

Kierkegaard and "The Leap of Faith"

Alastair McKinnon

Many literate people assume that Kierkegaard is the author of the phrase "leap of faith"¹, some scholars appear to regard it as a fair summary of his thought and many though not all as evidence of his "irrationalism." In this brief study I show that this phrase does not occur even once in his published writings, that the number of co-occurrences of the relevant words and their variants in these writings is very much smaller than one would expect and that the lists of words most closely associated with these two words contain at most a single word in common. In short, I show that Kierkegaard never used this phrase and that, given all we now know about his use of these words, that it is almost unthinkable that he should have done so. Finally, and very briefly, I show that this phrase is incoherent and meaningless, speculate about its possible origins, suggest some areas for further study and note the significance of these findings for the interpretation of his thought.

I believe and have been assured that the only possible counterpart of "leap of faith" is "Troens Spring" and that there is no other way of expressing this phrase in the Danish language. I therefore begin by noting that this phrase does not occur even once in Kierkegaard's published writings.

Of course it is extremely difficult for even the most careful reader to establish the absence of a word or phrase in any large corpus but it is an easy and simple matter to have a computer do so. In fact I have searched my own corrected machine readable version of the third edition of Kierkegaard's *Samlede Værker* and can report that this phrase simply does not occur in any of the thirty five works in that edition. More precisely, I can report that these works do not contain a single instance of *Troens Spring* or, indeed, of any expression consisting of variants of these words. This seems to me to settle this particular question quite decisively and I add only that it illustrates one obvious

and important use of the computer in philosophy and literary studies which has not yet been adequately appreciated.

There would seem to be only two possible objections to this claim. It might be argued that there are one or more other phrases in Kierkegaard which can or should be translated as "leap of faith." For example, Louis Pojman² has suggested that the Greek phrase *μετάβασις εις άλλο γενος*³ should be translated in this way and this seems to have some support in a passage in the *Papirer*⁴ in which Kierkegaard appears to treat the first of these words as synonymous with "leap." In fact, the expression itself means simply "passing to another realm of thought"⁵ and the passage in question makes no mention of faith. We conclude therefore that this phrase cannot be so translated and that Pojman's suggestion simply begs the point at issue.

A second possible objection is that the respected and still current Swenson-Lowrie English translation of AE uses the phrase "the leap of faith" (15/15) and that there must therefore be some justification for it in the original text. Now it is true that the passage in question concerns the acquisition of faith and speaks of "... those probabilities and guarantees which he [the believer] rejected in the beginning when he made the leap of faith, the qualitative transition from non-belief to belief –", thus equating "the leap of faith" with "the qualitative transition..." In fact the original reads "hvilke jo netop bleve forsmaaede da han selv begyndende gjorde Springets qualitative Overgang fra Ikke-Troende til Troende" and so does not even mention a "leap of faith" but speaks only of "the qualitative transition [passage, crossing] from non-believing to believing," a thought much more in keeping with the nature and emphasis of this work. In short this single occurrence of "leap of faith" in an English translation is simply a mistranslation.

In this connection I should perhaps also report an objection which has been raised but which I have not yet seen in print. The argument, at least so far as I can understand it, is that Kierkegaard would certainly have used the phrase "leap of faith" but was prevented from doing so because he associated the notion of a leap with Lessing and Jacobi both of whom he treats ironically. If true, this might possibly explain the absence of this phrase from AE but certainly not from the rest of the authorship in which these two are rarely mentioned. Further, neither Kierkegaard nor Climacus could possibly be said to have an "ironical" attitude to either *leap* or *faith* as such. Of course Kierke-

gaard's association of a leap with thinkers he regards ironically may help to explain the great gulf between these two concepts in his writings which we shall see shortly but it surely cannot mean that the absence of this phrase is not decisive.

Before leaving this first point I stress that the above claim is made specifically with respect to Kierkegaard's *Samlede Værker* and that I cannot yet categorically assert that there are no occurrences of this phrase in the *Papirer*, this because the computer version of this text is not yet completely finished and because Cappelørn's justly famous *Index* is necessarily selective. The fact remains however that we have not yet found any occurrence of this phrase in a virtually complete and substantially accurate computer version of this text, this despite many references to *Spring*, particularly in the early entries. This suggests that if Kierkegaard did indeed ever use this phrase it was probably prior to the beginning of the authorship and before he was entirely clear about the importance and complexity of his concept of the leap⁶. I also note that the relevant parts of the *Papirer* are his private reflections as distinct from what he has chosen to put on public record, that many are from his very early days and that any subsequent discovery of one or two instances of this phrase in these notes would not be particularly damaging to our essential thesis.

I trust that the majority of readers will accept the non-occurrence of *Troens Spring* as final and decisive and accept our claim as settled but propose now to summarize very briefly and simply the results of many detailed statistical studies which I regard as even more conclusive and which should also help us to understand that the absence of this phrase from Kierkegaard's works is no accident. Before doing so however I pause to stress that many of these studies include all significant forms of these words and are therefore about these concepts and not merely the words in which they are expressed. However, as Kierkegaard himself noted, it is possible to say the same thing in many different ways. Thus while our investigations clearly show that he seems even to have had an aversion to this phrase, they do not and cannot show that some form of the *notion* thought to be expressed by it is not present in his thought. I stress this point and so need not repeat it.

The first six of these studies compares the number of observed and expected co-occurrences of *Troens* and *Spring*

and their variants in the sentences and paragraphs of the four works showing the highest frequencies of these words (FB, BA, PS and AE) and of the corpus as a whole, this on the assumption that the occurrence of one is truly independent of that of the other. Briefly, each of these studies shows that in virtually every one of the 30 cases examined the expected so far exceeds the observed that we are forced to conclude that his use of one has tended to inhibit his use of the other and that this tendency is so marked that we have to postulate a kind of opposition or repulsion between these words and concepts in his thought and writings. To cite one of the few cases where the numbers are too small for the results to be significant: there should be 0.144 co-occurrences of *Troens* and *Spring* in the sentences of FB but in fact there are none. By contrast there should be 2.404 co-occurrences of *Troens* and *Ridder* (knight) in these same sentences but in fact there are 35. The results of most of our other cases are statistically significant and do not require any such comparisons.

As a matter of special interest we report that we have plotted the relative frequencies of paragraphs containing one or more of the eleven main forms of *Tro* and one or more of the ten main forms of *Spring* in each book of the corpus against its corrected mean date of composition and that this plot clearly shows that paragraphs containing some form of both words are more common in the earlier than the later works. In fact only three of the last 20 contain any such paragraphs and the last 13, SFV through HCD, contain none at all. This suggests that even if there may once have been a very loose tie between these two concepts it weakened with the passage of time and finally disappeared altogether. This conclusion is confirmed by the trend line of this plot which shows a clear decline in the number of such paragraphs with approximately 3.6 per title in 1838 and none at all by early 1854. This trend is "poetically" confirmed by the fact that though both *Troens* and *Spring* show the same frequency in DS and Ø, their occurrences are widely separated⁷ and clearly have no connection with one another.

The book is a very large and coarse co-occurrence unit⁸ and we have compensated for this fact by computing Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient for the frequencies of *Troens* and *Spring* in the 35 works of the authorship. The score for this test is + 0.247 which looks like a modest positive correlation but this result is significant at only the 0.152 level and

could therefore be expected in 15 out of 100 cases. There is therefore no statistical ground for claiming that these words are significantly associated even at the book level. Note that this properly reflects the fact that these words show very different distributions across the corpus. Both appear in a number of books which do not contain the other; for example, *Troens* occurs in EE2, KK, CT, SD, YTS, TAF, TS and B21 while *Spring* does not and *Spring* occurs in TTL, BFF and SFV while *Troens* does not. Further, both are much more frequent in certain books than the other; for example, *Troens* is 25 times more frequent in FB, 11 times more frequent in PS and 4.5 times more frequent in AE while *Spring* is almost 14 times more frequent in BA, 5 times more frequent in EE1 and almost 5 times more frequent in LA. Note too that this reported correlation coefficient is very much less than that for other pairs of words generally accepted as strongly tied in Kierkegaard's works. For example, the same coefficient for *Don* and *Juan* is 0.999, for *Lessing* and *Existents* (existence) 0.951, for *Mediationen* (mediation) and *Subjektivitet* (subjectivity) 0.971 and for *Plato* and *Socrates* 0.994. Clearly the score for *Troens* and *Spring* is not at all comparable. Clearly, too, even at the book level these words have only a very tenuous association with one another.

This result is further confirmed by a study done several years ago on the first eight dimensions of Kierkegaard's authorship and based upon the frequencies of the 250 most frequent nouns and names in the books of that corpus⁹. *Troens* was part of the original study and *Spring* has since been added as a supplementary point. The results show that these two words have the same sign on the first four (and most important) dimensions but different signs on three of the last four. Equally important, they show that the average distance between these words on all eight dimensions is 0.460 or approximately one-quarter of the distance between the furthest points on each. This is further clear evidence that these words have quite different distribution patterns or "profiles" across the works of the authorship. It follows, of course, that they are not linked in the way traditionally assumed.

In fact, this study provides some positive valuable clues to the nature and role of these two words and the differences between them. *Spring* is much closer to the "aesthetic" pole of the first or "aesthetic/religious" dimension, somewhat closer to the "aesthetic & religious" pole of the second or "aesthetic &

religious/attack” dimension, only slightly closer to the “worship God” pole of the third or “love the neighbour/worship God” dimension but, given its prominence in BA, naturally much closer to the “pathology of the self” pole of the fourth or “society/self” dimension. It is also somewhat closer to the “love of God” pole of the seventh or “love of God/commitment to the Good” dimension. By contrast, *Troens* is quite close to the “faith as the only way to God” pole of the fifth or “faith/despair” dimension, moderately close to the “single individual” pole of the sixth or “individual’s status/task” dimension and is closer than most points to the “individual in time” pole of the eighth or “time” dimension; three cases in all of which *Spring* lies on the other side of the point of origin and hence closer to the opposite pole. Of all these differences, perhaps the most interesting and important are those on the fifth and sixth dimensions, the fifth because it confirms that *Troens* is (naturally) associated with “faith as the only way to God” while *Spring* is associated, albeit weakly, with “despair as flight from God” and the sixth because it connects *Troens* with “the single individual” as the human task and *Spring*, though again weakly, with “the existing individual” as our actual or present status¹⁰. These facts show that there are important and substantial differences between these words, differences which we will see confirmed when we consider their aberrant frequency words.

Thus far we have reported that the phrase *Troens Spring* does not occur in Kierkegaard’s authorship and that these words, and in many cases their variant forms, show a marked tendency not to co-occur in Kierkegaard’s sentences or paragraphs and only a slight and insignificant tendency to co-occur even in units as large as his books. In the absence of any other explanation, it appears to follow that in his thought these words and, indeed, these concepts are quite unrelated or, as we have suggested, even opposed to one another. In order to explain this opposition we now attempt to understand these words by comparing their respective aberrant frequency words lists.

One good way to understand a word is to identify the other words with which it is most frequently and strongly associated. For this purpose we extracted all sentences containing the word *Troens* from the 16 works in which its relative frequency is equal to or greater than 0.50 and all sentences containing the word

Spring from the nine works meeting this same condition¹¹. We then did total word counts for these two "mini-texts" and identified all words whose frequencies represented 2.58 or more standard deviations from the corpus norm and which occurred 6 or more times in the larger *Troens* set and 3 or more times in the *Spring* set. This gave lists of 60 aberrant frequency words for the former and 63 for the latter which are shown side by side in Appendix B. These lists can be read and compared very simply; for example, the second row or line of the left one indicates that *Ridder* (knight) shows 49.93 standard deviations from the corpus norm and occurs 40 times in the *Troens* sentences of the works already indicated. Those concerned to understand the nature of and differences between these two words are urged to study these lists carefully.

The reader who knows these texts will no doubt recognize many of these connections but it may be useful to indicate their statistical ground. For example, there is less than one chance in 1,000,000 that any word having a Z-score equal to or greater than 4.75 would occur with its present or some greater frequency in a text of this length by Kierkegaard and a yet lower probability that those with higher scores would do so. These are extremely improbable odds even for text and we have therefore to conclude that their observed frequencies in these sentences must be due to the fact that in Kierkegaard's mind they are strongly associated with *Troens* and *Spring*, respectively. In passing we note that the Z-score of a word is an approximate index of the strength of its tie with the word in question and that we can therefore think of *Troens* as very strongly tied to *Ridder* and *Gjenstand* (object) and *Spring* to *qualitative* (qualitative) and *Overgang* (transition), etc. Of course anyone who knows Kierkegaard already knows these ties but may not be aware of those with words at or near the bottom of these lists.

We believe that a correspondence analysis of the matrices showing the frequencies of these words in the books in question would produce a truly deep and perspicuous account of these two words and make clear the great gulf between their roles in Kierkegaard's thought. However, our present study has a much more limited aim and we content ourselves with the following brief observations.

Perhaps the most striking feature of these two lists is that they do not share a single word or, more accurately, that they use even the one word they share in two quite different ways.

The first occurrence of *uendelig* in our *Spring* sentences describes the “infinite” impression created by the leap as, like a bird of prey or wild beast, it “break[s] forth from complete immobility”¹² while the remaining three are adverbs, as in “making the [Lessing’s] chasm infinitely wide.”¹³ By contrast, all 10 occurrences of *uendelige* in our *Troens* sentences are adjectives in the definite declension modifying such items as resignation, interest, passion, dialectic, need (or desire) and sorrow. I have done at least 50 such comparisons of the aberrant frequency lists of putatively related words and have never before seen a comparable result; indeed, such lists often show as many as 10% of their words in common.¹⁴ Even counting *uendelig* and *uendelige* as the same word (a very doubtful practice), this pair has only 1.2%. I conclude therefore that, surprising as this may seem, the words *Troens* and *Spring* have virtually no connection in Kierkegaard’s thought.

These lists also indicate that these words typically belong in quite different “sub-spaces” of Kierkegaard’s thought. The following are but a few obvious examples. As the reader can see, the *Spring* list includes many words associated with Christianity’s account of the Fall (the sin, Adam’s, innocence, guilt) while the *Troens* list includes many connected instead with its account of salvation (the God-Man, the Divine, Abraham, almost all noun and some verb forms of faith or believe, etc.).¹⁵ The former includes words connected with the individual’s condition or “status” (individual, the individual, character, existence, the existence) and the latter words connected instead with his “task” (the single one, the existing one, infinite, interest, etc.). The former contains terms which at least at first glance are dark and sinister (the sin, dread, the dread, guilt, guilty, care) but the latter ones which are clearly triumphant (faith, certainty, expectation, conviction, passion, possibility, infinite, eternal, victory, knight, hero). The former refers to Hegelianism as the Method but the latter does so primarily in terms of its opposing of the universal and the particular. The former explores how far Adam’s act may be explained (qualitative, quantitative, psychological, breaks out, transition, ambiguity, etc.) while the latter presents Abraham’s act as humanly unintelligible (human, humanly, the reason, absurd, paradox, spiritual trial, etc.). Finally, whether as a discontinuity in reality or as a human act or decision, *Spring* is essentially “sudden” while *Troens* is presented primarily as a movement, notably in FB as an extension of

and counterpart to the movement of resignation. In short, and as these lists show, these two *words* are quite different from and even opposed to one another. This, of course, is why there are significantly fewer sentences, paragraphs and books containing these two words and their variants than we would expect if they were truly independent of one another. Hence we need not content ourselves with the simple observation that there are no occurrences of the expression *Troens Spring* in Kierkegaard's thought. Given what we now know about the relation of these words in his thought we can add that it is almost unthinkable that he should have used this expression. In short, it is no accident that it does not occur in his works.

Finally one further point, not anticipated at the beginning of this study and hence not included in its announced agenda. It is still not certain whether Lessing ever used an expression which could be properly translated as "leap of faith" but it is certain that he at least entertained the notion. It is also certain that Kierkegaard understood him as having done so. That he dealt at length with Lessing's discussion¹⁶ without once using this expression is the clearest possible evidence we could have that he rejected it, perhaps as somehow unsound, as oversimplifying his position or, most probably, as inconsistent with his use of these terms. The moral is clear: he rejected this expression and so should we. No one, whether friend or foe, should ever again use or trust this easy slogan as a fair summary of his thought.

Perhaps only a definitive treatment of *Troens* and *Spring* such as that already suggested will finally convince everyone that these words do not belong together in Kierkegaard's thought but it is not difficult to show that the phrase "leap of faith" is one which we can all do quite well without. Quite simply, it is, in and of itself, incoherent and meaningless. This follows from the fact that faith is built into the notion of leap as used in this phrase and that on any possible rendering of it one uses faith in order to reach faith. Note in this connection that the phrases "leap to faith" and perhaps even "leap into faith" are not similarly incoherent since both speak of a leap (which is not itself necessarily an act of faith) into a state of faith. By contrast, this familiar slogan, at least as ascribed to Kierkegaard, assumes that one can use faith before one has it or, put another way, in order to achieve it, both of which notions are patent nonsense.

The contradictions in this phrase become yet more obvious if we look even superficially at the specifically Kierkegaardian notions of *Sprung* and *Troens*. Very briefly, the leap is both an ontological discontinuity and, resulting therefrom, a human act by which the individual bridges that discontinuity whether, for example, by passing from the quantitative to the qualitative or from thought to existence.¹⁸ By contrast, faith for Kierkegaard is a relationship to or with God¹⁹ and, in its specifically Christian form, one which must be constantly renewed every moment of one's life. Hence the notion of a sudden, once-for-all leap into anything like a Kierkegaardian Christian faith is particularly incongruous and confused.

The fact that Kierkegaard did not use "leap of faith" of course raises the question who first ascribed it to him and when and why he/she did so. Apart from current uses such as those already cited most of our findings have been negative. Despite its present wide use in at least parts of the English speaking world, none of the 30-odd works of quotations we have consulted show the phrase and, though using it in single quotes, even the New Oxford English Dictionary does not suggest a source.²⁰ Sørensen's paper "Kierkegaard's Doctrine of the Paradox" discusses various Danish treatments of this theme up to 1955 but makes no reference to either "leap" or "leap of faith."²¹ We have been unable to find any occurrence of *Glaubens Sprung* in either the older Schrempf or the newer Hirsch-Gerdes German translations neither of which translate AE 15 in this way. A number of commentators connect the thought with Barth's *Romans* but the phrase does not occur there, or at least not in Hoskyn's English translation of the sixth edition.²² More recently, Christa Kühnhold has used the phrases "den Sprung des Glaubens," "im qualitativen Sprung des Glaubens" and "dem Sprung des Glaubens"²³ in her account of Kierkegaard. Thus far we have not found any occurrences of "saut...foi" or variants thereof in the new complete French translation or other studies we have consulted. The translation of AE containing the phrase "leap of faith" is from 1945 but Lowrie does not use the phrase in the Index to his large study²⁴ and Swenson is clearly suspicious of it²⁵, which raises the interesting question who was responsible for the mistranslation of AE 15 already noted. In fact, given the circumstances, the attribution of this phrase to Kierkegaard is extremely puzzling. No doubt in certain cases it is due simply to ignorance of the text and indifferent scholarship but the use

made of this misattribution by others has driven me reluctantly to the hypothesis that, in some cases at least, it springs mainly from the well-founded but perhaps largely unconscious suspicion that Kierkegaard has made serious reflection on both human nature and Christian belief once again possible and that he must be stopped on that account. If the reader thinks this simply fatuous I invite him/her to reflect that approximately half of the scholars now working on Kierkegaard and at least the same proportion of thinkers claiming to represent his position insist upon interpreting him without any reference to the clearly and explicitly Christian character of his thought. Surely an age capable of such bad faith and wilful "scholarship" is also capable of deliberately projecting this phrase on to Kierkegaard especially since, as he has repeatedly shown, it is so much to their advantage to do so.²⁶

Four conclusions appear to follow from this study, all of them important for Kierkegaard research and interpretation. The first is that someone must now attempt to explain how our findings can be reconciled with the fact that Kierkegaard plainly thought of faith as involving something like a leap. Our results may be due to the fact that he noted the incoherence alleged above, that he saw or came to see the former as somehow included in the latter (as *round* is included in *circle*) or that he found a substitute for *Spring* more appropriate to his religious and, particularly, his later Christian writings. Any of the above might at least help to explain why there are so many fewer co-occurrences of these words and their variants than one would expect but so far as I can see none explain the other facts reported in this study or, especially, the marked differences between the abfreq lists for these words. But these are only suggestions and plainly someone should undertake a thorough study of the texts, perhaps with particular attention to these abfreq words, in order to discover when and why *Troens* and *Spring* became so clearly and completely separated in his mind.

The second is really a variant of the first. Most Kierkegaard scholars have some sense of his use of *faith* but few appear to have an equally clear idea of his use of *leap*; indeed most who have resisted the claims of this paper appear to do so because they think of his *leap* simply as an adjunct to his *faith*. This study has shown that this is quite wrong and that this concept has an important life of its own in Kierkegaard's thought. I

therefore conclude that it is worthy of a great deal of further research and reflection.

My third is that it is extremely important to study Kierkegaard in his own language, and sometimes even in a computer version of that language. This is obviously essential in cases such as the present one but this study clearly shows that translations can mislead and that our final appeal must always be to the original Danish text.

My fourth is that the expression "leap of faith" can no longer be attributed to Kierkegaard nor cited or conceived as evidence of his "irrationalism." This caricature is particularly inappropriate because Kierkegaard was actually extremely concerned with consistency and precision, emphasised the necessity of criteria as a basis for choice and provided detailed and careful mappings of human choices and, indeed, of the real life of the intellect.²⁷ He could be of great service to contemporary philosophy and thought and in retrospect the "leap of faith" tag looks more and more like an excuse to avoid the labour and pain of having to confront one of the greatest minds of modern times.

Notes

1. Arbaugh and Arbaugh and Louis P. Pojman present two interesting but typical cases. Both use this phrase in quotation marks but neither provide any references to Kierkegaard's own works. Perhaps even more revealing, both cite the phrase "Leap of faith" in their Indices and follow it with references to passages in their own texts which refer simply to the leap as such, this apparently on the mistaken assumption that the two are synonymous. See George B. Arbaugh and George E. Arbaugh: *Kierkegaard's Authorship*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1968, p. 428 and Louis P. Pojman: *The Logic of Subjectivity*, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1984, p. 172.

Arbaugh and Arbaugh also suggest on the page cited above that Kierkegaard has borrowed this phrase from Lessing. This is remarkable since Kierkegaard did not use it and hence did not borrow it from anyone.

Richard Schacht ascribes this phrase to Kierkegaard but seems reluctant to dismiss him as an irrationalist. See Richard Schacht, *Hegel and After. Studies In Continental Philosophy between Kant and Sartre*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1975, pp. 119-34. Of course there are others who take it as clear evidence of his alleged irrationalism; see, for example, Brand Blanchard, "Kierkegaard on Faith" in *Essays on Kierkegaard*, ed. Jerry H. Gill, Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1969, pp. 113-26). See also the following: Frederick Copleston, *Contemporary Philosophy*, New York: Newman Press, 1972, p. 153; Dan Magurshak, "The Concept of Anxiety: The Keystone of the Kierkegaard-Heidegger Relationship," *The Concept of Anxiety*, International Kierkegaard Commentary, Vol. 8, Mercer University Press, 1984, p. 173; and Ronald M. Green, "The Leap of Faith: Kierkegaard's Debt to Kant," *Philosophy and Theology*, Vol. 3, Summer 1989, pp. 385-411.

Canadians at least can take a wry satisfaction in one recent use of this phrase; see James A. Laxer, *Leap of Faith: Free Trade and the Future of Canada*, Edmonton: Hurtig, 1986.

2. Prof. Pojman made this claim during a public discussion at the Kierkegaard Conference held at the University of San Diego, February, 1989 but I confess that I have not yet found it in print. In this connection see also Claus von Bormann, "Kierkegaard und Lessing," *Text & Kontext*, Band 7, Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, n. 155, p. 44.

3. It is perhaps worth noting that there are only five occurrences of this phrase in the *Samlede Værker* and that all are in pseudonymous works. Their locations are as follows: PS 68/90, AE 84/90, 96/102, 112/121 and IC 37/30. (The explanation of this and other similar title codes used in study are given in Appendix A. Here, as in all such references, the first number refers to a page in the Danish third edition and, unless otherwise noted, the second to a page in the older English translations used in my own *Indices*.)
4. *Pap.* 10,1 A 361 quoted Hong & Hong, *Journals and Papers*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, Vol. 3, 2358. It appears also to be supported by a passage in the Swenson-Lowrie translation of AE which equates this expression with "a leap" but not, note, by the original Danish which speaks instead of "Overgangen." (AE 84/90).
5. Hong and Hong suggest the translation "Change into another category or kind". See Hong and Hong, *Ibid*, note 84, p. 796.
6. I put the matter thus because I am certain that I first met this suggestion in one of Gregor Malantschuk's writings but, of course, cannot now find it.
7. The single occurrence of *Troens* in DS is found at 313/277 and that of *Spring* at 144/124. The two occurrences of *Troens* in O are found on 313/277 and those of *Spring* on 93/81.
8. Two of Kierkegaard's books are more than 500 and six more than 300 pages long.
9. Alastair McKinnon, "Mapping the Dimensions of a Literary Corpus," *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1989.
10. The distinction between *Individ* and *Enkelte* (or, in terms of our dimensional study of the authorship, between the *status of* and the *task for* the individual) has been a prominent theme in the work of the late Gregor Malantschuk; see, especially, his *Fra Individ til den Enkelte*, København: C.A. Reitzels Boghandel, 1978. In this connection see also G.L. Hameete, *Kierkegaard: van Exemplaar naar de Enkling*, Delft: Eburon, 1990.
11. The 16 works showing at least this frequency for *Troens* are G, FB, T, BA, PS, AE, OTA, KK, KG, TSA, CT, SD, IC, YTS, TAF and TS and the nine showing at least this frequency for *Spring* are EE1, FB, BA, PS, AE, BFF, LA, TSA and SFV.

12. BA 214/117.
13. For example, AE 85/90.
14. Consider, for example, the comparable results for *Mediation*, en, -ens (mediation), Subjektivitet, -en, -ens, -s (subjectivity) and Existents, -en, -ens (existence) in AE using the same minimum Z-score and a minimum frequency of four. The lists for mediation and subjectivity have 8 or 6.50% of their words in common, those for mediation and existence 16 or 6.37% and those for subjectivity and existence 41 or 14.49%.
15. These results are consistent with and confirm the remarks already made in connection with the relation of *Spring* and *Troens* on the sixth dimension of the study mentioned in note 13 above.
16. AE 55-106/59-113.
17. Presumably it is considerations such as this which explain why Alasdair MacIntyre seems so careful not to ascribe the phrase "leap of faith" to Kierkegaard.
18. Gregor Malantschuk, "Søren Kierkegaards Teori om Springet og hans Virkelighedsbegreb," *Kierkegaardiana*, København: Munksgaard, 1955, pp. 7-15. For a briefer account of this concept see his Note on "Leap" in Hong and Hong, *Ibid*, p. 794.
19. I am grateful to Arnold B. Come for his suggestion that this contrast can be put in this way.
20. I am indebted and grateful to Prof. Frank Tompa of the University of Waterloo for this interesting intelligence.
21. N.H. Sørensen, "Kierkegaard's Doctrine of the Paradox," *A Kierkegaard Critique*, ed. Howard A. Johnson and Niels Thulstrup, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962, pp. 207-27.
22. Karl Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, trs. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
23. Christa Kuhnhold, *Der Begriff des Sprunges und der Weg des Sprachdenkens*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975, pp. 69 and 106.
24. Walter Lowrie, *Kierkegaard*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.

25. See, for example, David F. Swenson, *Something about Kierkegaard*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1945, p. 163.
26. I mean, of course, his repeated demonstrations that Christianity is a mortal wound which natural man will and must seek to avoid at all costs.
27. I am greatly indebted to Professor Arnold B. Come for his comments upon an earlier version of this paper and, particularly, for calling my attention to this fact. For a further discussion of this point see his forthcoming two volume study of Kierkegaard, especially chapters 6 and 8.
28. Of course it is impossible to document these claims in any brief space but as a kind of token evidence we note the following. In the *Samlede Værker* Kierkegaard uses the word *Consequents* (consistency) 178 times, *netop* (precisely, exactly, just) 1,706 times and *Kjendetegn* (criterion, mark) 25 times. In FB he says "... while those who do have faith should be prepared to offer some criterion for distinguishing the paradox from a temptation." FB 53/85 (trs. and ref. Alastair Hannay). In PS he goes to great lengths to explain why there can be no mark or criterion by which we can recognize the Unknown, an explanation similar to and no less impressive than Kant's demonstration in his *Groundwork* that we can understand why we cannot understand the incomprehensible. Finally, in EE1 and EE2 he provides detailed and illuminating descriptions of persons actually making choices. Presumably this is why John Laird found very little in this book "worth stating in a formal way" and Gilbert Ryle dismissed it as having nothing to do with ethics. Of course the real difficulty is that his accounts are simply too rich and too faithful to the complexity of human experience and thought to be acceptable to many philosophers.

Appendix A

LP	Af en endnu Levendes Papirer <i>[From the Papers of One...]</i>	TSA	Tvende ... Smaa-Afhandlinger <i>Two Minor ... Discourses</i>
BI	Om Begrebet Ironi <i>The Concept of Irony</i>	CT	Christelige Taler <i>Christian Discourses</i>
EE1	Enten – Eller. Første halvbind <i>Either/Or, vol. 1</i>	SD	Sygdommen til Døden <i>The Sickness Unto Death</i>
EE2	Enten – Eller. Andet halvbind <i>Either/Or, vol. 2</i>	IC	Indøvelse i Christendom <i>Training in Christianity</i>
G	Gjentagelsen <i>Repetition</i>	SFV	Synspunktet ... Forfatter-Virksomhed <i>The Point of View ... an Author</i>
FB	Frygt og Bæven <i>Fear and Trembling</i>	LF	Lilien paa Marken og Fuglen ... <i>"The Lilies of the Field and ... "</i>
T	Atten opbyggelige Taler <i>Eighteen Edifying Discourses</i>	FV	Om min Forfatter-Virksomhed <i>On My Work as an Author</i>
BA	Begrebet Angest <i>The Concept of Dread</i>	YTS	"Ypperstepræsten" ... "Synderinden" <i>"The High Priest'... '... Sinner"</i>
PS	Philosophiske Smuler <i>Philosophical Fragments</i>	TAF	To Taler ved Altergangen ... <i>Two Discourses at the Communion ...</i>
F	Forord <i>[Prefaces]</i>	EOT	En opbyggelig Tale <i>"An Edifying Discourse"</i>
SV	Stadier paa Livets Vei <i>Stages on Life's Way</i>	GU	Guds Uforanderlighed <i>God's Unchangeableness</i>
TTL	Tre Taler ved tænkte Leiligheder <i>Thoughts on Crucial Situations ...</i>	TS	Til Selvprøvelse, Samtiden anbefalet <i>For Self-Examination</i>
AE	Afsluttende ... Efterskrift <i>Concluding Unscientific Postscript</i>	DS	Dømmer selv! <i>Judge for Yourselves!</i>
BFF	Bladartikler, ..."Forfatterskabet" <i>[Articles about the Authorship]</i>	B21	Bladartikler 1854-55 I-XXI <i>Newspaper articles, 1854-5</i>
LA	En literair Anmeldelse <i>Two Ages</i>	DSS	Dette skal siges; ... <i>"This must be said ..."</i>
OTA	Opbyggelige Taler ... Aand <i>Purity of Heart, Gospel of Suffering</i>	O	Øieblikket, nr. 1-10 <i>The Instant, nos. 1-10</i>
KK	Krisen og en Krise ... Liv <i>Crisis in the Life of an Actress</i>	HCD	Hvad Christus dømmer ... <i>"What Christ thinks ..."</i>
KG	Kjerlighedens Gjerninger <i>Works of Love</i>		

Appendix B

Aberrant Frequency Word Lists for Troens and Spring

Word	Z-sc	f.	Word	Z-sc.	f.
Troens	230.21	345	Spring	206.09	85
Ridder	49.93	40	qualitative	130.87	31
Troen	32.09	76	Qualiteten	45.80	5
Gjenstand	28.64	59	qvantitative	42.01	3
Interesserethed	23.93	6	spring	36.36	3
Vished	20.54	23	Springet	22.72	8
Troende	20.46	26	quantitativ	21.84	3
Forventning	20.46	26	psychologiske	21.82	7
Absurde	16.82	13	bryder	18.06	9
Forargelsens	15.80	17	Angesten	16.49	9
Forvisning	12.44	8	bred	15.35	3
Hemmelighed	12.37	17	aah	15.35	3
Faktum	10.07	8	Synden	14.38	13
Gud-Mennesket	9.64	8	Overgang	13.30	5
Bevægelser	9.48	7	Adams	11.73	3
Forundring	9.35	8	Idealitet	11.21	5
Almene	8.77	12	Tvetydighed	11.10	4
Forstanden	8.77	12	Omsorg	10.86	4
Tegn	8.56	11	Methoden	10.71	3
Inderlighed	8.37	16	Dem	9.95	7
troe	8.18	21	Graven	9.79	4
Seier	8.03	10	Uskyldigheden	9.62	3
Paradox	8.01	8	Afgjørelsen	9.48	5
Anfægtelse	7.85	6	springe	9.26	3
Paradoxet	7.56	11	Lessing	9.11	4
Lidenskab	7.44	19	Individets	8.18	3
troer	6.97	22	Værdighed	7.78	3
tragiske	6.62	6	p.	7.48	3
Helt	6.57	9	forklare	7.42	7
salig	6.12	8	sat	7.34	7
Sphære	6.06	6	seet	7.28	8
Mulighed	5.84	16	medens	6.92	11
Bevægelse	5.77	12	Skylden	6.80	4
menneskeligt	5.76	8	Angest	6.79	5
ligefrem	5.71	12	psyologisk	6.73	3
bevare	5.64	7	Tilstand	6.47	5
uendelige	5.63	10	forklarer	6.38	4
evige	5.61	12	frem	6.01	8
forarges	5.61	6	Individet	5.64	6
Herlighed	5.50	8	Reflexionen	5.51	3
Mod	5.48	10	et	5.19	50
Betingelsen	5.40	6	afgjørende	5.18	5
Enkelte	5.35	17	Tilværelse	5.02	3

KIERKEGAARD AND "THE LEAP OF FAITH"

Word	Z-sc	f.	Word	Z-sc.	f.
absolute	5.05	11	bestandig	4.91	6
Myndighed	4.97	6	senere	4.89	4
bevise	4.95	7	Bestemmelser	4.81	3
Kraft	4.86	14	naturligvis	4.72	5
umiddelbart	4.78	6	ind	4.53	11
hellere	4.17	6	betyder	4.52	4
Existerende	4.10	7	sætter	4.48	4
menneskelig	4.01	9	gjælder	4.15	3
Lære	3.99	7	skyldig	4.06	3
absolut	3.92	11	Historie	3.85	3
Strid	3.71	7	Art	3.61	4
kan	3.69	93	uendelig	3.26	4
Guden	3.63	6	Individ	3.22	3
Tro	3.58	7	Tilværelsen	3.11	3
Sammenligning	3.55	7	bliver	3.10	16
Abraham	3.51	6	idet	3.04	5
talt	3.51	7	saadant	2.95	4
			sagt	2.92	5
			ligesom	2.89	7
			i	2.77	97