2. Modern Danish

Aage Hansen, *Vort vanskelige sprog*, Grafisk Forlag, 163 pp. That Danish is a language full of inconsistencies is obvious to anyone who has dealt with it at all, but this is perhaps the first time that these have been put into categories in such a way as to form some sort of pattern. Divided into three main headings—difficulties in orthography, morphology and syntax, the book gives a most thorough examination of modern Danish usage and the difficulties and uncertainties it reveals. It ought to be compulsory reading for any foreign student of Danish, and certainly for the species which continually asks for hard and fast rules!

3. Various

Evert Salberger, ‘Till Århus-stenen 6’, *DaSt.* This is an attempt to show that the final sentence of the inscription on this stone—saR x ati x skib x miþ x arna—which has always been regarded as a prose sentence, could in fact quite well be a perfectly normal piece of fornyrðislag.

Chr. Lisse, ‘Enklitisk nægtelse i sydomålene’, *DF.*

Ella Jensen, ‘Vestjysk stød i forbindelse med musikalsk accent’ (*ib.*).

LITERATURE

1. General

Johan Fjord Jensen, *Turgenjev i dansk åndsliv. Studier i dansk romankunst 1870–1900*, Gyldendal, 413 pp. Despite the somewhat specialized sound of the title, this is one of the most important contributions to the study of late 19th-c. Danish lit. to be published for a number of years. Its scope is extremely wide, and its implications far-reaching. It has long been acknowledged—not least by Karl Tiander in his study of the same name from 1913—that Turgenev has exerted a considerable influence on Danish lit., and numerous references have been made to it, none of which, however, made a serious effort to document it or to assess its true extent. The effort has now been made, and with complete success. The author acknowledges from the start that much of the influence necessarily must consist of intangibles, and consequently he never
claims more than is justifiable, being rather satisfied to indicate trends and probabilities where many less circumspect writers would make definite claims.

Not only because of the intangibles, but also because of the many facets of Turgenev's influence, this is a complex subject, but the author has produced a study of impressive lucidity both by defining the types of influence and dealing with them separately, and also by dividing the subject-matter into three main periods and showing the differences in the predominating influence types in each of these. Apart from the chap. on Vilhelm Møller's transls and articles, the most worth-while studies are without doubt those on J. P. Jacobsen, Drachmann and Herman Bang. The type of influence exerted on each of these writers is different, but all aspects are adequately documented and appraised, as are the influences of a minor nature or of a negative bias, as is the case with Pontoppidan. This book will surely assert itself as a standard work on the last 30 years of the 19th c.

Frederik Nielsen, *Digter og Læser*, Gyldendal, 191 pp. In a work consisting largely of essays previously published, the author here ranges over the whole field of Danish lit. from Holberg to Martin A. Hansen. Several articles deal with one specific work—those on Paludan-Müller's *Venus*, Nis Petersen's *Sandalmagernes Gade* and Pontoppidan's *Ørneflugt* being among the most interesting. In them the author has much to say that is stimulating, and he does make a considerable contribution to the understanding of a much-debated novel like *Sandalmagernes Gade*. Most controversial is his treatment of *Ørneflugt*, on which he puts a completely new interpretation. It is well supported, but surely cannot entirely replace the generally accepted one. The weakness of the art. is, perhaps, its failure to explain the famous ending to the story, on which the original interpretation is founded, and which certainly does not fit into the new one. There is, perhaps, a general tendency in the book to ignore what does not quite fit the picture; in dealing with *Sandalmagernes Gade*, Fr. Nielsen attacks those who talk of the anachronisms it contains as having no knowledge of Roman history. He then produces a long list of passages taken directly from Nis Petersen's sources, eminently sufficient to prove that much of the book, at least, is authentic. But he does not mention one single one of the so-called anachronisms and fails therefore to refute the charge. The general treatment of the novel,