял на язык и стиль Киркегора, и его метод непрямого сообщения можно в определенном смысле назвать наследием романтической иронии, которую Фридрих Шлегель определил как «форму парадоксального». Характеристика Киркегора как наследника романтической традиции позволяет классифицировать его основные стилистические приемы под общим термином «противоречие», который означает сознательное и даже преднамеренное использование различных стилистических и концептуальных противопоставлений, в столкновении которых раскрывается авторская мысль. В тексте «Повторения» можно выделить три типа противоречий. (1) Интертекстуальное противоречие между двумя произведениями. Публикуя свои книги под разными псевдонимами, Киркегор создает ситуацию, как будто друг с другом полемизируют два разных автора. (2) Концептуальное противоречие внутри одного произведения. Киркегор сталкивает в трактате двух противоположных персонажей

и две противоположные концепции повторения. (3) Лингвистические противоречия, а именно все те стилистические приемы, с помощью которых Киркегор приводит в действие свой метод непрямого сообщения и которые можно объединить под общим термином «игра слов», понимаемом в самом общем смысле: как шутливое и остроумное использование слов. Киркегор прибегает к каламбурам, различным фигурам повторения и параллелизма, и все эти стилистические приемы представляют собой противоречия, с помощью которых в иронической и остроумной форме выражается фундаментальная противоречивость жизни. В такой «борьбе» противоположностей создается не только ироническая интонация, но и раскрывается смысл понятий в их жизненной полноте.

Ключевые слова: датский язык, Сёрен Киркегор, философия, не прямое сообщение, романтическая ирония, игра слов.

Alexandra Ekrogulskaia

Master in Philology,

32, ul. Radishcheva, St. Petersburg, 191014, Russian Federation

E-mail: sensus_communis@inbox.ru

Экрогульская Александра Олеговна

Магистр по филологии,

Российская Федерация, 191014, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Радищева, 32

E-mail: sensus_communis@inbox.ru

Received: March 20, 2021

Accepted: April 26, 2021