

Homiletics

Joshua Cockayne

The Pulpit and the Stage

In this chapter, I explore nineteenth-century perspectives on homiletics which draw on the metaphor of the church as a stage, and the sermon as a kind of performance. The focus of the chapter will be a comparison between Søren Kierkegaard's discussion of homiletics and a view of preaching which Kierkegaard repeatedly critiques in his writings, namely, that of the Danish Bishop, Jakob Peter Mynster. For Mynster, the sermon is a performance in which the preacher presents the truths of Christianity to the congregation with the purpose of edification and upbuilding. Kierkegaard offers a detailed critique of the 'preacher as performer' view in many places in his writing: such a perspective, he thinks, leads to a kind of sham in which the preacher lacks integrity, yet presents himself as one to be followed. In contrast to this, for Kierkegaard, whilst preaching does aim at engaging each individual through edification, the role of the preacher is that of a stage prompter and not that of a performer. The prompter does not offer himself as one with authority to demonstrate the truth, but rather, as one who provokes and reminds the individual of her lines before God.

Following this, I conclude by drawing some comparisons between Kierkegaard's homiletics and the homiletics of those writing as part of the Oxford Movement in nineteenth-century Britain. As we will see, there are certain points of congruence between the theology of preaching found in Tractarian writers such as John Henry Newman and what Kierkegaard writes about preaching. Both Newman and Kierkegaard claim that the sermon should not be understood in rationalist terms – that is, preaching is not predominantly a method of teaching doctrine or theology. Instead, both maintain the sermon should seek to transform the everyday lives of the congregation and increase their devotion to God. Despite these points of similarity, the predominant difference between Kierkegaard's homiletics and that of the Tractarians is found in their approaches to authority. The Oxford Movement sought to re-emphasise the authority of the church, so the sermon becomes one of the key methods of propagating Christian truth. For Kierkegaard, in contrast, the preacher has no authority and the individual must seek to experience God's presence as a single individual. As I will show, this differing approach to religious authority is reflected in the accounts of preaching which are developed.

The Preacher as Performer: Mynster's Homiletics

From a contemporary perspective, it is undoubtedly Kierkegaard who is remembered as the prominent contributor to nineteenth-century Danish theology. However, this is not

a fair reflection on how this period would have been perceived from within. As Koch and Kornerup note, Bishop Jakob Peter Mynster (1775–1854) ‘more than any other became the central and representative figure in Danish theology and ecclesiastical life in the first half of the nineteenth century’ (1954: 6:141, translated in Thompson 2015: 195). Mynster’s influence, as Tolstrup describes it (2009: 267), is as ‘the architect behind the transformation from the State’s Church to the People’s Church’. Although the Danish Church had been officially separated from the Roman Catholic Church since 1536, the state enjoyed control over the running of the church until the writing of the 1849 constitution in which the authority was distributed to a public administration (Thompson 2015: 194). This change in structure of the church, which Mynster was instrumental in bringing about, was a movement inspired by Pietism and the emphasis on the faith of each individual member.¹ As Niels Thulstrup describes it, Mynster’s importance to the nineteenth-century Danish Church lay in

his activities as Church administrator, ecclesiastical politician, theological and edifying writer, and, in particular, preacher . . . He was a bearer of tradition and an outstanding representative of a culture in which humanism and Christianity were united, a culture that was going into decline. (1984: 32)

Those familiar with Kierkegaard’s writings will be familiar with Mynster as a figure of critique and ridicule,² yet equally someone for whom Kierkegaard had a great deal of admiration.³ We know that Kierkegaard was made to read Mynster’s sermons as a child by his father (Thompson 2015: 198) and continued to count them amongst his devotional readings (Pattison 2012: 172). Moreover, before becoming Bishop of Zealand, Mynster was a parish priest in the church attended by the Kierkegaard family, and confirmed Søren and his older brother Peter Christian (Thulstrup 1984: 22). So, Kierkegaard was very familiar with Mynster’s preaching and his approach to homiletics.

Much of what Kierkegaard writes about homiletics can be seen as a reaction to the practice of preaching in nineteenth-century Copenhagen, and it is often Mynster who bears the brunt of these critiques.⁴ However, as we will see, it is possible to read both Mynster’s and Kierkegaard’s contributions to the discussion of preaching as attempts to address the challenge of modernity which the nineteenth-century church in Denmark faced. The influence of Enlightenment rationalist thought on Danish culture resulted in a closely connected church and academy; many of the senior figures in the church were former or current theologians and professors at the University of Copenhagen. The challenge, then, was to demonstrate how Christianity and rationalist philosophy were related and to make the case for the importance of Christianity in an increasingly secular environment. There are some striking similarities in the way that both Kierkegaard and Mynster approach this challenge, despite their disagreements. As George Pattison notes:

Even if, from Kierkegaard’s point of view, Mynster had never grasped the gravity of the contemporary challenge to Christianity, it is clear that, despite his conclusions being essentially optimistic, Mynster was in his own way aware that Christianity could not simply take its place and role for granted. It is also striking that he sees the Christian response as needing to restore the dimension of inwardness and the heart as a counter-move to a certain kind of philosophy and a tendency to substitute literature for warm, personal relations. (2012: 178)

Let us now consider Mynster's contribution to the study of preaching in more detail. Mynster was not only known for his influential preaching, he also contributed to the study of homiletics. Before being installed as Chaplain Vor Frue Kierke, Mynster wrote the treatise, *Remarks Concerning the Art of Preaching* [*Bemærkninger om den kunst at prædike*] (1810), which was well received in Danish clerical circles (Pattison 2012: 173). Here, Mynster argues that the sermon should be regarded neither as a 'mission statement' (1852: 87, translated in Pattison 2012: 174), nor as an educational tool. Preaching ought not to aim at converting unbelievers or merely educating believers by engaging only their minds. For Mynster, the purpose of preaching is a kind of personal edification for those in the congregation. To achieve this, the preacher needs to engage not only a person's understanding (Mynster writes that 'thought is a light that illuminates all that is in a person' [1852: 90, translated in Pattison 2012: 175]) but also their hearts (he continues, 'if one is to address the understanding concerning religious and ethical matters, then the feeling for religion and the ethical must first live in the heart' [1852: 90, translated in Pattison 2012: 175]). As Pattison puts it, for Mynster, preaching 'is not primarily a matter of learning new information but of being confirmed in what is already known, something that simple but honest words can achieve as well as any' (2012: 173). Mynster clearly recognises the challenge to present Christianity in a way which is personally transformative and not merely something that is part of one's cultural identity. This response to an overly intellectualised Christian faith is something that he consistently addresses in his writings; for instance, in the preface to his devotional book *Observations on the Doctrines of Christian Faith* [*Betragtninger over de christelige Troslærdomme*], he writes:

I have wanted to give benevolent readers a devotional book that is one in which reflection might satisfy not merely the understanding but speak to the whole disposition, consequently have an impact on feeling and will. But in doing this not merely that particular religious representation might be made clear and living, such as can take place in the usual collection of sermons and other writings for edification, but that the most important doctrines might be developed in a thorough-going coherence, and thus the particular representations be gathered into a whole, which – this was the author's desire and endeavour – might make a contribution towards the conveyance of a complete, thorough and efficacious knowledge of Christianity. (1846: iii–iv, translated in Thompson 2015: 196)

In response to the challenge posed by rationalism, Mynster recognises that rational thinking alone cannot arrive at the kind of truth with which Christianity is concerned (1852: 95). And, thus, the preacher should not aim at the development of rational argument which engages the intellect alone and neglects the importance of the heart and the conscience. However, in contrast to the kind of extreme separation of philosophy and Christianity which we find in places in Kierkegaard's writing (the pseudonymous author Johannes Climacus writes that 'Science and scholarship want to teach that becoming objective is the way, whereas Christianity teaches that the way is to become subjective' ([1846] 1992a: 130), for example), Mynster writes that truth 'demands the unscientific as well as the scientific' (1852: 96, translated in Pattison 2012: 176). So, for Mynster, whilst preaching must not be a merely academic pursuit, it is not entirely distinct from it in the way that we find in much of Kierkegaard's writings.

Rather than using argument to convince or persuade the congregation, Mynster saw the preacher's task as one of presenting truth to the individual ('to set forth the highest objects

before the eyes of men, to open their eyes to see what is in front of them' [1852: 98, translated in Pattison 2012: 176]). The preacher's role is to make the object of preaching 'visible' and 'to invite each person to come and see it as it is' (1852: 99, translated in Pattison 2012: 176). For Mynster, the role of the preacher is to engage the individual in a kind of personal reflection, and there is a certain skill to this; it is notable that Mynster writes of the 'art' (*konst*) of preaching – preaching is something which the preacher must craft in a particular way to engage the individual. This is a craft which involves the preacher's use of 'similes and figurative words, his personifications, his manner of address, now to the whole company, now to each individual in particular, his frequent question . . .' (1852: 99–100, translated in Pattison 2012: 176). This picture of preaching is akin to a kind of performance. As Pattison describes it:

Mynster insists the preaching is primarily a 'live' or 'performance' art. It is part of the regrettable assimilation of preaching to a more academic kind of discourse that the preacher organizes his material into a series of 'points', also evidenced by the growing custom for people to leave the service after the sermon and the fashion for printed sermons that readers can 'study' at leisure. But the written text of a sermon is 'only preparatory not the work itself.' . . . The 'live' speaker will adapt his words and ideas to his particular audience, and not simply give free rein to what he wants to say and how he wants to say it. (2012: 177, quoting Mynster 1852: 113)

What is lacking from the written presentation of the sermon is the kind of engagement between preacher and congregation which aims at showing truth. For Mynster, this is wrapped up in how the sermon is delivered and not just the content of what is written. Although Mynster describes preaching as a kind of performance, this is not a task which requires pretence (although, as we will see, this is precisely Kierkegaard's problem with him) – the preacher himself must be engaged in the task of preaching: 'Tis not preaching the gospel but ourselves', Mynster writes. 'For my own part, I had rather direct five words point blank to the heart' (1852: 105, translated in Pattison 2012: 175). The preacher must be engaged personally in his task of preaching, yet, in contrast with Kierkegaard's repeated claims to be 'one without authority', for Mynster, 'the preacher is not ashamed either of his authority or of his "I" and Mynster's sermons duly make plentiful use of the "I" of one who, as an ordained pastor, is entitled to speak authoritatively in his own voice to his flock' (Pattison 2012: 189).

The Preacher as Stage Prompter: Kierkegaard's Homiletics

The idea of discussing Kierkegaard's homiletics might strike some as strange. Throughout his writings, Kierkegaard critiques the church and questions the very idea of the ordained pastor.⁵ Thus, rather than giving a theology of ecclesiastical practice, Kierkegaard appears to be deeply sceptical of the whole enterprise. Furthermore, he repeatedly insists that his own religious writings are not sermons at all, but rather 'discourses'.⁶ The implication appears to be that Kierkegaard's religious texts exist to be read in a certain way and not delivered by a pastor or someone who claims to have authority. As Kierkegaard puts this point in his journals:

A Christian discourse deals to a certain extent with doubt – a sermon operates absolutely and solely on the basis of authority, that of Scripture and of Christ's apostles . . .

A sermon presupposes a pastor (ordination); a Christian discourse can be by a layman. (1999: VIII¹, A 6)

As well as this difference in the kind of authority associated with a sermon, there is also a difference in form between the discourse and the sermon. Whilst the sermons of Mynster were often reproduced in written form, as we have seen, for Mynster there is something lacking from the written discourse which can only be achieved through the performance of preaching. Kierkegaard, in contrast, lays emphasis on his writings as pieces of written text from which the reader is encouraged to 'read aloud, if possible' ([1851] 1990: 2).

In light of these issues, it may seem that Kierkegaard is not interested in giving a theology of preaching at all. Yet, this would be an oversimplification of the issues involved. We know, for instance, that, despite his criticism of preaching, Kierkegaard occasionally delivered some of his 'discourses' in church services.⁷ So, whilst he clearly still regarded himself as a layman without authority, he occasionally delivered his discourses orally to a congregation. Additionally, as Sylvia Walsh notes in reference to Kierkegaard's 'Communion Discourses':

In jotting down text for possible communion discourses in his journals, Kierkegaard sometimes refers to them as Friday sermons (*Fredags-Prædikener*) and sometimes as Friday discourses (*Fredags-Taler*). The identification of the communion addresses as discourses rather than sermons in his published works clearly reflects Kierkegaard's idiosyncratic view of them in conformity with the claim that he wrote and spoke without authority. (2011: 15)

To complicate matters further, as Pattison tells us (2012: 174), we know that Mynster saw no real difference between the sermon and the discourse. The word that is used for preaching by Mynster (*taler*) is the same word used by Kierkegaard to refer to his discourses. And, in praising a volume of Kierkegaard's discourses, Mynster writes that Kierkegaard's discourses really are sermons (ibid. 174). So it is far from clear that the distinction between discourse and sermon is as obvious as Kierkegaard makes out.

Central to Kierkegaard's refusal to call his discourses sermons is his scepticism about the authority of the established church. This is an issue which there will not be space to explore in detail here – the topic of this chapter is that of homiletics and not of ecclesiology. However, without going into Kierkegaard's views on ecclesiology in detail, we can see that there is still much in his writings that can inform the study of homiletics. Even for those who do not share Kierkegaard's scepticism of the established church, much of what he writes about preaching can help inform a contemporary study of homiletics.

A great deal of what Kierkegaard writes regarding preaching is framed negatively as criticism of his contemporaries in the Danish Lutheran Church. As we have seen, Kierkegaard clearly expresses some admiration for Mynster and valued much of his work; however, he is also very critical of Mynster's preaching in many places. For Mynster, preaching is a kind of performance art, and so we also find the metaphor of stage and performance in relation to preaching in many places in Kierkegaard's writings. However, unlike Mynster, Kierkegaard uses this analogy to critique existing views on preaching, rather than to endorse them. For instance, in a journal entry, Kierkegaard writes that,

In paganism the theater was worship – in Christendom the churches have generally become the theater. How? In this way: it is pleasant, even enjoyable, to commune with

the highest once a week by way of the imagination. No more than that. And that actually has become the norm for sermons in Denmark. Hence the artistic distance – even in the most bungled sermons. (1999: IX, A 39)

This short passage illustrates much of what Kierkegaard finds troubling about the performative view. First, this kind of preaching makes Christianity into an act of enjoyment in which the sermon is part of a person's comfortable, everyday life and the true challenge of Christianity is never realised. The preacher's role in Christendom is to entertain, whereas, as we will see, for Kierkegaard the preacher's role ought to be to challenge and provoke the listener to exist as a single individual before God. Second, the sermon as an art of performance brings with it a kind of 'distance'. As I will explain in more detail shortly, Kierkegaard thinks that the preacher in Christendom is a kind of actor who performs for his congregation, but fails to live up to these standards himself. This kind of preacher is compared to a swimming coach who cannot swim, yet still stands at the side and shouts instructions to those in the pool (ibid. IX, A 198). I will consider each of these points in turn, before going on to consider what Kierkegaard suggests as an alternative model for homiletics.

First, then, one of the issues Kierkegaard raises with preaching in Christendom is that it fails to engage each individual in a manner which is personally transformative in the way that, he claims, Christianity requires. The importance of becoming a single individual before God is a theme which pervades Kierkegaard's entire authorship and not just his writing on preaching. For instance, in *The Sickness Unto Death*, the pseudonymous author Anti-Climacus writes: 'Christianity teaches that this individual human being – and thus every single individual human being, no matter whether man, woman, servant girl, cabinet minister, merchant, barber, student, or whatever – this individual human being exists *before God*' ([1849] 1980: 85). Additionally, in the *Point of View of My Work as an Author*, he writes that one of the primary aims of his authorship is this task of provoking others to realise their position as a single individual before God ([1859] 1998: 118). Problematically, most preaching fails to engage the congregation in this kind of reflection on their own existence before God. The result of the nationalised Lutheranism which Kierkegaard critiques is a lapsed and 'cheap' Christianity in which being a Christian can be combined easily with being a thief or an adulterer ([1851] 1990: 188–9).

One of the most striking discussions of how Kierkegaard thinks that preaching in Christendom has distorted true Christianity is in his parable of the preaching geese. Kierkegaard imagines a group of geese who gather every Sunday to hear one of the other geese preach:

The gist of the sermon was as follows: What a high destiny geese have, to what a high goal the creator – and every time this word was mentioned the geese curtsied and the ganders bowed their heads – had appointed geese. With the help of their wings they could fly away to distant regions, blessed regions, where they really had their homes, for here they were but aliens.

It was the same every Sunday. Thereafter the assemblage dispersed and each one waddled home to his family. And so to church again the next Sunday, and then home again – and that was the end of it. They flourished and grew fat, became plump and delicate – were eaten on St. Martin's Eve – and that was the end of it.

That was the end of it. Although the Sunday discourse was so very lofty, on Monday the geese would tell each other what had happened to one goose who had wanted to

make serious use of the wings given by the creator and intended for the high goal set before it – what happened to it, what horrors it had to endure. The geese had a shrewd mutual understanding about this. But of course they did not talk about it on Sunday; that, after all, was not appropriate, for then, so they said, it would be obvious that our Sunday worship actually makes a fool of God and of ourselves. (1999: XI², A 210)

Just like the goose-preacher, Kierkegaard thinks that those who preach do attempt to provoke and challenge their hearers to take seriously the claims of Christianity, but for some reason, this never translates into transformative action. The sermon is a focus for entertaining the masses on a Sunday, but makes little difference to the individual come Monday morning. As Kierkegaard explains it, the culture of Christendom is one which

we play, allow our imagination to amuse itself in a quiet hour of Sunday daydreaming, and otherwise stay right where we are – and on Monday regard it as a proof of God's grace to get plump, fat, delicate, get layered with fat – that is, accumulate money, get to be somebody in the world, beget many children, be successful, etc. (Ibid. XI², A 210)

Whilst this is clearly a problem which is symptomatic of the culture as a whole, and not only as the result of poor preaching, Kierkegaard does suggest that the preacher has a specific role in counteracting or encouraging this 'fatty' kind of Christianity in which challenge is never actualised. In part, this problematic culture is down to the preacher's trivialising of the challenge of Christianity. For instance, Kierkegaard writes that 'Everywhere in life's trivialities they find analogies to the highest. Someone has had a loss, and presto! – the preacher refers to it as the Isaac whom Abraham *sacrifices*. What nonsense!' (ibid. VIII¹, A 629). To take another example, *Anti-Climacus* contends that the sermon-presentation encourages the congregation to be admirers of Christ and not imitators ([1850] 1991: 237). This results, *Anti-Climacus* tells us, from the preacher's use of observation:

The 'observation' does not come too close to either speaker or the listener; the observation very reliably guarantees that it will not become a matter of personal remarks . . . Whether or not you, the listener, do what is said does not concern me, and scarcely yourself; it is observation and at most it is a question of the extent to which the observation has satisfied you. (Ibid. 236)⁸

The preacher's use of observation encourages the kind of culture which is exemplified in the geese parable, namely, a church which is encouraged and entertained by the preacher's performance, but never takes seriously the challenge of Christianity. The preacher as an observer encourages an admiration for Christ, but fails to enable individuals to realise that Christ requires they be like him through imitation. As *Anti-Climacus* puts it, 'no admirer has ever wanted . . . to become just as poor, despised, insulted, mocked, and if possible even a little more' as Christ (ibid. 241). Kierkegaard thought that the view of preacher as a performer constructs a sham image of what it is to be a Christian and thus distorts the most challenging aspects of Scripture. To take another example, Kierkegaard remarks that when the book of Job is preached about, the preacher rushes too speedily to the resolution in which Job gets all things back. Kierkegaard writes that, 'This is why I prefer to preach about the preceding period' (1999: IX, A 191).⁹

So, one of the key problems Kierkegaard has with preaching as performance is the false

view of Christianity which he thinks it constructs. Not only does the problem concern the congregation, however, but there is also a problem concerning the preacher himself. In his biography of Kierkegaard, Joakim Garff recounts a humorous episode in which Kierkegaard imagines replacing Mynster with a kind of music box to enact the sermon in his place; this would allow every church to benefit from Mynster's uplifting sermons, yet the benefit would be that 'there is nothing scandalous when a preaching machine does not practise what it preaches' ([2005] 2010: 655). This is a point Kierkegaard makes in many places in his writings, both in direct reference to Mynster, but also in his more general remarks concerning the act of preaching.

Again, the metaphor of performance and theatre is used to express Kierkegaard's concern with preaching; Anti-Climacus compares the preacher to an actor ([1850] 1991: 234–6), for example.¹⁰ Whilst acting requires a kind of courage, Anti-Climacus remarks, there is something of an illusion about the actor's role; he becomes like someone else through the performance. The preacher, in contrast to this, cannot ever truly maintain this illusion of pretending to be someone he is not – even if no one else is watching, Anti-Climacus tells us, we know that 'the eye of the omniscient one is' (ibid. 235). Thus the preacher's 'task is: to be himself, and in a setting, God's house, which, all eyes and ears, requires only one thing of him – that he should be himself, be true' (ibid. 236). We can see, then, how Kierkegaard's use of performance imagery stands in contrast to Mynster's views. Whereas, for Mynster, preaching is an art of performance, for Kierkegaard, this is the very feature of preaching which he often finds so troublesome. And as we saw with the story of the music box as a replacement for Mynster's preaching, Kierkegaard also held that there was a problem with the preacher's own relationship to God. As Anti-Climacus describes this problem:

It is a risk to preach, for as I go up into that holy place – whether the church is packed or as good as empty, whether I myself am aware of it or not, I have one listener more than can be seen, an invisible listener, God in heaven, whom I certainly cannot see but who truly can see me. This listener, he pays close attention to whether what I am saying is true, whether it is true in me, that is, he looks to see – and he can do that, because he is invisible, in a way that makes it impossible to be on one's guard against him – he looks to see whether my life expresses what I am saying. And although I do not have authority to commit anyone else, I have committed myself to every word I have said from the pulpit in the sermon – and God has heard it. Truly it is a risk to preach! (Ibid. 234)

What Anti-Climacus draws attention to here is that, through the act of preaching, the preacher distinguishes himself from the Christian masses. He puts himself forward as a single individual before God. And thus, preaching brings with it a kind of judgement that one is far from God and that one's life does not live up to the challenge of being a Christian. In this way, the act of preaching is an act of judgement – it is not that preaching gives one authority to judge others, but rather, Anti-Climacus tells us, the preacher puts himself in a place of judgement as God 'looks to see whether my life expresses what I am saying' (ibid. 234).

Although Kierkegaard is clearly critiquing Mynster, along with other members of the Danish established church, it is not clear that what he says is merely a personal attack. I think that Kierkegaard sets his sights higher than this. There is a way of reading Kierkegaard's critique in more general terms: the problem with preaching in the way that Mynster conceives of it is a problem with authority in general. By placing oneself in a

position of authority over others and by engaging in the act of preaching as performance, one puts oneself forward as someone to be followed. It is here that the difference between 'sermon' and 'discourse' becomes apparent. As Pattison puts it:

Kierkegaard's discourses are consequently sermon-like works that are distinguished from sermons precisely by their lack of authority and by the absence of the authorial and authoritative 'I'. The work of reading the discourses is not that of deriving views and opinions second-hand from the authoritative author telling you what to think. The author, as Kierkegaard put it in one of the prefaces to the discourses, 'continually desires to be as one absent on a journey'. The aim is not to draw the reader into the fellowship of the Church . . . but to leave the reader alone with God. (2012: 189, quoting Kierkegaard [1843] 1992b: 179)

According to Pattison, it is this difference in authority which can help to explain the prominence Kierkegaard gives to the written discourses read aloud, rather than spoken sermons given from a figure of authority. However, Kierkegaard's point can be generalised to homiletics in general, I think. To see this, let us consider some of Kierkegaard's positive remarks concerning the act of preaching.

As well as engaging in a comprehensive critique of the culture of Christendom and the failures of the preaching of his contemporaries, Kierkegaard does also make some positive claims about the subject in his writings.¹¹ The metaphor of performance and theatre which Kierkegaard uses to critique the act of preaching in Christendom is also helpful to see what he has to say positively about homiletics. In his 'Occasional Discourse on the Occasion of Confession', Kierkegaard sets aside a portion of the text to reflect on the very idea of a confession discourse. In order to avoid the kind of passive observation which Anti-Climacus described, Kierkegaard writes that 'the discourse must *decisively* require something of the listener . . . that he as reader share the work with the one speaking' ([1847] 1993: 122). Note that although this passage is taken from a written discourse which is prefaced by Kierkegaard's commendation that the reader 'read aloud' (ibid. 5), the text is still presented in oral terms: Kierkegaard writes of the 'speaker' and the 'listener'. Although this may be connected to the kind of reading which Kierkegaard expects of his reader (namely, reading aloud), I think much of what is said can extend to spoken preaching.

In order to 'explain the relation between the speaker and the listener', Kierkegaard uses 'a metaphor drawn from the secular arts' (ibid. 123). He begins by making an observation regarding the relation between the actor and the stage prompter – the prompter wishes to be insignificant and overlooked and everyone's eyes are fixed on the actor. However, although the actor 'hears everything he has to say from that hidden one who sits and whispers', 'No one is so foolish as to regard the prompter as more important than the actor' (ibid. 134). Kierkegaard then goes on to apply this analogy to the act of preaching:

Now forget the jest of art. Alas, when it comes to the religious discourse, many people are so foolish as they regard the speaker from a secular point of view and see him as an actor and see the audience as spectators who judge the artist. But this not the way it is, by no means. No, the speaker is the prompter; there are no spectators, because every listener should look inwardly to himself. The stage is eternity, and the listener, if he is the true listener (and if he is not, it is his own fault), is standing before God through the discourse. The prompter whispers to the actor what he has to say, but the actor's

rendition is the main thing, is the earnest jest of the art; the speaker whispers the words to the listener, but the main thing, the earnestness, is that the listener, with the help of the discourse and before God, in silence speaks in himself, with himself, to himself. The discourse is not spoken for the sake of the speaker, so that he may be praised or criticized, but the objective is the listener's rendition. (Ibid. 124)

We can see much of the previous critique of preaching as performance in what Kierkegaard says here. The model of the preacher entertaining the congregation as an actor entertaining his audience is fraught with the risks which I have outlined in more detail above. However, his remarks are not entirely critical here. In fact, the discussion of the preacher as a stage prompter provides us with an alternative model of homiletics which stands in stark contrast with Mynster's. Note, again, that whilst Kierkegaard presents this discourse in a written form, the metaphor of the stage prompter gives the impression that the discourse is to be spoken to the individual. Thus there is no reason why this metaphor cannot be extended to thinking more generally about homiletics, rather than narrowly focusing on what Kierkegaard describes as 'discourse'.¹²

The metaphor of preacher as stage prompter gives an entirely different perspective on the performance of preaching. Rather than observing the performance of another and looking to the preacher as example of faith, the individual in the congregation is the actor. Preaching should engage the individual in some way. Kierkegaard's confession discourse gives us some indication of what this might look like. Rather than presenting doctrine or making observation, Kierkegaard directs questions at each individual. For instance, he writes:

The discourse now asks you: *Are you living in such a way that you are conscious of being a single individual?* The question is not the inquisitive kind such as one asks about the individual with regard to distinction . . . No, it is the earnest question about what each person is according to his eternal destiny about what he is to be conscious of being, and when is this question more earnest than when before God he considers his life? (Ibid. 127)

In this way, just as the stage prompter is important and yet wants not to be noticed, the preacher should move the focus from his own observations and direct the focus to the individual in the congregation as actor on a stage.

Kierkegaard's metaphor also changes who the audience is in the act of preaching. The individual is not passive in the way that the performance view describes, but rather, she must realise that she is performing before the audience of God. As he describes it:

As soon as the religious address is viewed from the secular point of view . . . the speaker becomes an actor and the listeners become critical spectators; in that case the *religious* address is performed *secularly* before some people who are present, but God is not present any more than he is in the theater. The presence of God is the decisive element that changes everything. As soon as God is present, everyone has the task before God of paying attention to himself – the speaker during his speech has the task of paying attention to what he is saying, and the listener during the speech has the task of paying attention to how he is hearing, whether through the discourse he within himself is secretly speaking with God; otherwise the listeners would also have a task in common with God, so that God and the listeners would jointly check on the speaker and pass

judgement on him. (Ibid. 125)

As with the earlier discussion of preaching, Kierkegaard suggests that preaching is an act of judgement. However, if it is the individual and not the preacher who is the performer, then it is the individual and not the preacher who is in the place of judgement. As we can see in the extract above, the most important feature of successful preaching is that the individual becomes aware of God's presence.¹³ It is precisely this factor which Anti-Climacus uses to distinguish the admirer from the imitator in *Practice in Christianity*: whereas the admirer stands at a distance from Christ and avoids the challenge of coming close Christ in his abasement ([1850] 1991: 237–8), the imitator, the true Christian, experiences Christ in 'contemporaneity' (ibid. 246). As Anti-Climacus explains 'contemporaneity' earlier in the text, to experience Christ as contemporary is to experience Christ not merely as a historical figure, but also as a person whose presence is still with his believers in some way (ibid. 9).¹⁴ In engaging with God's presence and in coming near to Christ as contemporary, transformative change is possible in the life of the individual. Unlike the waddling geese who listen but never fly, Kierkegaard's view of preaching is that it should remind the individual of God's presence, which brings with it the judgement that one is far from Christ. As he puts this in a journal entry, 'By becoming contemporary with Christ (the exemplar), you discover precisely that you don't resemble it at all. . . . From this it follows, then, that you really and truly learn what it is to take refuge in grace' (2011: 9). We can see how, on Kierkegaard's picture, the authority of the preacher becomes of very little importance. It is the presence of God which makes the difference in the life of the individual and thus, the preacher's aim is to neither teach nor entertain, but, rather, to prompt those who are gathered, or who read the discourses aloud, that they exist before God.

Much of my discussion has focused on Kierkegaard's homiletics and his critique of Bishop Mynster, which no doubt gives a fairly one-sided account. However, there is more in common between these two figures than is suggested by looking only at Kierkegaard's attacks on Christendom. Mynster clearly saw the challenge that contemporary culture posed to the Christian. In some ways, this is framed in similar terms to those used by Kierkegaard, as Thompson highlights that 'Mynster's life and writings display a complex relation to the objective and the subjective' (2015: 197). The challenge that the preacher faces, to present the truths of Christianity in a way which changes the lives and actions of individuals, is a challenge which both Mynster and Kierkegaard took seriously. Whilst both recognise that Christianity must respond to the challenges of culture and that the truths of Christianity must be realised inwardly by each individual, on the topic of homiletics there is disagreement on how to meet this challenge. For Mynster, the preacher's job is to reveal the truths of Christianity in a way which engages both the mind and the conscience. Preaching is therefore not an academic pursuit, but rather a kind of performance art which aims at engaging each individual in a personal way. In contrast to this, as we have seen, Kierkegaard is deeply sceptical of preaching as a performance; for Kierkegaard, Mynster 'had allowed the cultural forms of modernity to override those of Christianity' (ibid. 198). The speaker of the religious discourse is not a figure of authority or judgement, but rather, a person who provokes and prompts the individual to realise her existence before God. It is the presence of God alone which can change a person's actions.

Wider Perspectives on Preaching in the Nineteenth Century

By giving a detailed overview of just two views on homiletics, we have seen that the challenges faced by the nineteenth-century Danish Church forced both critics and clerics to reform and adapt their view on preaching to present Christianity as a living and transformative faith. Both Mynster and Kierkegaard attempt to provide a revised model of Christian homiletics to meet these challenges; although, as we have seen, their approaches are strikingly different. And though there is not scope for a detailed comparison, it is worth noting that the challenges faced by Mynster, Kierkegaard, et al. were not unique to nineteenth-century Danish Lutheranism. For instance, by briefly looking at the Oxford Movement in nineteenth-century Britain, we can see some parallels that reinforce this idea that views on preaching adapt to changes in culture.

Just as the Lutheran Church in Denmark was forced to respond to the challenges of modernity and the increasing secularisation of culture, those in the nineteenth-century Church of England faced a similar threat. One response to these challenges was developed in the Oxford or Tractarian Movement, initially formed around the scholar and priest John Keble and which came to include John Henry Newman, Richard Hurrell Froude, Henry Edward Manning and Edward Bouverie Pusey, amongst others. The Oxford Movement sought to call the church back to its catholic and apostolic roots, as well as to resist the political movements of the Whig and Radical politicians who wanted to subjugate or even abolish the established church (Brown and Nockles 2012: 1). As Stewart Brown and Peter Nockles describe it, the Oxford Movement

proclaimed boldly that the Church of England represented the divine authority that society needed in order to meet the challenge of the spread of religious and political liberalism and unbelief and was a counterpoise to the growing influence of evangelical individualism with its emphasis on private judgment. In contrast to the latter, the movement's leaders promoted an unostentatious but deep spirituality which emphasised awe, obedience, reverence and the principle of reserve when communicating religious knowledge. The Tractarians placed a particular value on fasting, self-denial and asceticism. (Ibid. 2)

We can see that many of the challenges faced by the nineteenth-century Church of England were similar to those with which the Danish Church was confronted. In both cultures, the rise of secularisation, liberalism and unbelief had become an increasingly difficult challenge for the church to face. There are also some similarities in how these challenges were responded to. For instance, both Kierkegaard and Newman sought to refute the influence of rationalism on Christian thought by calling people to devotion and religious obedience.¹⁵ However, it is clear that there are also many differences in approach: the kind of individualism which the Tractarians resisted is exemplified well by Kierkegaard's emphasis on the single individual before God. Moreover, the undermining of the church's authority which we find in Kierkegaard's writings is entirely contrary to the Tractarians' call to rediscover apostolic authority in the Church of England.

A notable similarity between those in the Oxford Movement and both Kierkegaard and Mynster is the emphasis on reforming the practice of preaching in the church in response to the challenge of modernism. We can see that many of the concerns which Mynster and Kierkegaard had with certain kinds of preaching were shared by those in the Oxford Movement. For example, as in Kierkegaard's writings, in Tractarian thought we see an

emphasis on the inwardness of Christian faith and a defence of the claim that having faith is more than an assent to a set of rational doctrines. Furthermore, in agreement with both Kierkegaard and Mynster, the Tractarians gave the preacher a crucial role in the communication of faith. Newman, for instance, writes that the preacher must '*always* strive in every pulpit so to . . . warn people that it is quite idle to pretend to faith and holiness, unless they show forth their inward principles by a pure disinterested upright line of conduct' (1891: 1:89). Similarly, Manning critiques many existing sermons as being 'too often general and unpractical' and goes on to write that:

It is not enough that the matter of a sermon be true. It needs, so to speak, flesh and blood, human sympathy and the breath of life. The preacher must come down into the midst of his people: he must descend into the detail of every day; into the particulars of trial, the commonplace of duty, character, and personal experience. (1849: 79)

Many of those who preached during this period resist a kind of dry and overly academic teaching. As Robert H. Ellison summarises the Tractarian view, the preacher should aim 'not to bring the congregation to assent to a theological theory or set of propositions, but rather to persuade, indeed, to compel men and women to embark upon a spiritual course of action' (1998: 19). It is clear that this summary could equally be applied to the homiletic insights drawn by Kierkegaard.

However, there is much that separates the homiletics of those in the Oxford Movement from Kierkegaard's views on preaching. A key point of divergence between Kierkegaard and the Tractarians comes from their attitude to religious authority. We have seen that Kierkegaard repeatedly undermined the authority of the church – the requirement for having faith, according to Kierkegaard, is that a believer must be contemporary with Christ. Thus it is not by the church's authority or through the church's teaching that a person comes to faith, but rather, through each individual's own encounter with the person of Christ. In contrast to this, for Newman, the truth of Christianity is spread 'not as a system, not by books, not by argument, not by temporal power, but by the personal influence of such men as . . . are at once teachers and patterns of it' ([1872] 1970: 91–2). And, hence, as Pattison puts it, for Newman,

the burden of the sermon is precisely that the historical transmission of faith from person to person allows for and presupposes a fundamental analogy with the original communication of faith to the first apostles . . . Newman's position presupposes that the individual's experience and judgement can, as it were, repose on what is given and experienced in the life of the Church. For Kierkegaard, however, the infallibility of the Church is just what we cannot presuppose. . . . Kierkegaard's call for contemporaneity is . . . a way of saying that the individual's relation to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ must have a basis other than the mere fact of participation in the life of the Church. (2012: 196–7)

Clearly, there is much more to be said on the points of similarity and difference between the nineteenth-century Danish Church and the Oxford Movement in nineteenth-century Britain.¹⁶ However, what we have seen is that the revision of the theology of homiletics is one of the key ways in which both of these traditions seek to respond to cultural challenges. Whilst the respective homiletics of these two periods of nineteenth-century theology are vastly different, in both Copenhagen and Oxford the threat which modernism

and rationalism posed to the Christian faith forced a revision in this core practice of the church.

Conclusion

What has been a consistent theme throughout our consideration of nineteenth-century homiletics is that changes in culture call for changes in church practice. By looking at the role and purpose of the sermon, we have seen how those in the Danish Church sought to respond to the challenges of rationalism. All of the thinkers I have considered have held that the sermon ought to aim at transforming the actions of the individuals in a congregation and not merely their beliefs. However, Kierkegaard clearly stands out from many of the other thinkers in this period as someone who seeks not merely to revise our homiletics in response to an overly intellectualised Christendom, but rather, to entirely reform the practices of the established church and to undermine its authority. Even if we do not follow Kierkegaard's ecclesiology entirely, however, what he says regarding the sermon can be informative for homileticians. Kierkegaard's claim that it is only God who can transform lives, if true, means that preaching must primarily seek to engage those present with the presence of God. And whilst many thinkers here discussed would no doubt agree with this, the challenge with which we are left is to consider to what extent the preacher's authority facilitates or distracts from the experience of the transformative presence of God.

Notes

1. As Thulstrup notes (1984: 73), Mynster's role as the Bishop of Zealand would have given him the status of a first amongst equals.
2. Kierkegaard writes, for instance, that Mynster 'handles his office like a lawyer bureaucrat' (1999: IX, A 39) in a journal entry from 1848.
3. For instance, following his critique of the very concept of a Christian pastor, Kierkegaard writes: 'I regard Bishop Mynster very highly, and not simply because the memory of my father links me to him. No, M. expresses the purely human in the most masterful way I have ever seen' (1999: IX, A 240).
4. Although I focus almost entirely on the views of Mynster and Kierkegaard in this essay, Mynster is not the only target of Kierkegaard's attack on the church. In fact, much of Kierkegaard's disagreement is with Mynster's successor as Bishop, Hans Lassen Martensen, and occasionally, with the pastor and theologian, Nicolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig. It is the interaction between Kierkegaard and Mynster which I think can best inform a theology of homiletics. For a helpful overview of the impact of Mynster, Grundtvig and Martensen, see Thompson 2015.
5. See, for instance, Kierkegaard 1999: X³, A 93. As Pattison puts this point, 'Kierkegaard puts the very idea of a Church as such up for question to the extent that what he effectively asks is, simply: Does Christianity actually need a Church?' (2012: 203). What follows from much of Kierkegaard's thought, as Pattison describes it, is the idea or the possibility of 'a kind of Christianity that was able to dispense with the Church' (ibid. 204).
6. For instance, Kierkegaard claims that the genre of his writings is "'discourses," not sermons, because its author does not have authority to *preach*' ([1843] 1992b: 5). He also writes that his collection of discourses 'in more than one respect are not, and thus for more than one reason are not called, *sermons*' ([1847] 1993: 215).
7. On the Communion Discourses, for instance, Kierkegaard tells us that 'Two of these discourses, which still lack something essential to be, and therefore are not called, sermons, were delivered in Frue Church' ([1848] 1995: 249).

8. This is a passage which is aimed at Mynster's preaching in particular: as Garff notes, this was one of the specific passages which sparked controversy between Mynster and Kierkegaard after the publishing of *Practice in Christianity*. Although Kierkegaard denied that the remarks on observation were aimed at Mynster, Mynster remained unconvinced ([2005] 2010: 655). Considering that one of the most widely read devotionals at the time was Mynster's *Observations on the Doctrines of Christian Faith* (1833), this accusation was hard for Kierkegaard to rebut (ibid. 655).
9. It is not merely the distortion of the challenge of Christianity which Kierkegaard remarks on. It is also the oversimplification of profound aspects of Christian doctrine. As Anti-Climacus puts this point, 'The way the pastor – and this is the same, only even more ridiculous – proves with three reasons that to pray is a bliss that "passes all understanding." What a priceless anti-climax – that something that passes all understanding – is proved by three reasons, which, if they do anything at all, presumably by no means passes all understanding. No, for that which passes all understanding – and for him who believes in it – three reasons mean no more than three bottles or three deer! – To go on, do you believe that a lover would ever think of conducting a defense of his being in love, that is, admit that to him it was not the absolute, unconditionally the absolute, but that he thought of it as being in a class with arguments against it and on that basis developed a defense; that is, do you believe that he could or would confess that he was not in love, inform against himself that he was not in love? And if someone were to suggest to a lover that he speak this way, do you not believe that the lover would consider him crazy; and if besides being in love he was also something of an observer, do you not think he would suspect that the person suggesting this to him had never known what love is or wanted him to betray and deny his love – by defending it? – Is it not obvious that the person who is really in love would never dream of wanting to prove it by three reasons, or to defend it, for he is something that is more than all reasons and any defense: he is in love. Anyone who does it is not in love; he merely pretends to be, and unfortunately – or fortunately – he is so stupid that he merely informs against himself as not being in love' ([1849] 1980: 103–4).
10. To take another example of this theatre imagery from Kierkegaard's journals: 'An actor portrays the man of nobility, the hero, the witness of the truth, and the like; he expresses all these noble, elevated, heroic feelings and thoughts. Would anyone deny that it would be jolting if the actor did this in person. But why is a pastor supposed to have the right to do this? The actor may also be a believer just like the rest of us and the pastor; to be sure, in Christendom we are all Christians, and yet our conformity is to the secular mentality. Why then is a pastor supposed to have the right to declaim in person all these wonderful virtues and continually create the confusion that he himself is the one who carries them out? A very logical mind could be tempted to make the following proposal: Completely abolish the pulpit and the clerical vestments, ordination, and the like. Arrange a little stage in the church, with the usual kind of curtain. There is no objection to using the organ if desired. A prelude is played. The curtain goes up, and "the pastor" comes out, or if a combined performance is wanted, several "pastors" come out in historical costumes. One of them would play the role of Luther. The stage director (incidentally, he could just as well be borrowed from the theater, since the Secretary for Ecclesiastical Affairs is also the Theater Secretary) has seen to the authenticity of the costume – he would declaim one of Luther's sermons. There would be some tears, of course, just as there are tears in the theater when a tragedy is presented; but for the most part crying in church is believed to be different from crying in the theater, which may well be true sometimes but as a rule is not true' (1999: X³, A 93).
11. Kierkegaard also writes positively about specific sermons. For instance, in an entry from 1850, he writes: 'At vespers in Frelsers Kirke the other Sunday (it was my birthday) I heard a theological graduate, Clemmensen. It was a simple sermon, but the kind I like. In his sermon, probably without knowing it, he slipped in a bit of highly poetic beauty; following the Gospel text (John 16: 23–8), he had preached about life as a coming from the Father and a returning to the Father. Then came the usual part about life as a path. After that he quite effectively drew a picture of a father who sends his son into the world. Then he abandoned the metaphor for actuality, and

- it became our relation to God. And then he said: And when at last, in the hour of death, the traveller's cloak is discarded and the staff laid down – *the child* goes in to the father. Superb! I wager that Clemmensen said that quite unwittingly; if he had thought about it he perhaps might even have preferred to say: the soul or the transfigured one or something similar. But no, “the child” – that is superb’ (1999: X³, A 30).
12. It is also important to note that some of the features of Kierkegaard's discussion are features of the fact that the discourse is a discourse on the occasion of confession, and so not everything that is said can be assumed to extend to preaching more generally. Nevertheless, the analogy of the stage prompt contrasted with the preacher as an actor certainly seems to be relevant to much of the prior discussion.
 13. Kierkegaard often stresses the importance of engaging with God's presence. For instance, in reference to preaching, he writes: ‘I do not wish to be made a fool of in church. That is why I desire an empty church – then God is present, and for me at least that is more than enough’ (1999: VIII¹, A 277). His discourses are often headed by short prayers which seek to make the individual aware of God's presence, for instance: ‘You everywhere present One, when I was considering how I would speak and what I would say, you were present. When the single individual decided to go up into your house and went to it, you were present; but perhaps to him it was still not really being present – bless, then, our devotion that we all, each one individually, may in this hour apprehend your presence and that we are before you’ (ibid. X, A 210).
 14. What Kierkegaard means by ‘contemporaneity’ is not entirely clear. For two existing interpretations of this concept, see Stokes 2010; Cockayne 2017.
 15. See Ferreira 1994 for a comparison of Newman's and Kierkegaard's accounts of faith.
 16. See Pattison (2012: 194–8) for a more detailed comparison of Newman and Kierkegaard on this point.

References

- Brown, Stewart J. and Peter B. Nockles (2012), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830–1930*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cockayne, Joshua (2017), ‘Contemporaneity and Communion: Kierkegaard on the Personal Presence of Christ’, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 25.1: 41–62.
- Ellison, Robert H. (1998), *The Victorian Pulpit: Spoken and Written Sermons in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Susquehanna, PA: Susquehanna University Press.
- Ferreira, M. Jamie (1994), ‘Leaps and Circles: Kierkegaard and Newman on Faith and Reason’, *Religious Studies*, 30: 379–97.
- Garff, Joakim [2005] (2010), *Søren Kierkegaard: A Biography*, trans. Bruce H. Kirmmse, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1849] (1980), *The Sickness Unto Death*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1851] (1990), *For Self-Examination and Judge for Yourself*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1850] (1991), *Practice in Christianity*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1846] (1992a), *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments*, 2 vols, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1843] (1992b), *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1847] (1993), *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1848] (1995), *Christian Discourses and The Crisis and a Crisis in the Life of an Actress*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren [1859] (1998), *The Point of View*, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren (1999), *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*, 7 vols, 2nd edn, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, assisted by Gregor Malantschuk, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kierkegaard, Søren (2011), *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Notebooks Volume 5*, ed. Niels Jørgen Cappelørn et al., Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Koch, Hal and Bjørn Kornerup (eds) (1954), *Den Danske Kirkes Historie*, 7 vols, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Manning, Henry Edward (1849), *A Charge Delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester in July, 1849*, London.
- Mynster, Jakob Peter (1846), *Betragtninger over de christelige Tros lærdomme*, Copenhagen: Deichmanns.
- Mynster, Jakob Peter (1852), *Blandede Skrifter af Dr. J. P. Mynster*, 6 vols, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Newman, John Henry (1891), *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, 2 vols, ed. Anne Mozley, London.
- Newman, John Henry [1872] (1970), *University Sermons*, London: SPCK.
- Pattison, George (2012), *Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stokes, Patrick (2010), "'See For Your Self': Contemporaneity, Autopsy and Presence in Kierkegaard's Moral-Religious Psychology', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 18.2: 297–319.
- Thompson, Curtis L. (2015), 'Shapers of Kierkegaard's Danish Church: Mynster, Grundtvig, Martensen', in Jon Stewart (ed.), *A Companion to Kierkegaard*, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 193–206.
- Thulstrup, Niels (1984), *Kierkegaard and the Church in Denmark*, Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzel.
- Tolstrup, Christian Fink (2009), 'Jakob Peter Mynster: A Guiding Thread in Kierkegaard's Authorship?', in Jon Stewart (ed.), *Kierkegaard and His Danish Contemporaries, II: Theology*, London: Routledge, 267–87.
- Walsh, Sylvia (2011), 'Introduction', in Søren Kierkegaard, *Discourses at the Communion on Fridays*, trans. Sylvia Walsh, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1–35.