

NAME KIERKEGAARD PAPER FOR
NOM JAMES COLLINS FALL '62

No. D-3
D00034
D0004



Re-Order No. GL-210R

D0003

D0003

INTRODUCTION

The possibilities for a study correlating life experiences with speculative inquiry and philosophical thought are abundant in the case of Søren Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard is a member of a list of philosophical and religious figures of the past century who could be classified loosely as "personal thinkers." The direct and explicit life-reference of his thought is obvious. He is not primarily a philosopher; he is not at all a detached and scientific observer. He is in a sense a psychologist, but probably no more than he is a philosopher. His characterizations of the inward experiences of various types of people are lucid, informative, and brilliant. But he is never content to describe and to analyze human experience. He is, in a very definite sense, a kind of prophet; his intent is always to exhort, to awaken, and even to offend, if this is necessary. Nor is he content to exhort merely to an ethical type of perfection; he presumes throughout his writings the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and the divinely-pronounced meaning of the Christian vocation. In this sense he is much more than an ethicist or an ethical preacher, and very much more than a worldly-wise and prudent man.

The fact that Kierkegaard is not a detached thinker, but is profoundly and solely concerned with the situation, meaning, and import of human becoming explains, in great part, the extremely personal and almost autobiographical nature of his work. His thought is very definitely a product of his own experience of becoming; his type of thought, and his particular variety of contribution to philosophical and religious literature, necessarily demand an interpretation in terms of his own personal experience. "Because his works are so largely autobiographical, or reflect his own life in its successive stages, no interpretation of them can be intelli-

gible which is not essentially biographical."¹

The divisions of the ^{book} ~~paper~~ need some explanation. In ^{Chapter} ~~Part~~ I, emphasis is laid on the formative influence of Kierkegaard's father on his intellectual development; the materials and instruments of his later work came into being in these early years. ^{Chapter} ~~Part~~ II shows Kierkegaard becoming a man, growing in independence, and finally taking a drastic step in determining his own future work. In ^{Chapter} ~~Part~~ III, we consider the authorship of Kierkegaard prior to his formal outburst against the established Church of Denmark, and the specific events which ultimately determined the direction he would take in the last years of his life. ^{Chapter} ~~Part~~ IV comprises these final years, in which he was singly bent upon proclaiming the illusion of Christendom and in issuing the "midnight cry" of warning. In ^{Chapter} ~~Part~~ V, a very brief critique is presented of Theodor Haecker's essay Kierkegaard the Cripple, in which a radically different interpretation of the life-thought relationship is suggested.

Chapter
PART I

THE MYSTERIOUS FAMILY: 1813-1830

Søren Kierkegaard, the seventh and last child of Michael Pedersen Kierkegaard and Anne Sørensdatter Lund, was born on May 5, 1813, in Copenhagen. He refers to the year of his birth as "the unfortunate financial year, when so many other false notes were put into circulation."² His early years were marked by a seemingly insignificant relationship to his mother,³ and by the dominant influence of his father. *See Hnote 3* Michael Pedersen Kierkegaard is responsible for planting many of the roots which were to develop into the main lines of his son's later work. Intellectually, imaginatively, religiously, psychologically, and emotionally, the father was a prolific sower of the seeds of his favorite son's outstanding qualities. An analysis of the following statement will enable us to appraise adequately his influence.⁴

I had a thorn in the flesh, intellectual gifts (especially imagination and dialectic) and culture in superabundance, an enormous development as an observer, a Christian upbringing that was certainly very unusual, a dialectical relationship to Christianity which was peculiarly my own, and in addition to this I had from childhood a training in obedience, obedience absolute, and I was armed with an almost foolhardy faith that I was able to do anything, only one thing excepted, to be a free bird, though but for one day, or to slip out of the fetters of melancholy in which another power held me bound.⁵

Leaving aside for the moment the "thorn in the flesh," we can profitably explicate the other early biographical details which Kierkegaard recalls in this passage.

Both father and son were equipped with an amazing imaginative capacity. Kierkegaard himself tells us how his father, rather than permitting him to go outside, would propose that they both take an imaginative excursion, hand in

hand, around the room.⁶ The boy determined where their fancies would carry them. Søren's father would describe vividly all that they saw; they would greet people along the way, and even listen to the sound of carriages as they drowned out his father's voice. Kierkegaard developed "an almost vegetative tendency to drowse in imagination,"⁷ but he is quick to point out the intellectual factor in his imaginings. His imagination was never allowed to run riot, but was forced to be exact and to reflect reality. These vicarious excursions served also to quicken the development of the rare talent of penetrating to the inward life of men, to the spiritual realities that determine human actions and patterns of behavior; he was learning an accurate and lucid knowledge of his own inward relationship to reality, and he would later be able to recognize and describe in vivid fashion the inner dynamisms that make men what they are. His personality typology, marked by a clear descriptive consistency, was later to benefit from these imaginative habits; his psychological acumen is rooted in great part in the intellectual-imaginative foundations laid by these conversations with his father.⁸ See footnote 8

Kierkegaard mentions, besides imaginative development, the early cultivation of an appreciation for dialectic, of a sense for the sudden and unexpected.⁹ As a child, he was allowed to sit in on philosophical discussions which his father conducted with relatives and friends, and he experienced great delight in watching his father's power of dialectic destroy in an instant a finely structured argument. The inexplicable power of a single word to turn light into darkness, clarity into confusion, fascinated him; he gradually learned to follow the arguments very closely and to pay strict attention to all that was said. He "surmised . . . that the reason why the father by a single word was able to turn everything upside down must be that he himself had forgotten something in the succession in which his thoughts were arranged."¹⁰ But along with his dialectical abilities was

power of the word

add fr.
footnote 10.

preserved the confidence in experienced reality acquired in his imaginative excursions. He was later to be very enchanted (and influenced) by the Hegelian dialectical processes, but he was also able at all times to claim that between him and Hegel there remained the hairsbreadth of actual existence.¹¹

Kierkegaard speaks of "a Christian upbringing that was certainly very unusual" and "a dialectical relationship to Christianity which was peculiarly my own." These phrases are suggestive of the tragic element existent in the boy's home and of two prominent features of his personality and world-view, features which were to influence the direction and intensity of his later work immensely: his religious melancholy and his uncompromisingly austere impression of the meaning of the Christian vocation.

The "crazy" character of his spiritual training¹² stems directly from the life and personality of his father. M. P. Kierkegaard was haunted tortuously throughout his entire life by the memory of the day when he, a cold and hungry boy, stood on a hilltop in his native Jutland, and cursed God for allowing him to suffer as he did.¹³ His deep-seated melancholy communicated to Kierkegaard early in life the vague impression that things were amiss, the dreadful presentiment that attuned him to the tragic and the sinful in man.¹⁴

The central doctrinal referent in the religious training of Kierkegaard was the Crucifixion.¹⁵ The demanding categories of the Christian existence, of which the chief is suffering, were impressed upon Kierkegaard at an early age.¹⁶ And even when he wavered before the Christian faith, he maintained the knowledge of what the Christian vocation is, and of how it had been prostituted in his age.¹⁷ As a child, he preserved in silence these strange feelings and awarenesses; they grew within him until they could no longer be retained and were poured forth in a torrent of exhortation and finally of fierce polemic.¹⁸

The tragic character of the Kierkegaard household was suspected even by those who had never visited him at home,¹⁹ for his schoolmates later recalled how they received from him the impression of a "home wrapped in a mysterious half-darkness of severity and oddness."²⁰

Kierkegaard speaks also of "a training in obedience." His father taught him a profound sense of responsibility, an "integral impression of duty," as he was to recall through the words of Judge William in Either/Or.²¹ The prevalence of Hegelian idealism, with its de-emphasis on human freedom and the individual, and the powerful appeal of Romantic immediacy, would never prevail against the deeply ingrained awareness of the free, indeterminate, and reflectively responsible character which is for Kierkegaard the defining mark of human existence.

What is the "thorn in the flesh" spoken of by Kierkegaard? Many opinions have been offered in answer to this question; the problem is by no means definitively solved.²² However, after reading the portion of the Journals which has been translated into English by Dru and The Point of View for My Work as An Author, I see the evidence as leaning rather heavily in the direction of the position held by Hohlenberg and Lowrie: that Kierkegaard is referring to his melancholy and to his inability to shake himself free of it.²³

A few remarks must be made about Kierkegaard's early schooling. In 1821, he began attending Michael Nielsen's School of Civic Virtue. His school years are marked above all by a growing sense of his being an exception, different from his fellow men. His physical frailty and awkwardness and the quaint clothes which his father forced him to wear made him an object of ridicule.²⁴ The only defense he had against the taunts of his schoolmates was provided by his sharp wit. He managed to develop a talent for seeing through the weaker side of others, and attacking them in vulnerable and indefensible spots.²⁵ He was able, through his cleverness with words and repartee, to hide his melancholy; in fact, at times this

ability proved to be his only joy.²⁶

Kierkegaard speaks of his growing consciousness of his exceptional status among men:

When this is given (i.e., such a pain and such a close reserve), it depends upon the personal characteristics of the individual whether this lonesome inward torment finds its expression and satisfaction in hating men and cursing God, or in the very reverse. The latter was my situation. As far back as I can remember, I was in agreement with myself about one thing, that for me there was no comfort or help to be looked for in others. Sated with the many other things bestowed upon me, filled as a man with longing after death, as a spirit desirous of the longest possible life, my thought was, as the expression of a melancholy love for men, to be helpful to them to find comfort for them above all clearness of thinking, and that especially about Christianity. The thought goes very far back in my recollection that in every generation there are two or three who are sacrificed for the others, are led by frightful sufferings to discover what redounds to the good of others. So it was that in my melancholy, I understood myself as singled out for such a fate.²⁷

The sense of a special vocation was awakened early in Kierkegaard's life; it is interesting to note that this feeling of being set apart was never a vague and undefined sort of thing, but from the very beginning had some kind of connection with Christianity.

Kierkegaard says a few pages earlier:

From the time when there could be any question of the employment of my powers, I was firmly determined to employ them all to defend Christianity, or at any rate to present it in its true form. For very early indeed, by the help of my upbringing, I was in a position to ascertain for myself how seldom Christianity is presented in its true form, how they who defend it most commonly betray it, and how seldom its opponents really hit the mark.²⁸

PART II

STUDENT AND LOVER: 1830-1842

On October 30, 1830, Kierkegaard matriculated at the University of Copenhagen. At the request of his father, he enrolled in the faculty of theology,²⁹ but his main interests during most of his years at the University were not theological, but aesthetical and philosophical. The early Journals display his fascination with the Romantic movement, but they also indicate that he was never fully satisfied with the tenor of Romanticism.³⁰ Three literary figures especially fascinated Kierkegaard--Don Juan, Faust, and the Wandering Jew. He had plans to treat each of these characters poetically.³¹ His familiarity with these three figures was later of great advantage to him in his characterizations of the aesthetic sphere of existence.

Kierkegaard's study of Hegel during his early years at the University was mostly indirect. Even by 1837, his knowledge of the primary sources was slim.³² Kierkegaard's tutor, Hans Larsen Martensen, tried to couch Christian doctrine in Hegelian terms; it is in this context that Kierkegaard first became familiar with the philosophy of Hegel. He had by 1835 decided that "Christianity and philosophy cannot be reconciled."³³ Kierkegaard's early interest in Hegel as a religious thinker, and his introduction to Hegelianism through his theological tutor, in addition to his propensity for dealing with the concrete problems of human existence, rendered his approach to Hegel unscientific and sociological. It was the popular understanding of Hegel, rather than the fine points of dialectic, which occupied Kierkegaard's mind; he saw Hegelianism as the focal point of social attitudes which to him smacked of mediocrity; the immanentism of Hegel was

conducive to a stifling bourgeois attitude of compromise and comfortableness, satisfaction with the status quo, and religious attitudes opposed in principle to Christianity.³⁴

It is difficult to restructure the exact sequence of major events in this period, particularly prior to 1838. Hohlenberg's ordering seems to be more convincing than Lowrie's, but nothing definite can be said about the exact time of some of the most important happenings.

Kierkegaard was slowly alienating himself from his father during his early years at the University. We have already mentioned his abounding self-confidence, and we can presume that the new-found freedom and feeling of maturity at being a college student added to his desire for independence. A feeling of resentment due to the strange upbringing he had received, coupled with the uncertainty about his father's state of soul, probably provided the initial impetus in the estrangement. In addition, only his desire to be free of his father's admonitions motivated him to continue the study of theology.³⁵

He played an extremely active role in student affairs at the University, being involved in political discussions and literary work.³⁶

The following journal entry is probably the key to the understanding of one of the central events in Kierkegaard's life, an event which he calls "the great earthquake."³⁷

It made a terrible impression upon me the first time I heard that the indulgences contained the statement that they remit all sins: "etiam si matrem virginem violasset."-- I still remember the impression it made upon me when some years ago, filled with a youthful and romantic enthusiasm for a master-thief, I went so far as to say that it was only the misuse of powers, and that such a man might still be converted, and father said very solemnly: 'there are offenses which one can only fight against with God's continual help.' I hurried down to my room and looked at myself in the glass . . . --or when father said, as he often did, that it would be a good thing to have 'a venerable confessor to whom one could open one's heart.'³⁸

Hohlenberg reads quite a bit into this entry, perhaps too much. He sees the father's retort about sin as both a warning and a kind of confession to his son. I would prefer to emphasize the confession aspect. Michael Pedersen Kierkegaard is here shown to be formally admitting the deep trouble in his soul, his feeling that he has committed a sin that is unpardonable before God. That is why Kierkegaard adds his father's remarks about the benefits of a father confessor, of someone to whom he could unburden his conscience. His father's hidden guilt and fear, so long a cause of foreboding and melancholy in Kierkegaard, now strike him with new forcefulness. His suspicions are still vague and undefined, but he knows with certainty that something is deeply disturbing his father.

Kierkegaard took a vacation for about a month and a half in the summer of 1835. He went to Gillileje, lived at an inn, and took long walks and excursions in the surrounding vicinity. While at Gillileje he recorded an entry in his Journal which is of great importance in understanding this period of his development.³⁹ He had been searching for the Archimedean point, a stable foundation for a life-view.⁴⁰ He now realizes that this is not to be found in either pleasure or knowledge (Hegelian philosophy), and that, as a matter of fact, it is to be found nowhere at all until he first comes to know himself, and to experience the power of determining the direction of his own being. And he determines that the deciding factors in his life are going to be cognition, inwardness, subjectivity as the criterion of truth.⁴¹ He knew that this self-possession would not be easily gained, but he was prepared for the uphill struggle. It was in this condition that he returned to his father in Copenhagen.

Hohlenberg and Dru both place the great earthquake at this time in Kierkegaard's youth. There now occurred a definitive break with his father resulting from the discovery of some sin that his father had committed.⁴² We do not know the details of his discovery of his father's secrets, nor do

break up the
paragraphs

we know which of the secrets affected Kierkegaard so profoundly. There are entries **both** in the Journals and in some of his other writings which enable us to put together a somewhat accurate picture of what may have happened. What is more important, however, is the nature of the sin which was disclosed to Kierkegaard. Hohlenberg again comes up with a plausible theory. In an entry quoted above, where Kierkegaard mentions his conversation with his father about the master-thief, he includes also a reference to something that would appear to have no relation to the rest of the entry. "It made a terrible impression upon me the first time I heard that the indulgences contained the statement that they remit all sins: 'etiam si matrem virginem violasset.'" It is certain that the first child of Michael Pedersen Kierkegaard and Anne Sørensdatter Lund was conceived out of wedlock,⁴³ and it is almost as certain that Kierkegaard knew this all along. But is it possible to surmise, by putting together the two separate elements of this single journal entry, one referring to a crime of rape and the other to his suspicions of some secret sin of his father, that this secret sin of which Kierkegaard became formally aware was an act of rape? This certainly is a possible reading of the Journal. It seems more likely that he would be profoundly affected by this than by the knowledge of the father's act of cursing God on the heaths of Jutland; this knowledge would also seem to account more convincingly for the sense of solidarity with his father's guilt which Lowrie makes so much of,⁴⁴ and for the correlation of this sense of solidarity with the notion of original (inherited) sin.⁴⁵

In an entry from 1838, Kierkegaard describes the great earthquake.

Then it was that the great earthquake occurred, the terrible revolution which suddenly forced upon me a new and infallible law of interpretation of all the facts. Then I suspected that my father's great age was not a divine blessing but rather a curse; that the outstanding intellectual gifts of our family were only given to us in order that we should

rend each other to pieces: then I felt the stillness of death grow around me when I saw in my father, an unhappy man who was to outlive us all, a cross on the tomb of all his hopes. There must be a guilt upon the whole family, the punishment of God must be on it; it was to disappear, wiped out by the powerful hand of God, obliterated like an unsuccessful attempt, and only at times did I find a little alleviation in the thought that my father had been allotted the heavy task of calming us with the consolation of religion, of ministering to us so that a better world should be open to us even though we lost everything in this world, even though we were overtaken by the punishment which the Jews always called down upon their enemies: that all recollection of us should be utterly wiped out, that we should no longer be found.⁴⁶

The resolute decisiveness of the Gilleleje period has disappeared, and in its place has come a listlessness, a more determined split with his father, and an inner revolt against Christianity.⁴⁷

Kierkegaard now took a livelier part in the affairs of the University and of the town than ever before.⁴⁸ In The Point of View he speaks of the condition of his spirit at this time.⁴⁹ He mentions an aggregation of pleasures, passions, dispositions and feelings, and experimenting with other men's states of soul. He describes how his imagination would work for long periods at a time, "trying out my mind as one tunes an instrument." And he speaks of the path of perdition. This latter probably refers to some sexual sin which he committed in a state of drunkenness and which he recalled only some time after it had been committed.⁵⁰ These experiences and imaginative experiments, when added to his interest in the literary characters Faust, Don Juan, and the Wandering Jew, account for his analysis of what he calls the aesthetic sphere of existence, with its three "major chords" of sensibility: sensual immediacy, doubt, and despair.⁵¹

There are two incidents which seem to have turned Kierkegaard in the direction of changing the pattern of his life. The first is the recall of his sin, which he records (possibly) in this journal entry of October 8, 1836:

The extraordinary way in which something long forgotten suddenly bursts into consciousness is really quite remarkable; for example, the recollection of something wrong of which one was hardly conscious at the moment of acting-- Lightning announcing a violent storm. They do not come forward, they literally burst forth with tremendous power, demanding to be heard. And that, generally speaking, is how we are to understand the passage in the Gospels: that on the day of judgment man will be held responsible for every idle word he has spoken.⁵²

The other impetus to "conversion" was "the mighty trumpet of my awakening,"⁵³ P. M. Møller, whose contribution was probably in the form of an admonition rebuking Kierkegaard for the careless use of his polemical wit.⁵⁴

Whatever the exact sequence of events may be,⁵⁵ a decisive change had taken place in Kierkegaard's outlook, around the first of June, 1836. Resolutions to change begin appearing in the Journals, suggestive of the entry he recorded while at Gillileje. He realizes that conversion is a slow process, and he manifests impatience at times, but he is determined to go through with it. The entries for the rest of 1836 and for 1837 display not only his effort to do something about his biting sarcasm,⁵⁶ but also his increased isolation from his associates, his exclusive concern with aesthetic and philosophical studies, and his growing suspicion of philosophy.⁵⁷ His attitude towards Christianity seems to be more favorable and there are some indications that he is not going to stop in his own personal development at this ethical stage, but will pass on into a more religious sphere of existence.⁵⁸ He manifests his scorn for the comfortable bourgeois citizens, because they espouse mediocrity and compromise, and do not know

. . . enthusiasm for greatness. . . . Their ethics are a short summary of police ordinances; for them the most important thing is to be a useful member of the state, and to air their opinions in the club of an evening; they have never felt homesickness for something unknown and far away, nor the depth which consists in being nothing at all, of walking out of Norresport with a penny in one's pocket and a cane in one's hand . . . They have never even

had a glimpse of the idea which is behind that saying, after one has forced one's way through the hidden and mysterious door into that 'dark realm of sighs,' which in all its horror is only open to foreboding,--when one sees the broken victims of seduction and inveiglement, and the tempter's coldness.⁵⁹

P. M. Møller died on March 13, 1838. Kierkegaard describes the period elapsing between Møller's death and the next journal entry in April as "a long time . . . in which I have not been able to concentrate upon the slightest thing."⁶⁰

The religious growth apparent in the Journals for the two years since his awakening is climaxed by an entry of May 19, 1838:

Half-past ten in the morning. There is an indescribable joy which enkindles us as inexplicably as the apostle's outburst comes gratuitously: 'Rejoice I say unto you, and again I say unto you rejoice.'--Not a joy over this or that but the soul's mighty song 'with tongue and mouth, from the bottom of the heart!! 'I rejoice through my joy, in, at, with, over, by, and with my joy'--a heavenly refrain, as it were, suddenly breaks off our other song; a joy which cools and refreshes us like a breath of wind, a wave of air, from the trade wind which blows from the plains of Mamre to the everlasting habitations.⁶¹

This experience of joy, and effective belief in God's fatherly love, is the result of a confession on the part of his father of the sins which had lain so veavily on his heart and had ruined the relationship between father and son.⁶² Only his estrangement from his father had kept him back from the full Christian commitment, and now that estrangement was no more. There were no barriers holding him back any more from a completely religious existence. "I learnt from him the meaning of fatherly love and so was given some idea of divine fatherly love, the one unshakable thing in life, the true archimedean point."⁶³ The Journals now begin to show a preponderance of entries dealing with religiousness of a Christian vein.

The events which we have been setting forth here of the years 1837-1838 overlap with another set of incidents which are best studied separately: the beginnings of Kierkegaard's

*Look
quite, + a
guide for his
future views of
religion*

romance with Regine Olsen. Kierkegaard first met Regine on May 10, 1837, at the home of the Rørdaam family. The two were immediately attracted to each other, but the attraction brought to Kierkegaard some serious worries.⁶⁴ He was a penitent and he felt that his isolation from other men was a sign that he was called to a very special kind of life by God.

Shortly after passing his theological examination, he took a trip to his father's native Jutland. He returned on August 6, and three days later went to the Olsen household; this was the first of many visits. On September 8, he confessed to her his love and two days later she accepted his proposal of marriage. Melancholy followed immediately upon his success. "The next day I saw that I had made a blunder. A penitent as I was, my vita ante acta, my melancholy, that was enough*."⁶⁵ There followed a temporary quarrel, her devoted attachment, his deeper conviction that they must part; he sent back the ring, but

. . . she fights like a lioness to retain him, beseeching him in the name of Christ and by the memory of his deceased father not to desert her, so that, to save her life and reason, the hero feels himself obliged to pretend that he is only a mean scoundrel who has been playing with her affections--and after two months of this cruel ^{deceit} (cruel most of all to himself) she lets him go.⁶⁶

In his journal entry "My relation to 'her'" Kierkegaard mentions another factor besides his sin, his vita ante acta, and his incommunicable melancholy, a factor which seems to lie behind these three, and which certainly later in life he saw as the main reason for his not marrying Regine: the call of God to something special and different. "There was a divine protest, that is how I understood it. . . . If I had not believed that God had lodged a veto she would have been victorious."⁶⁷

PART III

THE LITERARY REMAINS OF A SOLITARY: 1842-1849

This period of Kierkegaard's greatest literary productivity can be broken down into four parts. We must treat the pseudonymous works, the Corsair incident, the Adler affair, and the beginnings of a more direct form of communication.

There are two main sets of pseudonymous works: the aesthetical works (Either/Or,⁶⁸ Repetition, Fear and Trembling, and The Concept of Dread) and the philosophical works (Philosophical Fragments and The Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments.)

The central theme of the aesthetical works is the theory of the three spheres of existence. We have seen how Kierkegaard's studies and his experiences between the great earthquake and the awakening influenced his ability to describe with such lucidity the dialectic of the aesthetical existence. Much of what he has to say about the ethical and religious spheres is also influenced by the past experiences of his life,⁶⁹ notably his confinement of the ethical sphere to the married state.

Early in the summer of 1843, Regine became engaged to Fritz Schlegel, who had been interested in her before she had committed herself to Kierkegaard.⁷⁰ Despite the fact that he was hoping that she would be able to forget him and find happiness with somebody else, the news came as a tremendous shock to Kierkegaard. Lowrie feels that this definitive termination of his relationship with Regine is the real point of his decisive conversion.⁷¹

The philosophical works were written during the period 1844-1846.⁷² It is in these works that Kierkegaard carries on formally his polemic against Hegelianism.⁷³

What are we to make of the pseudonyms? All of the works which we have considered were not published under Kierkegaard's name, but under various assumed titles. We can handle the

problem of the interpretation of the pseudonyms by examining what Kierkegaard himself tells us in The Point of View, and by fitting into his own explanation what we know about his life at this time. This should give us an adequate understanding of the meaning and function of the employment of pseudonyms.

Keeping pace with the publication of the aesthetic volumes, there was a series of religious writings called Edifying Discourses. Kierkegaard states in The Point of View that these discourses demonstrate conclusively that throughout the period of his formal authorship he is a religious writer, that religion was not something he "fell into" after a time; he confirms this by pointing out that the discourses were published under his own name rather than ascribed to a pseudonym. The "telegraphic notice of the religious"⁷⁴ which they convey indicates at the same time that the aesthetical works cannot be taken at their face value, but must be interpreted in terms of the distinctively religious writings which accompany their publication, and which are avowedly the more direct message of Kierkegaard to his readers.

Kierkegaard tells us that when the aesthetic writings are seen in their over-all context, they are seen to be a "deception."⁷⁵ The type of deception he is referring to is that which was employed by Socrates. Another man is under an illusion of one sort or another; the proper way to "deceive" him into the truth is not through the direct communication of what we wish to get across to him, but through dealing with him on his own grounds. In this sense, "one does not begin thus: I am a Christian; you are not a Christian." Rather,

one begins thus: Let us talk about aesthetics. The deception consists in the fact that one talks thus merely to get to the religious theme. But, on our assumption, the other man is under the illusion that the aesthetic is Christianity; for, he thinks, I am a Christian, and yet he lives in aesthetic categories.⁷⁶

Pseudonyms are employed because these works do not really proclaim what Kierkegaard is as an author. His own life was at this time not being lived in aesthetic categories, but in

the religious sphere. He tells us that he "understood from the beginning that this productivity was of an interim nature, a deceit, a necessary process of elimination."⁷⁷

This last phrase introduces another factor which must be considered. I do not think that the aesthetical works are formally religiously orientated, planned deceits in a higher service, until after Kierkegaard learned that Regine was no longer available to him. I think that she is the primary and dominant reason for his writing Either/Or, Repetition, and Fear and Trembling, and it is not until after these works that we find the religious orientation having anything more than a secondary part to play in his authorship.⁷⁸

If the pseudonymous works are to be considered as in some way a deception employed to lead people to the truth, how is this statement of the truth finally to be introduced? In addition to referring to the Edifying Discourses⁷⁹ as counterbalancing the pseudonymous writings, Kierkegaard insists that we must regard the Postscript as the turning-point in his writings. The Postscript is neither an exclusively aesthetical work, nor is it exclusively religious.⁸⁰ But the "author," Johannes Climacus, himself not a Christian, poses the problem which Kierkegaard wished to bring to the forefront of contemporary minds: what does it mean to be a Christian?⁸¹

One of Kierkegaard's friends in his student days had been P. L. Møller, like Kierkegaard formally a student of theology, but more interested in aesthetic pursuits. (This man should not be confused with the P. M. Møller mentioned above.) Møller had no underlying religious concerns about him at all, and Kierkegaard was able to detect this. Møller was probably Kierkegaard's model for the Seducer in Either/Or.⁸² Møller himself probably felt that he was the model, and this suspicion prompted an article in Gaea, An Aesthetic Journal, December 20, 1845, criticizing Kierkegaard's work and attacking his person.⁸³ On December 27, Kierkegaard replied to Møller

by publishing an article in The Fatherland. The piece was entitled "The Activity of a Wandering Aesthete, and How He Came to pay for the Banquet." The article is signed "Frater Taciturnus, captain of the third part of Stages in Life's Way." This article is a bitter attack on Møller's person, especially stinging in that it revealed that Møller was a regular contributor to the local political comic paper, The Corsair.⁸⁴

Møller replied in The Fatherland on December 29, and on January 2, 1846, The Corsair replied to Kierkegaard in the first of what was to be a series of forceful articles accompanied by damaging caricatures. Other papers caught the fad, and Kierkegaard soon became the laughing-stock of Copenhagen.⁸⁵ What particularly hurt him was the fact that people who had been his friends and from whom he expected some support remained completely silent. The common people, with whom he used to talk on the streets, began to ignore him, and children to mock him. His only refuge--and this only for a short time--was to take his frequent carriage-drives in the country. His Journals from the time of this incident to the end of his life continue to reflect his disappointment in his former friends for their failure to do more than remain silent through the entire affair.⁸⁶

The effects which this incident had on Kierkegaard's life were momentous.⁸⁷ Lowrie distinguishes the effects into the negative result of an increased consciousness of his being "different" from the universal human, and the positive effect of an increase in his sense of a special call; his singularity would no longer be a feature of his personality which he must try to hide. He had seriously contemplated becoming a minister and retiring to a country parish, but he now decided that he should rather devote himself exclusively to religious writing. It was clear to him now that he must become a sacrifice for his generation.⁸⁸ In addition, his thinking on the nature and position of the human individual received an added impetus

from the Corsair incident. He came to realize vividly the destructive influence of the journalists, both because of the distorting power they have over the minds of their readers, and because of the harm they can do to the people whom they choose as the objects of their criticism and abuse.⁸⁹ His reflections about the evil influence of the press were the beginnings of a change in his formal attitude to the business of being an author.⁹⁰ He had planned to retire to a country pastorate after publishing the Postscript. He now reconsidered his poetic urge to productivity, and came to view it as a sign from God that he should continue in this vein, despite the hardships and suffering involved. As Hohlenberg indicates, this decision involved a victory over his broodiness, which would have impelled him once again to depart from the center of activity and lead a life of "penance" in a country parsonage.⁹¹

Several clarifications about the exact nature of his position had to be made before Kierkegaard could determine the precise direction of his future work. These clarifications were provided by the Adler incident. Adolf Peter Adler was a parish priest who had published in 1843 a collection of sermons, in the preface of which there was stated a claim that the author had had a vision of Jesus Christ, and that a part of the sermons were written under divine inspiration. This claim led to Adler's dismissal from the State Church in August, 1845. Kierkegaard read avidly the works of Adler and wrote several long essays which he intended to publish together under the title The Big Book about Adler. He concluded that Adler's claims were preposterous, that he should retract his statement about a revelation, and that he was justifiably dismissed by his superiors. He was led by his interests in this affair to consider once again the problem of the individual and the crowd, and especially of the extraordinary individual. If he was to be "the extraordinary," then accepting a pastorate was out of the question, despite his financial difficulties at this time; confidence in God--a religious

category--was called for.

In what way did he regard himself as extraordinary? He was clearly no apostle; he had no direct commission and authority from God to preach Christianity. An apostle has no responsibility for the doctrine he preaches, but only for his personal response to the commission received. Kierkegaard regards himself rather as a genius, free and responsible for both the doctrine he preaches and his personal appropriation of what he believes to be a divine call. Kierkegaard continually emphasizes that he is a genius without any authority from God.⁹²

The nature of Christianity was also more impressed upon him as a result of his reflections at this time. "Christendom versus Christianity" is brought to the forefront of his consciousness with a greater intensity than ever before.⁹³ His conception of himself as an extraordinary individual, an unauthorized genius with a dialectical relationship to God, and his conviction that Christendom is an illusion provided the foundation for the major details of the rest of his life.⁹⁴

Of course, his own personal fulfillment of the task of being a Christian demanded first of all a battle against the reserve which stemmed from his melancholy.⁹⁵ On Wednesday of Holy Week, 1848, Kierkegaard recorded in his Journal, "My whole being is changed. My reserve and self-isolation is broken-- I must speak. Lord give thy grace."⁹⁶ The next entry reveals his confidence that he will be victorious over his melancholy.⁹⁷ The task ahead of him was not to be easy; many discouraging moments would confront him, but the recognition of the incommensurateness of his reserve with the life of a true Christian witness had impressed him powerfully enough to keep him going.⁹⁸ The spell which had kept him silent for so long was now broken.⁹⁹ "Trusting to God I have dared, but I was not successful; in that is to be found peace, calm, and confidence in God. I have not dared: that is a woeful thought, a torment in eternity."¹⁰⁰

+ factor of
inspiration

PART IV

THE CRY AT MIDNIGHT: 1849-1855

If he was to speak out openly, what was he to say? "He saw that his task must be to urge that the first condition necessary for Christianity is the demand that the preacher's life be in conformity with what he preaches."¹⁰¹ He felt that Christianity must be preached and lived again in its pristine strength. With this as his goal, he produced two books during this period: Sickness Unto Death, which deals with the individual as faced with the claim of Christianity; and Training in Christianity. Two powerful scruples bothered him when he thought of publication. First of all, in view of his own demands that the preacher live a life commensurate with what he exhorted his people to, he wondered whether he himself was justified in publishing these works. And secondly, he was afraid of offending Bishop Mynster, the primate of the established Church, who had been a good friend of Kierkegaard's father, and whom he himself respected greatly.¹⁰² Kierkegaard knew that Mynster would be deeply hurt by the publication of Training in Christianity.

He solved the first problem, at least temporarily, by adopting a new pseudonym for these two works. He issued these books under the name of Anti-Climacus, and gave his own name as editor. "Anti-Climacus" indicates that the views expressed in these writings are those of a man opposed to the world-view of Johannes Climacus. That is, while Climacus admitted that he was not a Christian, Anti-Climacus claims to be a Christian in an extraordinary degree.¹⁰³ The second problem was more difficult for Kierkegaard to solve.¹⁰⁴

Some months after the publication of Training in Christianity, Mynster wrote a small work entitled Further Suggestions as to How the Affairs of the Church in Denmark Should be Handled. In this work, he couples together references to Goldschmidt ("one of our most talented authors") and to Kierkegaard ("the gifted author.") Kierkegaard took this as a personal affront on the part of Mynster, unrelated to Kierkegaard's central concern, Christianity. He made no reply, but now deemed an attack on the establishment to be inevitable. During the three years between the publication of For Self-Examination¹⁰⁵ and his articles of 1854-1855 attacking the established Church, he was preparing drafts and baring his weapons for the assault. He wanted to wait until Mynster's death before he began a sustained attack on Christendom.¹⁰⁶ It was not easy for him to restrain the poetic demand for productivity, especially since literary work had long been his one delight and recourse.¹⁰⁷ Financial difficulties were becoming more acute, but in a way this contributed to his satisfaction, since his wealth had long disturbed his conscience.¹⁰⁸

Bishop Mynster dies on January 30, 1854.¹⁰⁹ On February 5, Martensen, Kierkegaard's former tutor at the University, delivered a panegyric on Bishop Mynster, describing him as "irreplaceable,"¹¹⁰ "a genuine witness for the truth," one of the "holy chain of witnesses which stretches from the days of the Apostles." Kierkegaard regarded this speech as partly directed at him. He immediately prepared a retort, which, however, he refrained from publishing until December 18, when it appeared in The Fatherland.¹¹¹ He entitled the article "Was Bishop Mynster a Witness for the truth? one of the 'true witnesses for the truth?' Is this truth?" He contrasts Mynster's Christianity, which "soft-pedals, slurs over, suppresses, omits, something of what is most decisively Christian, something which we men think rather inconvenient, because it wants to put us under restraint and prevents us from fully enjoying life," with the life of a witness to the truth,

"a man whose life from first to last is unacquainted with all that can be called enjoyment."¹¹² The article was dated February, 1854, a sign of the long preparation antedating the step he was taking. Kierkegaard of course astonished the public by the release of this article; nobody knew how to answer him; nor did anybody suspect what was yet to come. Twenty articles followed in rapid succession, each more outspoken than those that had preceded it. The attack was no longer centered on Bishop Mynster; this was just "the thin edge of the wedge."¹¹³ Kierkegaard extends his attack to cover the entire establishment, which he now refers to as "an audacious indecency."¹¹⁴

In May, 1855, Kierkegaard issued a pamphlet entitled This has to be said; so be it then said. This pamphlet he referred to explicitly as "the midnight cry." It had been written long before, but Kierkegaard was waiting for an opportunity to release it; the opportunity came in the form of an article in The Fatherland. On April 24, 1855, a Provost named Victor Bloch wrote an article demanding that Kierkegaard be excluded formally from the Church of Denmark. Kierkegaard's reply indicated that this would not disturb him in the least:

Whoever you are, my friend, or whatever your life in other respects may be, by ceasing to take part in the public worship of God (if ordinarily you do take part in it) anyway as it now is (with the claim that it is the Christianity of the New Testament) you have for ever one guilt, and a great one, the less. You do not take part in making a fool of God by calling a thing New-Testament Christianity which is not New-Testament Christianity. . . .

The official worship of God (in its claim to be the Christianity of the New Testament) is, from a Christian point of view, a counterfeit, a falsification.¹¹⁵

From May 24 to September 24, 1855, a series of nine pamphlets called The Instant appeared. These contained the last words of Kierkegaard to his contemporaries and to posterity. The later journal entries, with their neglect of dialectic and their singleness of purpose, had been a prelude to the style of journalism employed in The Instant.¹¹⁶

On October 2, 1855, Kierkegaard collapsed on the street and was carried to the Frederick's Hospital. From all indications, he suffered some kind of a stroke which rendered him paralyzed from the waist down.¹¹⁷ At the hospital, he received only a few visitors, including his friend, Pastor Emil Boesen, who recorded his conversations with Kierkegaard.¹¹⁸ Kierkegaard refused to see his brother Peter,¹¹⁹ and even to receive Communion from a minister of the established Church. He died on November 11, 1855, practically penniless, but confident that he had fulfilled his mission and grateful to God for taking him at this time. He was buried one week after his death, from the Cathedral Church of Our Lady, but not before his nephew, Henrik Lund, had publicly complained of the irony displayed by the Church, who took as its own a man who had so thoroughly rejected it.¹²⁰

PART V

ANOTHER INTERPRETATION

The main theme of Theodor Haecker's book Kierkegaard the Cripple is the extent of the influence of Kierkegaard's physical constitution on his life and thought. The essay is unconvincing; many weak arguments are employed in an effort to establish the theory that Kierkegaard's bodily deformity¹²¹ had a direct and dominant influence on his work. We can here treat of only ^{one} application which Haecker makes.¹²² Haecker argues: the body-soul disharmony in Kierkegaard caused him to be unable to find the proper objective harmony in the world. Human existence becomes for Kierkegaard an active, ethical relation, to the exclusion of all other considerations. His emphasis on human becoming is rooted in a subjective type of speculation that is dangerous and delusive. The objective order of salvation (Baptism, love of God and neighbor, the Commandments) is passed over in favor of an ethics of human honesty; Kierkegaard is basically an ethical thinker, and even when he suspends the moral order for something higher, he concentrates on the propriety of the actions and unconsciously falls back into the purely immanent order of human rightness. He gives unequivocal supremacy to the will.

This theory is both an exaggeration of the importance of his deformity, and a basic misreading of Kierkegaard. It is not at all likely that, despite his conviction that Christianity demanded a direct form of communication (even to the extent of leaving to posterity an explanation of his work as an author), he should neglect to tell us of the most decisive factor in his work. The "thorn in the flesh" had prevented him from communicating directly all that he should have

said. We have tried to show that, although the "thorn in the flesh" has some reference to his bodily condition, it signifies primarily his melancholy; he finally discovered that it could be overcome, and he dealt with it successfully. His early relationship with his father was more than enough to account for such a condition of spirit, without forcing us to search for a cause that is more obscure, and especially for one so seldom mentioned by Kierkegaard himself.

It is true that Kierkegaard is not an objective, scientific thinker, and that his considerations, even when they become formally philosophical, are both prompted and guided by the concrete facts of human existence. Haecker is correct when he says that Kierkegaard's insights deserved a metaphysical atmosphere which is healthy and pure, that his conception of God as "infinite subjectivity . . . wholly objective to His own subjectivity," is Thomistic, and that Thomism would have kept him from philosophizing about the "absurdity" of divine truth in the light of human understanding.¹²³ But that this prevents him from being a truly religious thinker, concerned with man's relationship with a transcendent reality, and carrying his speculations beyond the range of human ethics, does not follow. Honesty, in the sense of resplendancy and openness before all men, in the full consciousness of being a Christian, is a religious category diametrically opposed to that form of "ethical thinking" which expresses itself in "police ordinances," and in an order far beyond that of natural proprieties and rational dictates.

The statement that Kierkegaard gives unequivocal supremacy to the will, disturbing the hierarchy of order and truth, leaves out the fundamental point: Kierkegaard is not primarily a speculative thinker. He is working in the order of human existence, and in this order he properly gives unequivocal supremacy to the human act, an act of decision and choice involving the whole man.

CONCLUSION

More can be done bi doctrinally with Kierkegaard than with most philosophers, because he never divorced his thought from its direct referents in his own experience. In this paper we have attempted to indicate how the events of his life determined the direction and subject matter of his thought. His doctrine on the three spheres of existence, his polemic with the Hegelians, his concentration on the given facts of human existence, and his relationship as an individual to Christianity are all adequately intelligible only when viewed against the background of the major experiences in his life.

The danger which is present in a bi doctrinal study of most thinkers is not quite as pronounced, then, in the case of Kierkegaard. His works are the product of an intense interior struggle regarding ultimates; he treats primarily of man's confrontation with a divine demand. There is one danger, however, which must be avoided at all costs.

Study of Kierkegaard's life is essential to, but not sufficient for, an assessment of his mind. This observation would be superfluous, were it not for some recent abuses of the biographical materials. They have been analyzed from a psychiatric standpoint, with a view to explaining away his thought in function of a neurotic personality. Doubtless, there is room for legitimate psychiatric study of many features of Kierkegaard's character: his relation to his father, his sickness and melancholy, his unhappy love affair and general attitude toward women and marriage, his inability to communicate with others in a frank and easy way, his extreme sensitivity, and his intensely introspective bent. But psychiatric and psychoanalytic findings cannot rule upon the truth or falsity of his position. It is sheer nonsense to offer as philosophically conclusive the Freudian report that, at his death, Kierkegaard appears to be no more than a "poor, emaciated, thin schizoid." There is a sense in which Kierkegaard's personality-traits are just as irrelevant to the question of validity as is the fact of Nietzsche's insanity--extremely personal thinkers though they both were. The

findings of abnormal psychology should be kept strictly subordinate to philosophical analysis.¹²⁴

That Kierkegaard was not what psychologists would refer to as a normal personality is very true. The characteristics mentioned above, especially certain marks of his melancholy, definitely indicate a psychic unrest of somewhat major proportions.¹²⁵ But he never did lose the necessary modicum of balance, as is reflected in his realistic awareness of his own eccentricities and departures from the normal, and in his basically healthy and psychologically salvific reference of himself to the Christian enterprise. The oddities of his personality must be understood and included in an explanation of his thought, but they cannot be taken as militating against the valid character of much that he says.

Inevitably, his own limitations and peculiarities were reflected in his writings. These qualifications should always be kept in mind by the reader. They do not release him from the responsibility of taking Kierkegaard seriously for his wider import, but they do place upon him the added duty of making his own transcription of the Kierkegaardian message, of testing it according to the common human canons of evidence and proof, and of supplementing it by truths which Kierkegaard himself overlooked or deliberately kept in the shadow.¹²⁶

FOOTNOTES

¹Walter Lowrie, Kierkegaard (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), p. ix. See also James Collins, The Mind of Kierkegaard (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953), p. 1. Lowrie's biography is the standard English work on the life of Kierkegaard. This book, along with Johannes Hohlenberg's Søren Kierkegaard, translated by T. H. Croxall (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954), provided the principle biographical materials for this paper. Collins' book was the principal doctrinal study of Kierkegaard employed. In a study such as this, only the principal lines of doctrine, in their general structure, can be studied as a function of a man's life. The philosophical positions considered here in relation to the life of Kierkegaard are his statements on the three spheres of existence, Hegelianism, the human individual, and Christianity. Only those biographical influences, and they are abundant, which considerably affected these doctrines are handled here.

In addition to the biographies mentioned above, two specifically autobiographical sources were employed: The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard, edited and translated by A. Dru (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), and The Point Of View for My Work as an Author, translated by Walter Lowrie (London: Oxford University Press, second printing, 1950).

²Journals, quoted in this form in Denzil Patrick, Pascal and Kierkegaard (London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), II, 4. Denmark suffered bankruptcy in 1813.

³Hohlenberg presents an interesting hypothesis concerning this relationship. His suggestion will be examined later in this paper. [Kierkegaard's mother was a very simple and uneducated woman who failed utterly to comprehend the intellectual and imaginative flights of her talented children.]

⁴In this first section of the paper, important general influences, rather than specific events, will be considered.

⁵Point of View, p. 82.

⁶These details are given us in the unpublished and incomplete work Johannes Climacus or De Omnibus Dubitandum Est. This work was written in 1842 or 1843. Parts of it appear in Dru's translation of the Journals, pp. 108-111.

⁷Journals, p. 109.

⁸See Hohlenberg, p. 34. As Hohlenberg says, "In spite of the paucity of outer incidents in his own life, [he was able] to draw upon an inexhaustible and penetrating richness of

understanding about life at large."⁸

⁹See Journals, p. 109.

¹⁰De Omnibus Dubitandum Est, quoted by Lowrie, p. 34. Dru does not include this passage in his edition of the Journals. [Hohlenberg points out that Kierkegaard's fascination was with the form of the expression of thought, rather than with content. This is a fascination he never lost; it influenced his own style, "with its musiclike construction, which lets the thoughts be separated, then meet, then be intermingled again, like the voices in a fugue."] P. 37.

[Kierkegaard himself mentions the imaginative and dialectical abilities he possessed at the end of his childhood: "My imagination and my dialectic constantly had material enough to operate with, and time enough, free from all bustle, to be idle. For long periods I have been employed with nothing else but the performance of dialectical exercises with an adjunct of imagination, trying out my mind as one tunes an instrument."] Point of View, p. 80.

¹¹See Collins, p. 113. I do not mean to imply that the philosophical discussions at the Kierkegaard home were centered around Hegel, who was not yet a prominent figure in Denmark. Rather, the discussions focused on a Wolffian brand of rationalism. See Collins, p. 5.

¹²Point of View, p. 76.

¹³See Lowrie, p. 22. Kierkegaard later captured pathetically the power of this event and its consequences: "How terrible about the man who once as a little boy, while herding the flocks on the heaths of Jutland, suffering greatly, in hunger and in want, stood upon a hill and cursed God--and the man was unable to forget it even when he was eighty-two years old." Journals, entry 556, p. 150. Kierkegaard journeyed to Jutland in 1840, and while there recorded his impressions of the countryside: "The heaths of Jutland must of all places be suited to develop the spirit powerfully; here everything lies naked and uncovered before God, and there is no room for the many distractions, the many little crevices where consciousness can hide and where seriousness has such difficulty in running down one's scattered thoughts. Here consciousness must firmly and scrupulously close itself around itself. And on the heaths one may say with truth. 'Whither shall I flee from thy presence?'" Journals, entry 338, p. 86.

¹⁴But this apprehensive feeling was to go further, and this is where Kierkegaard recognized the danger in his upbringing. "The danger is not that his father or tutor should be a free-thinker, not even his being a hypocrite. No,

the danger lies in his being a pious, God-fearing man, and in the child being convinced thereof, but that he should nevertheless notice that deep in his soul, there lies hidden an unrest which, consequently, not even the fear of God and piety should calm. The danger is that the child in that situation is almost provoked to draw a conclusion about God, that God is not infinite love." Journals, entry 1055, pp. 374ff. Kierkegaard was taught that God is love, but it was later to take a profound religious experience to make this truth meaningful in his life.

The nature of M. P. Kierkegaard's melancholy can be treated in more detail. Many of the features of his life led him to believe that God was going to inflict terrible punishment upon him for his sin. The long list of material blessings and wealth affected him profoundly; he felt that he was being allowed by God to prosper in this way, in order that the eventual punishment would be that much more painful for him to bear. And finally, he came to believe that God's wrath would be visited also upon his family, and that he would live to see all of his loved ones taken from him. This feeling was somehow communicated to his son, who was sure he would die before the age of 34.

We are able to piece together some of the details of Kierkegaard's coming to suspect the trouble in his father's life. These, however, can be more profitably analyzed in the following section of the paper. Chapter.

¹⁵His father is pictured as introducing a representation of the scene at Calvary among some other pictures and toys. The impression Kierkegaard experienced was profound, so profound that it took some of the child out of him. "He forgets entirely the other pictures which you have showed him; for now he has got something entirely different to think about." The boy is left at first with a wonder that God would permit this evil, then with a yearning to slay those who wrought the crime; this yearning would later be transformed into a militant anti-worldliness, and finally into a desire to suffer as Christ suffered, and for the same truth. Kierkegaard, Training in Christianity, quoted in Lowrie, pp. 40f.

¹⁶Too early, as Kierkegaard himself admitted. For a child, he feels, should be allowed to "play with holy things." A man does not become a Christian as a child, but only in the maturity of self-possession. See Lowrie, p. 61.

¹⁷See Point of View, pp. 76f.

¹⁸In a journal entry of 1848, Kierkegaard divides his religious training into the two categories of melancholy and profound Christian awareness. "It is terrible when I think, even for a single moment, over the dark background which, from

the very earliest time, was part of my life. The dread with which my father filled my soul, his own frightful melancholy, and all the things in this connection which I do not even note down. I felt a dread of Christianity, and yet felt myself so strongly drawn toward it." Journals, entry 841, p. 273. He was always apprehensive and in a sense resentful of the burden of being a Christian. "When one first begins to reflect upon Christianity it must certainly have been a scandal to one before one enters upon it, [sic] one must even have wished that it had never come into the world or at least that the question had never arisen in one's consciousness. Journals, entry 105, p. 41. See also Hohlenberg, p. 39.

¹⁹See Hohlenberg, p. 31.

²⁰Report from Welding, the Dean of Viborg (quoted in Lowrie, p. 58.)

²¹Quoted in Lowrie, p. 37.

²²The main reasons for the uncertainty are, first of all, Kierkegaard's refusal to elaborate on this point, and secondly, the lack of biographical materials on Kierkegaard from his contemporaries. As Theodor Haecker says, "The fault lies in the untimeliness of Kierkegaard. At the time of his death, naturalism had begun to blossom everywhere, then came the worship of science, to be followed soon after by that of technical progress, the neglect of the true, eternal philosophy and the abandonment of the search for truth." Kierkegaard the Cripple (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), p. 1.

²³The most conclusive evidence for this comes from the juxtaposition of several journal entries. First of all, the quote from The Point of View given on page three is similar to several remarks made in the Journal. Kierkegaard grew out of his childhood with a confidence that he could do anything he wanted to do, except to conquer his melancholy. See entry 600, p. 169; entry 841, p. 273. In entry 600, Kierkegaard talks of a mysterious "disproportion between soul and body," a "sad discord with its attendant suffering" as the thorn in the flesh. This might be taken to indicate that the thorn in the flesh is a combination of something physical with an attendant melancholy, as Collins holds. (See p. 10.) If this is the case, I still think melancholy is what is chiefly referred to in this phrase. In entry 694 (p. 218), Kierkegaard mentions a possibility of finally being able to conquer his melancholy and reserve and in entry 747 (p. 235), he mentions his new-found confidence that this is indeed possible; he feels that he can now speak out, and reveal himself to his contemporaries. He speaks of his doctor having arrived just as he made the decision to speak out, and says that he did not consult him

this dual
relation is
stronger
Pascal, too

about this. This is significant, since in entry 600, where the discord between soul and body is mentioned, there is further mention of his doctor being pessimistic that this discord can ever be resolved. If entry 600 and entry 747 are juxtaposed, then the physical factor, if there is one at all, seems to be very minimal; the thorn in the flesh appears to be his melancholy. Then, in entry 749, we learn that he did speak with his doctor again, and again felt that his self-isolation could not be penetrated, at least yet. An even clearer piece of evidence is offered in entries 1252 (pp. 462f.) and 1271 (pp. 473f.) In entry 1252, the thorn in the flesh is mentioned explicitly in connection with the experience of power to conquer his melancholy reported in entry 747. In entry 1271, every other possible meaning is practically eliminated. "Originally I was in possession of the outward requirements for the enjoyment of life, and within me, that is all too certain, there was desire enough to enjoy life--but there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a cross: and I could not really succeed in enjoying life.

"Then, as the conditions for enjoying life began to disappear, and financial worries came upon me, it occurred to me that it might be possible for the thorn in the flesh to be taken from me." When read in the context of the other entries, this seems to me to be sufficient evidence that the thorn in the flesh refers to his melancholy and an attendant bashfulness and painful reserve.

²⁴See Hohlenberg, p. 28. Hohlenberg even feels that Kierkegaard's father deliberately prepared the boy for suffering, i.e., that the father's premonition of impending evil for his family was so strong that he consciously handled Søren so as to prepare him for the day when the wrath of God would descend.

²⁵Ibid., p. 30.

²⁶See Point of View, p. 76. In the Journals for 1837, there is one terse entry that manifests the discrepancy between the inward state and the seeming reality: "I am a Janus bifrons; I laugh with one face, I weep with the other." Entry 140, p. 47. At the time of his passing to the University, he was described by the rector of the School of Civic Virtue: "He has a good intelligence, open for everything that promises unusual interest, but for a long time he was childish in a high degree and totally lacking in seriousness." Quoted in Lowrie, p. 57.

It was chiefly his wit, we may presume, that endowed him with a sense of superiority and an almost unbounded self-confidence. He states that, at the time of his enrollment at the University of Copenhagen, "I went out into life with a proud and almost foolhardy bearing. I have never at any instant in my life been deserted by the faith that one can do what one will--only one thing excepted, all else unconditionally,

but one thing not, the throwing off of the melancholy in whose power I was." Point of View, p. 78.

²⁷Ibid., p. 79.

²⁸Ibid., p. 77.

²⁹It is not likely that he wanted to choose another field of study at the time of his enrollment; his brother Peter had also obeyed the wish of his father and had successfully completed the theological course at the University. See Lowrie, p. 66. Peter was at this time in Germany for doctoral studies.

³⁰One of the earliest entries in his Journals (entry 4 in the Dru edition) manifests his dissatisfaction with the nature-worshippers: "The reason why I cannot really say that I definitely enjoy nature is because I am unable to understand clearly what I enjoy. A work of art, on the other hand, I can understand; I can--if I may so express it--find the archimedean point, and once I have found that everything easily becomes clear to me. I can then follow the one great thought and see how all the details serve to throw light upon it. I can see, as it were, the author's whole individuality like a sea in which every detail is reflected. The author's mind is related to mine, it may well be superior to mine, but like mine it is circumscribed. The works of God are too great for me; I inevitably lose myself in the details. That is also why people's expressions when they look at nature: it is lovely, magnificent, etc. are so insipid, for they are all too anthropomorphic, they stay at the outside; they cannot express the depths within." Pp.1f.

³¹See Hohlenberg, p. 49.

³²See Collins, pp. 103f. Both biographical sources are lacking in sufficient information about the history of Kierkegaard's philosophical pursuits, but Collins has ample matter on this subject. See especially pp. 99-111.

³³Journals, entry 32, p. 22. By "philosophy," Kierkegaard refers to both Hegelianism and rationalism, the only philosophical systems he knew at the time. See Collins, pp. 100f.

Collins points out (p. 102) that at this time "Kierkegaard was sure of the following points: God cannot predestine a man in such a way as to rob him of his freedom; the act of faith itself is free; the God of the Christians is personal, transcendent, and met with in a personal and morally strenuous encounter, rather than in an obscurely mystical, natural piety." Compare this with Lowrie's theory that the

irreconcilability of philosophy and Christianity meant that at this time Kierkegaard felt that Christianity must be rejected in favor of philosophy. Although he wavered for a time before the demands of Christianity, and even at this time was sharply critical of the Christian establishment, I do not think that he ever favored opting for Hegelian philosophy in place of the Christianity of the New Testament. Lowrie's theory is connected with his ordering of events during this period.

The remark about a mystical piety pertains to the Romantic mysticism of Schleiermacher which fascinated Kierkegaard for a while, but which he soon came to view with as much dissatisfaction as he displayed in his criticism of Hegel. See Collins, pp. 101ff.

³⁴See Collins, p. 22; also pp. 105ff.

³⁵On October 27, 1831, Kierkegaard took and passed the examination which qualified him for candidature in theology. This examination freed him from the requirements of attending lectures. There was no specified time limit for acquiring the degree in theology. See Lowrie, p. 67 and pp. 77ff.

³⁶"He took an active part in the Student Association, which served as a debating society; and he took part in the organization of the 'Academica,' which was a secession of elect spirits from the larger organization." Lowrie, p. 90.

Lowrie depicts the group of students with whom Kierkegaard associated, a group in which he "was not so much welcomed . . . as tolerated," because "he was admired for his wit and his prodigious knowledge, but also feared, especially by those who were the butt of his terrible sarcasm." Lowrie, p. 96. Kierkegaard is described as "a talented but insolent youth who used his wit to wound his comrades and triumph over them, had no apparent fellow-feeling, but stood aloof from life and superciliously observed it." Lowrie points out that his unsympathetic type of insightful observation of others was later to be mellowed when he became a "spy in a higher service." Even so, it still remains true that Kierkegaard always fell short of realizing the full meaning of the present social reality of the Church. See Collins, pp. 215ff.

³⁷See Hohlenberg, pp. 51ff. This entry appears as a marginal note to a February, 1837, entry dealing with foreboding and dread of sin, and especially with the danger of giving scandal to children. The main entry reads: "A certain foreboding seems to go before everything which is to happen; . . . but just as it can act as a deterrent so too it can act as a temptation, awakening in man the thought that he is, as it were, predestined; he sees himself led on to something as though by consequences which he cannot influence at all. One must therefore be very careful with children, never believe

the worst, or, as the result of an ill-timed suspicion, or a chance remark (the infernal-machine which sets fire to the tinder which is in every soul) induce that state of anxiety in which innocent but weak souls are easily tempted to believe themselves guilty, to despair, and so take the first step towards the goal foreshadowed by the alarming foreboding--a remark which gives the kingdom of evil, with its stupefying, snake-like eye, an opportunity of reducing them to a state of spiritual impotence. Woe to him by whom the scandal cometh applies in this case also." There are actually two marginal additions to this entry. The first reads: "Here belongs the effect which reading the history of an illness can often produce--though even here there are two factors, the stuff of the illness is in a sense given in the fear--for it is difficult to say which produces the other--there is a certain susceptibility, so powerful that it is almost productive--

"The effect too which executions, for instance, produce--

"The numerous phenomena produced by the doctrine of the sin against the Holy Spirit.

"All sin begins with fear (just as fear of a disease makes one susceptible to it) but the first man did not begin with fear--there was then no original sin." Journals, entries 101, 102; pp. 40f.

³⁸Journals, entry 103, p. 41. Kierkegaard had been interested in the character of the master-thief several years earlier. An entry of September 12, 1834, reads: "I am surprised that no one has ever (as far as I know), treated the idea of a 'master-thief', an idea which would certainly lend itself very well to dramatic treatment. We must notice how nearly every nation has had an idea of that kind, that an ideal thief has occurred to all of them, and we shall see that however different Fra Diavolo is from a Peer Mikkelsen or a Morten Frederiksen they have certain traits in common. . . . We must be careful to remember that people have never thought of badness, theft or robbery alone as being at the bottom of the idea. On the contrary they have always thought of the master-thief as good natured, lovable, charitable and moreover with lightning decision, cunning and sagacity, not stealing for the sake of stealing, i.e., in order to appropriate someone else's possessions, but stealing for some other reason.

Journals, entry 5, p. 2. And, on January 29, 1835: "Naturally we must also imagine him furnished with a highly developed sense of humor which can very well be combined with his general dissatisfaction, which is precisely what makes him satirical, and--although he must not always be thought of as dissatisfied--can nevertheless easily be combined with his plebeian origin and national characteristics." Journals, entry 6, p. 2.

³⁹The entry reads in part as follows: "What I really lack is to be clear in my mind what I am to do, not what I am to know, except in so far as a certain understanding must precede

every action. The thing is to understand myself, to see what God really wishes me to do; the thing is to find a truth which is for me, to find the idea for which I can live and die. What would be the use of discovering so-called objective truth . . . What good would it do me to be able to explain the meaning of Christianity if it had no deeper significance for me and for my life? . . . I certainly do not deny that I still recognize an imperative of understanding and that through it one can work upon men, but it must be taken up into my life, and that is what I now recognize as the most important thing . . . That is what I lack and that is what I am striving after. . . . I have looked in vain for an anchorage in the boundless sea of pleasures and in the depth of understanding; I have felt the almost irresistible power with which one pleasure reaches out its hand to the next; I have felt the kind of meretricious ecstasy that it is capable of producing, but also the ennui and the distracted state of mind that succeeds it. I have tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and often delighted in its taste. But the pleasure did not outlast the moment of understanding and left no profound mark upon me. It seems as though I had not drunk from the cup of wisdom, but had fallen into it. . . . It is useless for a man to determine first of all the outside and afterwards fundamentals. One must know oneself before knowing anything else . . . It is only after a man has thus understood himself inwardly, and has thus seen his way, that life acquires peace and significance . . . Although I am still far from having reached so complete an understanding of myself, I have, with profound respect for its significance, tried to preserve my individuality--worshipped the unknown God. Warned by a premature apprehension I have tried to avoid coming into close contact with those phenomena whose power of attraction would perhaps exercise too great an influence upon me. I have tried to master them, studied them individually and examined their importance in men's lives, but at the same time guarded against going, like the moth, too near the flame. I have had but little to win or lose from the ordinary run of men. . . . And so I stand once again at the point where I must begin my life in a different way. I shall now try to fix a calm gaze upon myself and begin to act in earnest; for only thus shall I be able, like the child calling itself 'I' with its first conscious action, to call myself 'I' in any deeper sense.

"But for that patience is necessary, and one cannot reap immediately where one has sown. I shall bear in mind the method of the philosopher who bade his disciples keep silence for three years after which time all would come right. One does not begin feasting at dawn but at sunset. And so too in the spiritual world it is first of all necessary to work for some time before the light bursts through and the sun shines forth in all its glory. For although it is said that God allows

the sun to shine upon the good and the wicked, and sends down rain upon the just and the unjust, it is not so in the spiritual world. And so the die is cast--I cross the Rubicon! This road certainly leads me to strife; but I shall not give up. I will not grieve over the past--for why grieve? I will work on with energy and not waste time grieving, like the man caught in the quicksands who began by calculating how far down he had already sunk, forgetting that all the while he was sinking still deeper. I will hurry along the path I have discovered, greeting those whom I meet on my way, not looking back as did Lot's wife, but remembering that it is a hill up which we have to struggle." Journals, entry 22, pp. 15-20.

⁴⁰See Collins, p. 21.

⁴¹See Hohlenberg, pp. 55f.

⁴²A journal entry shortly after his return to Copenhagen reads: "'What!' he said to himself, 'the man who penetrates his brother's most secret thoughts, does not that fatal gift bring him to the frightful condition which comes upon the Wandering Jew, who wandered through the gay tumult of the world without joy, without hope, without pain, in dull indifference, which is the caput mortuum of despair, as though through a dreary and disconsolate desert?'" Journals, entry 26, p. 21.

Lowrie dates the Great Earthquake at about the time of Kierkegaard's enrollment at the University of Copenhagen; Geismar dates it in 1838. Hohlenberg's arguments for his own restructuring of this period are convincing.

⁴³The wedding took place on April 26, 1797, and the first child was born on September 7.

⁴⁴See, for example, Lowrie, pp. 70, 128.

⁴⁵Hohlenberg also thinks that this may explain Kierkegaard's reticence with regard to his mother. "Possibly in the conduct of the parents, and in his father's treatment of his mother, there may have been something which early made him suspect that something was abnormal, and this perhaps made it impossible for him to speak of her; or, if he had written anything about her, made him destroy it. For, as he says in one place, he does not want the essential secret of his life to become known. We have here, it may be, 'The concrete explanation, which I conceal in my inmost heart, the explanation which really contains the horror for me still more precisely.' Here may be 'the even more terrible thing,' which he will not write down. Rightly can he say that no one after his death should in his papers find the secret word which explains everything. And that is why he never mentions his mother." Pp. 63f.

⁴⁶Journals, entry 243, pp. 66f. It must be admitted that this entry could serve as an argument for the cursing incident being the sin which so profoundly moved Kierkegaard.

In the next entry Kierkegaard outlines the effects which this event had upon his life. "Inwardly torn asunder as I was, without any expectation of leading a happy earthly life . . . without hope of a happy and comfortable future--as it naturally springs from and lies in the historical continuity of family life--what wonder then that in desperate despair I grasped at naught but the intellectual side in man and clung fast to it so that the thought of my own considerable powers of mind was my only consolation, ideas my one joy, and mankind indifferent to me." P. 67.

⁴⁷"He saw now that his father's Christianity was not the confidence and certainty he had thought it to be, but rather an anxious, desperate clinging to a faith which could not give him the help and comfort he needed. It led to an inner revolt against the Christianity which, although it had made the father himself so unhappy, he yet had wanted to force on his son. All the fire within him rose in protest against this religion of suffering and punishment, as Christianity now seemed to his eyes to be." Hohlenberg, p. 64.

In The Point of View, Kierkegaard reports the effects of the great earthquake on his conception of Christianity. He did not abandon his Christian faith, but neither did he live it. He is torn between offence at Christianity and the necessity of bowing to its truth, joined with a sympathy for his father who, with it all, was "the best of fathers." (Quoted in Hohlenberg, p. 64.) His journal entries at this time are filled with sarcastic and critical remarks about Christianity, and yet we can detect that he still knew that the ultimate cure for his troubled soul lay in the Christian religion. "The same thing happens to Christianity, as to all radical cures, one puts it off as long as possible." Journals, entry 27, p. 21. He speaks of the leap which is necessary if one is to live Christianity, and the difficulty of this leap because of the "curiously oppressive air" of Christianity. Journals, entry 32, p. 22. See also The Point of View, pp. 76f.

⁴⁸See Hohlenberg, pp. 66ff.

⁴⁹"So I fared forth into life--initiated into all possible enjoyments, yet never really enjoying, but rather (to indulge the one pleasure I had in connexion with the pain of melancholy) laboring to produce the impression that I enjoyed. I fared forth into acquaintance with all sorts of men, yet it never occurred to me that I had a confidant in any of them, and certainly it never occurred to any one of them that he was my confidant. That is to say, I was constrained to be and

was an observer. By such a life, as an observer and as spirit, I was extraordinarily enriched by experiences, got to see quite near at hand that aggregation of pleasures, passions, dispositions, feelings, etc., got practice in seeing a man through and through and also in imitating him. My imagination and my dialectic constantly had material enough to operate with, and time enough, free from all bustle, to be idle. For long periods I have been employed with nothing else but the performance of dialectical exercises with an adjunct of imagination, trying out my mind as one tunes an instrument--but I was not really living. I was tossed about in life, tempted by many and the most various things, unfortunately also by errors, and, alas! also by the path of perdition. So I was in my twenty-fifth year, to myself an enigmatically developed and extraordinary possibility, the significance of which and its character I did not understand, in spite of the most eminent reflection which if possible understood everything. I understood one thing, that my life would be properly employed in doing penance; but in the proper sense of the word I had not lived, except in the character of spirit; a man I had never been, and child or youth even less." Point of View, pp. 79f.

⁵⁰See Lowrie, pp. 131-134; Hohlenberg, pp. 69f.

⁵¹Collins, p. 50. The presentation of the three spheres of existence is, for all practical purposes, a theory of man's emotional life. "He has shown that the life of feeling has inherent structure and system, . . . that it is possible to retain a deeper passion while thinking objectively about it, . . . that we can be objective with respect to our own subjectivity without losing it." David Swenson, Something About Kierkegaard, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, third printing, 1948), p. 161. The aesthetic man finds his meaning in life in extracting from it the maximum amount of enjoyment; this sphere incorporates a wide variety of attitudes.

"The sensuous side of human nature makes two important contributions to Kierkegaard's view of existence. It is only through sense perception that the individual is brought into contact with the existent material world, and hence only through this medium that man obtains a sensuous intuition of real movement. Our dependence upon an empirical source for our perception of actual becoming is one of the cornerstones of his polemic against Hegel's idealistic and absolutist theory of mind. Furthermore, neglect of the flesh is the first step toward neglect of the passional element in man and reduction of desire, will, and resolution to aspects of thought. A Don Juan is there to remind us that no conception of human existence is adequate, which cannot find a distinctive place for sensuous experience and the full play of the passions." Collins, p. 52.

The Romantic soul, when balanced, displays the "exuberance and primitive drive" of an unreflective man, a contradiction to idealizing and over-intellectualizing tendencies. Ibid., p. 53. But there is an inherent danger that the stress on immediacy of experience will lead to an exclusive preoccupation with aestheticism, to a revolt from the kingdom of the spirit, as Kierkegaard himself experienced. The full life of the passions is not present in a Don Juan, because he is not reflective enough to make a meaningful decision in his own life. When Kierkegaard stresses the freedom and responsibility of the single human individual, he is directing his polemic against both the Romantic conception of life and against Hegel. His main charge against the aesthetic way of life, with its basic state of sensual immediacy and resultant instability and restlessness, is that moral will and reflective reason are sacrificed to imagination and "concrete intelligence"; maturity is stunted. See Collins, pp. 54f.

His own experience during this period also had some bearing on what he would say about the second phase of the aesthetic dialectic, the state of doubt. In his own life, he had experienced the transition from the confident buoyancy of Don Juan to the skepticism of Faust. "Anyone who reflects upon the futility of trying to satisfy the human spirit in the sheer flow of immediate feeling and pleasure is liable to become skeptical about every supposed certainty, resting place, and moment of joy." Ibid., pp. 56f.

But it is in the Wandering Jew that Kierkegaard finds the truest symbol of his age; the aesthetic life necessarily culminates in despair. Ibid., p. 64.

⁵²Journals, entry 76, p. 30.

⁵³Dedication to The Concept of Dread, quoted by Hohlenberg, p. 71.

⁵⁴"Poul Møller, about the time when it became clear to Kierkegaard that he was on the downward path, must have said something which acted upon Kierkegaard like a trumpet call, and awakened him from his indolent condition. What this word was we do not know. We only have two sayings of Poul Møller to, or about, Søren Kierkegaard. One is an expression which according to Kierkegaard's own telling he often used: 'You are so polemic through and through that it is quite dreadful.' The other is a thing which Poul Møller, when on his deathbed, enjoined upon Sibbern to carry to Kierkegaard. It was this: 'Tell little Kierkegaard that he must take care not to plan too wide a course of studies, because doing so has caused me much injury.' Of these only the first raises any question." Hohlenberg, pp. 71f. See also Lowrie, pp. 142-145.

⁵⁵Lowrie presents a restructuring of the possible sequence of events during the first half of 1836. That the awakening

took place around the end of May or the first part of June, 1836, is obvious from the Journals.

⁵⁶See Journals, entry 118, p. 43; Lowrie, p. 161.

⁵⁷See Lowrie, pp. 152-157.

⁵⁸See Journals, entries 127, 150, 166, 174; see also Lowrie, pp. 159ff.

⁵⁹Journals, entry 149, pp. 49f.

⁶⁰Journals, entry 189, p. 56. Hohlenberg assigns the writing of the Diapsalm 'I cannot be bothered with anything' to this period following Møller's death. "I can't be bothered to do anything, I won't walk--it tires me; I won't lie down; for either I should lie down for a long time, and I won't do that, or I should get up again immediately, and I won't do that--I won't ride-- it is too violent an exercise compared to my apathy; I only feel inclined to drive; to let a number of objects glide past me, while I am comfortably and evenly shaken, lingering in beautiful places simply in order to feel my own languor--my ideas and my conceits are as unfruitful as a eunuch's passion--I look in vain for something which might enliven me--not even the pithy language of the Middle Ages can destroy the ennui which dominates within me--Now, indeed, I feel the significance of what is said of Christ's words: that they have life and spirit--in short: I do not want to have written what I have written, but neither do I want to cross it out." Journals, entry 131, p. 46.

⁶¹Journals, entry 207, p. 59.

⁶²See Lowrie, pp. 180-185.

⁶³Journals, entry 335, p. 86.

⁶⁴At least if we can accept Regine Olsen's feeling that the following entry refers to her: "Again the same scene today-- nevertheless I got out to the Rørdams--merciful God, why should that inclination awaken just now--Oh, how I feel that I am alone-- Oh, cursed be that arrogant satisfaction in standing alone-- all will despise me now--but thou, O my God, take not thy hand from me now--let me live and better myself." Journals, entry 119, p. 44.

⁶⁵Journals, entry 367, p. 92.

⁶⁶Lowrie, p. 192.

⁶⁷Journals, entry 367, pp. 93f. On the twelfth anni-

versary of their engagement, Kierkegaard recorded in his Journal: "My engagement to her and the break are really my relation to God, they are, if I may say so, divinely speaking, my engagement with God." Entry 1281, p. 479. Lowrie rightly contends that we cannot understand Kierkegaard's life and his work without understanding as a basic determinant his conviction that he had been set aside as a sacrifice for his generation. See pages 202f; also Hohlenberg, pp. 96f. The universal human was not his category. The "thorn in the flesh" takes on a new meaning when we see how his melancholy, which was really the factor that set him apart from everybody else, also ate down right into his bodily life and kept him from realizing the universal human. The orders read "Further!" See Journals, entry 259, p. 70; also Collins, pp. 10f.

Shortly after breaking the engagement, Kierkegaard traveled to Berlin, where he worked on Either/Or, and attended the lectures of Schelling. He returned to Copenhagen on March 6, 1842.

⁶⁸Kierkegaard gives us many reasons for writing Either/Or. First of all it was written for Regine, to convince her that he was a scoundrel, and to try to soften for her the blow of his refusal to marry her. It was especially by "The Diary of the Seducer" that he meant to repel her. But certainly the second part of the work (which was written first) cannot be imagined as repelling her; this must be taken as presenting to her an Either/Or also. He tells us also that the book was intended to communicate a metaphysical position, that "everything brings one up squarely against the dilemma" of either the aesthetic life or the ethical. See Lowrie, p. 242.

In addition to these two reasons, there are the two which he mentions in The Point of View as applying to his entire aesthetical production: (1) that his whole work as an author is religious, and that the pseudonymous works are intended as a deceit to lead men to the truth; (see Point of View, pp. 39-41); and (2) that the aesthetical works are a poetical evacuation, necessitated by the store of emotional experiences which had welled up within him. (Ibid., pp 84f.) It is because of the latter that he can say that "through sorrow at having to make her unhappy, I became an author; through sorrow at having to make her unhappy, I have as an author loved almost superhuman exertion; and in the service of truth have sought dangers which all would flee from." Forlovelsen, quoted in Hohlenberg, p. 116. We will leave the explanation of the religious question aside until we come to the question of the pseudonyms.

⁶⁹The ethical sphere was never looked upon by Kierkegaard as self-sufficient for human existence, and, in fact, he came to despise an exclusively ethical view of life as bourgeois. This is because he limited himself too closely, in his view of the ethical sphere, to the character of Judge William, the protagonist of ethical existence in Either/Or and in Stages on Life's Way. Judge William advocates that a happy married life is the goal of human existence and the apex of moral perfection. "Marriage I regard as the highest telos of the individual human existence, it is so much the highest that the man who goes without it cancels with one stroke the whole of earthly life and retains only eternity and spiritual interests--which at the first glance seems no slight thing but in the long run is very exhausting and also in one way or another is the expression of an unhappy life." Stages on Life's Way, quoted in Collins, p. 86. Collins shows how this position stems from Kierkegaard's own experience regarding marriage: "The aesthetic works provide no satisfactory account of how a married life might be incorporated within the religious sphere of existence. Kierkegaard's personal case impresses him so forcefully, that he is ready to conclude that marriage is the prime factor in directing personality to exclusively immanent and finite ends and in sponsoring an esthetic interpretation of religious concepts. The varieties of ethical experience are not investigated in as much detail as are the varieties of esthetic experience. Insufficient attention is paid to individual self-sufficiency, to dedication of one's life to humanitarian ends, or to other prominent forms of ethical existence which also present themselves as substitutes, for the love and service of God. Where marriage is involved, Kierkegaard is more concerned to provide a corrective for his own temptations than to give a balanced account of its ethical function. This is an invidious sense in which it is true that the aesthetic books mark first of all his own education in the meaning of existence." Ibid., p. 87.

⁷⁰Just before the news of the engagement had reached Kierkegaard, he had done considerable work on two books, Repetition and Fear and Trembling, both of which were meant in part for Regine. In Fear and Trembling, we have the first mention in an aesthetic work of the suspension of the ethical in the face of a direct summons from God to something further. Repetition was changed in part by the news of her engagement, and made into an almost comical work. See Lowrie, pp. 257f.

⁷¹See Lowrie, p. 263. He had previously been toying with the possibility of getting her back, and had not committed himself fully to the orders he felt he had received. And, in fact, Kierkegaard himself says in The Point of View that "with my predisposition for religion, or rather, I may say, with my decided religiousness, this factum was for me at the same time a religious awakening, so that I came to understand

myself in the most decisive sense in the experience of religion, or in religiousness, to which, however, I had already put myself into relation as a possibility." Point of View, pp. 83f. It seems that we could date the formal and explicit religious orientation of all his works from the time when he received the news of her engagement. Up to this time, his aesthetic works had been primarily and formally a means of communicating with Regine and of evacuating the poetic storehouse which had welled up inside him. Only secondarily, if at all consciously, had they been a deceit in a higher service. We will treat this a bit more in detail in connection with the pseudonyms.

⁷²The Fragments was published on June 13, 1844; the Postscript on February 27, 1846.

⁷³As we pointed out above, it is not with the details of the Hegelian system that he chooses to contend, but with the social phenomena which result from an absolute idealism of this sort. Kierkegaard is a vitally personal thinker, and resists the treatment of humanly vital questions in an objective fashion. Truth can only be possessed, he feels, when it is acquired by self-activity, through reflection; and this proves to be a vain acquisition if it does not transform the thinker's personality and shape his existence, his life as a human being. See Lowrie, p. 302. This is what Kierkegaard calls the theory of double reflection. As long as one is concerned with the concrete facts of human existence, an objective system is impossible.

As Collins points out (pp. 121ff.), Kierkegaard is not anti-intellectual or irrational. He had no acquaintance with a metaphysics which was anything other than a mental fabrication. He wanted to preserve Christianity from the logicizing tendencies of the Hegelians. He does not deny that genuine knowledge can be acquired through the various scientific disciplines, but this knowledge is one of "essence and possibility." Once thought claims to include existence and actuality, it takes on a comic aspect, since it attempts to generate existence in the same way as it gives rise to possibility. The danger which especially sets Kierkegaard on his guard is that man may come to be but a moment in the pure thought of the absolute mind. "Hegel makes an easy transition from the standpoint of the individual mind to that of the absolute mind, considered as a process of thinking its own development and self-explication. Kierkegaard admits that the transition could be made, if it could be shown that, for the finite human self, to be means to-be-a-moment-of-pure-thought. Now, this equivalence can be demonstrated only in

the imagination, by abstracting from, and thus forgetting about, the existing reality of the individual. This can be done in a fit of absentmindedness, perhaps, but the pose cannot be maintained for long, under normal conditions and under the gaze of the comic spirit. . . .

"A truly systemic view of reality belongs only to God, for only He can embrace within His eternal vision the breadth, temporal span, and secrets of existence and becoming." Collins, pp. 128f.)

The interests which drove Kierkegaard to write these philosophical works are basically the same as those which played a part in the aesthetical works: he is presenting in both his unique theory of human existence. Even in the aesthetical works, he had singled out certain Hegelian themes for criticism. See Collins, p. 106, and pp. 112-119. For the influences which Schelling and others had on Kierkegaard's critique of Hegel, see pp. 107-111. His explicit task in the philosophical works is "the restoration of a sense of the possibility-relationship between God and man. This is the only way open to a deepening of human existence." Collins, p. 136. The world-historical outlook is antagonistic to everything that is ethical, "severs the individual from empirical relationships, robs him of personal freedom and responsibility, and saps the initiative from human planning under contingent circumstances." *Ibid.*, pp. 135f. The last-mentioned function of the world-historical outlook is responsible for the formation of a comfortable bourgeois population which espouses mediocrity.

⁷⁴Point of View, p. 39.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 40f.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 85f.

⁷⁸He uses pseudonyms for these three writings because they do not express his true view of human existence. But neither were they primarily strategic devices for winning adherents to a religious way of life. Rather they are formally messages to Regine and a necessary evacuation of the poetic. None of Kierkegaard's aesthetical works can be interpreted as having only one level of meaning; the religious orientation of his aesthetical writings may well have been present from the start--but it was not the purpose which was formally dominant at the time when the first three aesthetical works were penned. I think that Kierkegaard was a religious writer from the first, that he knew this, and wanted to show this to others in the Edifying Discourses. But I do not think that the

aesthetical works fitted formally from the first into a religiously finalized scheme. Collins (pp. 35-42) presents a view which seems to agree with this; he adds other significant possibilities which may have figured prominently in Kierkegaard's use of pseudonyms--Kierkegaard's delight in mystifying others and his desire to communicate with Regine without betraying her confidence. It is only when he views his work in retrospect, under the formality of divine Providence, that he sees the earliest writings as contributing to a whole scheme.

It must be pointed out that although we must be careful about accepting any of the statements made in the aesthetical works as expressing Kierkegaard's own view, the characters and pseudonyms employed in these writings reflect at least some single facet of his personality. Many of the details narrated in the form of stories in these writings are drawn from Kierkegaard's own life, as we can readily see by correlating these stories with certain entries in his Journals.
+ especially a facet of human freedom upon which he has reflected, with imaginative power

79 Kierkegaard says, "I held out Either/Or to the world in my left hand, and in my right the Two Edifying Discourses; but all, or as good as all, grasped with their right hand what I held in my left." Point of View, p. 20.

80 Kierkegaard tells us that this is why, although the book was written under a pseudonym, his own name appears as editor. See Point of View, p. 13.

81 For the first time, one of his writings "takes cognizance of the pseudonymous work, and of the eighteen Edifying Discourses as well, showing that all of this serves to illuminate the Problem--without, however, affirming that this was the aim of the foregoing production, which indeed could not have been affirmed by a pseudonym, a third person, incapable of knowing anything about the aim of a work which was not his own." Point of View, p. 13. And, "having appropriated the whole pseudonymous, aesthetic work as the description of one way a person may take to become a Christian (viz. away from the aesthetical in order to become a Christian), it undertakes to describe the other way (viz. away from the System, from speculation, etc., in order to become a Christian)." Point of View, pp. 41f.

Kierkegaard speaks of the problem of becoming a Christian, as it is formulated in reference to these works, as a problem in reflection. This is because the particular context in which Kierkegaard must formulate and solve the problem of becoming a Christian is that of "Christendom"--his name for the "conditions in a so-called Christian country," where everybody is under the illusion that he is a Christian. See Point of View, pp. 22ff. When Christians were concerned with the conversion of pagans, they tried to communicate directly

to the people the message of Christianity; but in Christendom, where everybody is nominally a Christian, the first task is not to preach Christianity, but to try to force people to take notice for the first time of the real difference that stands between their own lives and a religious mode of existence. "If a man lives . . . in categories entirely foreign to Christianity, in purely aesthetic categories, and if someone is capable of winning and captivating him with aesthetic works, and then knows how to introduce the religious so promptly that with the momentum of his abandonment to the aesthetic the man rushes straight into the most decisive definitions of the religious--what then? Why, then, he must take notice. What follows after this, however, no one can tell beforehand. But at least he is compelled to take notice. Possibly he may come to his senses and realize what is implied in calling himself a Christian. Possibly he may be furious with the person who has taken this liberty with him; but at least he has begun to take notice, he is on the point of expressing a judgment. Possibly, in order to protect his retreat, he may express the judgment that the other is a hypocrite, a deceiver, a dunce--but there is no help for it, he must judge, he has begun to take notice." Point of View, p. 37.

82 "He had those marks of character which always interested Kierkegaard: the very mixture of sensuousness and reflection which is so fully worked out in the figure of the Seducer. Both Victor Eremita in the preface to Either/Or and A in his introduction to the 'Diary of the Seducer' speak of the Seducer as of a real person, and give such a detailed description of him as to presuppose a living model. It is not impossible that all the mystifying complexity of how A found a manuscript draft to the 'Diary' in his room, and secretly copied it out, may refer to an actual event, wherein by some accident Kierkegaard got hold of some of Møller's manuscripts." Hohlenberg, p. 162.

83 The criticism was chiefly of Part III of Stages on Life's Way ('Guilty/Not Guilty?'). Møller refers cryptically in the article to Kierkegaard's exposé of Møller's motives, see Hohlenberg, pp. 162ff.

84 "The Corsair, Denmark's earliest political comic paper, was founded in 1840 by Meir Aaron Goldschmidt. When a young student twenty years old, Goldschmidt had found his métier by showing his talents to his contemporaries through this unusual medium. The paper was often witty in its contents, but, to our way of thinking, rather naive in its presentation. In politics, the paper stood for the liberal opposition. The result was a perpetual series of conflicts with the censor, followed by prosecutions and terms of imprisonment, the latter being usually served by proxies whose names figured in quick succession as editors of the paper. The

paper was very successful in Copenhagen, and was read by all." Hohlenberg, p. 165.

The release of this news was stunning to Møller, especially because he was at that time very hopeful of being appointed to the Chair of Esthetics at the University of Copenhagen; the revelation of his association with The Corsair would probably destroy his chances of receiving this appointment.

The Corsair had several times praised Kierkegaard's writings, especially Either/Or. Kierkegaard had no wish to be honored by the Corsair, partly because of the type of publication it was and partly because he was politically a conservative and a royalist. He had been planning to take some kind of action against The Corsair. Møller's article provided him with a perfect opportunity. In his retort, he wrote, "Would that I might get into The Corsair! It is really bad for a poor author to stand so singled out in Danish literature, that (assuming of course that we pseudonyms are one and the same person) he is the only one who is not abused there. . . . Victor Eremita has even had to suffer the disgrace of being made immortal--in The Corsair! And yet, I have really been in The Corsair, though this article of Møller's because ubi spiritus, ibi ecclesia: ubi P. L. Møller, ibi The Corsair." Quoted in Hohlenberg, p. 167.

⁸⁵Particular reference was made to his physical constitution, especially his thin legs and the unequal length of his trousers. See Lowrie, p. 351; also caricature in Hohlenberg, p. 171.

⁸⁶Goldschmidt himself became so ashamed of the whole incident that he abandoned the paper in October, 1846. Møller soon departed completely from Denmark and died in degradation in France. See Hohlenberg, pp. 172-175.

⁸⁷With Lowrie, I find it hard to agree with those biographers who are so surprised that this event took on so much importance in Kierkegaard's life. It seems natural that an event such as this, involving so many elements that Kierkegaard had long been disturbed about, would have a powerful impact and "add a new string to his instrument." Lowrie identifies the "new string" as "a new capacity, a deeper tone, and a broader compass." See p. 364.

⁸⁸See Lowrie, pp. 362-388; Journals, entry 626, pp. 189f.

⁸⁹"What he most complained of was the irresponsibility of journalistic writing and the absurd pretension that the anonymous writer represents an immense number of people, if not the vast majority." Lowrie, p. 364. Kierkegaard holds for the equality of all men, but not for the treatment given

by the press, which causes the individual to become immersed in the crowd, in the untruth, the numerical. Men are equal, but by a process of levelling up: every man can attain his last end. The equality of all men is essentially a religious category, a condition "before God." See Lowrie, p. 365; Collins, pp. 190-197.

Other factors besides the Corsair incident influenced Kierkegaard's doctrine on the human individual. The Journals of this period indicate a concern with the revolutionary tendencies of his day. As Collins points out, Kierkegaard wanted to tell men that the major decisions are made on an individual plane; the person's vocation from God is more significant than political upheavals. Kierkegaard is so repelled by the idea of a herd mentality that he is never able to see the full relevance of ethical and religious concerns in the social sphere. See Collins, pp. 185f.

90 "In this age, and indeed for many ages past, people have quite lost sight of the fact that authorship is and ought to be a serious calling implying an appropriate mode of personal existence. They do not realize that the press in general, as an expression of the abstract and impersonal communication of ideas, and the daily press in particular, because of its formal indifference to the question whether what it reports is true or false, contributes enormously to the general demoralization, for the reason that the impersonal, which for the most part is irresponsible and incapable of repentance, is essentially demoralizing. . . . In our age, which reckons as wisdom that which is truly the mystery of unrighteousness, viz. that one need not inquire about the communicator, but only about the communication, the objective only--in our age what is an author? An author is often merely an X, even when his name is signed, something quite impersonal, which addresses itself abstractly, by the aid of printing, to thousands and thousands, while remaining itself unseen and unknown, living a life as hidden, as anonymous, as it is possible for a life to be, in order, presumably, not to reveal the too obvious and striking contradiction between the prodigious means of communication employed and the fact that the author is only a single individual--perhaps also for fear of the control which in practical life must always be exercised over everyone who wishes to teach others, to see whether his personal existence comports with his communication." Point of View, pp. 44f. This was written in 1848, after Kierkegaard had decided on the Christian exigency of a more direct form of communication than he had employed in the pseudonymous works. It indicates that the Corsair event and his subsequent reflections about the press on his changing view of the nature of his authorship.

91 See Hohlenberg, pp. 184f. The Corsair incident had set him apart as "the extraordinary; the persecution he suffered was a sign of the commensurateness of his teaching with his

life, for "the truly religious author has only one syllogism; . . . when he is asked how he knows that he is right, and that what he says is true, then he answers, 'I know it because I am laughed at.' . . . The truly religious author is always polemic. Every religious author or speaker or teacher who withdraws, and does not stay where danger is, and where evil has its stronghold, he is a traitor, as will eventually appear." Quoted in Hohlenberg, p. 184.

⁹²See Hohlenberg, pp. 192ff.

⁹³See Hohlenberg, pp. 194f.

⁹⁴The gradual change in his attitude toward his function as an author was accompanied by a shift in his conception of the religious sphere of existence. There is a mode of human existence which is peculiar to Christianity, and which is beyond other religious realizations of the human personality. Kierkegaard distinguishes between "religiousness A" and "religiousness B". Religiousness B is a wholly new life of faith; faith is not the infinite resignation of the Kierkegaard of 1843; true Christianity is not a religion of hidden inwardness, but demands a corresponding expression before men of one's fundamental self-commitment. For a brief but clear statement of the two types of religious personality, see Swenson, pp. 175ff. -1/

⁹⁵He firmly believed that if he should speak out directly his life would be in danger. See Journals, entry 638, pp. 195f. The Journals of 1847 reflect a debate which he carried on with himself over the propriety of endangering his life for the sake of the truth.

⁹⁶Journals, entry 747, p. 235.

⁹⁷The initial feeling of power to rid himself of the thorn in the flesh is accompanied by the recurrence of the notion of accepting a pastorate.

⁹⁸An entry for May 11, 1848, shows the connection between his confidence that he can conquer his melancholy reserve and his new conception of faith. Prior to this time, he had resigned himself to the fact that he must bear his melancholy as long as he lives (in contrast to the immediacy of simple people who feel that in time God will make things all right.) But now he experiences a new kind of immediacy, an "immediacy after reflection," which expresses itself in the belief "by virtue of the absurd that God will help him temporally." Resignation enables a person to accept the due punishment for his guilt; faith helps him to know that his sin is forgotten by God. This realization was what Kierkegaard needed to break the spell of his melancholy, so that "the unhappy childhood and youth of the exception is transfigured into spirit." Journals, entry

753, pp. 238f.

⁹⁹Kierkegaard gives us a brief "history" of his melancholy disposition in entry 754, p. 240.

¹⁰⁰Journals, entry 829, p. 268.

¹⁰¹Hohlenberg, p. 205 Christendom was an illusion for two reasons: first of all Christianity did not make the impact upon individuals that it is meant to make; and secondly the established Church of Denmark was Christian in name only. The blame for both of these conditions was attributed to the priests, who failed in their own lives to give witness to the truth of Christ in the world.

¹⁰²Mynster had always asserted the value of personality over against the Hegelian system, and emphasized the "how" of Christianity. He had not been an ambitious prelate either, but had won his high position without seeking it. See Hohlenberg, p. 218..

¹⁰³See Hohlenberg, p. 207. Lowrie says that the consideration of Regine also influenced Kierkegaard's use of this pseudonym, and his delay in publishing. He was afraid that she would be distressed and even personally involved in the notoriety that would attach itself to his name if he would publish under his own name. See p. 461. He tried, through Fritz Schlegel, to be reconciled with Regine, but Schlegel would hear nothing of it. See Lowrie, pp. 461f; Hohlenberg, pp. 225-231. Hohlenberg (p. 227) mentions some incidental meetings on the streets in which Kierkegaard and Regine did not talk to one another. On the contrary, Lowrie (p. 571) states that, in their last chance meeting, Regine said in a low voice, "God bless thee. May it go well with thee."

¹⁰⁴Already in 1846, his Journals indicate a growing concern with the illusion of Christendom being perpetrated by the priests of the establishment, and his anguish at the difficult relationship that existed between him and Mynster. See, for example, entry 613, pp. 176f. These entries became more frequent during 1847; in 1848 both The Sickness unto Death and Training in Christianity were written. His deliberations and doubts about the wisdom of publishing at this time are reflected in several ways: his adoption of the pseudonym Anti-Climacus, his refusal to publish The Point of View, and his dealings with Rasmus Nielsen, who used to visit him every Thursday, and to whom Kierkegaard exposed his ideas and his strategies. Kierkegaard soon realized his mistake in choosing such an associate and decided that he would have to handle his own business all alone. For the details of his association

with Nielsen, see Hohlenberg, pp. 210-214.

¹⁰⁵In the summer of 1851, Kierkegaard published a short work, About My Work as an Author in place of the longer and more personal Point of View which he had decided not to publish. After For Self-Examination, he had written Judge For Yourself, which he also decided not to publish. The meaning of the title is: with a New Testament in his hand, every man is in a position to judge for himself about the requirements of Christian discipleship. See Lowrie, p. 466.

¹⁰⁶Some interesting changes took place in Kierkegaard's mentality during this waiting period. For one thing, he became an avid student of Schopenhauer's works, and although there was much that did not meet with his approval, some elements were contagious, especially a disparagement of woman. He insisted on celibacy as a demand of the Gospel. See Lowrie, pp. 487f.

Kierkegaard is no longer the dialectical thinker that he was in earlier days. He now sees only one side of the issue confronting him, and a dominant theme in his Journals is the purity of heart that wills only one thing. All indecision has disappeared from his considerations; he perceives clearly his task, and is resolutely determined to carry it out. The pathology of melancholic reserve is no longer apparent. The Journals indicate only an ardent preparation for the day when he can publicly launch a sustained attack on the established Church of Denmark.

It is obvious from the Journals of 1852 that Kierkegaard had definitely discarded all thought of accepting a pastorate in the country. The comfort and security of such a life no longer held any attraction for him. He was definitively committed by this time to the task of proclaiming the illusion of Christendom, despite the suffering, financial difficulties, and eventual death he knew it would involve. See Lowrie, pp. 494-497.

¹⁰⁷See Journals, entry 1294, p. 490.

¹⁰⁸For a discussion of his financial status at this time, see Lowrie, pp. 500-504; Hohlenberg, pp. 152-158. He practiced for some time a rather stern ascetical life, and acquired a great admiration for the monastic vocation. He says, rather figuratively of course: "Christianity's first and foremost duty is to return to the monastery from which Luther broke away." Journals, entry 1326, p. 508.

¹⁰⁹The Journals record no entries from November 2, 1853, to March 1, 1854. His first entry after the death of Mynster begins: "So now he is dead." He continues with some reflections on Mynster, the establishment, and his own task. See entry 1296, pp. 493f.

¹¹⁰As Lowrie points out, Martensen hoped to replace Mynster. See p. 565.

¹¹¹He wanted to wait until Martensen would be installed as Primate, in order to render his reply as forceful as possible. In contrast to the anonymity of the press, which Kierkegaard deplored, this article appeared under his own name.

¹¹²Quoted from Hohlenberg, p. 233.

¹¹³Lowrie, p. 569.

¹¹⁴Hohlenberg, p. 237.

¹¹⁵See Hohlenberg, p. 237.

¹¹⁶As for the effects of these pamphlets, it was a "matter of course that free-thinkers and sectaries should hail S. K.'s attack upon the Established Church, but the sequel proved that it was welcomed within the Established Church, even among the pastors. The effect of S. K.'s writings at that time, as it has been even since, was to persuade some that they did not properly belong in the Church, to stimulate others to be better Protestants, and induce still others to take refuge in the Roman Church." Lowrie, p. 570. For a description of the contents of each pamphlet, see Hohlenberg, pp. 243-251. Lowrie, pp. 572-582, quotes selections of Kierkegaard from both The Fatherland and The Instant.

For the most part, of course, the parsons were greatly aggravated, and even Kierkegaard's brother, Peter, spoke publicly in a disparaging manner of the work Kierkegaard was doing. See Hohlenberg, p. 251.

¹¹⁷Kierkegaard had injured his spine as a youngster, due to a fall from a tree. It is possible that this injury, which left him somewhat deformed, was involved in the stroke.

¹¹⁸See Journals, pp. 548-553.

¹¹⁹Lowrie presents some information about Peter's character and his attitudes toward his brother that help to justify Kierkegaard's refusal. Søren knew that Peter was unsympathetic with him; even after Kierkegaard's death, Peter condemned his brother's undertakings. See Lowrie, p. 585.

¹²⁰For details on the funeral, see Lowrie, pp. 586f; Hohlenberg, pp. 271-274.

¹²¹In 1942, Ricard Magnussen published two volumes on Kierkegaard. In the first volume, he attempted to prove that Kierkegaard was a hunchback, and in the second that this bodily

condition was the dominant influence in determining Kierkegaard's thought. The reports which we have from Kierkegaard's contemporaries inform us that he was extremely round-shouldered, somewhat stooped, and awkward in his motions. His nephew, Professor Troels¹Lund, told Magnussen that these outward appearances were due to a hunchback condition. Dru, in the introduction to the English translation of Haecker's book treats as irrelevancies some strong objections to the claim that this condition was a major factor in Kierkegaard's life.

¹²²See pages 12-23.

¹²³See pages 13f.

¹²⁴Collins, pp. 18f.

¹²⁵See Lowrie, p. 97.

¹²⁶Collins, pp. 19f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kierkegaard, Søren, The Journals. Translated and edited by Alexander Dru. London: Oxford University Press, 1938. 603pp. (Public library.)

_____, The Point of View, etc. (including The Point of View for My Work as an Author, Two Notes about 'The Individual,' and On My Work as an Author.) Translated with introduction and notes by Walter Lowrie. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. 174pp. (Fusz)

Collins, James, The Mind of Kierkegaard. Chicago: Regnery, 1953, 304pp. This is the best general work in English on the thought of Kierkegaard. (Fusz)

Haecker, Theodor, Kierkegaard the Cripple. Translated by C. Van O. Bruyn. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950, 53pp. (Fusz)

Hohlenberg, Johannes, Søren Kierkegaard. Translated by T. H. Croxall. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954. 321pp. Not as many helpful quotations as Lowrie's book, but a very well organized and thorough study. (Fusz)

Lowrie, Walter, Kierkegaard. London: Oxford University Press, 1938. 636pp. This is the standard English biography. The quotations from Kierkegaard's works are very helpful. This book is not too well organized. (Fusz)

Patrick, Denzil, Pascal and Kierkegaard, Vol. II. London: Lutterworth Press, 1947, 413 pp. Contains a helpful chapter on the social and political background in Denmark during Kierkegaard's life. (Fusz)

Swenson, David, Something about Kierkegaard. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1948. 259pp. Contains a helpful essay on the spheres of existence. (Fusz)