

<CT>THE TEXTUALITY OF SEXUALITY: INTERPRETING HOMOSEXUALITY IN  
TWO EUROPEAN INTER-WAR NARRATIVES

<CA>*Per Esben Myren-Svelstad*

<ABS>ABSTRACT

This article is a comparative reading of the novella *Verwirrung der Gefühle* (1927) by the Austrian author Stefan Zweig and the novel *Følelsers forvirring* (1937) by the Norwegian author Borghild Krane. While both titles translate as *Confusion of Emotions*, and both deal with the fates of homosexuals, this is the first study to ask how the connections between the two works create literary meaning, and what this might imply for the textual mode of existence of homosexuality. Employing poststructuralist theories on the textuality of sexuality, this article argues that interpretation of linguistic and cultural signs is fundamental to the idea of homosexuality in the European inter-war years. Positing the existence of a homocultural code, the article explores in depth how the ability to understand and reproduce a particular system of references is depicted as vital in understanding same-sex attraction. Moreover, the article argues that the way Krane intertextually connects her novel to Zweig's novella should be read as symbolic of how the homosexual condition is marked by the mastering of various codes.

KEYWORDS: Stefan Zweig, Borghild Krane, intertextuality, homosexuality, code-switching

In 1927, the Austrian author Stefan Zweig published a collection of three novellas called *Verwirrung der Gefühle*, literally translated in English "Confusion of Emotions." The

eponymous novella is a sentimental depiction of the fate of a homosexual university professor. Ten years later, the Norwegian physician Borghild Krane published her first book, the novel *Følelsers forvirring*—which may also be literally translated as *Confusion of Emotions*. Krane’s novel is also a portrayal of the impossibility of homosexuality in the inter-war years, and has been called “the first Norwegian lesbian novel.”<sup>1</sup> The titular and thematic overlap between these two works makes it relevant to study how they portray issues of same-sex desire in the 1920s and 1930s as a textual problem.

In this article, I will argue that the intertextuality in Zweig’s novella and Krane’s novel can be read as expressions of what I term a homocultural “code,” that is, a system of references that allude to and connote homosexuality, thereby underlining how this sexuality must often be exhorted and uncovered without being mentioned. By way of comparative readings of key scenes in the two narratives, I wish to support three analytical findings. First, that Krane’s citing Zweig’s title signals a need to read these two texts in comparison, something that has not yet been done. This fact is all the more surprising given the close connection between the two works and the historical status of *Følelsers forvirring*. Second, I argue that both narratives depict the constitution of a homosexual culture through citation, thereby underlining the importance of knowledge and interpretation in order to make this culture readable. Third, my analysis shows how this intertextuality establishes a metaliterary theme of code-switching as a symbol of the homosexual condition.

Zweig’s *Verwirrung der Gefühle* has recently been translated into English by Anthea Bell with the title *Confusion* (2009), which is the title I will be using, while referring to Krane’s novel by its original title *Følelsers forvirring*, as no English translation exists.

### **Citation as a Means of Coding**

Already the contemporary Norwegian author and critic Barbra Ring commented on the similarity between the two works in her review of Krane's debut book: "‘Verwirrung der Gefühle’ heter også Stefan Zweigs bok om de ulykkelige mennesker—de kan være de beste og klokeste og høist kulturelt utviklede ellers, sier dikterne—som er født med unaturlig tilbøyelighet for sit eget kjønn"<sup>2</sup> ("Verwirrung der Gefühle" is also the title of Stefan Zweig's book about the unhappy people—who may otherwise be the best, wisest, and culturally most developed, according to the poets—who are born with an unnatural inclination for their own sex). The scholar Lars Rune Waage has also addressed this titular overlap in an analysis of *Følelsers forvirring* drawing primarily on Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity. Waage additionally remarks that the idea of "confusion" has an apologetic function on behalf of homosexuality—one cannot be legally punished for being confused.<sup>3</sup> While I believe Waage is right, he does not explore whether there is more to the identical titles than Zweig and Krane sharing an apologetic view on homosexuality. My claim is that the relations between the works in question constitute a complex intertextuality, the title being only one (albeit crucial) element. As argued by Gérard Genette, a title may be regarded as what he terms a paratext, which "presents" a literary work by "commanding" our reading of it, thus influencing its reception.<sup>4</sup> Instead of simply stating that Krane "took" her title from Stefan Zweig, we might ask what effect this intertextuality has. While we cannot know whether it is the result of Krane's intentionality or simply the "confluence" of similar ideas,<sup>5</sup> this intertextuality should be studied as a literary device of the same importance as tropes and composition.

Zweig's *Confusion* is the story of Roland, a heterosexual scholar of literature, who reminisces about his time as a student. Initially lazy and debauched, the young Roland becomes the confidential assistant of a renowned professor specialized in Shakespearean theater. However, his affectionate relation to the professor—who stays unnamed throughout

the novella—is complicated by the unpredictable behavior of the latter, as well as his wife’s seeming interest in the young student. In the end, the professor admits his inclination for other men, and tells Roland about his “Qualen des Tantalus”<sup>6</sup> (“torments of Tantalus”<sup>7</sup>): Always surrounded by young, male students, while unable to declare his desire to them, the professor has realized that even his love for Roland will remain unconsummated. He kisses Roland, and then implores the student to leave him. Back in the frame narrative, the elderly Roland remembers his old master with pity and admiration.

Krane’s *Følelsers forvirring* is compositionally very different from its predecessor. The novel principally follows the main character Åse, whereas the second, and shortest, part also focuses on her friend Randi. These two lesbian women, along with Åse’s gay adoptive brother Dmitri, embody different solutions to the problem of living as a homosexual in the 1930s. Åse is a book-learned young woman, with little knowledge of the world as she has grown up in Norway’s rural, northern regions. She slowly gives up hopes of living her sexual identity openly, and instead devotes her life to being a teacher. While Åse thus quietly attempts to assimilate into greater society, Randi on the other hand is a vital and defiant character who wants to live her life without regard to societal norms. After a failed attempt to establish a stable relationship in the United States, Randi moves back to Norway at the end of the novel, resigning in the face of her “torments of Tantalus”<sup>8</sup>—another intertextual nod to Zweig’s novella.<sup>9</sup> After a strange plot twist involving a short affair with Dmitri, a car hits Randi while she’s crossing the street. Her friend’s resignation and subsequent death lead Åse to conclude that the troubles of homosexuals are no worse than those of others. Everyone deviates from the ideal of normality, Åse now believes, and the only solution is cultivating compassion toward one’s neighbor.<sup>10</sup>

As should be clear from these short summaries, both works involve contemporaneous Western ideas on homosexuals drawn from both medicine and public debate. A good example

is the rather unmotivated erotic relation between Randi and Dmitri. While this has been ridiculed in the later reception of *Følelsers forvirring*,<sup>11</sup> in light of prevailing nineteenth and early twentieth-century theories on homosexuality, their relationship could make sense as complimentary: the “masculine” lesbian is attracted to the “effeminate” gay man.<sup>12</sup> Randi’s inner monolog supports such a reading: “[H]ennes styrke og hans svakhed trakk hverandre som magneter med motsatt benevnelse. Det er en tiltrekning som skjer efter en naturlov”<sup>13</sup> ([H]er strength and his weakness pulled each other as magnets with opposite poles. It is an attraction happening according to a law of nature). Nevertheless, scholars have remarked how Åse’s unwillingness to battle for her rights as a lesbian indicates a heteronormative value system; the lesbian is allowed to live with her nature, but not openly.<sup>14</sup> Randi’s transgression of this norm results in her death.

In spite of their similarities, then, a striking difference in the political message of the two texts is detectable. While *Følelsers forvirring* comes close to trivializing the plight of homosexuals in its attempt to include lesbians in a general “condition humaine,” *Confusion* expresses far more sympathy and understanding for male same-sex love. The following analysis of the depiction(s) of homosexuality in these texts is contextualist and poststructuralist. Importantly, I will use the term “homocultural code,” which is to be understood as a system of markers, textual and linguistic elements, and even rhetorical tropes, prevalent in these works, which *potentially* point to homoeroticism and a homosexual subculture. “Code” in this article, then, should be understood in its linguistic definition as a system of references, conventions, and rules. In these works, the potential for homosexual meaning is, to use a concept of Roland Barthes’ invention, “writable” for anyone familiar with the culture of a Western society where discourses on homosexuality are prolific and controversial.<sup>15</sup>

It is necessary to underline that this approach is fundamentally different from queer readings that presuppose a textual “camouflage” under which there is a hidden layer of meaning.<sup>16</sup> Such readings, where homosexual meaning is seen as encrypted, as it were, imply that homosexuality in the early twentieth century cannot be referred to openly, due to the repressive discursive regimes forcing the author to hide the true meaning of the text. However, I will argue that connotation, allusion, and ambiguity are rather fundamental to the textual existence of homosexuality—evasiveness creates the effect of homosexuality, so to speak. The homocultural code is hence a term for the cultural elements that draw on the discursive configuration of homosexuality as something taboo and “unsayable,” but simultaneously something that must be exhorted and discussed. This effect, then, actually underlines the explicit depiction of the destiny of the lesbian and gay characters in these narratives.

Through early twentieth-century discourses on sexuality—such as law and medicine—the homosexual is imagined as someone of whom it is critical to produce knowledge, but where that knowledge is also dangerous, restricted, and transmitted evasively. Modern homosexual definition therefore produces the homosexual as a marked difference in language, which it is necessary to uncover, but which is also dangerous, as knowledge of homosexuality risks destabilizing respectable gender norms.<sup>17</sup> There exists, in other words, a cultural demand to read homosexuality as difference: Whereas the heterosexual body is “unmarked,” homosexuality is imagined as a deviation with visible characteristics—such as gender role inversion, degeneration, and abnormal genitals.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the idea of a visible, homosexual anatomy still existed in 1930s Norway. For example, in the first article on homosexuality written for the general Norwegian public, the physicians Torgeir Kasa and Karl Evang state that passive homosexual men often have broad pelvises, little body hair, and an accumulation of lipids around the thighs and buttocks.<sup>19</sup>

Although the threatening immorality of homosexual physiognomy means that homosexuality is only connoted in much inter-war literature, it is not actually hidden from the reader in *Confusion*, nor in *Følelsers forvirring*. Where the former uncovers at the end that the professor is a homosexual, the main character of Krane's novel is labeled as "perverse" early on. On the one hand, this hints to a structural inversion—one might perhaps say "perversion"—in Krane's novel; where the sexuality of Zweig's professor is a potential surprise, Krane emphasizes the topic of sexuality from the beginning of the main plot. Keeping Åse's lesbianism hidden in a play of implication and connotation until the end of the narrative, as Zweig does, would thus seem ineffective. On the other hand, the early revelation of the characters' sexuality in the Norwegian novel shows that the linguistic configuration of homosexuality does not in fact hinge on it remaining unstated or ambiguously described. Rather, implications and evasive allusions form part of homosexual existence, even when it is narratively "uncloseted."

I understand the cultural construction of homosexual meaning through theorist David Halperin's concept of the homosexual "double outlook": homosexuals are raised in a heteronormative environment and know the acts of normative gender behavior, while at the same time living in a dissident relationship to this majority culture.<sup>20</sup> This dissident outlook allows for a citation and recoding of the cultural elements of the heteronormative majority. Gay culture thus contributes in creating and consolidating an assembly of usual "signifiers of gayness."<sup>21</sup> Hence, there are ways to *connote* homosexuality so that it is simultaneously expressed and not. The homosexual thus masters "two different systems of reference"<sup>22</sup>—what I choose to term "codes." The paratextual interplay between the two narratives contributes in defining the homosexual situation as one of constant interpreting, reading, and having to switch between differing codes.

Halperin's approach allows us to circumvent the question of the sexual subjectivity of the author, since we are talking about systems of reference grounded in cultures. In this respect, Halperin uses a helpful analogy: although there is a "French culture," the elements this culture comprises are not exclusive to, or necessarily embraced by, all Frenchmen, nor does one have to *be* French by birth to share in them.<sup>23</sup> Likewise, one might call the French language a code—in the sense that a text in French requires a specific cultural background of its author as well as of its reader: that of having been raised in a francophone environment, or having chosen to study the language. In our context, then, the cultural background of the authors, and not their sexuality, is the interesting question.

Zweig lived and worked in Vienna at the same time as Freud—a man who revolutionized the consensus on sexuality.<sup>24</sup> The two men admired each other mutually,<sup>25</sup> and one might expect that Zweig was influenced by Freud's innovative understanding of homosexuality as a potential in the development of every individual. As for 1930s Norway, historian Martin Skaug Halsos underlines how the menace of homosexuality was a central topic in the creation of a modern welfare state concerned with public health: "In the beginning of the twentieth century most Norwegian scientists were educated in Germany and were in general highly influenced by German scientific knowledge. Consequently, the scientific understanding of homosexuality in Norway drew heavily from German sexology."<sup>26</sup> In other words, the contemporaneous understanding of sexuality in Krane's time was to a large extent based on medical discourses in German-speaking Europe. Furthermore, as pointed out by Danish scholar Dag Heede, and the homosexual subculture in Scandinavia has historically drawn heavily on Berlin.<sup>27</sup> This is another reason to read these two works in conjunction, as they present a concrete example of the influence on Scandinavian literature of German discourses concerning homosexuality.



One might regard the homocultural code as a special case of what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari call *minor literature*. The French theorists analyze “minor literature” as one made by a minority in a majority language.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, such a literature is marked by a strong coefficient of *deterritorialization*.<sup>29</sup> Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts have been fruitfully applied to gay and lesbian literature. For instance, David Lloyd has underlined how Jean Genet’s reappropriation of identifying labels is also a deterritorializing of majority discourse.<sup>30</sup> However, I choose to employ Halperin’s understanding of gay culture’s “parasitic” relation on majority culture for two reasons. First, as Halperin emphasizes, homosexuals are an invisible minority, raised in a majority culture of which they know the codes, thus being able to hide their “dissident” identity. Second, this approach indicates that gay and lesbian identity and the homocultural code, likely to a larger extent than other minority identities and codes, are constituted in dialectic with majority culture.

### **The Issue of Interpretation**

At the very start of *Confusion*, the aged Roland reflects upon a Festschrift in his honor, containing a biography of himself written by colleagues. While Roland acknowledges the bare facts laid out here, he realizes that his friends are unaware of the inner forces that have shaped his life. Already at this point the novella introduces the trope of interpretation, from the narrative perspective of a philologist whose job is, exactly, interpretation: “Und so ward ich, der ein Leben daran gewandt, Menschen aus ihrem Werke darzustellen und das geistige Gefüge ihrer Welt wesenhaft zu machen, gerade am eigenen Erlebnis wieder gewahr, wie undurchdringlich in jedem Schicksal der eigentliche Wesenskern bleibt, die plastische Zelle, aus der alles Wachstum dringt.”<sup>31</sup> (“And so I, who have spent a lifetime depicting human beings in the light of their work, portraying the intrinsic intellectual structure of their worlds,

was made aware again from my own experience of the impenetrability in every human life of the true core of its being, the malleable cell from which all growth proceeds.”<sup>32</sup>)

The novella thus begins with a moment of metareflection. Having always striven to analyze the life and the world of authors through texts, Roland is reminded that the inner forces of human life remain opaque to outsiders. This insight launches the retrospective core narrative, where the reader is informed of Roland’s life as a student in Berlin, his cooperation with the professor, and the latter’s avowal of his feelings for Roland, ending in a kiss. Roland never sees him again, and their volumes on Shakespeare are never published. However, the story concludes in a return to the frame narrative: “Keinen habe ich mehr geliebt”<sup>33</sup> (“I have never loved anyone more”<sup>34</sup>). That is, Roland’s love for his professor surpasses that for his parents, wife, and children.

As will already be obvious, the novella is replete with elements of a homocultural code: Roland’s immorality and ambiguous fascination with the professor; Shakespeare, known for his sonnets addressed to another man; the theater as symbol of role-play and an “inauthentic” existence, possibly symbolizing the homosexual’s need to hide and play a social game that does not reveal his “real” nature. Moreover, the conclusion of the novella, and indeed the student-professor relation as a whole, mimic the pederastic ideal of Antiquity, where the young man’s love for an older and wiser man is purer than that for wife and family, leading to a higher intellectual and moral understanding. Traces of this kind are scattered throughout the novella, and to many—educated, upper class—readers in 1927, the professor’s final confession would not have come as a surprise. These ambiguous traces exemplify how a homocultural code is created through the citation of certain cultural elements.

While the novella presents the pederastic ideal as a counter-discourse to the contemporaneous medical view of homosexuality as a degenerative perversion, it also shows how the professor/student relation must stay hidden in order to save both Roland’s honor and

that of his teacher. The learned tradition evoked here is significant. At the time, classical pederasty had been employed in defense of (male) homosexuality in André Gide's polemic dialog *Corydon* (1927). One might also assume that Zweig was familiar with the pederastic eroticism depicted in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig* (1912), which, like Gide's text, contains many allusions to classical learning. The active use of pederasty in this politico-polemical way indicates a twofold intertextuality in gay literature. Firstly, a literary and historical archive of male homosexuality presented as edifying and noble is reactivated and alluded to in opposition to condemnatory modern sexology. Secondly, this use of an ancient Greek archive itself turns into a trope that allows twentieth-century texts on homosexuality to "cite" each other, as we may say that Zweig here cites, or alludes to, Gide.

By alluding to the tradition of pederasty, Zweig presents insight into the homocultural code as part of a traditional Western, male, and bourgeois form of erudition. Indeed, Roland's initial lackadaisical attitude to his studies is contrasted with the many elitist markers of homosexuality that he fails to decode until the end. As Eve K. Sedgwick has observed, what we might call the "gay canon" has significant overlaps with the general Western canon.<sup>35</sup> This would be part of the reason why it is open to appropriation by the gay subculture, as Halperin claims. However, this also illustrates that Zweig's novel does not defend homosexuality per se, but a "noble" form of male-male relation striving for spiritual and intellectual advancement. Furthermore, the pederastic relationship indicates a male-centeredness, which is transformed in Krane's later intertext.

Indeed, while borrowing an array of tropes from Zweig, Krane's novel differs greatly in its narrative technique; Krane uses a third-person narrator and substantial parts of interior monolog. While this allows for an almost polyphonic exploration of the different experiences of the main characters, the narrator and the characters also often voice a more distanced, at times ironic or critical, attitude to their problems. This is obvious as small-town girl Åse,

having just started her studies in Oslo, gets to know the more street-smart and slightly older woman Gerd. After a while, Gerd grows tired of Åse's ever more importunate friendship. Åse is unaware of the nature of her fascination for her new friend until a key scene, where she sees Gerd to the bus stop. There, Gerd decides to break up their friendship. Åse is stupefied, and Gerd is annoyed: "Forstår du ikke? Men herregud, menneske, du er da ikke noe barn og du er da ikke dum. Begriper du ikke at det ikke henger riktig sammen, at det er—at det er—at du er—du er pervers"<sup>36</sup> ("Do you not understand? But for God's sake, woman, you're not a child, and you're not stupid, after all. Are you unable to fathom that it doesn't make sense, that it is—that it is—that you are—you are perverse"). Gerd runs to catch the bus and leaves Åse to sort out the revelation on her own.

This confrontation introduces one of the standard tropes of the novel: the contrast between academic and intuitive knowledge. Gerd, the office-worker, sees and understands things about other people that Åse the student has failed to discover in books. The former's use of the term "perverse" demonstrates how the medical discourse trickles down and is cited by non-specialists. At the same time, it is significant that homosexual knowledge is transferred in an informal setting, on the street as it were. This first revelation forebodes Krane's treatment of lesbian knowledge as different from the gay male culture depicted by Zweig in terms of its content, but still similar in its mode of transmission.

While the scenes of revelation are vastly different, the relationships depicted have an important point in common. As Ring noted, "Zweig skildrer en eldre professors ulykkelige kjærlighet til en ung student, Borghild Krane en ung lærerinne"<sup>37</sup> (Zweig depicts the love of an older professor for a young student, Borghild Krane, a young schoolmistress). Indeed, Åse is forced to resign from her teaching position after being accused of an immoral relationship to one of her female pupils. We may also note that both of the main characters in *Confusion* are scholars of literature, whereas Åse teaches "languages and history."<sup>38</sup> In other words, all

the main characters deal professionally with languages and interpretation. However, their social positions are clearly different: a university professor represents the educated élite to a far higher degree than does a schoolteacher. Again, this suggests that the differing experiences of Zweig's and Krane's characters are based in gender and, by extension, class differences.

Nevertheless, added to the trope of interpretation is one of teaching and gathering of knowledge that underlines both the importance of knowledge as interpretative tool and the school as arena for same-sex experiences. Åse develops a caring, friendly relationship to her troubled pupil, Signe. After Signe's mother complains about their relationship (albeit platonic) to the principal, Åse is forced to take a leave of absence. During her time away, Åse learns of Signe's unexpected death in a newspaper. This unhappy (and unconsummated) lesbian relationship is a tragic, intertextual parallel to the pederastic ideal represented by Roland and the professor in *Confusion*. The fact that these relations are established at school or at the university is significant, since these are places for seeking, testing, and producing knowledge.

At the same time, the university in particular represents a location of potential pederastic relationships, locations that seem isolated from the outside world (cf. the idea of "the ivory tower") where a group of people convene based on common interests. Moreover, academics communicate in a "tribal" language, as a possible analogy to the opaque homocultural code. As French historian Laure Murat writes, the homosexual subculture consists of "hidden illegals who show themselves,"<sup>39</sup> a statement pointing to the paradoxical existence of homosexuality in culture as something that is visible and obscure at the same time. While readable and thus accessible to anyone culturally taught to recognize it, homosexuality also tends to evade direct labeling. The school, as an arena for strong

teacher/pupil attachments, aptly renders the *potentiality* of homosexuality, which is depicted as, exactly, *only* potential and therefore threatening.

### **Confusing Code-Switching**

The theme of interpretation thus points to the evasiveness of the homosexual code, and how it is created in a dynamic interplay between authoritative, medico-legal markers of homosexuality, and the more intangible gossip, ambiguous cultural markers, and word on the street. The difficulties of interpretation also play a large role in the theme of code-switching, which is most prominent in Krane's novel.

As young girls in Northern Norway, Åse and her little sister, Ebba, fight with the children next door about who has the richest family. The quarrel ends with Åse rejecting the very idea that the two families are comparable: "Vi har ingenting med dokker å gjøre. Vi er ikke sammen med dokker. Vi er ikke engang norsk. Vi er russisk"<sup>40</sup> ("We don't have anything to do with you all. We aren't together with you. We're not even Norwegian. We're Russian"). Indeed, their mother is Russian, a fact that signals Åse's special identity from the outset. Moreover, this identity entails the mastery of two different codes, since Åse is the only family member to have acquired her mother's native tongue.<sup>41</sup> Knowing a different code creates an extraordinary identity that permits Åse to performatively locate herself in the minority group "Russian." While foreboding her later location in another minority group—that of the "perverse"—this scene also underlines the importance of mastering a linguistic code in the creation of a minoritarian identity. The introduction of Dmitri, a Russian refugee adopted by Åse's family, who also turns out to be homosexual, underlines this analogy between sexuality and nationality.

Ironically, Åse's problem is her seeming inability to comprehend the homocultural code, as shown in her confrontation with Gerd. Even after her realization, she still tries to

resist using it, as when Åse and Randi meet as students at an all-female college in Cambridge. In one scene, the two Norwegian women go to a café with a group of students, where they notice a gay male couple. Scandalized, the women start gossiping, and one of them claims to be able to always see through “that kind of people”:

“Jeg merker straks når slike mennesker er til stede. Jeg har et instinkt som aldri narrer mig der. [ . . .].” Randi og Åse så på hverandre. De var like, ikke bare i det at de var landsmenn. Om Åse ikke hadde brydd sig om å opfatte det før, skjønte hun det nu. Randi hadde forstått det hele tiden. De var derfor hun hadde sagt at de burde være venner og være dus for de hadde spesiell grunn til det. *Og andre ting hadde hun også sagt. Åse hadde ikke brydd sig om å opfatte det, men nu var der ingen vei utenom.*<sup>42</sup>

“I can always tell when that kind of people are present. I have an instinct that never fools me in such cases. [ . . .].” Randi and Åse looked at each other. They were alike, not only in being compatriots. If Åse had not cared to perceive it before, she understood now. Randi had been aware all the time. That was why she had said they should be friends and use the informal *du* pronoun [instead of the formal *De*], because they had a special reason to. *And she had said other things, too. Åse had not cared to perceive it, but now there was no way out.*)

This sequence starts ironically: the reader knows that Åse is a member of “that kind of people,” but her unnamed fellow student has not realized, in spite of her bragging about her “instinct.” However, Åse’s identity is obvious to the audacious Randi, and it is indicative of their different life projects that Åse struggles against using a common system of references between them. Randi, the novel’s unapologetic lesbian character, does not win her friend over

until they are placed in a situation where they *know* something the others do not. Although their words and gestures are perfectly perceivable to the rest, they have the ability of an invisible minority to communicate in a hidden manner. Here too, the novel uses nationality as an analogy to sexual identity. While Åse and Randi have a common national language—Norwegian—they also master a less obvious code that stays imperceptible to the others. Interestingly, this anticipates Halperin’s parallel between national culture and homosexual culture.

This scene also shows how the depiction of languages and code-switching is connected to the theme of knowledge. Just as Åse has failed to discover that she is “perverse” through her bookish learning, her fellow student at the prestigious university of Cambridge also lacks the ability to determine who belongs to “that kind of people.” Here, it seems pertinent to recall Edelman’s observation that the modern idea of homosexuality is constructed as something of which knowledge is crucial yet impossible to establish unambiguously.<sup>43</sup> *Følelsers forvirring* continuously expresses an idea of the homosexual code as something not necessarily taught in the institutionalized transfer of knowledge, but as a subculture, transmitted privately, in the way Åse has acquired her Russian mother tongue at home. This knowledge, as Eve K. Sedgwick has stated in a different context, is fundamental to the idea of sexuality: “Modern ‘sexuality’ and hence modern homosexuality are so intimately entangled with the historically distinctive contexts and structures that now count as *knowledge* that such ‘knowledge’ can scarcely be a transparent window onto a separate realm of sexuality, but, rather, itself constitutes that sexuality.”<sup>44</sup> Taking Sedgwick’s point further, one might say that Randi’s and Åse’s tacit insight is in itself part of their sexuality, and one may thus argue that the very hiddenness of their identities does not hide a “core” of “real” lesbianism, but that hiding and unspoken knowledge *constitute* homosexuality, as it is imagined in inter-war Western cultures.



*Følelsers forvirring* here represents an interesting transformation compared to *Confusion*, as the café scene can be read in contrast to Roland's first visit to the professor's home office. On the wall, the professor keeps a copy of Raphael's *School of Athens*: "unwillkürlich meinte ich in Sokrates' eigenwilligem Gesicht eine Ähnlichkeit mit seiner Stirn zu entdecken"<sup>45</sup> ("instinctively I thought I traced a similarity to his own brow in the highly individual face of Socrates"<sup>46</sup>). In addition, the office features a bust of Ganymede, the mythological origin of pederasty. Next to it is a sculpture of St. Sebastian, a martyr often homoerotically depicted as tied to a pole, wearing a loincloth and penetrated by arrows—an emblem of gay male masochism.<sup>47</sup> For a reader familiar with the homocultural code, these elements will be obvious markers of the professor's homosexuality. Roland, however, is unable to read any precise significance into them. To him, these objects only suggest a vague feeling, reflecting the nascent pederastic nature of his relationship to his teacher: "aus diesen Dingen sprach symbolisch eine mir neue Art der geistigen Schönheit, die ich nie geahnt und die mir noch nicht deutlich war, wenn ich auch sie brüderhaft zu spüren mich schon bereitet fühlte"<sup>48</sup> ("they spoke to me of a new kind of intellectual beauty, a beauty that I had never suspected and that still was not clear to me, although I already felt prepared to turn to it with fraternal emotion"<sup>49</sup>). The excerpt suggests how in some cases academic knowledge is one of the necessary requirements for reading the homocultural code, while simultaneously alluding to the theme of a homosexual subculture as filled with signs that are not always readable to the "uninitiated." Another example of this is the expression "brüderhaft" ("fraternal emotion"), to be discussed below in connection with a key scene leading up to the crisis in the novella.

The intertextual relation between Zweig's and Krane's texts exposes an important difference in the cultural traits of male and female homosexuality. While in *Følelsers forvirring*, knowledge of one's lesbian identity is depicted as a form of street-smartness as

opposed to academic knowledge, in *Confusion*, male homosexual culture is rather depicted as a part of high culture. One might recall Ring's assertion that homosexuals are often depicted as "the best, wisest, and culturally most developed."<sup>50</sup> As mentioned, many of the signals of homosexuality in the professor's office allude to pederasty, underlining the connotations of the student-teacher relationship. The most obvious female equivalent, the archaic poet Sappho—a highly relevant parallel to Åse as she is often imagined as a schoolmistress for her young girlfriends<sup>51</sup>—never appears in *Følelsers forvirring*. In the Norwegian novel, there is a striking lack of a lesbian iconography that might have played the same role as the artworks mentioned in Zweig's novella.

In fact, a mention of Sappho in *Følelsers forvirring* might have been in conflict with the heteronormativity of the novel. The Greek poetess is often employed as a positive forerunner for female homoeroticism, much like the role played by the pederasty of Socrates in gay male culture. For example, the controversial and widely read work *Geschlecht und Charakter* by Austrian philosopher Otto Weininger stated that Sappho's genius was due to her more masculine soul.<sup>52</sup> The absence of Sappho is thus possibly indicative of the different political projects of Krane and Zweig. In this way, Krane exposes—perhaps deliberately, perhaps inadvertently—the double marginalization of female homosexuals: they are invisible in society, but also to a large degree in (high) culture.

However, other homocultural tropes abound in Krane's novel. For example, the constant travels of Åse and Randi and the exile of Åse's half-brother Dmitri point to the homosexual's homelessness. The theme of exile is not present to the same degree in Zweig's novella, although we are informed of the professor's constant travels to the gay subcultures of Germany's big cities. While Zweig—somewhat subversively—depicts mastery of the male homocultural code as a parallel to being familiar with the greatest treasures of Western culture, Krane rather underlines the importance of mastering a "foreign language" through the

trope of the homosexual's exile. This language or code is not taught in any formal setting, but acquired at home or in situations where gossip and practical knowledge is transmitted—what Sedgwick has called “the rich, unsystematic resources of nonce taxonomy.”<sup>53</sup> These settings are, of course, strongly associated with female experience.

### **The Inability to Express Confused Emotions**

A further intertextual element between the two works might be considered part and parcel of the eponymous “confusion.” The scene where Åse and Randi negotiate their confidentiality also seems to have a parallel in Zweig's novella, where the idea of confusion is explicitly tied to the problem of interpretation. At the completion of the first volume of his study on Shakespearean theater, the professor wants to celebrate by going informal and proposing a toast: “. . .Niemand hat mehr für mich getan, keiner so treulich mir geholfen. Und darum sage ich nicht, I h n e n habe ich es zu danken, sondern . . . d i r habe ich es zu danken. Komm! Nun wollen wir eine Stunde ganz brüderlich sein!”<sup>54</sup> (“. . .No one has ever done more for me, no one has helped me so faithfully. And so it is you,’ he concluded, changing from the formal *Sie* to the familiar *du* pronoun—‘it is you whom I must thank. Come! Let us sit together like brothers for a while!’”<sup>55</sup>). Here, no doubt, is the model for Randi's insistence that she and Åse use the informal second-person pronoun. This short address carries many potentially homoerotic signals: Roland has been *faithful* to the professor, and the latter wishes to thank him by being “like a brother”—a possible allusion to the subcultural expression “warm brothers” [*warme Brüder*] for male homosexuals.<sup>56</sup> In addition, the German original shows by way of an ellipsis how the hesitant professor tryingly introduces the *du*-pronoun, here in its dative form *dir*: “sondern . . . d i r habe ich es zu danken.”<sup>57</sup> In the code of the majority, this short hesitation might present itself as common decency; one does not throw out an informal pronoun, one tries it out, as it were, taking one's time to signal a change in social conventions.

However, one might also read the professor's carefulness as the homosexual's wary approach to someone he hopes might be a "brother." As Halperin points out, the elements that make up the potential homocultural code are after all also part of the majority code, because the former recodes elements from the latter while keeping them ambiguous and evasive.

This is the point where the crisis in Zweig's novella arises, as Roland, going out to fetch wine glasses, discovers the professor's wife in the corridor, listening in on their conversation with a dark, threatening look on her face. Back with the professor, Roland's joy disappears: "[W]ie durch geheime Poren rieselte die ganze geheime Freude aus. Verworren, ja beschämt vernahm ich, wie er mir nochmals dankte, nun mit dem vertrauten Du, silbern klangen die Gläser zusammen"<sup>58</sup> ("[A]ll my secret joy seeped away as if through hidden pores. Confused, indeed ashamed, I heard him thanking me again, still using the familiar *du*, and our glasses touched with a silvery sound"<sup>59</sup>). Roland's reaction is difficult to understand, unless one takes into account his problematic love triangle situation. Having moved into the professor's house and worked "faithfully" together with his master, he has not only acquired a degree of closeness to the professor that is lacking in the latter's actual marriage. His shameful, unhappy mood on being discovered by his teacher's wife points to an implicit insight into the fact that this closeness somehow oversteps the boundaries of the respectable. As Sedgwick has argued, the male homosocial spectrum enters a crisis with Western modernity's need to define the limit between homo- and heterosexuality: homophobia may be considered "a mechanism for regulating the behavior of the many by the specific oppression of the few."<sup>60</sup> Hence, while this scene is potentially a depiction of Roland's bad feelings for the professor's wife, it also makes sense in light of the need to keep male relations on the side of the respectable.

Troubled, Roland withdraws to his flat, to the dismay of his professor. While Roland is lying distressed on his bed as though in a feverish state, the professor enters and ends the

familiar address between them: “Ich wollte Ihnen nur sagen . . . wir lassen lieber das Du . . . Das . . . das . . . paßt sich nicht zwischen einem Mulus und seinem Lehrer . . . verstehen Sie? . . . Man muß Distanz halten . . . Distanz . . . Distanz”<sup>61</sup> (“I only wanted to say . . . we’d better not. You . . . It isn’t right, not a young student and his teacher, do you understand?” He had changed back to the formal *Sie* pronoun. ‘One must keep one’s distance . . . distance . . . distance . . .’<sup>62</sup>). Here, Bell’s translation omits the professor’s decision on behalf of both to “rather leave the *du*” (“wir lassen lieber das Du”), thereby underlining the ambiguity in his withdrawal from the close relation. The statement that an undefined “it” is inappropriate between “a young student and his teacher” implies something more than just an improper use of pronouns.

After the professor leaves him, Roland stays in bed, and his confusion reaches a pinnacle just as the professor’s wife knocks on his door to invite him for dinner. She reveals that her husband has left for “wieder einer seiner üblichen Ausflüge”<sup>63</sup> (“another one of his usual excursions”<sup>64</sup>), which causes Roland to break down sobbing and babbling. The wife comforts him: “Aber plötzlich wurde ihre Stimme hart. ‘Ich weiß es selbst, wie er einen verwirren kann, niemand weiß es besser’”<sup>65</sup> (“[. . .] but suddenly her voice grew hard. ‘I know just how he can confuse one, nobody knows better.’”<sup>66</sup>). This central conflict in the novella shows how also Zweig ties the idea of *confusion* to not only (lack of) knowledge, but also to a pragmatic-linguistic jumble. From their first encounter, Roland has dreamed of being a confidential friend of the professor, but his wife’s threatening glance indicates that the change to a familiar form of address is not a matter of joy. The danger inherent in their relation is underlined by the professor’s almost manic repetition of the word “distance.” He has tried to approach Roland through an ambiguous code the student does not understand, but which is understood, and feared, by the wife because of her deeper knowledge of her husband. The confusion felt by Roland may thus be read as a result of his unfamiliarity with the

overdetermination of the professor's system of references, where a word such as "brother" carries potential homoerotic meaning. The confused emotions are in this way the result of a linguistic confusion.

Krane's use of the word "confusion" likewise invokes a lack of knowledge and an inability to convey direct meaning. The sole instance in her novel where the term is used to qualify the word "emotions" is during Randi's return to Norway from the United States. On board the ship, she reflects upon her situation: "Hun strøk sig over ansiktet og sa trøstende til sig selv: 'Selv om man plutselig finner sig på et øde hav av ensomhet og forlatthet, så er det jo ikke verden som går under eller tilværelsen som taper sin mening, det er bare våre følelser som forvirres'"<sup>67</sup> (She stroked her face and comforted herself, saying: "Even though one suddenly finds oneself on a desolate ocean of solitude and abandonment, it does not after all mean the world is ending or that one's existence is losing its meaning, it is only the confusion of our emotions"). The quote is symptomatic of Krane's sometimes unconvincing dismissal of her characters' problems: Randi's fundamental life crisis is written off as a mere "confusion" with no existential consequences. However, her confusion is the result of her losing her Norwegian girlfriend Ågot to a male Scandinavian immigrant in New York, Sven. At the beginning of part two of the novel, Randi has been seeing Ågot for a year, but there is an ominous lack of communicative contact between them:

De sa ikke stort på veien, det vil si Ågot sa et og annet, men Randi kunne ikke ta sig sammen til å svare noe ordentlig.

"Er der noe i veien?" spurte Ågot da de var kommet inn.

"Nei da." Hun rystet på hodet. Så forsikret hun: "Du vet jo at jeg –"

– elsker dig, vilde hun ha sagt, men tidde.<sup>68</sup>

(They did not speak much on the way home, that is, Ågot said a few things, but Randi could not collect herself in order to give a proper answer.

“Is something the matter?” Ågot asked after they came inside.

“Oh no.” She shook her head. Then reassuringly: “You know I—”  
—love you, is what she would have said, but went silent.)

Randi is tired of society’s judgment. Her inability to declare her love can be interpreted as a result of the exhaustion she is left with by constant disappointments and condemnations. It is characteristic how the missing declaration of love is conveyed with a dash marking an empty space filled in by the narrator. The declaration cannot be transmitted in dialogue; the rhetorical tropes of ellipsis and aposiopesis are given the task of representing the love that cannot be represented. This silence is exactly what the novel portrays as homosexuality’s mode of existence. Ågot does understand Randi’s use of the homocultural code, as is evident when Sven courts her: “‘Ja,’ svarte hun—igjen. ‘Men det er umulig. Jeg kan ikke. Randi—hun elsker mig også’” (“Yes,” she answered—again. “But it is impossible. I cannot. Randi—she loves me too”).<sup>69</sup> Here, one might recall Sedgwick’s comment to the Foucauldian theory of silence as speech act: “‘Closetedness’ itself is a performance initiated as such by the speech act of a silence—not a particular silence, but a silence that accrues particularity by fits and starts, in relation to the discourse that surrounds and differentially constitutes it.”<sup>70</sup>

Interruptions and taciturnity are the signs of the homocultural code conveying the love that is too taboo to mention.

Randi renounces her relationship with Ågot because a lesbian couple cannot attain happiness within the logic of the novel. As Randi explains: “Jeg vil bort herfra, for dette mellem oss må få slutt. Det er på mange måter en misforståelse”<sup>71</sup> (“I want to go away from here, because what is between us must come to an end. In many ways, it is a

misunderstanding”). She seems to have succumbed to the prescriptions of society: Same-sex love is wrong, and living it is a “misunderstanding”—close to synonymous with “confusion.” At the same time, this is a way of constantly defining homosexuality as an issue that has to do with language and comprehension. The question of what a “correct” understanding of a lesbian relationship would involve is left unanswered. Perhaps this is one of the main points of the novel: Because there is no universally accepted paradigm for such a relationship—and references to possible subcultural models, such as Sappho, remain absent—the confusion caused by this lack remains unsolvable.

### **Intertextuality as Homosexual Literarity**

The titular overlap between these two works is not simply a singular, paratextual connection between two fictional texts that happen to depict and discuss the question of same-sex desire. Rather, this intertextuality signals two important aspects pertaining to the homosexual condition in inter-war Europe. First, Krane connects her novel to Zweig’s novella in a way that invites the reader to look for other intertextual traces, thereby contributing in building a gay and lesbian literary tradition. Second, on a metaliterary level and by alluding to Zweig’s novella, Krane indicates that the very constitution of a code and the linguistic configuration of homosexuality as connotation are important tropes in gay and lesbian fiction. Through their portrayal of the homocultural code, both narratives appear as metareflections on the importance of knowledge in the way homosexuals live and navigate the world. However, *Følelsers forvirring* more strongly underlines the linguistic aspect of the necessity to interpret signs, a fact we may ascribe to the secondary status of Krane’s book and the exile of the lesbian woman. Indeed, the character Randi is introduced abroad (in England), lives abroad (in the United States), and dies shortly after her return to Norway. The lesbian who wants to live a full life is denied a homeland.



In spite of their empathetic depiction of homosexuals, it is difficult to gauge the political import of these works. Feminist author Gerd Brantenberg has called *Følelsers forvirring* self-contradictory and “the book that cannot be written”: “Dersom man mener at lesbisk kjærlighet er unatur og bør bekjempes, så kan man jo heller ikke skrive noen roman om dens berettigelse. Men dersom man allikevel gjør det, og skriver slik at leseren får sympati med den lesbiske hovedpersonen, vil selve utgivelsen av boken måtte tas som et forsvar for det den forkaster”<sup>72</sup> (If one thinks lesbian love is unnatural and should be fought against, one cannot, after all, write a novel about its legitimacy. But if one still does, and if one writes it in such a way that the reader feels sympathy with the lesbian protagonist, the very publication of the book will have to be read as a defense for what it rejects). In my view, the “confusing” value system of the novel exposes the definitional crisis of homosexuality in the Scandinavian inter-war years, as well as the need to temper sympathy with propriety. At this time, the medical discourse of the sick and wretched homosexual strongly challenged the biblical idea of the sodomite as a sinner and evil wrongdoer. Nevertheless, the novel seems to provide a message that homosexuality is worthy of sympathy only as long as the homosexual suffers silently and learns to cope with her destiny—as long as she chooses celibacy, like Åse. Moreover, *Følelsers forvirring* demonstrates the double marginalization of lesbian women, who lack the plethora of cultural models available to gay men. Krane seemingly attempts to transfer Zweig’s account of a male-homosexual subculture into a story about women, but instead of the sympathy and love expressed by Roland, Gerd’s definition of Åse as perverse is never challenged, and the novel concludes in death and resignation.

A somewhat more sentimental norm can be glimpsed in *Confusion*. The professor stands out as a blameless sufferer. He is a noble, learned, caring man, ostracized by a society that refuses to acknowledge his love as legitimate. Instead of corrupting the young Roland by his influence, he turns out to be a decisive and stabilizing influence in the life of the budding

scholar. Moreover, his wife also suffers from what is no doubt a marriage of convenience on the part of the professor. This, then, comes across as a powerful counterargument to the belief that homosexuals should be forced into heterosexual relations as a “cure.” Like Krane, Zweig avoids providing a glimmer of hope for the homosexual trying to live out his or her sexuality. Still, in *Confusion*, this might also be read as a call for change; the professor’s innocence makes his misfortunes seem even more unfair.

The paratextual relation between these two works interestingly conveys how homosexuality is not only *in* literature, but that it can also be understood *as* literature. As Genette has stated, relations between literary texts constitute “la litt  rit   elle-m  me”—they produce literary significance.<sup>73</sup> The goal of this article has been to show that intertextuality in homocultural utterances may be considered signs of a homocultural code, an evasive, alluding and connotative language that is the discursive mode of existence for homosexuality. Further, the intertextuality between *Confusion* and *F  lelsers forvirring* underlines the theme of interpretation, homelessness, and code-switching as overdetermined symbols of the homosexual condition in the European inter-war years. It is marked by exile, the need to read signs, and the mastery of different systems of reference as indication of an invisible minority identity.

<BIO>PER ESBEN MYREN-SVELSTAD is an associate professor of Norwegian at NTNU in Trondheim, Norway.

#### Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Gerd Brantenberg, *P   sporet av den tapte lyst: Kj  rlighet mellom kvinner som litter  rt motiv* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1986), 35.

<sup>2</sup> Barbra Ring, “Borghild Krane: F  lelsers forvirring,” *Urd* 41, no. 44 (1937): 1388.

<sup>3</sup> Lars Rune Waage, “Borghild Kranes *F  lelsers forvirring* (1937) – En queer lesning av Norges f  rste lesbiske roman,” *Norsk Litteraturvitenskapelig Tidsskrift* 15, no. 1 (2012): 18.

---

<sup>4</sup> Gérard Genette, *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), 7–8.

<sup>5</sup> I borrow the term “confluence” from Susan S. Lanser, *The Sexuality of History. Modernity and the Sapphic, 1565—1830* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014).

<sup>6</sup> Stefan Zweig, “Verwirrung Der Gefühle,” in *Verwirrung Der Gefühle. Drei Novellen* (Leipzig: Im Insel, 1927), 267.

<sup>7</sup> Stefan Zweig, *Confusion*, trans. Anthea Bell (New York: New York Review Books, 2009), 146.

<sup>8</sup> Borghild Krane, *Følelsers forvirring* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1937), 185.

<sup>9</sup> For a more thorough discussion of the myth of Tantalus in literary depictions of same-sex desire, I refer to my article on the subject: Per Esben Myren-Svelstad, “Tantalizing Idylls. Nature and Unattainable Pleasures in Gay and Lesbian Literature,” *Scandinavian Studies* 89, no. 3 (2017).

<sup>10</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 204.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Brantenberg, *På sporet av den tapte lyst*, 38.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature. Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 67.

<sup>13</sup> Krane, *Følelsers Forvirring*, 193

<sup>14</sup> Astrid Utne, *Følelser i eksil. Lesbisk identitet i norsk mellomkrigslitteratur, med en analyse av Borghild Kranes roman Følelsers Forvirring* (Tromsø: Universitetet i Tromsø, 1993), 152; Waage, “Borghild Kranes *Følelsers Forvirring* (1937),” 23.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (Paris: Seuil, 1970).

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Heinrich Detering, *Das offene Geheimnis* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013).

<sup>17</sup> Lee Edelman, *Homographesis* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 7–12.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

- 
- <sup>19</sup> Torgeir Kasa and Karl Evang, “Homoseksualitet,” in *Seksuell Opplysning*, vol. 1, ed. Karl Evang (Oslo: Tiden, 1947 [1932]), 185
- <sup>20</sup> David M. Halperin, *How to Be Gay* (Harvard University Press, 2012), 456–57.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 84.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 456.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.
- <sup>24</sup> Laure Murat, *La loi du genre: Une histoire culturelle du ‘troisième sexe’* (Paris: Fayard, 2006), 229.
- <sup>25</sup> Ingrid Spörk, “‘Mit Einer Finsteren, Einer Schwarzen Liebe’. Zu Liebesdiskursen in Stefan Zweigs Erzählerischem Werk,” in *Stefan Zweig Reconsidered: New Perspectives on His Literary and Biographical Writings*, ed. Mark H. Gelber, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 175.
- <sup>26</sup> Martin Skaug Halsos. “Norway 1842–1972: When Public Interest Demands,” in *Criminally Queer: Homosexuality and Criminal Law in Scandinavia, 1842–1999*, eds. Jens Rydström & Kati Mustola (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2007), 102.
- <sup>27</sup> Dag Heede, “A Gay History of Nordic Literature: Reflections on a Future Project,” in *Rethinking National Literatures and the Literary Canon in Scandinavia*, eds. Ann-Sofie Lönngren et al. (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2015), 164.
- <sup>28</sup> Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure* (Paris: Minuit, 1975), 29.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>30</sup> David Lloyd, “Genet’s Genealogy: ‘European Minorities and the Ends of the Canon’,” in *The Nature and Context of Minority Discourse*, eds. Abdul R. JanMohamed & David Lloyd (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 383.
- <sup>31</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 156.
- <sup>32</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 10.

- 
- <sup>33</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 274.
- <sup>34</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 153.
- <sup>35</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008), 52.
- <sup>36</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 37.
- <sup>37</sup> Ring, “*Borghild Krane: Følelsers forvirring.*”
- <sup>38</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 96.
- <sup>39</sup> Murat, *La loi du genre*, 55.
- <sup>40</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 9.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 99, emphasis added.
- <sup>43</sup> Edelman, *Homographesis*, 6–7.
- <sup>44</sup> Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 44.
- <sup>45</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 186.
- <sup>46</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 47.
- <sup>47</sup> Ellis Hanson, “Wilde’s Exquisite Pain,” in *Wilde Writings*, ed. Joseph Bristow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 119.
- <sup>48</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 187.
- <sup>49</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 47.
- <sup>50</sup> Ring, “*Borghild Krane: Følelsers forvirring.*”
- <sup>51</sup> Cf. Holt N. Parker, “Sappho Schoolmistress,” in *Re-Reading Sappho. Reception and Transmission*, ed. Ellen Greene (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
- <sup>52</sup> Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter. Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung*, vol. 1 (Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920 [1903]), 78.
- <sup>53</sup> Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 23.

- 
- <sup>54</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 277, original spacing.
- <sup>55</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 95.
- <sup>56</sup> Cf. Göran Söderström, “Gan och hans blå matroser,” in *Sympatiens hemlighetsfulla makt. Stockholms homosexuella 1860–1960*, ed. Göran Söderström (Stockholm: Stockholmia, 1999), 310.
- <sup>57</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 227.
- <sup>58</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 229.
- <sup>59</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 97.
- <sup>60</sup> Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (Columbia University Press, 1985), 88.
- <sup>61</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 234.
- <sup>62</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 104–05.
- <sup>63</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 237.
- <sup>64</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 109.
- <sup>65</sup> Zweig, “Verwirrung der Gefühle,” 238.
- <sup>66</sup> Zweig, *Confusion*, 110.
- <sup>67</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 180.
- <sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.
- <sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.
- <sup>70</sup> Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 3.
- <sup>71</sup> Krane, *Følelsers forvirring*, 170.
- <sup>72</sup> Brantenberg, *På sporet av den tapte lyst*, 39.
- <sup>73</sup> Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982), 9.