

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 23.02.26

Om leksikonet: [https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om\\_leksikonet.pdf](https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf)

## Anonym utgivelse

Noen forfattere vil ikke oppgi sitt navn og vil heller ikke bruke psevdonym. Da kan en løsning være f.eks. å ha “By a lady” på bokomslaget (slik som i Jane Austens *Sense and Sensibility*, 1811), eller ordet “anonym” på bokomslaget (slik som i *Kinderegg-effekten: En miljøthriller om mord, makt og mye penger*, 2007), eller utelatelse av enhver betegnelse på forfatteren.

Anonyme er “all publications that are unsigned, signed by Anonymous, signed with stars or other non-alphabetic symbols, signed with a phraseonym, or signed with a name that is not a form of the author’s legal name. [...] Two forms of authorial signing that are often considered anonymous are initials that correspond to an author’s legal name (as with Victorian versifiers L.E.L. or J.K.S.) and a phraseonym on the model of “By the author of ...” But the former is only a lazy signature or a token of discretion; the name behind the initials can usually be filled out by the author’s acquaintances and regular readers. And the latter hints at a coherent, flesh-and-blood creator in the same way as a pseudonym, pointing as it does to an “author,” one who shares physical integrity and temporal development with his textual corpus. Phraseonyms, of course, can be more or less revealing: “A Lady” is nondescript enough, but “A Merchant of Newcastle and Friend to the Catholic Faith” is less so. Borderline, too, are cases where the text is unsigned but the author reveals his name or the names of his family members somewhere in the text.” (Kopley 2016)

En strategi er å identifisere seg som forfatter ved å henvise til tidligere, anonyme verk: “by the author of Waverley” o.l. (Jeandillou 1994 s. 83-84). “Jane Austen (1775-1817) is one of the most famous authors in the western canon [...] during her lifetime, her works were all published anonymously. Her first novel to be published, *Sense and Sensibility*, was simply ‘By a Lady’. Her next published novel, *Pride and Prejudice*, was ‘By the Author of *Sense and Sensibility*’.” (<https://www.writersinspire.org/content/anonymous-jane-austen>; lesedato 17.01.26)

Det går an å oppgi sitt navn uten å si at man er forfatteren. Den franske romanforfatteren på 1800-tallet Étienne-Léon de Lamoignon oppga seg selv som oversetter av de bøkene han sannsynligvis hadde skrevet selv (Didier 1989 s. 105-106).

John Mullan publiserte i 2007 boka *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature*. Han skriver: “Anonymity became much less common in the twentieth century, and few leading literary authors made much use of it. The first obvious reason for this is that the convention of genteel reticence about making your name public had been eroded away. Many of the authors I have looked at in this book were not really either shy or modest, and some used anonymity or pseudonymity precisely in order to excite curiosity. But the convention of reticence allowed them to play their games. Authors hoping to make their names by winning critical or popular approval might begin their career anonymously, conforming to a pattern of tentativeness that, amongst novelists, was still common in the nineteenth century. If a book were successful, the writer could then declare him- or herself on the title pages of subsequent books.” (Mullan i <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/j.ctv1h9dhhc.13.pdf>; lesedato 09.02.26)

Det har vært “en av anonymitetens historiske funksjoner [...] å skape oppmerksomhet og få leseren til å spekulere omkring tekstens opphavsmann. Ganske slik “Anonymous” bak *Primary Colors*, nøkkelromanen hvor hovedpersonen minnet mistenkelig om en viss Bill Clinton, klarte det i 1996, inntil forfatteren Joe Klein ble avslørt. [...] Litteraturforskeren John Mullan har nettopp utgitt en bok kalt *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature*, en imponerende eksempelsamling fra anonymitetens trykkehistorie. På 1700-tallet var anonymitet regelen snarere enn unntaket i publiseringen av litteratur i Storbritannia. Så sent som i århundrets tre siste tiår ble over 70 prosent av romanene utgitt anonymt, og i det neste århundrets tre første utkom fremdeles rundt halvparten av romanene uten forfatterens navn. [...] Slik Mullan fremstiller det, er det umulig å forstå den britiske romanens historie uten å forstå anonymitetens og pseudonymitetens historie. Da en dame ved navn Jane Austen utga sin første roman, var det som “A Lady”, en så alminnelig og attraktiv forfatterbetegnelse at også adskillige menn benyttet seg av den. For mange handlet anonymitet om at det var vulgært og “ungentlemanly” å sette ting på trykk, og kanskje var det slik for den enormt populære Sir Walter Scott, i årevis kjent som “Den store Ukjente.” (Morgenbladet 29. februar–6. mars 2008 s. 34-35; skrevet av: “Anonym er professor i engelsk litteratur ved ILOS, Universitetet i Oslo”)

“Some of the greatest works in English literature were first published without their authors’ names. Why did so many authors want to be anonymous – and what was it like to read their books without knowing for certain who had written them? In *Anonymity*, John Mullan gives a fascinating and original history of hidden identity in English literature. From the sixteenth century to today, he explores how the disguises of writers were first used and eventually penetrated, how anonymity teased readers and bamboozled critics – and how, when book reviews were also anonymous, reviewers played tricks of their own in return. Today we have forgotten that the first readers of *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Sense and Sensibility* had to guess who their authors might be, and that writers like Sir Walter Scott and

Charlotte Brontë went to elaborate lengths to keep secret their authorship of the best-selling books of their times. But, in fact, anonymity is everywhere in English literature. Spenser, Donne, Marvell, Defoe, Swift, Fanny Burney, Austen, Byron, Thackeray, Lewis Carroll, Tennyson, George Eliot, Sylvia Plath, and Doris Lessing – all hid their names.” (<https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691139418/anonymity>; lesedato 09.02.26)

“For samfunnsrefsere som Swift og [Alexander] Pope handlet det dessuten om å skape usikkerhet og stimulere til spekulasjon. Det vi nå tenker på som den tidlige romanen, var forresten ofte en selvbiografi i fiksjonsform som oppga å være skrevet av hovedpersonen. Det gjaldt bøker som *Robinson Crusoe*, *Pamela* og *Moll Flanders*. Så begynte jakten på den usynlige forfatter. På 1800-tallet ble det å gjette forfatterens kjønn så å si en del av lesningens gleder. Kvinner skrev under med mannsnavn for å unnsnippe kjønnskategoriene, mens enkelte menn gikk motsatt vei. Lesernes interesse for å identifisere forfatteren, var med på å forme deres grunnleggende forståelse av teksten, og deres fortolkninger. Stort sett ble det etter hvert likevel slik, påstår Mullan, at det siste en anonym forfatter ønsket, var å forbli ukjent.” (anonym! i *Morgenbladet* 29. februar–6. mars 2008 s. 35)

“Sometimes the last thing that an anonymous author wants is to remain unidentified. Look at the lengths to which Jonathan Swift went to ensure that *Gulliver’s Travels* was published anonymously and you might suppose that he was anxious to keep his authorship hidden. He arranged for a sample part of the manuscript, probably transcribed in another man’s handwriting, to be dropped in secret by an intermediary at a publisher’s house. It was accompanied by a letter purporting to be from Lemuel Gulliver’s cousin, one ‘Richard Sympson’, which offered the whole of the Travels for publication in return for £200. The letter had been written by Swift but copied out for him by his friend John Gay. The publisher, Benjamin Motte, was told that, within three days, he should either return the ‘Papers’ or give the money ‘to the Hand from whence you receive this, who will come in the same manner exactly at 9 a clock at night on Thursday’. With only some cavils about being allowed time to raise the large sum of money that was being demanded, Motte bravely accepted the mysterious offer. A few nights later he duly got the rest of the book. Soon afterwards, Swift’s friend and probable co-conspirator Alexander Pope discussed the business with the puzzled publisher, pretending to be quite as mystified as he was. He reported the conversation in a letter to Swift: ‘Motte receiv’d the copy (he tells me) he knew not from whence, nor from whom, dropped at his house in the dark, from a hackney coach.’ The author himself had returned quietly to Dublin to resume his duties as Dean of St Patrick’s Cathedral.” (John Mullan i <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/>; lesedato 09.02.26)

Den nederlandske 1600-tallsfilosofen Baruch Spinoza ga ut sitt verk *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (1670) uten noe forfatternavn. I førsteutgaven ble det opplyst av forleggeren var “Heinrich Künrath, Hamburg”. Men en forlegger med dette

navnet fantes ikke. Den egentlige forleggeren var nederlenderen Jan Rieuwertsz (Vries 1970 s. 107). Mange lærde lesere av Spinozas latinske traktat ble opprørt over innholdet. Spesielt var hans benektelse av Guds evner til å gjøre undere provoserende for kirken. Det kom mange smedeskrifter mot den til å begynne med ukjente forfatteren (Vries 1970 s. 114-115).

Den britiske 1700-tallsfilosofen David Hume publiserte boka *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739) anonymt. “Dette var ikke fullt så merkelig som det kan høres ut. Flere andre filosofiske verker ble i Humes samtid utgitt anonymt, og det av forfattere som den gang hadde og delvis fremdeles har kjente navn: Baxter, Hutcheson, Mandeville og Wollaston. Av disse er det Hutcheson som fremdeles er kjent, og han publiserte alltid sine engelske skrifter anonymt. Muligens kan dette ha sammenheng med at de lærde den gang kanskje av og til skammet seg over å publisere på “almuens” språk, på liknende måte som en del vitenskapsmenn i våre dager skammer seg litt over eventuelle populære publikasjoner.” (Hiorth 1972 s. 14)

Franskmannen Voltaires roman *Candide, eller optimismen* (1759) ble utgitt anonymt, og med “oversatt fra tysk” av en mystisk “Herr doktor Ralph” på tittelbladet, noe Voltaire antakelig tok med for å forvirre sensurmyndighetene.

Den tyske advokaten Theodor Gottlieb von Hippels *Om den borgerlige forbedring av kvinner* (1793) ble utgitt anonymt. Hans radikale kvinnesyn passet etter hans egen mening for dårlig sammen med hans arbeid som advokat og senere borgermester i Königsberg. Hippel mente at kvinner burde bli fullverdige medlemmer i samfunnet, med samme rettigheter som menn (Krähmer 2018 s. 56-57).

Den amerikanske romanforfatteren “Catharine Sedgwick’s name appeared on the title page of only one of her books published during her lifetime, her 1835 *Tales and Sketches* [...] a number of Sedgwick’s letters to family and friends in which she makes such statements as “I have a *perfect horror* of appearing in print” and “I did hope my name could never be printed except on my tomb.” [...] Sedgwick’s anonymity was a market strategy for constructing an authorial persona rather than an absence of an author or a denial of authorship” (Melissa J. Homestead i <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi>; lesedato 17.01.26).

James A. Secords bok *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of ‘Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation’* (2001) handler om en bok av skotten Robert Chambers, utgitt anonymt. “Fiction or philosophy, profound knowledge or shocking heresy? When *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* was published anonymously in 1844, it sparked one of the greatest sensations of the Victorian era. More than a hundred thousand readers were spellbound by its startling vision – an account of the world that extended from the formation of the solar system to the spiritual destiny of humanity. As gripping as a

popular novel, *Vestiges* combined all the current scientific theories in fields ranging from astronomy and geology to psychology and economics. The book was banned, it was damned, it was hailed as the gospel for a new age. [...] Prince Albert reads aloud to Queen Victoria from a book that preachers denounced as blasphemy vomited from the mouth of Satan. [...] Secord reveals how *Vestiges* was written and how the anonymity of its author was maintained for forty years.” (<https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/V/bo3613191.html>; lesedato 12.09.24)

“When Robert Chambers self-protectively issued without a name his 1844 treatise on evolution, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, thousands of intrigued readers bought the book, speculating on its true parent and welcoming or rejecting its substance, according to their household faith. James A. Secord notes, in his book on Chambers, “Anonymity was especially rare in history, biography, and science ... An anonymous book claiming conclusions at the highest theoretical level was a curiosity, and demanded an exceptional degree of trust from its readers.” Eighty years later, publishers would blame the poor sales of Elizabeth Robins’ *Ancilla’s Share: An Indictment of Sex Antagonism* (1924) on the “Anonymous” on its title page: “it won’t move without a name.” This was a doubtful claim, since reviewers identified the author, but it is telling that the publishers thought the claim *could* seem plausible. The differing receptions of Chambers and Robins intimate that by the 1920s, the public was no longer willing to indulge anonymous texts informed by research, even if the author were known. What once read as caution and inspired tolerance now seems to have read as cowardice and inspired dismissal.” (Kopley 2016)

Noen adelsmenn har valgt å utgi bøker anonymt når innholdet ikke ble ansett som passende for en adelsmann. Den franske markien Hervey de Saint-Denis ga i 1867 ut boka *Drømmene og måtene å styre dem på: Praktiske observasjoner* uten forfatternavn. Denne boka er basert på Saint-Denis’ notater om sine egne drømmer gjennom fem år, skrevet ned i 22 notatbøker. Han lagde også tegninger for å vise ting han hadde drømt.

Ofte er ikke forfatterne av reiseguidebøkene på 1800-tallet oppgitt i bøkene, og en av grunnene kan være at forfatterne skrev for å tjene penger og ikke ønsket sitt navn knyttet til slike bøker. De ville ikke skade sitt renommé som “seriøse” forfattere av annen litteratur (Guilcher 2011). En annen grunn til anonymiteten var at forlagets sjef og forlagsredaktørene krevde at bøkene i en reiseguideserie skulle ha en enhetlig stil, uten individuelt særpreg knyttet til navngitte forfattere.

“Until the end of the nineteenth century, anonymous publication was common in Britain. Motives were various and genre-dependent. Periodical pieces were by default unsigned, to protect the author of a controversial piece and to promote objectivity and impartiality in reviewing. Anonymity likewise protected the authors of satires and political verse, and, for the especially mischievous, facilitated deceit. Concealing the authorship of novels seems often to have increased sales, as in the

case of Sir Walter Scott, for many years “The Great Unknown.” Anonymity also helped preserve distinct authorial identities: Scott withheld signature of his novels so as to distinguish these productions, to his mind vaguely ignoble, from his poetry, which he signed. Acknowledging his poetry did not injure the respectability of this officer of the court at Edinburgh, but acknowledging his novels might have had more violent consequences. Women had particular reasons to choose anonymity, in columns and on spines: to act modestly, to guard against slander and injury, and to gain a hearing. That respectable women should keep their name out of the papers, and that less respectable women should keep out of sight altogether, were views characteristic of a society compelled by a clutch of unsigned novels concerning London women of uncertain reputation. The *Anonyma* series, as it came to be known, began with the unsigned *Anonyma, or, Fair but Frail* (1863), possibly by Bracebridge Hemyng.” (Kopley 2016)

“Readers could not delight endlessly in speculating on the identities of veiled authors. At some point publishers had to admit authors’ real names or make clear that they would not; either way, the guessing game would end. Further, a surfeit of a rare commodity kills its market. By the 1870s, in Britain and America, anonymous novels must have already become sufficiently rare that calling attention to their authorship sufficed to drive a series. But as more and more publishers issued similar lines, they undermined the scarcity of mysterious authorship that had prompted initial success. [...] Perhaps prompted by the several series of anonymous works, the noun *anonymity* became common in periodicals. The *OED* dates the word’s first use to 1820, but it was rare until the 1880s.” (Kopley 2016)

“[A]utobiographical interpretation gave poets more cause to be anonymous [...] Robert Browning acutely felt the new motive for anonymity at the start of his career, when he published *Pauline* (1833) without a name, but, Ferry suggests, later developed the dramatic monologue as a way of guarding privacy while admitting authorship, crucial for turning a profit. Alfred, Lord Tennyson likewise withheld his name from his first book of poetry, *Poems by Two Brothers* (1827), which was actually by three (Alfred, Frederick, and Charles), and then signed his name to all subsequent volumes except *In Memoriam* (1850). The cult of the author contributed to the decline of anonymity, as did women’s foothold in the literary establishment and readers’ desire for provocative authors to own up to their conduct. By the 1890s, most periodicals used signatures, the ideals of objectivity and impartiality replaced by new ideals of transparency and responsibility.” (Kopley 2016)

“The difficulty of gathering and organizing data on anonymous books was already apparent in 1901, when Henry Guppy, Head Librarian of Manchester’s newly built John Rylands Library, published the short pamphlet *The Cataloguing of Anonymous Literature*. [...] works that do not identify an author on the title page, including those credited to initials or “By the author of ...” His own publication, originally printed in the Library Association Record, would qualify, since he signed with the phraseonym “The Editor.” After describing the widely divergent

cataloguing approaches of several major libraries, Guppy recommends that all libraries catalogue anonymous works by first substantial title word or subject and cross-reference generously.” (Kopley 2016)

“In *A Room of One’s Own* (1929) Virginia Woolf famously suggests that “Anon, who wrote so many poems without signing them, was often a woman.” And in her unfinished essay “Anon,” written in 1940, Woolf blames the printing press for killing the oral tradition that had promoted authorial anonymity: “The playwright is replaced by the man who writes a book. The audience is replaced by the reader. Anon is dead.” Woolf’s broad-stroked literary history appeals as much for its crisp narrative arc as for its romantic vision of lullabying nurses and large-hearted bards. But what is its truth? Scholarship on the printed word has abundantly recognized that, far from being dead, Anon remained very much alive in Britain through the end of the nineteenth century.” (Kopley 2016)

Amerikaneren John Corbett fant et gulnet manuskript i en bruktbuikk, og oppdaget at det inneholdt beskrivelser av autentiske gangstere i Chicago på begynnelsen av 1930-tallet. Manuskriptet var anonymt, og ble utgitt av Corbett i 2020 med tittelen *Bullets for Dead Hoods: An Encyclopedia of Chicago Mobsters, c. 1933* (Jacques Picard i <https://www.dicopathe.com/bullets-for-dead-hoods-une-encyclopedie-des-gangsters-de-chicago/>; lesedato 21.08.25). “In the early 2000s, writer, curator, and gallerist John Corbett struck thrift gold at a going-out-of-business Chicago junk shop when he stumbled onto a browned and brittle manuscript intimately documenting the Chicago mob of the early 1930s. The tone of its typewritten and hand-annotated pages immediately grabbed him – sensationalistic and funny, they read like an embellished police blotter, naming names, listing addresses, and recounting crimes. Presented here in facsimile in order to capture the dossier’s distinctive materiality, *Bullets for Dead Hoods: An Encyclopedia of Chicago Mobsters, c. 1933* offers a detailed rundown on the Chicago Outfit through 140 noir character sketches, which range from the infamous – Al Capone, George “Bugs” Moran, the Everleigh Sisters – to their lesser known aiders and abettors. Whoever dared to put this testament together was clearly someone with access to information – a cop? a reporter? a bitter mafioso? – but who would’ve risked sharing these particulars, and why, is a mystery that will likely never be solved.” (<https://soberscove.com/book/bullets-for-dead-hoods/>; lesedato 21.08.25)

“Europe under Hitler saw anonymous autobiographical accounts such as the unsigned *Refugee: An Autobiographical Account of Life Under the Nazi Régime by a German Woman, with a Chapter by her Husband* (1942). African-American writers who wrote of passing as white had cause to conceal their work from those they knew. James Weldon Johnson’s novel *The Autobiography of an Ex-Colored Man* (1912) was signed as Anonymous, and E. C. Williams’ similarly-themed novel *When Washington Was in Vogue* (1925-26) was initially serialized as *The Letters of Davy Carr: A True Story of Colored Vanity Fair*, with no name except that included in the title. Both books, notably, were presented as nonfiction, to

increase readers' concern for the sensitive material. While nonfiction rooted in research gained credibility from signature, nonfiction (or seeming nonfiction) rooted in the author's life gained credibility from the lack thereof." (Kopley 2016)

"[M]ost people who have been teenagers will be familiar with *Go Ask Alice* (1971), signed "by Anonymous," the apparent diary of an unnamed teenager girl but really an anti-drug crusade by Beatrice Sparks. A phraseonym could also emphasize shameful content (e.g. "By One Who Should Have Known Better"), as could a significant pseudonym (e.g. "I. Repent") but the whiffs of the eighteenth century would undermine any intended gravity and hint at wholesale invention. A phraseonym or significant pseudonym would be even less appropriate for works whose publication carries risk, such as autobiographical accounts of mental illness. Here strict anonymity both protects and advertises in equal measure; a pseudonym protects but does not advertise." (Kopley 2016)

"Joe Klein was famously unmasked as the anonymous author of the novel *Primary Colors* [1996] based on handwriting analysis and comparisons between the novel and his other writings." (<https://ndlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/NDL305.pdf>; lesedato 09.02.26) "*Presidential Novel* by Anonymous [...] The mystery author of this disappointing White House saga might be pleased to remain anonymous [...] In 1996, an unknown American political commentator, writing as "Anonymous", published an unputdownable portrait of Bill Clinton's scramble to the top of the greasy pole. *Primary Colors* was sharp and witty; its author was obviously on the inside track. Here was the truth that only fiction could tell. Together with the fascinating phenomenon of Bill Clinton himself, a scriptwriter's dream, it possibly inspired [TV-serien] *The West Wing* and certainly breathed new life into an old genre. Only six months after publication was it finally revealed that the author was the journalist and columnist Joe Klein. [...] Almost a generation on, the White House is again occupied by a character you could hardly make up [...] There was, of course, speculation. Was it Klein again? (Stout denials.) Or, from inside Obama's circle, David Plouffe or Robert Gibbs, the White House press spokesman? Or even the president himself? The truth turns out to be more mundane. The author of *O* [*O: A Presidential Novel*, 2011] is almost certainly John McCain's ghostwriter Mark Salter, a professional politico trying to turn a quick buck. [...] *O* is such a disappointment that, if Mark Salter did write it, he'll be glad to protect his reputation behind the figleaf of anonymity." (Robert McCrum i <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2011/feb/06/o-a-presidential-novel-review>; lesedato 09.02.26)

"I 2006 utga Kagge forlag "Kongepudler", en satirisk roman der den anonyme, men tydelig velinformerte forfatteren beskrev hvordan Trond Giske og Ari Behn planla å gripe makten etter Jens Stoltenbergs avgang. Boka utløste en voldsom jakt på identiteten til forfatteren i pressen. Men forfatterne [sic] klarte å bevare anonymiteten [...] Å være anonym blir bare mer og mer morsomt [uttalte forfatteren]. Særlig setter jeg pris på å overhøre diskusjoner om hvem jeg er. Jeg er

lei av forfatteres uendelige merkevarebygging. Flere forfattere bør la verkene tale for seg selv.” (*Dagbladet* 14. juni 2008 s. 62)

Kagge forlag ga i 2011 ut boka *Mordet på anonym* med “Anonym” oppgitt som forfatter. “I april kommer hans/hennes første krim, *Mordet på Anonym*. Den ukjente forfatteren er som man forstår innblandet i boken, som foregår på et krimcruise med forfattere fra norsk og skandinavisk bokbransje. Heller ikke denne våren er vi garantert å få vite hvem som dekker seg bak Anonym. Forlaget har lovet å avsløre forfatteren når noen gjetter riktig. Erling Kagge påstår at det har ingen gjort.” ([http://www.aftenposten.no/kul\\_und/litteratur/article3997350.ece](http://www.aftenposten.no/kul_und/litteratur/article3997350.ece); lesedato 18.02.11)

“Each time I see an anonymous article, I, and frankly, many other readers, feel a mixture of irritation, confusion, and skin-tingling mystery. Why, to what do we owe the honor of reading this allure of mystery? [...] When you submit a piece anonymously, or if you tell the newspaper you want your article published anonymously, what you are fundamentally saying is that you are a) not proud of your writing or opinions, b) scared of the potential fallout and criticism that will occur after your piece is published, c) you don’t want to offend specific people, whether they are friends, professors, or administrators or d) you want to encourage discourse on a new subject or angle, but you are afraid of being known by your (perhaps unpopular) stance on a subject or e) you’re writing about a socially stigmatized, so-called “embarrassing” topic and you don’t feel fully comfortable about the topic. All of these reasons are problematic. To be clear, identity protection is important, and it’s important especially to those who have suffered intolerable actions and crimes, like rape or violence, who may not want to be named yet still want their voices heard. [...] it seems almost sad to not want to share your ideas with the world and stand by them as your own. If you don’t associate your name with your piece, are you really proud of it? Do you truly feel like what you’ve written is yours, that those words or opinions came from you? What’s going on in your subconscious? As readers, we can never know, yet we remain curious. Taking it from another angle, let’s say you decide to write anonymously because you’re worried about being criticized or worried you’ll offend someone. To begin with, such feelings may signify that you need to carefully examine your article and make sure you’re not just writing it in a moment of spite and fiery emotion. But if you still feel like your ideas are sound, and maybe just different and opposed to what the majority of your audience feels, then you should still associate yourself with it. It’s dangerous to go anonymous in such cases mainly because of the precedent it sets: that it’s okay not to defend a contrary view, that it’s okay just to throw an article out to the readers without the support of the author who carefully crafted it (you), that dissenting or unusual opinions should not be valued the same way as the majority opinion, that they are either better or worse than other opinions. Ultimately, you are not taking ownership of your ideas and saying it’s okay for others not to take ownership of their ideas and writings as well. [...] If you write anonymously, you’re also unwittingly perpetuating stereotypes

and assumptions of what type of material is “controversial” or “embarrassing.” ” (Marianne Gunnarsson i <https://thecarletonian.com/6680/viewpoint/on-writing-anonymously-for-a-publication/>; lesedato 14.01.26)

“Publishing a research paper anonymously is generally not acceptable as it goes against the norm of transparency in authorship and academic publishing. An author is expected to be responsible and accountable for any work that he or she has published. Most editors and publishers would not allow anonymous publication. However, in a few extreme and exceptional situations, anonymous publication may be allowed. These include situations where revealing the identity of the author could pose a threat to his or her life, lead to loss of employment, or where the content of the paper contains extremely personal details of the author, such as medical problems or social issues faced by the author.” (Kakoli Majumder i <https://www.editage.com/insights/publishing-a-research-paper-anonymously-a-case-study>; lesedato 14.01.26)

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>