



AENSI Journals

Journal of Applied Science and Agriculture

ISSN 1816-9112

Journal home page: www.aensiweb.com/JASA



Kierkegaard and Modalities of Human Existence

¹Zabihollah Bahrami, ²Mohammad Sadegh Zahedi, ³Hossein Houshang

¹Ph.D Student, Department of Comparative Philosophy, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University Tehran, Iran.

²Assistant professor of philosophy, Department of Islamic Philosophy, Imam Khomeini International University Qazvin, Iran.

³Associate Professor of Philosophy, Imam Sadiq University Tehran, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 June 2014

Received in revised form 25 July 2014

Accepted 20 September 2014

Available online 1 October 2014

Keywords:

Kierkegaard, aesthetic sphere, religious sphere, love.

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses Kierkegaard's viewpoints concerning man's three existential spheres, that is, aesthetic sphere, ethical sphere, and religious sphere. Kierkegaard's thinking on human existential spheres is not irrelevant to his personal stages of living and his intellectual foundations. He is a subtle thinker who does not want to find present a merely theoretical system for the lives of all the humans, unlike previous and contemporary philosophers. Rather, he values the individuals and the unique characteristics of each individual. He considers life as something entirely individual, something that depends on an individual's states of mind such as awareness, selection, and continuous decision-making. Kierkegaard considers aesthetic sphere as the lowest order of human existence, and he maintains that an individual can experience the existence at a higher order, that is, the ethical and religious spheres which entail commitment, responsibility, and love, by finding such elements as consciousness and selection.

© 2014 AENSI Publisher All rights reserved.

To Cite This Article: Zabihollah Bahrami, Mohammad Sadegh Zahedi, Hossein Houshang, Kierkegaard and Modalities of Human Existence. *J. Appl. Sci. & Agric.*, 9(16): 66-73, 2014

INTRODUCTION

Soren Aabye Kierkegaard (1813-1855) was born in Copenhagen, Denmark... Kierkegaard's life was influenced by his father's conditions; some people believe that the accident which happened to Kierkegaard's father greatly influenced the lives of both the father and his son, Soren. In addition, Some Kierkegaard commentators such as caputo believe that some of his works were prompted by his sudden breakup with his fiancée Regine Olsen, and that some of his works were his explanations to her. Kierkegaard died on November 11, 1855. On the point of his death, he did not allow any priest to perform the religious rites for funeral service

With all his powers, Kierkegaard nourished a wish to subvert Christianity, but he maintained that the real 'original Christianity' was the enemy of the materialism of 'the Christian world'. After Munster died, Kierkegaard led the fight against the body of priests and the whole 'Christian world' all alone.

Kierkegaard holds that life satisfaction does not depend on the confirmation of others. Although he secured the agreement and satisfaction of others, he was not satisfied with himself when he was alone. He, therefore, advised that we should know ourselves more and more in order to obtain satisfaction with life.

Prior to knowing anything, man should know himself. When man has an internal knowledge of himself, he can then find peace, and meaning may shoe itself in life.

Existence:

According to existentialists, existence is the particular trait or attribute of man, and it is merely applicable to him. In their viewpoints, 'to exist' originally means 'to seek out', or, 'to stand out', which applies to mankind, and not other creatures or existents. Heidegger maintains that 'a rock is, an animal is, an angel is, God is, but only man exists'.

Kierkegaard distinguishes the intrinsic existence From what is called existence by negligent usage; the intrinsic existence, he says, is true for a person who wills his eternal responsibility out of complete self-consciousness. Kierkegaard's general principle can be described as action and life rather than mere theory and knowledge, individual accompaniment and decision rather than neutral objectivity without participation.

Kierkegaard considers existence, that is, the individual original existing as the center of gravity of his philosophical thinking and contrasts it with the crowd or masses, and writes:

Corresponding Author: Zabihollah Bahrami, Ph.D Student, Department of Comparative Philosophy, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University Tehran, Iran.

«Masses are everything and nothing, the most dangerous powers and the most meaningless, the category of masses is the mirage of contemplation that deludes individuals into feeling arrogant, since everyone can attribute this monstrous multitude to himself

A crowd- any crowd, rather than this or that crowd. The crowd that is now or the crowd that once was, not a crowd consisting of low or high people, not a crowd consisting of rich or poor people, and so forth- is in essence without truth because it renders individuals audacious and irresponsible, or at least, it reduces them to a part of the whole, undermining the sense of their responsibility.

Kierkegaard does not deny the masses or the multitudes, but he ascribes originality to the individuals, and he does not accept the concept of collective or corporate man since he believes that life belongs to the individuals and their individual decisions will-power rather than their community.

«Individuality has passed its time, and it is not the time for it, and every theoretical philosopher identifies with humanity as a whole, and in this way, something grows infinitely big, and at the same time, nothing

Subjectivity is Truth:

Descartes considers the universe as the representation of man's mind, and maintains that what guarantees the objectivity of this picture is God's sincerity, that God is not a deceiver. To Descartes, mind is the mirror of nature. Mind presents the images of things in the outside world, along with the real time and place of the universe, together with its substances and events, to itself. Nevertheless, the real place of the universe does exist independently of its representation and its perception, as a creature depends only on God for its existence. Philosophers after Descartes, such as rationalist philosophers Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibniz, and such empirical philosopher as Berkeley, Locke, and Hume became involved in problems and questions he had raised. In the course of this mode of thinking, Kant comes to the fore, and epistemology reaches its apex. By writing, 'critique of pure Reason', he seeks to present a systematic model for the determination of conditions and limits of knowledge, and in particular, the knowledge of mankind. In this way, philosophy is reduced to studies of knowledge. Studying how to know the universe and the things became the unique territory of philosophy recognized by science.

Kierkegaard rises against this epistemological system of philosophy and other holistic movements. In Kierkegaard's view, gathering some abstract concepts in accordance with the principles of reason in order to provide an intellectual system for the justification of universe and man and the origins of both, is fanciful, and in some respects, ridiculous. Man is not the founder of truth, and he can not be such a founder. This is the truth that encompasses man, and man is encompassed in it.

In his thinking, truth is something totally intrinsic and individual, free from theories and intermental or cross-mental theory making. «The most important thing is to find the truth which is the truth for me. I should look for the meaning or idea for which I desire to live and die. What's ever the good of finding a so-called objective truth, or of perusing the philosopher-made systems and, if necessary, taking them to task for their fallacies and contradictions and inconsistencies? And what's the good of being able to theorize about the government and combine all the components in a whole and make a world in which I am not supposed to live but to hold up for others to see? What's the good of being able to put forth the meaning of Christianity, what's the good of being able to explain many isolated facts if they don't have a deeper meaning for me and for my life?

Kierkegaard says that it is wrong to put emphasis on what each person believes and whether the belief is false or not, since, contrary to philosophers' expectations, it is impossible to determine if a belief is false or not. Instead of asking whether a person's belief is right or false, we should ask if the subject has an appropriate relationship with his beliefs or not. Is the relationship 'true'? Is the person enthusiastically and whole-heartedly committed to this belief? This means passing from the objective truth to the subjective truth.

Individualism:

Kierkegaard's thinking is based on the individual. He gives paramount in life to the individual. Or rather, he thinks that life originates in individuals. Kierkegaard's motivations for paying attention to the individual stem from religion, and he is inspired by the Aquinian and Lutheran conception of the lone individual in the presence of God. He believes that the paramountcy of our uniqueness is a function of standing in the presence of God, similar to standing before the absolute brightness of a white light, where masks fall down and we have to be undisguised and straight forward with and by ourselves.

Kierkegaard complains about the way of thinking by his contemporary people since the general attitude to man and to the universe is collectivistic due to the dominance of contemporary philosophies such as the Hegelian philosophy, and consequently, man is not recognized as an individual but a creature with a merely social existence and with a life and developments in his life which are considered to be completely social.

«In the continual sociability habit-forming of our age, people have become so indifferent to loneliness that they know no other use for it than a punishment for criminals. Anyway, the truth is that to have spirits is a crime

in our age. Therefore, it is natural for such people, I mean the lovers of loneliness, to be classified as criminals.
»

The utmost paramount of the individual, on the whole, can be perceived in Kierkegaard's famous epigram: «If ever my grave is to have an epitaph, I prefer the inscription: 'That individual'»

Life spheres:

For the life of an individual, Kierkegaard develops a dialectics in the process of which the individual can obtain the higher-order stages of life. In the process of passage in the life spheres, spirit takes the form of individuality, and passage from a sphere to another one takes place by an aware selection and through the willpower and through action rather than pure thinking.

«None of the great men in the world will be forgotten. However, each of these great ones has had his own specific magnificence, and his magnificence has been proportional to the magnificence of the object of his love: A person who loved himself, his greatness has come from himself, and a person who loved other humans, his greatness originates in his devotion, but a person who loved God has a greatness above others.»

In his work, 'Either/or', his first book under a pseudonym in two volumes winning fame for him, Kierkegaard talks of three main options which can serve as the guiding principles of life for an individual. Simply put, his three options are: According to option one, the individual lives for himself. In option two, the individual lives for others, and in option three, the individual lives for God/ Kierkegaard calls these spheres of life, the aesthetic, the ethical, and the religious spheres respectively.

Kierkegaard believes that these spheres have orders (of importance). He maintains that the individual can move from a lower order to a higher one through his selection and action. The aesthetic sphere is the lowest sphere of life. The ethical sphere stands at a higher order, and finally, the religious sphere is the highest sphere of life. One of the key words in Kierkegaard's philosophy is the concept of selection or choice, and its importance can be easily perceived from the title of his famous work 'Either/or'. Kierkegaard's phrase implies that the aesthetic sphere is not, in the first instance, a sphere which has been selected, but rather, it is a sphere in which selection can be made, In one sense, 'Either/or' means that either the individual does not make a selection in which case he has an aesthetic and pleasurable [hedonistic] life or he makes a selection in which case his life is based on selection. 'Either/or' is not, in the first instance, a matter of choice between good and evil, but it is a selection which entails both good and evil together, or else, neither good nor evil.

Aesthetic sphere:

The aesthetic sphere is the sphere in which the individual lives for himself, and in which he does not adhere to any rule or principle save the principle of pleasure. Kierkegaard considers the domain of existential aesthetics as the sphere of 'natural man' or 'the psychosomatic self' as J Preston Cole puts it, this self can be considered to be 'the dative self'?

An aesthete does not make selection and decisions in his way of living because he thinks that any selection will bring about remorse. «If you marry, you will regret, and if you don't marry, you will regret. Whether you marry or not, you will feel sorry about it. If you laugh at the folly of the world, you will be sorry, and if you cry over the folly of the world, you will be sorry again. At any rate, whether you laugh at or cry over the folly of the world, you will regret doing it. If you trust a girl, you will regret, and if you don't trust her, you will still regret. Anyway, you will regret whether you trust a girl or not.

In the aesthetic sphere, the aesthete looks for the meaning of 'self' outside himself. In addition to looking for sensory pleasure and finding himself like a passive victim of external forces such as destiny, the aesthete looks for 'the self' outside himself, and this causes a distance between the aesthetic sphere and the reality, and the distance is increased by abstract philosophical systems such as the Hegelian philosophy. Such a comprehensive abstract system which wishes to assume the existence of the individual in a historical background? Separate from his environment.

From the view point of Kierkegaard, the abstract intellectual philosophy tends to limit itself to the aesthetic sphere. To him, life is the very thing that is going on, rather than the thing that is studied intellectually.

Existence is not, definitely, a philosophical system with a new perspective taken from life. Man's insight and undressing can never remain outside the totality of life and look at it as an observer, in a way other things outside the self are observed. Kierkegaard maintains that pure thinking is a delusive perspective, although he does not deny the value of man's reason.

The ethical sphere:

The ethical sphere is a sphere in which the individual about other and lives for others. In the Hegelian philosophy, this entails the evolution [perfection] of universal consciousness individuals only represent their own age, and there is no room for the individual's specific tough's and motivations. In order to perfect himself, a person has to make selections, and this objective and historical evaluation cannot lead to the individual's transcendence.

«what magnifies me is the thing I do rather than the thing that happens to me, and no about, no one will be magnified because of winning the grand lottery.»

Kierkegaard says: since selection is an absolute selection, 'Either / or' is also absolute. In one sense, 'Either/or' depends on selection..... I just want to convince you of the principle that when selection is necessary, express yourselves and pay attention to the existential sphere which is ethically qualified.... This selection is the only way through which a person can maintain his spirit and vanquish the whole being and enjoy the world without any misconduct.

Characteristics of the ethical sphere:

In his book 'Fear and trembling' Kierkegaard discusses the qualities and characteristics of the ethical sphere. These qualities can be formulated as follows:

1. The ethical is, in itself, general and universal.
2. The ethical is essentially inner- abiding, and it does not have a purpose or end outside itself, and it is the end of anything outside it.
3. The ethical mission of the individual is the permanent expression of himself in the universal and the annulment of his individuality to transform into the universal.
4. As soon as the individual demands his individuality of the universal, he commits a sin, and only if he confesses his sin, he can reconcile with the universal
5. After entering into the universal, if the individual feels like demanding his individuality, he will be entrapped by temptation, and it is not possible to escape from the temptation save by remorse and surrender to the universal.
6. The ethical does know anything by the name of chance or sentimentality.
7. The ethical does not resort to experience.
8. The ethical does not play jokes on virtues, and it assigns heavy responsibilities on the weak shoulders of a hero.
9. The ethical asks man to believe the reality and to have the courage to fight all the difficulties and hard ships.
10. The ethical warns against the acceptance of the complicated computations of the reason or intellect, which are even more deceitful and more elusive than ancient oracles. The ethical warns against any untimely esteem.

Ethics and the religious:

Kierkegaard believes that the religious (that is, Christian) ethics is a gift, and it is a kind of life involvement to respond to this gift,

Abiding by the principles and instructions of the Christian canon law is considered by him to be an appropriate response to this Divine gift. For example, love for others can be based on the religious precept 'thou shall love thy neighbor as thou lowest thyself', or else, it can be based on a non- religious love. Kierkegaard maintains that 'Christian love is a bridge between the temporal and the eternal.

He believes that the reason for so much emphasis on love for neighbors is that it is related to eternity when we love others, we should be responsible for them, and it is this responsibility that connects the individual to eternity.

Kierkegaard holds that love can liberate the individual in one sense and can control him in another sense. The love Kierkegaard has in mind is the religious ethics, i. e. , the precept 'Thou shall love the neighbor'. In this way, the individual is kept under control, in the one hand, with complete obedience to this ethical precept as a religious obligation, and he is connected to eternity and qualified for infinite freedom, in the other hand, in obedience to this religious teaching.

The word 'ethics', and its meanings in the ethical sphere

Like the words 'aesthetics', and 'religion', the word 'ethics' has more than one meaning in Kierkegaard's writings. The term has been used in two senses:

An existential sphere or stage which is annulled by a higher of religious life.

A mode of life which is annulled in the religious life.

The first meaning of ethics

In the first sense, ethics is equivalent to ethics in the Hegelian thinking, that is, the customs and traditional habits- In this sense, ethics is an international issue, or rather, a dominant social norm. Social norms seem to be the highest frame of reference to make a judgment in human affairs. In this kind of ethics, nothing is superior to social norms. In this sense of ethics, even a human sacrifice is justified as a service to the society; when Agamemnon tries to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia, he becomes a hero in the famous tragedy because a human sacrifice is needed for the success of the Greek mission sent to troy.

According to Kierkegaard, going beyond the aesthetic sphere and setting foot in the ethical sphere, even in the first meaning, is possible for the aesthete only when he reaches the point of explosion in his growing stream of disappointment in a way that he enthusiastically wants to select his true self and he wants to know what causes the destruction of his ill and decrepit self.

An interesting point in the first meaning of ethics is that the seemingly ethical duties and obligation, which have not been created through the individual's conscious selection and which have been formed out of habit and blind obedience, cannot be covered by the first meaning of ethics. Another point in the first meaning of ethics according to Kierkegaard's terminology is that abiding by the religious ethical precepts entails a sort of ethical task-orientation, and this ethical life is 'to live with the internal enthusiasm', i. e. 'the very communion with God. This relationship is not a distant relationship on the basis of religious teachings derived from spiritless experiences similar to Kant's task-orientation.'

The task-orientation that Kierkegaard has in mind in the religious ethics is not on the basis of reason alone. It is, rather, based on the individual's close relationship with the infinite which he refers to as love. In the Kantian task-orientation, however, the individual's feelings and emotions are not involved in doing one's ethical duties.

As for the other kind of ethics, i.e. the ethics derived from the virtues of a society which is not religious, it can be said that abiding by the universal in such an ethics as an obligation has more affinity with Kant's task-orientation, since the ethical norms of this kind of ethics as a universal are merely an intellectual process.

b)The second meaning of ethics:

To Kierkegaard, ethics in its second sense means the distinction between good and evil for the determination of values, not through social norms, but through God. Ultimately, definition and determination of values and the distinction between good and evil by God will be superior to any human definition and determination.

In order to show the difference between the ethics in the first meaning and the ethics in the second meaning, Kierkegaard uses the story of Abraham who tries to sacrifice his son.

Kierkegaard considers ethics in the first meaning as a temptation for Abraham the prince of faith, as Kierkegaard puts it, and he considers ethics in the second meaning as a task or obligation for him.

«But what does temptation mean? It usually refers to something that prevents man from doing his obligations. Here (in the story of Abraham), temptation is the ethics in its first meaning because it tries to prevent Abraham from doing what God.»

The religious sphere:

The religious sphere is the sphere in which the individual lives for God. Kierkegaard considers all the three spheres acceptable options, and the individual can choose any sphere to live in.

Kierkegaard's personal selection is, however, the religious sphere.

Based on his thinking principles, he looks at the truth of religion and criticizes the images and profiles of religion presented up to his time. He does not regard the Christian faith as the rumination of Christ's teachings. In his opinion, the Christian teaching is an intense intra individual aspiration, which cannot be materialized through human fabrications or through the administration of a priest. Based on his different thinking on the truth of Christianity, he rises against his contemporary official Christianity, and ultimately, he boycotts every church activity.

«Whoever you are, whatever your life is, my friend, stop going to church and don't take part in the religious public services in the way they are now.(and it is claimed that the New Testament Christianity is nothing other than this) lest you commit more sins, great sins. You should not take part in a show which ridicules God.»

Kierkegaard does not regard Christianity as a doctrine. He does not mean, of course, that Christianity lacks opinions. In his book, 'the postscript, he maintains that Christianity is not a philosophical doctrine which has to be understood by means of intellectual theories, since Christ was not a philosopher, and the Apostles were not a small community of scientists, Christianity is a doctrine whose materialization is possible, and desirable, in the domain of 'being', and therefore if it is considered merely types of religiousness theoretically, it might not be known.

Type A religiousness:

According to Kierkegaard, Type A religiousness is a universal and general religiousness. This type of religiousness is a way of religious life that most religious people in any religion have. This type of religiousness is indeed unconditional obedience of a set of religious teachings. Therefore, Type A religiousness might be seen in the life of an idolater.

On this type of religiousness, Kierkegaard says that «Type A religiousness can exist in atheism, and this type of religiousness can exist even in Christianity for any person who is not a devout Christian whether he has been baptized or not.»

Type B religiousness:

Type B religiousness is a higher- order religiousness. As Kierkegaard is concerned with the faith of Christianity and the truth of Christianity, he considers this higher- order religiousness 'to be Christian', and in his opinion, to be a Christian is the individual's involvement in type B religiousness and the secondary ethics. One of the characteristics type B religiousness is the leap of faith. To Kierkegaard, type B religiousness and the secondary ethics, as a form of the religious sphere , are obtained through the leap of faith for the individual. Other characteristics of type B religiousness is that it is paradoxical- this characteristics is absent in type A religiousness which is more universal and more superficial. Concerning type B religiousness and Christianity (as type B religiousness), Johannes Climacus says that type A religiousness is not specifically the Christian religiousness since it is not a paradoxical religiousness.

Faith:

Kierkegaard was continuously thinking to find out the truth of Christianity. Ultimately, he found the truth of Christianity in the leap of faith, but in his opinion, faith is not the conventional faith.

The explanation he presents for faith is in a way that it will be very difficult to gain faith, if not impossible.

According to Kierkegaard, the value of faith lies in the fact that it realizes the 'self' of the individual in the highest order of 'self'. The realization of 'self' in faith is not, of course, like the realization of the aesthetic self which remains in indecision, nor is it like the realization of the ethical self which is limited to the universal and its rules. The realization of self by means of faith is the highest value because it derives from the willpower of subject, and because it directs the individual from finite to the border of infinity in relation to God. Subject is the aware synthesis of finite and infinity ,that relates the self to the self, and functions to become its own self , which is feasible only through communion with god.

Risking and the leap to faith:

Kierkegaard uses the phrase 'risking and the leap to faith' in relation to the true faith (that is, the transcended faith), with the risking being related to the infinite, which entails the realization of 'the transcended self '. He maintains that risking is useful for a person who nourishes the realization and the exaltation of 'self '. By not risking the individual is likely to lose the realization and the exaltation of the whole of his existence. In this regard, Kierkegaard says that <<...from the world's perspective, risking is dangerous. Why? Because it might lead to losing. However, not risking is noxious and sly. By not risking, moreover, it is horribly easy to lose what is difficult to lose even in the most precarious gamblessince, if my risk was not calculated, the life would come to my assistance by punishing me, but if I don't risk at all, who will come to my assistance? Besides, what will happen if I lose myself by obtaining all the earthly advantages through not risking in the highest sense of the word (and risking in the highest sense of the word) in order to precisely know my own self?>>

«Without risking, there is no faith. Faith is exactly the contradiction between the inner infinite enthusiasm and the objective uncertainty.» If I am able to perceive God. Objectively, I will not have faith any longer, and exactly because I am not able to so, I have to believe in Him.

Paradox and faith:

When Kierkegaard sets forth the question discussion of paradox in relation to faith, he does not mean the mere faith because faith does not innately entail paradox, but the faith (i. e., truth) becomes paradoxical in relation to the existent individual ,and moreover, faith is not always paradoxical in relation to the individual, but the paradox emerges when the individual, in this relation, tries to kindle the torch of reason by the flame of faith.

The author of 'Fear and trembling' consider Abraham's faith the superior faith, and the reason for this superiority lies in the paradox of Abraham's faith and action. It is this paradox that can make a holy and Godly deed out of a crime. The paradox that gives back Isaac [Ishmael, according to the account in Muslim traditions] to Abraham is a paradox which cannot be explained away by any argument since faith begins exactly where reason ends.

Love and eternity:

In 'works of love', Kierkegaard maintains that is a bridge between time and eternity. Although he talks of types of love he believes that the root of every human love is the love for God since God is the one who planted love in the existence of man. Concerning the relationship between love and reason, he says that «. love is prior to intellectuality and it remains and continues after it.»

In the true or religious love as a relation, Kierkegaard believes, the individual does not seek himself or his own desires, and even forgoes the 'self'. «Love does not seek 'the self' since there is no 'I and you' in the (true) love. I and you in love are merely the requirements for the relation itself. Consequently, if there is no 'I and you', there can't be a self, either. Then, if there isn't any self at all, it will be impossible for the individual to seek himself on love.»

In the individual's love for God, this relation is deeper than his love for another man since, in Kierkegaard's opinion, «just as a calm lake has a deep fountain in its hidden depth, a loving man has in a mysterious way a love God in his depth of existence.» Kierkegaard considers enthusiasm one of the characteristics of the individual's life. In his opinion, individuals who lead a life without enthusiasm, and merely on the basis of tasks and obligations do not have an existence or an original being. He even prefers the life of an aesthete who bases his life on enthusiasm to the life in either of two spheres without any enthusiasm. He maintains that «Let others complain that age is the age of evil and atrocity. My complaint, however, is that our age is the age of wretchedness because it does not have enthusiasmAt least, I feel that those who express hatred, those who express love, those who kill their enemies, those who damn their descendants generation after generation, and those who sin, are humans.» (p82)[.....]

Conclusion:

Kierkegaard is a theologian thinker who does not choose the thinking for the making of theoretical closed systems. He is not a systematic philosopher who wants to develop an intellectual framework. He is, rather, a thinker who considers the value of thinking on the basis of open action. In other words, Kierkegaard is the philosopher of life. Kierkegaard is an individualist philosopher. He looks for a way of living in which the individual is able to achieve his true self.

To Kierkegaard, man's existential sphere are not distinct and isolated things. They are, rather, interconnected, and each sphere paves the way for the realization of another sphere. To him, an aesthete seeks only sensory pleasures, but at the same time, he does not want to involve himself in the process of selection, since he thinks that selection brings about remorse, and remorse is an obstacle to pleasure. In the aesthetic sphere, pleasures can take the form of the basest carnal desires or the highest artistic enjoyment. After plunging in pleasures and selflessness, if the aesthete gets disappointed or bored, and wants to realize himself in order to cure his disappointment' he must make a conscious selection and through frequent decisions, he must try to abide by ethical rules and principles of life. If so, the aesthete can realize the existential possibility of his ethical sphere in order to obtain the 'self'.

According to Kierkegaard, ethics is used in two senses: primary ethics, and secondary ethics. Based on ethics in the first sense, the individual follows the norms and values derived from social virtues. In the primary ethics, Kierkegaard does not suggest a specific ethical school such as task-orientation, utilitarianism, and so forth. What he puts emphasis on is a norm derived from the human virtues. Ethics in the second sense, however, will not be realized in the ethical sphere. This ethics, rather, comes to fore in the religious sphere, and it is manifested in faith. Ethics in the second sense, he maintains, is the complete commitment and obedience to God's orders and prohibitions, even if principles of the primary ethics are suspended.

To Kierkegaard as a person, the religious sphere is man's superior sphere of existence. Religious is a sphere in which the original or existent individual finds his finite in relation to infinity. In this sphere, faith is the individual's superior existential possibility which can be realized by boundless enthusiasm and risking.

In the religious sphere, Kierkegaard does not consider religiousness to be the same for individuals. According to Kierkegaard, there are two types of religiousness: Type A religiousness and type B religiousness.

Type A religiousness includes any religion and the followers of any religion. Type B religiousness, however, is the deepest state of religiousness in Kierkegaard's opinion. For this reason, faith can be divided into the conventional faith and the transcendental faith. Type A religious individuals [i. e., those who accept type A religiousness] have conventional [i. e., usual] faith, but the transcendental faith can be realized only in type B religiousness.

REFERENCE

- Ahmadi, Babak, 2002. Heidegger and the history of being. Publication, Tehran, nashre markaz
- Anderson, Susan Leigh, 2000. On Kierkegaard, Translate to Persian by khashayar dayhimi , publication Tehran tarhe now
- Biemel, Walter, 1990. Martin Heidegger. Translate to Persian by Bizhan Abdoulkarimi, publication, Tehran, sourosh.
- Bretall Robert, 1973. A Kierkegaard Anthology . Princeton university press
- Bedell, C. George, 1972. Kierkegaard and Faulkner: Modalities of Existence. Baton rouge, LA: 11-Louisiana State University Press.
- Caputo, D. John, 2008. How to read Kierkegaard, Translate to Persian by saleh najafy. publication Tehran, rokhade now.
- Copleston, 1994. A History of philosophy, New York London Toronto Sydneyland
- Cooper, D.E., 1995. Existentialism. London, Blackwell.
- Cole, J. Preston, 1971. The Problematic self in Kierkegaard and Freud .New Haven: Yale University Press
- Hubben, William, 1952. Dostoevsky, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and kafka New York: Macillan Publishing.

Kierkegaard's Writings, 1992, XII, Concluding unscientific postscript to philosophical Fragment, Tran's and ed. Howard and Edna Hong (Princeton: Princeton university press).

Kierkegaard, Soren, 1996. Papers and Journals: A selection, Trans. Alastair Hanney. (London and New York: penhuin Books).

Kierkegaard's writings, 1978. XIV. two ages: the age of Revolution and age present age. trans. and ed. Howard and Edna Hong (Princeton: Princeton university press).

Kierkegaard, Soren, 1987. Either/ OR, Part 1, Edited and Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong Published by Princeton university press.

Kierkegaard, Soren, 1988. Either/ or part II ,Trans. Howard V.Hong and Edna Hong. Prince...on: Prince...on up.

Kierkegaard, Soren, 1843. Fear and Trembling. Translated by: Walter Lowrie. Princeton university press.

Kierkegaard, Soren, 1980. The Sickness unto Death. Trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna Hong. Princeton: Princeton UP,

Kierkegaard Soren, 1949. Works of love.translated by david f:Swenson and lillan marvin Swenson introduction by douglas v.steere Princeton,nj:Princeton university press.

Kierkegaard Soren, 1995. Works of loveedited and translated by Howardv.hong and Edna H.Hong. Princeton,nj:Princeton university press.

Kirmmse, H. Bruce, 1990. Kierkegaard in Golden Age Denmark, Indiana University Press. Bloomington & Indianapolis.

Mosleh, Ali Asgkar, 2005. A reading of philosophies of Existence. Publication Islamic thinking and culture organization.

Malekian, Mostafa, 2007. An outline of the sphere of life. Publication negahe moaser.

Palmer Donald, D., 1996. Kierkegaard for Beginners. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc

Stephan Chites, 1972. " Pseudonymous Authorship as Art and Act", in Kierkegaard: A Collection of critical Essays, Edited by Josiah Thompson. Garden City, New York.

Verneaux, Roger, 1993. Phenomenology(Histoire de la Philosophie), Translate to persion by yahya mahdavi, publication, kharazmi.

Williamson, B. William, 1984 . Dicisions in Philosophy of Religion New York: Prometheus Books.

Watkin, Julia, 2001. Historical Dictionary of Kierkegaard's Philosophy .Lanham. MD: Scarecrow Press.