HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The Book on Adler is ostensibly about Adolph Peter Adler; essentially it is about the concept of authority. The book was never published because, in order to diminish emphasis on Adler and to concentrate on the concept of authority, the manuscript was revised by Kierkegaard more than any other of his manuscripts. The present volume is version III, the last integral version. Part of version III (Addendum II) was eventually published, with minor changes, as the second part of Two Ethical-Religious Essays (May 19, 1849), of which he wrote, “This little book is very significant. It contains the key to the greatest potentiality of all my writing, but not the one at which I have been aiming. And the second essay contains the most important of all the ethical-religious concepts, the one I have deliberately omitted until its appearance there.” The second essay, “The Difference between

1 Adolph Peter Adler (1817–1869), Danish theologian, pastor, and writer. After finishing his theological studies, he wrote a dissertation (in Danish, as Kierkegaard did, by special permission) on isolated subjectivity, Den isolerede Subjektivitet i dens vigtigste Skikkelser (Copenhagen: 1840). During the winter of 1840, he gave philosophical lectures at the University of Copenhagen, and in 1841 he was appointed pastor in Hasle and Rutsker on the island of Bornholm. The next year his Populære Foredrag over Hegels objective Logik was published. The following year a volume of sermons, Nogle Prædikener (Copenhagen: 1843), was published, and in the preface Adler asserted that he had received a revelation in which Christ dictated a new doctrine. He was suspended from his pastorate and eventually dismissed with pension by his ecclesiastical superiors. He then published documents on the affair in Skrivelser min Suspension og Entledigelse vedkommende (Copenhagen: 1845). On June 12, 1846, four books by Adler were published: Studier og Exempler, Forsøg til en kort systematisk Fremstilling af Christiendommen i dens Logik, Theologiske Studier, and Nogle Digte. Kierkegaard purchased the first three books on the day of publication and began writing what he called “The Book on Adler.”


a Genius and an Apostle,” is an analysis of the presumed author­
ity of genius and the qualitatively different apostolic authority.

Kierkegaard’s consideration of authority in Two Essays is an
epitomization of The Book on Adler and is in accord with what he
describes as the movement of the entire authorship:

from “the poet,” from the esthetic—from “the philosopher,”
from the speculative—to the indication of the innermost quali­
fication of the essentially Christian; from the pseudonymous
Either-Or, through Concluding Postscript with my name as edi­
tor, to Discourses at the Communion on Fridays* . . .

* . . . And a little earlier in that same year there appeared a
little book: Two Ethical-Religious Essays by H. H. The signifi­
cance of this little book (which does not stand in the author­
ship as much as it relates totally to the authorship and for that
reason also was anonymous, in order to be kept outside en­
tirely) is not so easy to explain without going into the whole
matter. It is like a navigation mark by which one steers but,
please note, in such a way that the pilot understands precisely
that he is to keep a certain distance from it. It defines the boundary
of the authorship. “The Difference between a Genius and an
Apostle” (essay no. 2) is: “The genius is without authority.”

Although an explicit, developed consideration of the concept
of authority is not part of Kierkegaard’s earlier writing, the theme
is by no means absent. Throughout the works, beginning with
The Concept of Irony (1841), authority on various levels and in
various forms is repeatedly represented and discussed. In The
Concept of Irony (even though Kierkegaard did not regard the
dissertation as part of the authorship proper), a variety of con­
cepts of authority constitutes a unifying theme: the authority of
Sophistic dialectic, the divine authority of the Delphic Oracle, the
authority implicit in Socratic ignorance, the authority of the

4 Under the pseudonym H. H.
5 On My Work as an Author, in The Point of View, KW XXII (SV XIII 494).
6 The Concept of Irony, with Continual Reference to Socrates, pp. 204–10, KW II
(SV XIII 284–90).
7 Ibid., p. 172 (227).
8 Ibid., p. 175 (258).
state,9 the authority of Socratic irony,10 esthetic authority,11 the authority of irony in writers,12 the immediate authority of Don Juan as a sensate genius,13 and the constitutive authority of the immediate I in its freedom.14 In Repetition (1843), Constantin Constantius discusses the authority of the comic genius,15 and the Young Man attests to the authority of Job’s character.16 In his concluding analysis of the Young Man, Constantin asserts that if the Young Man had possessed “a deeper religious background, he would not have become a poet . . . and he would also have had a quite different authority.”17 In Concluding Unscientific Postscript (1846), Johannes Climacus discusses the authority of the Bible, of the Church, of the test of time, and of speculative thought in the religious sphere.18 He also touches on the psychological authority of an esthetic philosophical genius,19 on the confusion of poetic authority with religious authority,20 on divine authority in religious address,21 and on the miraculous authority of an apostle.22 In Two Ages (1847), Kierkegaard contrasts the process of leveling in a disintegrating world with levels of authority in an organic society.23

Continuing the ascending line of concepts of authority, Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits (1847) presents the authority and task of parents as analogous to the Lord’s authority and task24 and presents Christ as the one of preeminent authority.25 This is repeated in Works of Love26 (1847), which also emphasizes
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9 Ibid., pp. 184–85 (267).  
10 Ibid., p. 196 (277–78).  
11 Ibid., p. 244 (320).  
12 Ibid., pp. 275–76 (348).  
13 Ibid., p. 293 (362–63).  
14 Ibid., p. 301 (370).  
15 Repetition, pp. 160–64, KW VI (SV III 200–03).  
16 Ibid., p. 207 (241).  
17 Ibid., p. 229 (263).  
18 Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments, pp. 23–57, KW XII.1 (SV VII 12–43).  
19 Ibid., p. 64 (48).  
20 Ibid., p. 441 (383).  
21 Ibid., p. 481 (418).  
22 Ibid., pp. 74, 388 (57, 337).  
25 Ibid., p. 302 (381).  
26 Works of Love, p. 97, KW XVI (SV IX 95).
the authority of the Gospel as speaking to, not about, and of the royal command, “You shall love,” The divine authority of the Christian proclamation is reiterated in Christian Discourses (1848), and the vitiating consequences of trying to give reasons for ultimate authority are discussed.

In his continued occupation with the concept of authority, Kierkegaard regarded himself as not having authority, a view that he stated as early as the preface to the first of the six volumes of discourses in 1843–44. This understanding of his role as that of a special kind of poet was expressed in numerous works in various ways, particularly in the phrase “without authority,” which became a motto for the entire authorship.

Having been occupied for a long time with the question of authority in many areas, especially in religion and also in logic
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27 Ibid., p. 14 (18).
28 Ibid., p. 24 (28).
30 Related issues are the presumption of so-called presuppositionless philosophy and science and the status of the principle of contradiction. See Supplement, p. 212 (Pap. III A 11). See also, e.g., Irony, pp. 274, 311, KW’II (SV’XIII 346, 379); Either/Or II, pp. 170–71, 223, KW IV (SV II 154–55, 200); The Concept of Anxiety, p. 81, KW’VIII (SV’XIV 350); Philosophical Fragments, or a Fragment of Philosophy, pp. 108–09, KW’VII (SV’IV 270); Postscript, pp. 110–13, 203, 304–05, 308, 315, 318, 347, 421–22, KW’XII.1 (SV’VII 90–92, 170, 261–62, 264, 271, 273, 301, 365–66); Two Ages, pp. 66, 97, KW’XIV (SV’XIII 63, 90). See also JP I 654, 699, 703, 705, 768; II 1240, 1610; III 3306 (Pap. VIII B 86; IA 324; IV A 57; V A 68, 70; III A 48; VI B 98.45; VI A 145).
32 Two Upbuilding Discourses (1843), p. 5, KW V (SV’III 11).
33 See, for example, Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses, pp. 53, 107, 179, 231, 295, KW’V (SV’III 271; IV 7, 73, 121; V 79); Three Discourses on Imagined Occasions, pp. 14–15, 26–27, KW’X (SV’V 182, 192); Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits, pp. 122–23, 157, KW’XV (SV’VIII 216, 247; On My Work as an Author, in The Point of View, KW’XXII (SV’XIII 501); The Point of View for My Work as an Author, ibid. (505, 563, 571, 604). See also JP III 2653; V 5646, 5688, 5903; VI 6220, 6256, 6257, 6271, 6317, 6325, 6338, 6367, 6526, 6533, 6577, 6587, 6616, 6655, 6665, 6746, 6936, 6947 (Pap. X1’A 333; IV A 87, B 1596; VII’A 116; IX A 189; X’B 40, 41; IX A 390; X’A 56, 74, 100, 162; X’A 177, 196, 375, 475; X’A 77, 261, 389; X’A 166; X’F A 250; X’F B 57).
34 The phrase is appropriately used as the title of the composite volume Without Authority, KW’XVIII.
and philosophy, Kierkegaard found in the “phenomenon” of Adolph Peter Adler a specific occasion for a discursive treatment of the issue. From references in the journals, it is apparent that Kierkegaard had known the writings of the Hegelian pastor on Bornholm. In his letter to the king requesting permission to write his dissertation in Danish rather than in Latin, Kierkegaard referred to the earlier permission granted to Adler. In a letter of June 29, 1843, to his brother Peter Christian Kierkegaard, he expressed an interest in Adler as a “phenomenon worth paying attention to.” After the publication of his Nogle Prædikener in July 1843, Adler sent Kierkegaard a copy. It was in the preface to this volume of sermons that Adler asserted that he had had a divine revelation. Six months later, in January 1844, he was suspended by his ecclesiastical superiors and in August 1845 was pensioned and removed from office. About a year later, on June 12, 1846, four volumes by Adler were published simultaneously. A few months earlier, Kierkegaard had published his Postscript (February 27, 1846) and Two Ages (March 30, 1846) and, having decided to conclude his career as a writer, had taken a vacation in Berlin (May 2–16, 1846). An observation in an entry written during the Berlin sojourn indicates that he had not forgotten Adler, and then the appearance of the four latest Adler books sharpened his attention and constituted the immediate occasion for Kierkegaard’s main task during the summer of 1846.

After the last of the Berlin journal entries (Pap. VII A 146,

35 See title page, p. 1.
38 Kierkegaard: Letters and Documents, p. 23, KW XXV.
40 See Supplement, p. 339 (Prædikener, p. 3).
44 Kierkegaard purchased three of Adler’s books on June 6, 1846, the day of publication: Studier og Exempler, Forsøg til en kort systematisk Fremstilling af Christendommen i dens Logik, and Theologiske Studier (ASKB 11, 13, 12).
May 13, 1846), the next entry in Kierkegaard’s journal is dated September 7, 1846. Just as the Corsair affair stopped Kierkegaard from walking the streets of Copenhagen as its preeminent peri­patetic, for which he substituted carriage trips to outlying areas of the beautiful island,45 so, too, his usual copious journal writing must have stopped because he was concentrating on what he called “The Book on Adler.” The ostensibly final copy (Pap. VII2 B 235) was written during the autumn of 1846 and January of 1847. The first preface is dated January 1847.46

“The Book on Adler” again posed for Kierkegaard the persistent question: should it be a signed work or under a pseudonym? His first idea was to call it a literary review under his own name, in accord with the intention to write no more after the conclusion denoted by Concluding Unscientific Postscript—with the possible exception of writing only reviews.47 Another idea was to publish the literary review in a volume titled “Minor Works,” which would also include what became Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits (March 13, 1847) under his own name.48 Then he thought that “The Book on Adler” could be published as a work by Johannes Climacus,49 the author of Philosophical Fragments and Postscript, but better yet, under a new pseudonym with Kierkegaard as the editor.50 The one chosen was Petrus Minor, and the title would be “The Religious Confusion of the Present Age Illustrated by Magister Adler as a Phenomenon.”51

Although the writing had been completed,52 publication of the book was delayed53—indeed, Kierkegaard never published it, although he considered that “the book does deserve to be read.”54 He had scarcely finished the final copy (Pap. VII2 B 235) before he wrote a report on the book.55 Something should be
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45 See The Corsair Affair, pp. xxix–xxx.
47 See JP V 5877 (Pap. VII A 9).
49 See Supplement, p. 223 (Pap. VIII B 22).
50 See Supplement, p. 224 (Pap. VIII B 24).
51 See Supplement, p. 223 (Pap. VIII B 21, 26).
52 See Supplement, p. 221 (Pap. VIII B 1); JP V 5997 (Pap. VIII A 84).
53 See JP V 6014 (Pap. VIII A 164).
54 See Supplement, p. 224 (Pap. VIII A 252).
done, he thought, to help a slow reader\textsuperscript{56} and to make it more clear that Adler had only a vague idea of what a revelation is.\textsuperscript{57} The book should include an appendix, an esthetic review of Adler’s four latest books, and the illusion should be maintained that Adler had written only his dissertation and the four latest books.\textsuperscript{58}

More important, however, than concern about titles and authorship was Kierkegaard’s continuing concern about the contents of the book. This concern had two aspects, one of which was the effect that publication of the book might have on Adler. It was “not without distress, not without sadness”\textsuperscript{59} that Kierkegaard wrote the so-called literary review. “He has a good head on him and has considerable experience in many \textit{casibus} of life, but at the moment he is a little overwrought.”\textsuperscript{60} As Kierkegaard pondered publication and repeatedly reworked the manuscript, he continued to bear in mind the possible effect on Adler. “I do not at all like this whole business with Adler. I am in truth all too inclined to keep Adler afloat. . . . But the trouble is that I am sorry for A., and I am almost afraid that it [the book] will have too strong an effect on him.”\textsuperscript{61} With changes, “the book will be read in an entirely different way and I will be spared mentioning Adler, for it is cruel to slay a man that way.”\textsuperscript{62}

Kierkegaard was also concerned lest the central issue be submerged in the particulars of Adler’s personal history. Ten months after completion of the manuscript, he wrote (December 1, 1847):

I have now organized and laid out the book on Adler again. The arrangement now makes everything as luminous and clear as possible.

The book has great merit. The trouble is that there really are

\textsuperscript{56} See Supplement, p. 221 (\textit{Pap. VIII}\textsuperscript{2} B 2).
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} See Supplement, p. 222 (\textit{Pap. VIII}\textsuperscript{2} B 3).
\textsuperscript{60} See \textit{Letters}, p. 156 (Letter 83).
\textsuperscript{61} See Supplement, p. 224 (\textit{Pap. VIII}\textsuperscript{1} A 252).
very few in our age who have enough religiousness to be able to benefit from it. In the long run, Adler with all his confusion still has more religiousness than most. The other trouble is that one gets involved with this confused person who has nothing to do and presumably therefore will write and write. But then the whole thing gets a wrong slant. In the book Adler is still a Nebensach [side-issue], but how easy it is for the matter to turn for a curious public into a cockfight between Adler and me. No, rather let Adler go his way. Then the book will become a book of essays.63

The result of Kierkegaard’s double concern about the contents of the book was that he made repeated revisions, deletions, additions, and reorderings. There are in all three integral versions of “The Book on Adler.” Version III is the text of the present volume. But the reworking of the manuscript did not stop with that. Two years after completion of the first version and after having been reshaped in two subsequent versions, “The Book on Adler” had in reduced, altered form become part of a contemplated composite volume of essays, of which Kierkegaard wrote: “As for ‘A Cycle of Ethical-Religious Essays,’ it dates from an earlier period. Its composition is also more unusual, because it is the original larger work that is chopped into pieces, and the occasion for the whole work (Adler) is omitted, and a separate essay, no. 3,64 added. I cannot get myself into it in such a way that I really have a desire to publish it. Moreover, it has been laid aside or put away more than once.”65

The abandonment of “A Cycle” and the publication of Addendum II (on the genius and the apostle) of “The Book on Adler” as part of Two Essays in 1849 did not, however, end Kierkegaard’s consideration of the remainder of version III. He pondered the possibility of publishing “Three Ethical-Religious Es-
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64 Essay no. 3 of “A Cycle” became essay no. 1 of Two Essays by H. H., “Does a Human Being Have the Right to Let Himself Be Put to Death for the Truth?”
Or perhaps the third essay, involving Adler, “A Revelation in the Situation in the Present Age,” could be published separately and the first two, “Something about What Could Be Called ‘Premise Authors’” and “The Dialectical Relations: the Universal, the Single Individual, the Special Individual” (the Introduction and Addendum I of version III of “The Book on Adler”) could be published, without the ones touching personally on Adler, as “Two Ethical-Religious Essays” by P. P., with Kierkegaard as the editor. But Adler as the specific occasion for the writing still remained the hindering consideration of yet another possible form of publication:

The trouble with the “Three Ethical-Religious Essays” is: I do not name Adler, and the whole thing will be understood to be about me, as if I would half insinuate that I myself was the extraordinary; and the confusion will become as disastrous as possible just at that moment. If I name Adler, then I will have the desperate man to deal with, which I by no means want; that is why I altogether gave up publishing the essay about him.

The best thing to do is not to publish them at all.

The third essay perhaps could be published separately.

But the remaining possibilities under consideration were not actualized, and for the same reasons that kept “The Book on Adler” from being published, with the exception of Addendum II, the essay on authority in Two Essays by H. H. Nevertheless, there was a lingering remnant of possibility, and four years after the publication of Two Essays Kierkegaard wrote a journal entry about “Three Ethical-Religious Essays” under a new pseudonym, which perhaps appealed to him more than the publication of the three essays: “N.B. If, instead of bearing the author-signature M. M., the three ethical-religious essays should have
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69 See Supplement, p. 335 (Pap. X6 B 63).
70 Pap. X1 A 544.
a proper pseudonym, I would call the author Emanuel Leisetritt, a pseudonym I perhaps could use, if not here, if I should ever again have need for a pseudonym."

The impetus behind the repeated reworking of the original and the subsequently revised, reduced, and reordered manuscripts was stated in version I: “I have chosen my task in such a way that the treatment, because of its more universal and more ideal character, will be able to be read in every age.” The subsequent versions constitute a progressive elimination of the particular, the personal, and the historical. Finally only one part (Addendum II) of “The Book on Adler” was published as part of a work in which no mention is made of Adler, and his name is not in the title: Two Ethical-Religious Essays (May 19, 1849). In this essay the issue, the concept of authority, remained, stripped of the elements clustered around the original occasion of the writing: Magister Adler.

Although the detailed complexity of the continual reordering, eliminating, adding, and revising of the manuscript of “The Book on Adler” was much greater than the short history above might suggest, the brief account may give the impression that it all was quite enough to occupy Kierkegaard from June 6, 1846, to May 19, 1849, when a small part of the Adler manuscript was published in Two Essays by H. H. On the contrary, during that time Kierkegaard began what has been called his second authorship, following the ending of the first with Concluding Unscientific Postscript. The review of Thomasine Gyllembourg’s Two Ages and “The Book on Adler” as a contemplated literary review would have kept Kierkegaard within his definition of having finished writing in the strict sense. During that three-year period, “The Book on Adler” with all its prolixity was nevertheless a Nebensach to Kierkegaard, just as Adler was a side issue to the main question of authority in that book. During those three years he worked not only on versions of the Adler manuscript but also on “Herr Phister as Captain Scipio,” The Point of View for My

72 Pap. X 93. The pseudonym was never used.
73 See p. 27.
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Work as an Author, and Practice in Christianity. In addition he completed the writing and arranged the publication of *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits* (March 13, 1847), *Works of Love* (September 29, 1847), *Christian Discourses* (April 26, 1848), *The Crisis and a Crisis in the Life of an Actress* (July 24–27, 1848), *The Lily in the Field and the Bird of the Air* (May 14, 1849)—and two months after the publication of *Two Ethical-Religious Essays* by H. H. (May 19, 1849) came *The Sickness unto Death* (July 30, 1849) and a little later *Three Discourses at the Communion on Fridays* (November 14, 1849).

The shock of the *Corsair* affair impelled Kierkegaard to start writing again despite his earlier resolve to stop, and the rich treasure of a second authorship was the yield. One can only wonder how much was contributed to the impetus in that new prodigious writing endeavor by the stimulus of work on the issue of authority in relation to Adler. Many would judge that the published result of that effort, “The Difference between a Genius and an Apostle,” is a very valuable yield justifying three years of work—and then, in addition, the very substantial beginning of a second authorship!

The *Book on Adler* is significant also in another way. The numerous revisions of what appears to be a fair copy (Pap. VII2 B 235) make the Adler manuscript unique in the authorship because the long process of writing and revising is manifest in great detail. The Danish scholar Johannes Hohlenberg concludes his discussion of the work with an emphasis on this aspect: “Hence the book is extraordinarily revealing, because it shows the working of Kierkegaard’s mind better than any of the other books. If we want to get an idea of what qualitative dialectic has to say when turned upon a very definite question, we ought to study the book about Adler.”

The present volume is a translation of the third and last integral, complete version of *Bogen om Adler*, modified in some parts according to changes in versions IV and V after the original larger
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Integral version II  (*Pap*. VIII B 7, 8:1).

Integral version III with incorporation of changes in later versions IV and V:
Table of Contents (*Pap*. VIII B 8:2)
Title and Pseudonym (*Pap*. VIII B 26).
Editor’s Preface (*Pap*. VIII B 27).


Chapter II. A Revelation in the Situation of the Present Age  (*Pap*. VIII B 9:5 = *Pap*. VII B 235, pp. 74–
3:12 with changes and deletions; \textit{Pap. IX} B 4 = \textit{Pap. VIII} B 9:5 with additional changes; \textit{Pap. X} B 57:3 with new title).

\textbf{Chapter III. Adler’s Own Shifting . . . His Four Latest Books}

\textbf{Chapter IV. A Psychological View of Adler as a Phenomenon and as a Satire . . .}

\textbf{Addendum I. The Dialectical Relations: the Universal, the Single Individual, the Special Individual}

\textbf{Addendum II. The Difference between a Genius and an Apostle}