

*The Accounting*¹XIII
493*Copenhagen, March 1849.*

When a country is little, the proportions in every relationship in the little land naturally are small. So, too, in literary matters; the royalties and everything else involved will be only insignificant. To be an author—unless one is a poet, and in addition a dramatist, or one writes textbooks or in some other way is an author in connection with a public office—is about the poorest paid, the least secure, and just about the most thankless job there is. If there is some individual who has the capability of being an author and if he is also fortunate enough to have private means, then he becomes an author more or less at his own expense. This, however, is quite appropriate; there is nothing more to be said about it. In that way the individual in his work will love his idea, the nation to which he belongs, the cause he serves, the language he as an author has the honor to write. Indeed, this is how it will be where there is harmony between the individual and the nation, which in turn in the given situation will be somewhat appreciative of this individual.

Whether the opposite of this has in any way been my experience, whether I have been treated shabbily by anyone or by some persons, is really not my concern but quite properly is their business. What is my concern, however—and I am so happy that it is my concern—is that I should and ought to give thanks for whatever favors and kindness and courtesy and appreciation have been shown to me in general or by particular individuals.²

³The movement the authorship describes is: *from* “the poet,” from the esthetic—*from* “the philosopher,” from the speculative—to the indication of the most inward qualification of the essentially Christian; **from** the *pseudonymous Either/Or*, **through**

XIII
494

Concluding Postscript, with my name as editor, to *Discourses at the Communion on Fridays*,* of which two were delivered in Frue Church.

XIII
495

This movement was traversed or delineated *uno tenore*, in one breath, if I dare say so—thus the authorship, regarded as a *totality*, is religious from first to last, something anyone who can see, if he wants to see, must also see. Just as one versed in natural science promptly knows from the crisscrossing threads in a web the ingenious little creature whose web it is, so an insightful person will also know that to this authorship there corresponds as the source someone who *qua* author “has willed only one thing.”¹³ The insightful person will also know that this one thing is the religious, but the religious completely cast into reflection, yet in

*Later, however, there appeared a new pseudonym: Anti-Climacus.⁴ But the very fact that it is a pseudonym signifies that he is, inversely, coming to a halt, as the name (*Anti-Climacus*) indeed suggests. All the previous pseudonymity is lower than “the upbuilding author”; the new pseudonym is a higher pseudonymity. But indeed “a halt is made” in this way: something higher is shown, which simply forces me back within my boundary, judging me, that my life does not meet so high a requirement and that consequently the communication is something poetical. —And a little earlier in that same year, there appeared a little book: *Two Ethical-Religious Essays* by H. H.⁵ The significance of this little book (which does not stand *in* the authorship as much as it relates totally *to* the authorship and for that reason also was anonymous, in order to be kept outside entirely) is not very easy to explain without going into the whole matter. It is like a navigation mark *by* which one steers but, note well, 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.”⁶ But precisely because genius as such is without authority, it does not have in itself the ultimate concentration that provides the power and justification for accentuating in the direction of “letting oneself be put to death for the truth”⁷ (essay no. 1). Genius as such remains in reflection. This in turn is the category of my whole authorship: to *make aware* of the religious, the essentially Christian—but “*without authority*.”⁸ —And finally, to include even the smallest, there came out later *The Lily in the Field and the Bird of the Air, Three Devotional Discourses*,⁹ which accompanied the second edition of *Either/Or*;¹⁰ and “The High Priest”—“The Tax Collector”—“The Woman Who Was a Sinner,” *Three Discourses at the Communion on Fridays*,¹¹ which accompanied Anti-Climacus’s *The Sickness unto Death*—two small books, both of which in the preface repeat that first preface, the preface to *Two Upbuilding Discourses* (1843).¹²

October 1849

religious was present from the very beginning; *Two Upbuilding Discourses* (1843) is in fact concurrent* with *Either/Or*. And in order to safeguard this concurrence of the directly religious, every pseudonymous work was accompanied concurrently by a little collection of “upbuilding discourses”—until *Concluding Postscript* appeared, which poses the issue, which is *the issue* κατ’ ἐξοχήν [in the eminent sense] of the whole authorship: *becoming a Christian*.^{**15} From that moment the gleam of the directly religious ceases, since now the exclusively religious writing begins: *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits, Works of Love, Christian Discourses*.¹⁷ But in order inversely to recall the beginning (corresponding to what *Two Upbuilding Discourses* was at the beginning, when the voluminous works were esthetic), there appeared at the end (when for a long period the writing was exclusively and voluminously religious) a little esthetic article by Inter et Inter¹⁸ in the newspaper *Fædrelandet*, no. 188–191, July 1848. The gleam of the two upbuilding discourses at the beginning meant that it was actually this that should advance, this at which it was to arrive; the gleam of the little esthetic article at the end was meant, by way of a faint reflection, to bring to consciousness that from the beginning the esthetic was what should be left be-

XIII
497

*This also serves to prevent the illusion that the religious is something one turns to when one has become older. “One begins as an esthetic author and then when one has become older and no longer has the powers of youth, then one becomes a religious author.” But if an author *concurrently* begins as an esthetic and a religious author, the religious writing certainly cannot be explained by the incidental fact that the author has become older, inasmuch as one certainly cannot concurrently be older than oneself.

***The situation* (becoming a *Christian* in *Christendom*, where consequently one is a *Christian*)—the situation, which, as every dialectician sees, casts everything into reflection, also makes an indirect method necessary, because the task here must be to take measures against the illusion: calling oneself a *Christian*, perhaps deluding oneself into thinking one is that without being that. Therefore, the one who introduced the issue did not *directly* define himself as being *Christian* and the others as not being that; no, just the *reverse*—he denies being that and concedes it to the others. This Johannes Climacus does.¹⁶—In relation to pure receptivity, like the empty jar that is to be filled, *direct* communication is appropriate, but when illusion is involved, consequently something that must first be removed, *direct* communication is inappropriate.

hind, what should be abandoned. *Concluding Postscript* is the midpoint, and so exactly—something that of course only lays claim to being a curiosity—that even the quantities of what was written before and after it are more or less equal if one, and rightfully so, includes the eighteen upbuilding discourses¹⁹ in the purely religious writing, and even the periods of the literary activity prior to and after *Concluding Postscript* are roughly equal.

Finally, this movement of the authorship is again decisively marked by reflection or is the movement of reflection. The direct way begins with individuals, a few readers, and the task or the movement is to gather a large number, to acquire an abstraction: the public. Here the **beginning is made**, *maieutically*, with a sensation, and with what belongs to it, the public, which always joins in where something is going on; and the movement was, *maieutically*, to shake off “the crowd” in order to get hold of “the single individual,”* religiously understood. At the very same time when the sensation *Either/Or* created was at its peak, at that very same time appeared *Two Upbuilding Discourses* (1843), which used the formula that later was repeated unchanged: “It seeks that single individual whom I with joy and gratitude call my reader.”²⁰ And precisely at the critical moment when *Concluding Postscript*, which, as stated, poses “the issue,” was delivered to the printer so that the printing could commence as soon as possible and the publication presumably quickly follow²¹—at precisely that moment a pseudonym, most appropriately in a

XIII
498

*This again is the dialectical movement (like that in which a religious author *begins* with esthetic writing, and like that in which, instead of loving oneself and one’s advantage and supporting one’s endeavor by illusions, one instead, hating oneself, removes illusions), or it is the dialectical method: in *working* also to *work against oneself*, which is reduplication [*Redupplikation*] and the heterogeneity of all true godly endeavor to secular endeavor. To endeavor or to work *directly* is to work or to endeavor directly in immediate connection with a factually given state of things. The dialectical method is the *reverse*: in working also to work against oneself, a redoubling [*Fordobelse*], which is “the earnestness,” like the pressure on the plow that determines the depth of the furrow, whereas the direct endeavor is a glossing-over, which is finished more rapidly and also is much, much more rewarding—that is, it is worldliness and homogeneity.

newspaper article,²² made the greatest possible effort to alienate the public* and after that began the decisively religious production. For the second time I religiously affirmed “that single individual,” to whom the next substantial book** (after *Concluding Postscript*), *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, or the first part of the same book, “Confessional Address,” was dedicated. Perhaps nobody paid much attention to the category “that single individual” the first time I used it, nor was much notice paid to its being repeated unchanged in the preface to every volume of upbuilding discourses. When I the second time or in the second potency repeated the message and stood by my first message, everything was done that I was able to do to make the whole weight of emphasis fall upon this category. Here again the movement is: *to arrive at* the simple; the movement is: *from* the public to “the single individual.”²⁵ In other words, there is in a *religious sense* no public but only individuals,^{†26} because the religious is earnestness, and earnestness is: the single individual; yet every human being, unconditionally every human being, which one indeed is, can be, yes, should be—the single individual. Thus it was and is a joy to me, the upbuilding author, that also from that moment the number of those increased who became aware of²⁹ this about *the single individual*. It was and is a joy to me, for I certainly do have faith in the rightness of my thought despite the whole world, but next to that the last thing I would surrender is my faith in individual human beings. And this is my faith, that

XIII
499

*Just one thing more, the press of literary contemptibility had achieved a frightfully disproportionate coverage. To be honest, I believed that what I did was a public benefaction; it was rewarded by several of those for whose sake I had exposed myself in that way—rewarded, yes, as an act of love is usually rewarded in the world—and by means of this reward it became a truly Christian work of love.²³

**The little literary review of the novel *Two Ages*²⁴ followed *Concluding Postscript* so closely that it is almost concurrent and is, after all, something written by me *qua* critic and not *qua* author; but it does contain in the last section a sketch of the future from the point of view of “the single individual,” a sketch of the future that the year 1848 did not falsify.

†And insofar as there is the *congregation* in the religious sense, this is a concept that lies on the other side of *the single individual*,²⁷ and that above all must not be confused with what *politically* can have validity: the public, the crowd, the numerical, etc.²⁸

however much confusion and evil and contemptibleness there can be in human beings as soon as they become the irresponsible and unrepentant “public,” “crowd,” etc.—there is just as much truth and goodness and loveliness in them when one can get them as single individuals. Oh, to what degree human beings would become—human and lovable beings—if they would become single individuals before God!

XIII
500

³⁰This is how I *now* understand the whole. From the beginning I could not quite see what has indeed also been my own development. This is scarcely the place for a lengthy account. Here it is just a matter of being able very briefly to fold together in simplicity what is unfolded in the many books or what unfolded is the many books, and this brief communication is more immediately prompted by the fact that the first book in the authorship now comes out the second time, the new edition of *Either/Or*,³¹ which I earlier was unwilling to have published.

Personally—also when I consider my own inner sufferings, which I personally may have deserved—personally, one thing absorbs me unconditionally, is more important to me and lies more upon my heart than the whole authorship: to express as honestly and as strongly as possible something for which I can never adequately give thanks and which I, when I at some time have forgotten the whole authorship, will eternally recollect unchanged—how infinitely much more Governance has done for me than I had ever expected, could have expected, or dared to have expected.

XIII
501

³²“*Without authority*” **to make aware** of the religious, the essentially Christian, is the category for my whole work as an author regarded as a totality. From the very beginning I have enjoined and repeated unchanged that I was “without authority.” I regard myself rather as a *reader* of the books, not as the *author*.

³³“Before God,” religiously, when I speak with myself, I call my whole work as an author my own upbringing and development, but not in the sense as if I were now complete or completely finished with regard to needing upbringing and development.³⁴