

The Problem of Knowledge in the Ethics of Kierkegaard's Works of Love

Kjell Eyvind Johansen

A kind of ethical theory?

There are several reflections on ethics in Kierkegaard's pseudonymous authorship, but very little on "ethical theory" in the traditional sense. But since the Kantian impact is strong and clear in *Either-Or*, a closer study of Kierkegaard's contribution to ethical theory could plausibly start with the assumption that his ethics is a version of Kantian, deontological, duty-ethics. Now my first objective is to show that there is good reason to doubt that the assumption about Kierkegaard's Kantianism in ethics will be in accordance with the ethical code of Kierkegaard's *Works of Love*. My second objective concerns the concept and role of knowledge in the *Works of Love*.

Either-Or is influenced by the Kantian distinction between freedom and necessity. According to *Either-Or* the ethical individual acquires the standpoint of freedom, but already in this work we find a difference from Kantian ethics. The supreme principle of morality in Kantian ethics stands above socially inherited norms and duties; in fact it gives us a standard by which one can *measure* these inherited norms and duties. The Kantian supreme principle is universal in the sense that it applies to every rational individual. The ethicist in *Either-Or*, however, starts his or her moral education with the appropriation of the socially inherited norms and duties, gradually extending his or her moral universe to all mankind. This process seems more like socialization into an existing world than acquisition of the Kantian standpoint of law-giving reason.

The lack of *universality* is perhaps even more clear in *Fear and Trembling*. In this work ethical claims are not directly tied to persons, but to functions and roles. It is not Agamemnon as a person who has the duty to protect his child, but Agamemnon *as a father*. And it is not Agamemnon as a father who has the duty to protect his country, but

Agamemnon *as an army leader*. Duties apply to functions and roles directly, and to persons occupying these roles indirectly. An ethics of this kind could be called *archaic* for the following reason: when Agamemnon sacrifices Iphigenia he is doing his duty as an army leader, but not as a human being, i.e. there is no place in an ethics of pure functional duties for duties constraining your actions, whatever function or role you might have. And it seems to be this restriction of ethics to functions and roles that allows the author to raise the question of whether Abraham could be justified in transcending the ethical.

The ethical point of view

Now, moving to the *Postscript*, we find a quite different conception of the ethical. In this work ethics is not confined to functions and roles, but applies to individuals directly. The ethical claim is described as an "indefeasible claim upon every existing individual", and it is said that every accomplishment is "dubious" "unless the individual has been ethically clear when he made his choice, has ethically clarified his choice to himself".¹

The ethical claim in the *Postscript* is universal in the sense that it applies to every choosing individual, but it is not seen or understood by every choosing individual. In order to discover the ethical claim and understand its force, one will need to take or acquire *the ethical point of view*, a point of view which is *subjective* and not objective. The idea can be put, it seems, in a paradoxical way by saying that ethics demands that I take the subjective point of view in order that I see the ethical and discover its claim.

It is important that the same individual can see itself and the world from different points of view, the subjective and the objective. In trying to be objective, we take the external view, the view from the outside, and we try from this viewpoint to understand our roles in history and society. Metaphysics is done from this point of view. The objective view is the view of knowledge. It is not my personal standpoint that matters, but objective truth. The objective view is impersonal. In the *Postscript* the objective view is the view from which the events in our lives are seen as determined by other events, and there is no place for freedom. It is the perspective of necessity.

The subjective point of view can be characterized as the inter-

nal perspective, or the view from the inside. Formulated in a Kantian way it seems to be the point of view we have as agents acting for reasons, and acting on the implicit assumption that we are free to act for reasons. But to Climacus in the *Postscript* the subjective point of view contains more. It is the standpoint from which the world matters to me, since to become subjective means to become interested and take interest in what happens to me. In the *Postscript* the subjective point of view is a position that we all naturally and immediately inhabit. But there is nevertheless more to it, since we continuously have to acquire it; it is so easy to “forget” ourselves, or to forget that we are subjects. We have a tendency to want to be something more, to be more “god-like” so to say, and view ourselves *sub specie aeternitatis*.

If we apply these thoughts about the distinction between the objective and the subjective view to the two *problems* raised by Climacus in the *Postscript*, we get the following result. The objective problem concerns of course the truth of Christianity. The subjective problem, however, is a question about one’s saying *yes* or *no* to (the teachings of) Christianity. Saying *yes* or *no*, to assent or dissent, is the subjective problem, or, to be more precise: it becomes the subjective problem when we discover that we have a responsibility for our *acquisition* of beliefs. Climacus thinks that we acquire beliefs by choosing sincerely to assent or dissent, and it seems correct to apply the concept of “mental act” to assent and dissent in the *Postscript*. But these “mental acts” do not, according to Climacus, follow from any proof or disproof. And this is true, of course, in the strict logical sense: Even if the conclusion logically follows from the premises in a deductive argument, my *assent* to the conclusion does not follow logically, neither from the premises nor from my assent to the premises.

We have found here, I think, the location of the ethical in the *Postscript*. The ethical claim concerns the acquisition of beliefs and attitudes, and what we do with or to ourselves in acquiring beliefs and attitudes. And this ethical claim is possible because we are not simply passive copies of our experiences, but beings capable of taking control and responsibility for the acquisition of beliefs. On this background the ethical question becomes a question about what principles should guide or govern the acquisition of beliefs, and it becomes an ethical question because these principles can be chosen. Experience itself, or the principle of induction, is a possible candidate for such a principle; it is the principle that comes, so to say,

“from below”. But Kierkegaard criticizes this principle, not only in the *Works of Love*, but also in *The Concept of Anxiety* and in the *Postscript*.

Works of Love and the Golden Rule

W*orks of Love* seems to be an interpretation of the Golden Rule. The whole book seems to be “embedded” in the Golden Rule: The second section of the first part of the book, the section with the title: “You *ought* to love”², begins with an intricate interpretation of the “as yourself” in the principle “Love your neighbour as yourself”. And the book ends with reflections on “the Christian equal to equal”³, i.e. not the principle saying that you ought to do to others what they do to you; and not the principle saying that what you do to others might happen to you if you were in their place; but the principle saying that what you do to others *will be* done to you. (I confess, however, that I find it very bewildering that God, in relation to us, should follow the first principle: a tooth for a tooth, an eye for an eye.)

First a general remark about the status of the Golden Rule. – To say that the Golden Rule is a moral *principle* gives better sense than to say that that rule is a moral *norm*. Moral principles are more general than moral norms, and can be used as a basis for the selection of moral norms. The Kantian Categorical Imperative is a moral principle, and so is the Principle of Impartiality. Moral principles stand *above* ethical theories such as, for instance, deontological and consequential theories. Theories such as deontological and consequential ones ought to be tested not only against our moral intuitions about singular cases, but also against moral principles. One remarkable thing about ethics is that people seem to agree more and better about right and wrong in concrete situations and about principles, i.e. on the highest and the lowest level of moral discourse, than about theories and norms, i.e. those entities that we find on the intermediate levels.

If this remark is correct, it follows that different ethical theories are compatible with the Golden Rule, and I will now shortly consider one modern interpretation of the Golden Rule. In *Freedom and Reason* Richard Hare presents an adapted illustration from Matthew 18.23⁴. The situation is that A owes money to B and B owes money to C. B's

position is the one we shall focus on. Now it is assumed that it is a law that creditors may exact their debts by putting their debtors into prison. B asks himself whether he ought to take this measure against A. He is inclined to do so, he wants to do so, but if he accepts the moral judgement that A *ought* to go to prison, he would also be committed to accepting the moral judgement that C ought to throw *him* into prison. Since moral judgements are prescriptive, B would also have to accept that C take measures to imprison *him*. But this B is not ready to accept. The important point is the last one: there is some action that B is not ready to accept if done to him.

This situation is of course rather special. Normally people will be affected by our actions in different ways and degrees, and the agent will not stand in the same relation to some third person as his or her neighbour stands in relation to him or her. In order to practise the rule I have therefore to use my imagination. I have to imagine that I take the place of the other, and I must decide whether the act is acceptable to me in my neighbour's position, having my neighbours interests and preferences.

The process described above is called "role-taking". Especially two pitfalls are important to avoid practising role-taking. The first is to fail to distinguish clearly between your own interests and the interests of the other. Your neighbour's situation in life might be very different from yours, and if you overlook this difference you might treat the other wrongly. – The second pitfall is to think that you know too well what the situation and the interests of the other are. You might even think that you know better than the other what his or her true interests are.

Three elements in the Golden Rule are important in this connection. First, it is the idea that I have to practise *self-detachment* in the sense that my interests and preferences are placed on the par with the interests and preferences of the other. Second, I must be *sincere* about interests and preferences in role-taking. I must be sincere about what I am willing to will if I were in the position of the other. Third, I need to *know* something about the other. And it is especially important to know whether there are any ethically relevant differences between the other and me.

Moving to the *Works of Love*, we find a remarkable difference in the interpretation of the Golden Rule. In this work we find, especially in its first part, a penetrating description of the differences between Christian love and worldly, preferential love. Christian

love is a duty, and as such it is universal, unselfish and autonomous. It is universal not in the sense of universalizability of norms, but in the sense that it is our duty to treat all men equally, on an equal basis and in the same way. It is unselfish in the sense that it is our duty to give up our preferential self-love; and it is autonomous in the sense that it is independent of the "object" of love. Worldly love, on the other hand, is inclination, preferential, selfish and heteronomous.

In focusing on these distinctions between universal Christian love and worldly preferential love, Kierkegaard excludes some genuine ethical problems from his consideration. He directs his attention so strongly towards the critique of all sorts of selfish preferential treatment, that he "overlooks" the problem connected with *ethically justified preferential treatment*. Such differential treatment springs from the fact that it is not always right to treat men equally; on the contrary, unequal treatment is in many cases the only right thing. There is, however, a plausible explanation of this "neglect". In order to practise neighbour love one must treat all men *basically* in the same way, not only independently of individual and social differences, but also independently of "ethical differences". A truly good and loving person ought to be unaffected by a deceitful act, and he or she treats the deceiver basically in the same way as anybody else.

The *Works of Love* consist of two parts. When one considers the main themes of the two parts, one finds a clear difference between them: The first part is about the *duty* to love, and its main thesis is that true neighbour love is self-denial or self-renunciation. The first part is a gradual destruction of immediate and natural self-love. – The second part – on the other hand – is *edifying* or constructive, and its ten sections explain the works of love. What could be the connecting link between these two parts, between the self-renouncing and the edifying part?

The negativity of the first part is rather obvious. Step by step the reader can follow the description of the interpersonal relationship that have to be given up because they are *not* true neighbour love. One has to give up the worldliness of the world. One has to give up all kinds of preferential love – which is not the same as ethically justified differential treatment – one must give up every preconceived conception of my neighbour and his or her interests; and one has to give up one's worldly conception of self-renunciation, i.e. the idea that self-renunciation is something that can be understood by human standards. The whole process is, it seems, a gradual extension of self-

renunciation, a gradual abstraction from all natural, worldly and human interests.

Assuming now that this description of the first part is correct, it seems natural to see it as an analogy to the first movement in the so-called *double-movement* of faith, i.e. the movement of resignation. It is, we can say, the movement of self-detachment. The second, edifying part could then possibly be seen as an analogy to the second movement in the Kierkegaardian *double-movement*: i.e. the second part could deal with the return to the world. Now the main question in this connection is how this return to the world should be understood. But, although these two movements are described apart, they must be practised together: the movement of detachment and return are both present in the works of love.

The first part of Works of Love

Let us now first focus on some broad lines in the “logic” of the first part, the detachment from the worldliness of the world. According to the traditional formulation, the Golden Rule seems to say that you ought to love your neighbour in the same way as you *in fact* love yourself. The foundation of the rule seems to be immediate and natural self-love. The Kantian critique of the rule is based on this interpretation, and one of the arguments mentioned in the *Grundlegung*, is that the rule, so understood, can give no basis for the duties we have towards ourselves.⁵

This is certainly Kierkegaard’s view as well. But according to Kierkegaard, and unlike Kant, the duties we have towards ourselves are based on man’s relationship to God. Outside Christianity, he thinks, there can be no basis for duties towards oneself. The reason for this is complex, but must have to do with the ground for despair: i.e. that man is not willing to accept his or her dependence on something other than him- or herself. In this connection the view that there can be no basis for duties towards ourselves is interesting against the background of the “ethical theory” in *Fear and Trembling*, where duties were attached to our social involvements through functions and roles.

In the *Works of Love*, however, Kierkegaard develops the conception of a duty towards oneself from the Golden Rule, with the assistance of Christian dogma – that worldly self-love is sinful – and consi-

derations about human nature – that men mostly throw their lives away in seeking to fulfill their self-interest. I will not go into details of the argument leading from the Golden Rule to the idea of a duty towards ourselves, but the main step seems to be that one has first to become one's neighbour's neighbour in order to love one's neighbour as oneself. If we did not take that first step, our neighbour would be the other as he or she meets us in and through our roles as fathers, teachers and so on. All these roles are differential and they will not generate neighbour love, but only differential duties. In order to become our neighbour's neighbour we must distinguish between two kinds of self-love: natural and immediate self-love, and the kind of love we have towards ourselves when we are our neighbour's neighbour. The first kind of love we can call preferential self-love, and the other kind non-preferential self-love. In non-preferential self-love we place ourselves on a par with our neighbour, not above or beneath, but on the same level. This seems to be the first step in the process of self-detachment: we are not giving our own personal projects and interests any priority over those of our neighbour.

According to Kierkegaard the formulation of the Golden Rule should be as follows: you ought to love your neighbour in the same way as you ought to love yourself. In modern ethical thinking this second "ought", the "ought" that applies to yourself, is usually thought to be merely prudential, and not strictly moral. And the moral "ought", the one that says that you ought to love your neighbour, is consequently thought to be founded on a prudential "ought", which means that it is in our own best interest to be moral and love our neighbour. We will secure our own interest better if we place ourselves on a par with our neighbour. This, we can say, is *prudential self-renunciation*, and it is a kind of self-renunciation that is within the scope of human reasoning and understanding.

When morality is based on prudence in this way, there cannot be any room for duties towards oneself, other than the duties that are merely prudential. As a consequence we must distinguish between humane and prudential self-renunciation and Christian. Christian self-renunciation is self-renunciation without any "hidden", founding self-interest. And this idea of unselfish self-renunciation would be impossible, I think, without the presupposition that there is another self to be loved in the process of self-renunciation.

It is not difficult to see that an extended, prudential self-interest lies at the bottom of the role-taking procedure. In taking the role of

the other, I do not take my own preferences with me, but I do ask myself whether an act is in my interest if I were in the shoes of the other, having his or her preferences. This is, of course, self-interest on a higher level than immediacy. But still, extended and “hypothetical” self-interest is important in this interpretation of the Golden Rule, since self-interest is the basis of the fact that the world matters to us and that we are not indifferent about what happens in the world, to us and to any other person.

The question now becomes how we are to understand the claim that we ought to detach ourselves, not only from the narrow and egoistic self-love, but also from the extended, prudential kind of self-love. The step beyond even extended self-interest is clearly intended to be a step beyond the worldliness of the world and beyond the foundations of all human ethics. But it must also be considered as a step beyond the Golden Rule itself, since this rule, reasonably interpreted, can only be taken to mean that extended, prudential self-interest is the basis of humane ethics and duties towards oneself. But then it is a dangerous step, since it is a point of *indifference* in relation to the world. And it is difficult to see, at this point, the ethical meaning of that step.

The second part of the Works of Love

The ethical meaning becomes reasonably clear, however, when we move from the first to the second part of *Works of Love*. Having detached oneself from all prudential, humane self-love, one can now introduce a new beginning, a beginning from a new “foundational ground”: true, Christian, neighbour love. But this new premise is not wholly new; it is, so to speak, the other side of the self-renunciation-coin: it is a kind of love which is ready to sacrifice not only something, but *all* prudential self-interest for the sake of Christian truth. This does not imply that anyone who passes through the “stages” of self-renunciation will end up with the works of love. There is, it seems, a personal either-or involved in the transition.

It has been raised as a critical point against Kantian ethics that it is unable to solve moral dilemmas in a world where evil exists. Kant’s ethics is considered to be ideal in the sense that a person who, acting only on maxims permitted by the Categorical Imperative, would act in a way which would be better suited for an ideal world than the real world. The Categorical Imperative demands that we

take the standpoints of moral lawgivers and act as members of the ideal world of ends in themselves, a world in which everyone acts as a universal lawgiver. It is not obvious, however, that an act which would be right in this ideal world of universal lawgivers would also be right in the "real", empirical world. On the contrary, since most of us have a rather limited capacity to act autonomously at least in some periods of our lives, for instance when we are very young, and since we are often driven by narrow self-interest in our dealings with others, what is right under ideal conditions could be very wrong under "real" conditions. Kantian ethics, then, ought to be combined with a theory of moral development and an ethical theory suited to cases where our capacity and willingness to act from moral reasons are restricted.

Could Kierkegaard's ethics of love do the job? I am in doubt about this possibility. The ethics of the *Works of Love* is real in the sense it is designed to fit a world where evil exists, but it is not a promising candidate for a *universal* ethics in an imperfect world. The reason is that the ethics of love in Kierkegaard's book rests on the assumption that the description of the world as being in a state of sinfulness is correct. His ethics rests on dogmatic, Christian truth. But this, it could seem, is only to take the problem of evil seriously. But it goes too far, it takes it *too* seriously. There is a strong "formal" reason for this. An ethics of self-sacrifice is not possible in a world where self-sacrifice is the general rule. Universal self-sacrifice is an ethically impossible *code*, since it *needs* some egoistic or self-interested object to act on.

The "strategy" of love is not, of course, to return good with evil; nor, it seems, to return good with good; but to return evil with good. Love is, one could say, to fight evil by not presupposing it. (There is a problem here, since evil is both known and not known – but I will return to this problem.) To return evil with good is, however, a dangerous strategy, since the long and strenuous fight with evil may change the one who loves into one who, if not hates, becomes cold and disinterested. But there is a greater danger involved in self-sacrifice as a moral code, and this danger does not come from the outside, from the worldliness of the world, but from the inside. It is a consequence of a wholehearted work of love. The loving person has understood, according to Kierkegaard, that the only beneficent act one man can do to another, is to help him to stand alone, to become himself or his own.⁶ But in doing this, the helper is not allowed to seek *his*

or *her* own. To leave all prudential self-interest behind will imply that you give up all interest in being confirmed in your own personal achievements, you have indeed to give up the whole idea of personal projects.

Is it true, as Kierkegaard suggests, that this would be a futile life? His first answer is no, but then he goes on to say that this kind of life is in a certain sense completely thrown away on the existence of the other. Following the ethical code of self-sacrifice he is ready to go under as an autonomous individual, and he is changed into an efficient power in God's hand. – Could one say, then, that in helping the other to autonomy, the helper is changed into a pure means?

Knowledge

The problem of knowledge in the ethics of the *Works of Love* is located in the second part of the book. The problem concerns two things: the concept of knowledge in this work, and the role of knowledge. First, some general comments on both the concept and the role of knowledge in the *Works of Love*. The concept of knowledge in the work is determined by the role it is thought to fill. And this role is ethically motivated; i.e. knowledge has a role to fill in the fight of love against evil. Love must fight evil without being affected by it. In order to achieve this double aim love fights evil by hiding it or overlooking it. What is hidden or overlooked is of course there; it is also *known* to be there, and the problematic point is that Kierkegaard seems to think that it is possible to know that it is there, without believing it, or acquiring the belief that it is there.

The works of love are all invisible. They leave, in a strict empirical sense, everything as it is. On the other hand, they make everything old look new by interpreting the world in the light of love. In interpreting the world in the light of love, two means or methods are characterized as essential: to believe everything and to hope everything. Love, Kierkegaard says, is a *mild interpreter* in the sense that it always chooses the mildest interpretation or explanation.⁷

In order to see how love works as a mild interpreter, we must consider the three concepts *knowledge*, *belief* and *love*. Now knowledge is not used in the traditional sense of justified, true belief. This concept of knowledge is in fact absent, not only from the *Works of Love*, but also from works like the *Fragments* and the *Postscript*, though both deal to some extent with epistemic problems. To “know”

in the *Works of Love* seems equivalent to: "having the hypothesis that...", or "having the assumption that...". Knowledge is impersonal and subjectless in the sense that it is not appropriated. Knowledge is not something that I or you believe; it is only possible truth, and it is only held as possible truth.

To think of knowledge in this way is to think of it in the same way as the old sceptics thought of it. And, as with the sceptics, Kierkegaard's idea of knowledge is motivated by ethical considerations. These considerations are two kinds.

First, the sceptical concept of knowledge seems to admit the possibility of knowing about evil without being affected by it, since sceptical knowledge is knowledge without appropriation. It is explicitly stated that knowledge in the sceptical sense is of this kind: it is not knowledge, Kierkegaard says, that taints man, but suspicion or suspiciously to believe.⁸ And it is not, of course, knowledge that edifies man, but lovingly to believe.

The other consideration concerns the interpretation of the other person. According to Kierkegaard knowledge plays the role of premise-giver for belief, and it does not by itself produce or result in belief. Belief, he thinks, is not about the things we know, but about things that can explain the things we know. And this kind of belief is achieved by means of an inference. This can be illustrated by a simple example. Assume that we know about an object that has the properties A, B and C. We cannot from these properties alone infer an explanation of these properties. We need some auxiliary principle saying that the properties A, B and C are normally caused by some other, hidden property D. When we make the inference, we believe in the auxiliary principle. This inference is an inference from what is known to what is to be believed, it is an inference from "below" and it is inductive, not abductive. But it is not an inference exclusively from what is known, but from what is known with the assistance of some general, auxiliary principle.

Put in a prosaic way, we can say that love is a general, auxiliary principle guiding inferences from "below", i.e. inferences from knowledge in the Kierkegaardian sense. The difference between these inferences and inductive inferences is not located in the direction of the inferences, they are both from knowledge to belief, but in the auxiliary principles. The auxiliary principles of inductive reasoning, i.e. objective reasoning, are all based on experience and caution. Kierkegaard suggests that they consist of a mixture of love and suspi-

cion.⁹ We can say, then, that love acts as a substitute for experience, caution and other prudential, inductive inference-rules in the acquisition of belief.

W*orks of Love* presents two auxiliary principles of love: to believe everything, and to hope everything, i.e. everything good. They are guides on the way “upwards” towards belief. Assuming now that belief is acquired in this way, not necessarily as a stable disposition, but as a conviction, we must be ready to face the world again, i.e. face the possibility of deception and disappointment. But love, Kierkegaard says, believes everything – and is never deceived; it hopes for everything – and is never disappointed. This does not imply, however, that a good and loving person, according to Kierkegaard, is ignorant of deceit and other wrong acts, but the good person will only know about these things in “a certain sense”. And the sense in which he or she knows it, is by knowing about it, but without being willing to believe it. Now is this the same concept of knowledge as the one which we had before, i.e. the impersonal and subjectless kind of knowledge? It cannot be. There is, I think, one good reason for this.

Consider first the difference between now and then. In the former situation we had knowledge in the form of knowing about possible truth. Knowledge without belief. Now the good and loving person is involved in the world because he has made his judgement about it, or parts of it, guided by love. What happens to this person he or she must know about and believe, since it is known that something *definite* has happened: a deceit or another wrong act. These are no longer simple possibilities in the eyes of a good person. And Kierkegaard says, in accordance with this interpretation, that the loving person knows very well that somebody deceives him, but he is not *willing to believe it*.¹⁰ Impersonal knowledge, on the other hand, does not depend on what one is willing or not willing to believe; it is rather a question of openness to possibilities. And it is a beautiful thought, indeed, that love interprets these possibilities by means of the two guiding principles. Difficulties arise, however, the moment one gets involved in making judgements. We are then caught by the fact that our judgements have possible consequences that are fulfilled or not. By not being *willing* to believe, we seem to hide from ourselves some fact that we know very well, and we know it in the sense that we also, or really, believe it.

Interpretation guided by love is characterized by Kierkegaard as an interpretational art.¹¹ Is it an art more at home in jurisprudence than in life? If one asks a lawyer whether he or she believes that all his or her defendants are not guilty, one will probably get an answer along the following lines: I do not take all cases, the lawyer says, and very often I really believe that my defendant is not guilty, but when I have reason to believe that my defendant is guilty of the charge, my task is to make him or her look as good as possible.

Now this is a perfectly possible situation. The lawyer's position is possible because he or she is not acting on *all* that he/she believes. Some beliefs remain hidden. Kierkegaard wants to avoid doublemindedness. To be doubleminded means to want two incompatible things, for instance eternal blessedness and earthly goods. Now, in the *Works of Love* the good and loving person wants to believe the good only. But is it not true that it is impossible not to believe that a deceitful act is done, when it is known that it is done? Could it perhaps be the case that a fuzzy lawyer represents a better description of what it is to stand between good and evil, since the lawyer has no chance at all to purify his or her soul?

Notes

- 1 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, Princeton 1960, p. 119-120, transl. by D.F. Swenson and W. Lowrie. – *Afsluttende uvidenskabelig Efterskrift*, Kbh. 1963, 3. udg., 9, p. 111.
- 2 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, Kbh. 1963, 3. udg., 12, p. 23.
- 3 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., 12, p. 358.
- 4 Richard Hare: *Freedom and Reason*, Oxford 1977, p. 91.
- 5 *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, Akademie-Ausgabe, 430, footnote.
- 6 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 266.
- 7 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 280.
- 8 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 225.
- 9 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 221.
- 10 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 231.
- 11 *Kjerlighedens Gjerninger*, op. cit., p. 281.