

6

Play It Again

Kierkegaard's Repetition as Philosophy and Drama

GEORGE PATTISON

Introduction: Theatre in Kierkegaard's Life and Work

IN THIS CHAPTER, I will look at Kierkegaard's relation to theatre, leading to a discussion of the role of theatre in his *Repetition*, together with some reflections on my own experience of adapting this work for theatrical performance. As we shall see, theatre is by no means marginal to Kierkegaard's authorship, but is a constant presence in it, as it was in his life.

In a short, posthumously published book entitled *The Point of View for My Work as an Author*, Kierkegaard attempted to explain the rationale behind what many readers experienced as the mystifying complexity of his pseudonymous authorship. In this "report to history," as he called it, he said that when he wrote *Either/Or* (the first of his great pseudonymous works), he was already in the monastery.¹ Among other things, this meant that he had renounced the prospect of marriage, as well as the pursuit of an academic or church career. But his was an odd kind of

1. See Kierkegaard, *The Point of View*, 31 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, 16:20).

monastery. For, as he tells us, he made sure every day to make short visits to the theater during the period of writing *Either/Or*, arriving late in the evening and staying for five to ten minutes, just long enough to be seen. He explains that the aim of this ruse was to ensure the pseudonymity of the 800-page book he was working on, so that his contemporaries would be unable to imagine that a “lounger” who had time to go to the theater every evening could possibly be the author of what one reviewer would describe as a “monster” of a book.²

We would completely misinterpret this cunning plan, however, to think that Kierkegaard merely used the theater as a ploy in one of his social maneuvers: quite the contrary. Theatre was a central and abiding passion of his life; *Either/Or* itself contains two big essays dedicated to theatrical works: Mozart’s *Don Giovanni* and A. E. Scribe’s comedy *The First Love*. The former is a general discussion of the work without reference to any particular performance, but the latter gives us a very direct glimpse of the theatrical world with which Kierkegaard was familiar, since it is a review of a performance at Copenhagen’s Theater Royal. It is not entirely accidental that it was a play by Scribe that caught Kierkegaard’s attention, since his work was regularly presented in Copenhagen, in translations by J. L. Heiberg, himself an eminent dramatist, critic, and promoter of Hegelianism, who was campaigning to redirect the Danish theatre away from German traditions and toward French ones. Although largely forgotten today, Scribe was the most successful of all contemporary French dramatists, said to have earned more in one year than all the rest of the dramatists in France (and I believe Europe) put together. Heiberg not only translated this work and many others, but his wife Johane Luise, the diva of the Danish stage, starred in it. Later, she would be the dedicatee of Kierkegaard’s most renowned piece of writing about the theatre, “The Crisis and a Crisis in the Life of an Actress,” which in a manner entirely favorable to the actress, compared her debut performance as Juliet in her teenage years to a reprise of the same role in her thirties. *The First Love* also starred Joachim Ludvig Phister, another actor who was a particular favorite of Kierkegaard, and to whom he would also dedicate an extensive article, which would not be published, however, during Kierkegaard’s lifetime.³ *Either/Or* also included a long essay on Antigone, which despite not referring explicitly to any actual produc-

2. *Ibid.*, 58–62 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, 16:39–44).

3. Both these articles will be discussed further below.

tion, seems most likely to have been inspired by the production staged in Berlin at the time of Kierkegaard's arrival in that city in October 1841.⁴ The production had music by Mendelssohn and was widely reported in the press, while the translation was the one used by Kierkegaard in the notes that gradually developed into his own essay on *Antigone*.

The theatrical pieces included in *Either/Or* and the essays devoted to Mme Heiberg (to whom Ibsen also dedicated a rather dismally bad poem) and Herr Phister by no means exhausted Kierkegaard's writing on theatre. In 1845 he published a short critical note on an 1845 production of *Don Giovanni* at the Theater Royal. His short, novella-like work *Repetition* included an extensive discussion of a Berlin production of the farce *The Talisman*, by the Austrian Johan Nestroy, prefaced by some general remarks about the nature of theatrical art. A further "literary" pseudonymous work, *Stages on Life's Way*, ends with a set of reflections about tragedy and comedy in the context of modernity. These reflections relate back to issues broached in the essay on *Antigone* and include a discussion of whether *Hamlet* can be considered a Christian drama.⁵

Although these works comprise Kierkegaard's major writings about theatre (and, if collected, would add up to a reasonably sized book), they by no means exhaust the manifold references to dramatic works and theatrical performances that appear throughout his works, sometimes in the form of merely fugitive remarks, sometimes in fuller allusions or brief discussions. Sophocles, Shakespeare, Molière, Lessing, and Goethe are amongst the "greats" who figure in his writings, alongside Danes such as Holberg, Adam Øhlenschläger, Henrik Hertz, J. L. Heiberg, and now forgotten personalities such as Scribe and Vernoy de St. Georges. These theatrical allusions also include references to ballet—specifically to the great reformer of the Danish ballet, August Bournonville—as well as to opera, notably *Don Giovanni*.

4. At the same time, Kierkegaard was reading Hegel's *Aesthetics* in which Antigone plays a significant role. In his *Philosophy of History*, Hegel goes so far as to call her "the heavenly Antigone, the most glorious figure that has ever appeared on earth . . ." (Hegel, *Geschichte der Philosophie* I in *Werke*, 18:509). As George Steiner has demonstrated, Hegel was by no means alone in his estimation of both play and heroine. On the contrary, he seems here to express a view widely held from the late-eighteenth through to the middle of the twentieth century (Steiner, *Antigones*, 1–19). Steiner discusses Hegel's view of *Antigone* on pages 19–42 and Kierkegaard's on pages 51–66. See also my *Kierkegaard and the Quest for Unambiguous Life*, 142–70.

5. Ziolkowski, *The Literary Kierkegaard*, 183–212. The "Shakespearean" theme in this "Letter to the Reader" also includes thoughts about Romeo, Juliet, and the modern (i.e., post-Romantic) devaluation of romantic love.

The fact that Kierkegaard himself was lampooned in at least one contemporary play and, in that sense at least, also *appeared* on stage, merely underlines the extent to which dramatic literature, theatre, and those associated with it were utterly integral to his life. As we have seen, he would also venture to the theater when abroad, but there is little doubt that the Danish Royal Theater was at the center of his theatrical experience. He knew and was known to several of the main writers, directors, and actors, however slightly. Not least significant of these was J. L. Heiberg himself who, though only named Director of the Theater in 1849 (relatively late in Kierkegaard's career), had been an active and influential figure in its complex artistic politics since at least 1831 and was married to the diva of the Danish stage, Johane Luise Heiberg, applauded by Kierkegaard, Ibsen, and many others. Given Heiberg's preference for French over German theatre, it is perhaps paradoxical that he was also one of those chiefly responsible for introducing Hegelianism to Denmark and attempting to popularize it, even writing a "speculative comedy" performed on the King's birthday in 1838. In this role, he would become the object of some of Kierkegaard's most bitter philosophical barbs, although as the tribute to Mme Heiberg was in part intended to show, Kierkegaard had also greatly admired him as a man of the theatre and the witty and stylish author of a string of successful musical comedies or vaudevilles.⁶

Theatre in 1830s and 1840s Copenhagen

But what was the theatrical life in Copenhagen, in which Kierkegaard took such a keen interest?⁷ It was certainly very different from the theatrical life of London then or any contemporary European capital today. The Theater Royal was the only proper theater in the city, although there

6. Heiberg's role in the culture of the Golden Age has been foregrounded in a number of translations and edited collections by Jon Stewart. See, e.g., Stewart (ed.), *Johan Ludvig Heiberg*; Stewart (ed.), *The Heibergs and the Theater*. The present author takes a more negative view of Kierkegaard's early attitude to Heiberg's idea of the application of the dramatist's "controlled irony" to existential and theological questions. See my *Kierkegaard, Religion and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis*, 96–115. In addition to Johane Luise, Heiberg's mother, Thomasine Gyllembourg, was a significant literary figure whose work was much praised by Kierkegaard, and he was also responsible for publishing *Clara Raphael*, generally regarded as one of the first feminist novels in Scandinavia. On these women see Katalin Nun, *Women of the Danish Golden Age*.

7. The following discussion of life at the Theater Royal is dependent on Peter Tudvad's definitive treatment in his *Kierkegaards København*, 214–91.

was also a range of entertainments such as Pierrot and Pantomime shows, put on at venues such as the Tivoli Gardens (from 1843), or at open-air events such as the summertime “Deer Park” fair. But if Copenhagen had only one main theater, the range of performances on offer more than compensated for this numerical limitation. In the 1831 season, from September 1 to May 31, the Theater Royal performed approximately one hundred different productions, from across the whole range of theatrical genres, including works by “the greats” and contemporary light entertainment. Performances were held on Sundays and public holidays, with rest days only on Christmas Day, Easter Day, and Whit Sunday. A Copenhagen resident such as Kierkegaard, therefore, could soon build up a rather rich stock of theatrical experiences.

When did Kierkegaard’s own theater-going begin? Children under ten were not legally allowed in the theater until 1849, and the Danish writer Peter Tudvad consequently guesses that since Kierkegaard was born in 1813 and came from a rather conservative family, it is unlikely that he attended the theater until the late 1820s, possibly having seen Mme Heiberg’s reputation-making performance as Juliet in the 1828–29 season when he was sixteen years old. The first clear reference to a contemporary performance is from September 1834—among the earliest of all Kierkegaard’s journal notes—again to a comedy by Scribe, *Fra Diavolo*. Starting from here, Tudvad has trawled through the Theater Royal’s calendar right through to 1855, the year of Kierkegaard’s death, noting the manifold possible allusions found in Kierkegaard’s published and unpublished works to any productions he might have seen.

In a small way, I suggest, this does change our view of Kierkegaard’s own creative writing process. To take one example among many: a journal note from November 1834 (among the very earliest of Kierkegaard’s surviving notes) contains references to yet another play by Scribe, to Goethe’s *Egmont*, and a comedy by Holberg. One might have assumed that these references would have been based on reading—he was also a prolific reader—but, since Tudvad shows these plays were performed earlier in the year, Kierkegaard is as likely as not drawing on his memories of live theatrical performances.⁸ Kierkegaard, in other words, is not

8. The note (Kierkegaard, *Journals and Papers*, vol. 1: entry 118; *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, vol. 27, 102:1) also, interestingly, has a distinct theological import. Kierkegaard writes: “Doubtless the most sublime tragedy consists in being misunderstood. For this reason the life of Christ is the supreme tragedy, misunderstood as he was by the people, the Pharisees, the disciples, in short, by everybody, and this in spite of the most exalted ideas which he wished to communicate. This is why Job’s life is

just sitting in the library reading books: he is out there in the theater and writing not just on what he has read but *on what he has seen*.

Kierkegaard's Theory of Theatre

That theatre is something *seen* is a key to Kierkegaard's understanding of theatre and of the limits of theatrical art in relation to religious existence. Danish, like German, speaks of theatergoers as "spectators" rather than the English "audience" (i.e., listeners) and the "stage" itself is referred to as a "show-place." But whether or not Kierkegaard is being guided by the built-in metaphors of his native language, his theory of theatrical art is explicitly developed in relation to what was then a standard distinction between plastic and musical forms of art. The former portray their subject matter in terms of non-temporal spatial representation whereas the latter are arts of time. This distinction is already found in Lessing, with whose *Hamburg Dramaturgy* Kierkegaard was familiar, and became normative for the aesthetic theories of German Idealism, including Hegel's. This was not conceived as a simple divide, however, with architecture, sculpture, and painting on the one hand and music, poetry, and other forms of literature on the other. According to Hegel and others, poetry too—including dramatic poetry—had a visual dimension. In fact, the whole sphere of the aesthetic, as Hegel conceives it, is bounded by the definition of art as representing the idea in a form commensurate with sensuous immediacy. What art—any art, including poetry—gives us is an image, an imaginative representation of the idea that is, in itself, beyond image and representation. It is the pure productive freedom of the divine, comprising both the divine freedom of God and the finite freedom of the human being. This definition suggests both the power, necessity, and limits of the aesthetic. In fact, Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics* both begin and end by drawing attention to these limits and arguing that, in an important sense, the age of art is past. Namely, while art will continue to be made and enjoyed and will serve the education of both the human race and its individual members (in the sense of *Bildung* or "formation" current at the time), it can no longer be regarded as the "highest" interest of humanity, which, for Hegel, is now science or knowledge.

tragic; surrounded by misunderstanding friends, by a ridiculing wife, he suffers." This is followed by the illustrative examples taken from Scribe, Goethe, and Holberg. It is also more than a little striking that this kind of "tragedy" is, at many subsequent points in his career, just what Kierkegaard feels he himself had suffered.

Kierkegaard adopts much of this Hegelian approach.⁹ He too sees art as presenting the idea in sensuous form. This basic definition, however, bears manifold nuance. Thus, in his eulogy of Mme Heiberg, he argues that the role of Juliet demands more than a pretty young actress who, in her person as well as in her art, shows us a pretty and innocent young girl (even if that is all that many of the public want to see). At the time of her own debut, Mme Heiberg—Miss Pätges as she was then—had herself been a ravishing, nineteen-year-old beauty. But Kierkegaard's question is whether, as an artist, she understands the *idea* of Juliet, the *idea* of female innocence. This question is only answered when, as Kierkegaard puts it, she undergoes the metamorphosis from being a girl to being a mature woman. A successful metamorphosis is one in which it becomes clear that she has indeed grasped the idea and, by virtue of the freedom this gives her, is able to play Juliet just as well in her thirties as she did in her teens. The performance is still a matter of sensuous representation—she *shows* us Juliet—but the sensuousness of the representation is now subordinated to the freedom of the idea.¹⁰

Nevertheless, as this example also suggests, such sensuous representation is only possible in relation to ideas that are, in and of themselves, appropriate to it. In this respect, Kierkegaard seems, like Hegel, to have believed that he was living in the age of “the end of art,” although against Hegel he sees ethics and faith rather than science or knowledge as the highest interest of humanity. As he puts it in *Stages on Life's Way*, “If the age of poetry is past, the task is to seize the religious. Nothing in between will do.”¹¹ Art, the sphere of the aesthetic, takes us so far, but cannot finally give adequate representation to the trials of spiritual life in and through which human beings come to develop the heart of their God-relationship. As opposed to the Hegelians, however, he does not see science, knowledge, or citizenship as adequate to living out all that spiritual life implies. Even religion is problematic, and a further twist in Kierkegaard's “end of art” theme, is that he comes to see public religion as no less “aesthetic” than the world of art and literature. Church itself has become a kind of theatre and the preacher a kind of actor. In the last year of his life he attacked the idea of church establishment in a series of highly satirical articles and pamphlets in which he made just this point,

9. For a full discussion of Kierkegaard's relation to Hegelian aesthetics see my *Kierkegaard: The Aesthetic and the Religious*, 1–62.

10. See Kierkegaard, *Christian Discourses*, 301–26.

11. Kierkegaard, *Stages on Life's Way*, 415 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, 6:384).

commenting that the clergy never seem to think that the traditional ban on burying actors in consecrated ground applies to them. Preachers, like poets, have come to see their task in terms of offering pictorial images of spiritual doctrines, and instead of calling their congregations to faith and action they offer them “quiet hours” in which to contemplate the soothing images that their preaching conjures forth.¹² (As an aside, we may note that this was indeed just what contemporary homiletic theory said should be the preacher’s task.)

Theatre in *Repetition*

Unlike many religious iconoclasts, however, Kierkegaard does not see the end of art as requiring the burning of books or the closing of theaters. As long as it remains within its proper limits and does not seek to become a substitute religion (as Kierkegaard and many others saw happening in Romanticism), art has a good, proper, and even necessary role in human life. His short, pseudonymous book *Repetition* contains one of the clearest passages in his work regarding this positive evaluation of the continuing role of art, a passage that may justly be called a celebration of theatrical art. The argument is rather straightforward but has significant connections to the entire network of Kierkegaard’s major philosophical and theological themes and, in this respect, provides an exceptionally helpful perspective on these themes.

Through the pen of his pseudonym Constantin Constantius, Kierkegaard argues that theatre has a special affinity to the stage of life that we would, perhaps, call adolescence. We have already seen that in Kierkegaard’s own lifetime there was some debate as to what was an appropriate age at which to allow young people to start attending the theater. In this context, Kierkegaard’s argument seems to favor a liberal approach. Theatre is not only permissible for young people: it is extremely desirable. Why? Because while theatrical representation appeals directly to the sensuousness that is the dominant element of their lives as children, it also gives them, via their sympathetic identification with the *dramatis personae* of the stage, an anticipatory experience of the multiplicity of possible roles that will become open to them as adults. Moreover, precisely because these are merely theatrical representations,

12. For a discussion of how this relates to the Danish homiletics of the time see my *Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Nineteenth Century*, 172–79.

they do not fall under the aegis of morality or ethics. For the time of the theatrical performance, there is no moral damage in identifying oneself with the robber chief or even Richard III or Lady Macbeth. These are all possibilities, but the fact that we entertain them as spectators does not mean that we accept or would accept them as actualities. The sphere of the ideal is, as a whole, the sphere of possibility—a point that would be central in Kierkegaard's criticism of Hegelian claims to base knowledge of God on the structure of human ideation. Such knowledge can never give more than possibility. Possibility is crucial. It is the dawn of freedom in the human spirit. But it is not, in this sense, the actuality of spirit. It must be actualized or made real through freedom and decision. But back to the theatre: by trying out the broadest possible multiplicity of roles—and we have seen how many roles the Theater Royal offered its audiences every year—the young person is educated in possibility and, in this way, educated in freedom. As the passage concludes, there comes a time when we must leave the theatre behind, the shadows of the stage flee away, and we are faced with the cold light of everyday, bourgeois reality in which we must learn to be who we are. Yet our lives as citizens and even, perhaps, as religious persons, will be all the more serious the more we realize that our task as adults is, precisely, to be the roles we choose for ourselves. Theatre teaches us just what it means to be in role, but we have then to choose our role and step forth in it onto life's stage.

In *Repetition*, the eulogy of theatre is contextualized in a discussion of the farces performed at Berlin's Königstädter Theater. As the text makes clear, this is not the kind of theatrical experience that theorists of high art usually spend much time discussing. But it is not accidental that just this genre is the focus of our discussion here.

But what is this passage doing in this extraordinary book, that is a bit like a novella and a bit like a work of philosophy? If *Repetition* is "about" anything, it is about time and the relationship between time and eternity. It begins with the question of whether motion is possible. As it soon becomes clear, this implies the further question regarding the meaning of that particular kind of motion that is a human being's existence in time. Does this mean, as Heraclitus suggested, that we are handed over to a chaotic flux of unrepeatable experiences, or is it possible for us to develop a coherent and sustainable identity through time, to develop a self, or in nineteenth-century language, to exist as spirit? Constantin does not attempt to argue the issue philosophically, but sets up a series of experiments. Perhaps the most serious of these—with obvious

connections to Kierkegaard's own current life crisis—is whether it is possible for a young man who has broken off his engagement to get back together with his jilted lover. But this primary “repetition” is illustrated more humorously when Constantin takes a trip to Berlin to see if he can relive his past experiences in that city—including the experience of farce at the Königstädter. The significance of farce emerges if, keeping in mind Heraclitus' saying that we cannot step twice into the same stream, we attend to Constantin's account of the effect farce has on him.

Thus did I lie in my box, discarded like a swimmer's clothing, stretched out beside the stream of laughter and unrestraint and applause that ceaselessly foamed by me. I could see nothing outside the space of the theater, hear nothing but the noise in which I was living, only emerging now and again, seeing Beckmann and laughing myself weary till I once more sank back, exhausted, beside that foaming stream.¹³

Precisely because farce lacks the structure of tragedy and more conventional forms of comedy, it is the purest possible theatrical representation of sheer flux, the pure flow of time itself. Therefore, it is the genre best suited to test the question: is repetition possible?

Here, as in his other experiments, Constantin's attempt ends in failure. The young man doesn't get his fiancée back and he himself is not moved to laughter as he was on the occasion of his last visit to the Königstädter. In his view, this demonstrates that repetition is not possible and that human beings are delivered over to the sheer flux of becoming and thrown towards death, as his twentieth-century reader Martin Heidegger would put it. He ends the first part of the book with a eulogy of the post-horn, which, as he says, is incapable of blowing the same note twice. It should be mentioned that this is not Kierkegaard's own position. Nevertheless, it does serve him to point us to where exactly the issue of faith lies. Are we, in the end, just products of time and no more, or are we creatures who live by virtue of a relation to the Eternal, to God?

Conclusion

Kierkegaard's pseudonymous writings are an attempt to address such questions in ways that shake us out of the too-easy conventions of academic discourse on religion. They include works that, like *Repetition*, are

13. Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, 166 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, 4:40–41).

novel-like in structure and form, works of satire, and works that frankly are virtually impossible to classify. Yet, interestingly, Kierkegaard never published any dramatic work. He had, as a student, written an Aristophanic satire on the Hegelian fad to which many of his fellow students had succumbed, and his journals contain a number of short dialogues, mostly of a comic or satirical nature.¹⁴ As has been mentioned, one of the most substantial pieces of theatrical writing he wrote was a study of the actor J. L. Phister in the role of Captain Scipio, written in 1848. Captain Scipio serves in the Papal Police and therefore represents the dignity of a uniform that has both political and ecclesiastical elements. Yet his job also involves the very undignified task of looking after the drains, and what gives the character particular comic effect is that he is constantly tipsy, balanced at the very edge of being drunk without ever actually being so. It is his mastery of expressing these comic contradictions that Kierkegaard finds so impressive in Scipio's performance.¹⁵ Yet, if Kierkegaard's writings belie his reputation as "the melancholy Dane" by their fascination with the comic and the many funny passages they contain, even at times using brief dialogue forms, he always stops short of fully dramatized comedy.¹⁶

Yet I have long been convinced that his own writing was deeply shaped by his experience of theatergoing. Furthermore, in terms of his own aesthetic theories, he is seeking, like the dramatist, to *show* us just what the various possible positions vis-à-vis the decision of faith look like when taken out of theology textbooks and "staged" in life. In a well-known article from the 1920s, Martin Thust compared Kierkegaard's authorship with a puppet theatre in which each pseudonym enacted a very particular and definite role.¹⁷ Whether or not the analogy entirely fits, it does flag up both the appeal and the limits of reading Kierkegaard under the rubric of "theatricality." On the one hand, Kierkegaard insists on showing what the ideas at issue in his works might look like if they are adopted by individual personae and lived out as real human possibilities. On other hand, he simultaneously treats each idea as somehow complete and finished in itself; although his characters and ideas interact

14. On the "cult" of Aristophanes in the early nineteenth century, see Ziolkowski, *The Literary Kierkegaard*, 55–86.

15. See Kierkegaard, *Christian Discourses*, 327–44 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*, 16:126–43).

16. On Kierkegaard's use of the comic, see Lippitt, *Humour and Irony*.

17. See Thust, "Das Marionettentheater."

or, at least, get juxtaposed, they do not essentially develop through this interaction and their scope is strictly defined from the start.¹⁸ It is this, I think, that Thust is aiming at by talking of a puppet-theatre rather than drama as such.

In 2013, I directed an adaptation of *Repetition* that was performed at John's College, Oxford, on April 25 and 26. If this practical theatrical experience is allowed to be fed back into our reflections on Kierkegaard's own text, it soon became clear during rehearsal that, precisely as *dramatis personae*, figures such as Constantin Constantius and the Young Man of *Repetition* have the potential for development and transformation that a strict application of Kierkegaard's own principles might not allow.¹⁹ That is to say, they have more breadth, depth, and credibility than the surface of the text at first seems to allow. They are less ciphers and more the germs of fully rounded existential characters.²⁰ Perhaps, being more informed by his own theater-going than he may have known, Kierkegaard's authorship is, despite everything, an essay in a kind of dramatic art.

Bibliography

- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Philosophie der Geschichte* I. In vol. 18 of *Werke*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.
- Herman, Wladimir. *Kierkegaards Sidste Dage*. Publication details unknown. Performed at Bellevue Theatre, Copenhagen, 1982.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *Christian Discourses/The Crisis and a Crisis in the Life of an Actress*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- . *Fear and Trembling/Repetition*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- . *Journals and Papers*. 2 vols. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1967, 1970.

18. In one early journal entry, for example, he objects to Lenau's Faust committing suicide, an act, he says, which doesn't fit with the essential idea of Faust; namely, that Faust represents doubt but not despair. See Kierkegaard, *Journals and Notebooks*, AA: 38, 44 (*Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter* 17, AA: 38, 44); references are to journal entry not page numbers.

19. Other adaptations of Kierkegaard's works or aspects of his life for the stage include Piper, *The Seducer*; Herman, *Kierkegaards Sidste Dage* (*Kierkegaard's Last Days*); Nagy, *The Seducer's Diary* (in *Hungarian Plays: New Drama from Hungary*); Poole, *All Women and Quite a Few Men are Right*.

20. The same can be said of other personages from the pseudonymous works. See the continuation of the story of Assessor Vilhelm in my *Kierkegaard and the Quest for Unambiguous Life*, 171–93.

- . *The Point of View*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- . *Søren Kierkegaards Skrifter*. Edited by Niels Jørgen Cappelørn et al. Copenhagen: Gad, 1997–.
- . *Stages on Life's Way*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Lippitt, John. *Humour and Irony in Kierkegaard's Thought: Climacus and the Comic*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 2000.
- Nagy, Andras. *The Seducer's Diary*. In *Hungarian Plays: New Drama from Hungary*. Edited by László Upor. London: Hern, 1996.
- Nun, Katalin. *Women of the Danish Golden Age: Literature, Theater and the Emancipation of Women*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2013.
- Pattison, George. *Kierkegaard: The Aesthetic and the Religious: From the Magic Theatre to the Crucifixion of the Image*. London: SCM, 1998.
- . *Kierkegaard and the Quest for Unambiguous Life. Between Romanticism and Modernism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- . *Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- . *Kierkegaard, Religion and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Piper, Myfanwy. *The Seducer*. London: Duckworth, 1958.
- Poole, Roger. *All Women and Quite a Few Men Are Right*. Unpublished. Performed at the Netherbow Arts Centre, Edinburgh Festival, 1986.
- Steiner, George. *Antigones*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Stewart, Jon, ed. *The Heibergs and the Theater: Between Vaudeville, Romantic Comedy and National Drama*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2012.
- , ed. *Johan Ludvig Heiberg: Philosopher, Littérateur, Dramaturge, and Political Thinker*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2008.
- Thust, Martin. "Das Marionettentheater Søren Kierkegaards." *Zeitwende* 1 (1925) 18–38.
- Tudvad, Peter. *Kierkegaards København*. Copenhagen: Politiken, 2004.
- Ziolkowski, Eric. *The Literary Kierkegaard*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2011.