

Dear reader,

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in *Kierkegaard's Concepts Tome IV* on December 5, 2016 available online:

<https://www.routledge.com/Volume-15-Tome-IV-Kierkegaards-Concepts-Individual-to-Novel/Emmanuel-McDonald-Stewart/p/book/9781032098883>

Original publication:

Gerhard Schreiber

Leap

Steven M. Emmanuel / William McDonald / Jon Stewart (eds.) *Kierkegaard's Concepts Tome IV*: 71–78

Farnham / Burlington, Ashgate, 2014, *Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception and Resources*

URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315234748-12>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Routledge: <https://www.routledge.com/our-products/open-access-books/publishing-oa-books/chapters>.

Your IxTheo team

Leap

Gerhard Schreiber

Leap (*Spring*—noun; *springe*—verb)

Like its Germanic cognates, the Danish word *Spring* (derived from the Old Norse verb *springa*, “to well up,” “to swell up,” “to break forth,” “to burst forth”) retains a tight link to its historical meanings “well,” “source [of water],” and “bursting forth.”¹ *Spring* can refer to the (single) leaping movement of a living being; to the sudden movement of a thing from one spot to another—particularly that of water spurting out of the earth, as in English “spring” (Danish, *kildespring*);² or, more generally, to a source, an origin, or a thing’s (first) appearance or bursting into bloom (once again as in English “spring”).³ Finally, *Spring* may also be used to describe behaviors, decisions, or actions that bring about new states of affairs, and which are marked by initiative and decisiveness. This gives Kierkegaard’s word for leap the special connotation of breaking forth, or of a sudden change in a course of development. Something new emerges in the leap that had not previously been there, or been such. As a species of transition, then, a leap is a movement that is not bound to any given path, even though it is directed toward an end. For it is its own end.

In Kierkegaard’s authorship we encounter the concept leap primarily in the pseudonymous texts he published between 1843 and 1846, particularly *The Concept of Anxiety* (64 occurrences) and the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (68 occurrences). The surmise that Kierkegaard developed his “theory of the leap”⁴ in the years 1843-1846 is further

¹See *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, vols. 1-28, published by the Society for Danish Language and Literature, Copenhagen: Gyldendal 1918-56, vol. 21, 1943, columns 480-7 (“*Spring*”) and columns 489-504 (“*springe*”); Christa Kühnhold, *Der Begriff des Sprunges und der Weg des Sprachdenkens. Eine Einführung in Kierkegaard*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter 1975, pp. 7-9.

²Kierkegaard uses this meaning of *Spring* almost exclusively in a figurative sense, cf. *SKS* 5, 366 / *EUD*, 382; *SKS* 7, 169 / *CUP1*, 183; *SKS* 15, 167 / *BA*, 45.

³Still more specifically, *Spring* can also be used to refer to the budding of plants, like that of trees in the springtime (*løvspring*).

⁴*Pap. V C 12 / JP* 3, 2352; cf. *SKS* 18, 241, *JJ*:318 / *KJN* 2, 221.

supported by the fact that we find only scattered mentions of the “leap” in Kierkegaard’s published and unpublished writings, as well as in his journals and notebooks, both before and after this period. (The same holds for all of Kierkegaard’s upbuilding discourses, Christian discourses, and newspaper articles—even the ones he wrote during the years in question.) During the winter of 1843-1844, Kierkegaard gathered materials relevant to the leap-concept in Loose Paper 283.⁵ This document includes numerous ideas and reflections that would later find their way into his published texts, especially *The Concept of Anxiety* and the Climacus writings.

For Kierkegaard, the leap represents the answer to a question he formulated in numerous attempts and variations, namely, the question of how a new quality may arise as the result of a continuous quantification.⁶ The leap is the category of transition from quantitative changes within a certain quality to a change in the quality itself. Quality is indifferent to quantity, inasmuch as a given quality remains the same even when the relevant quantity is altered. On its own, quantity cannot generate (new) quality; quantity is an irrelevant determinant with respect to quality.⁷ For this reason, the transition from a quantitative to a qualitative determination cannot take place without a leap.⁸ The leap, then, stands for a discontinuous, qualitative change,⁹ which, unlike any gradual transition, does not merely involve a quantitative modification of an existing determination,¹⁰ but generates something qualitatively new. In the moment of the leap, in other words, a certain existing determination ceases to exist: in approximating a limit, the given determination exhausts its possible variations and is replaced or displaced by a different determination that has come into

⁵See notes 23 and 27 below.

⁶Cf. *SKS* 4, 336 / *CA*, 30; *Pap.* V B 49:5, pp. 107f. / *CA*, Supplement, 180f.; *Pap.* VI B 13 / *JP* 5, 5787; *SKS* 27, 269, *Papir* 277:1 / *JP* 1, 261; *SKS* 27, 276, *Papir* 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2345; *SKS* 27, 276, *Papir* 283:1 (with *Pap.* V B 49:5, p. 108 / *CA*, Supplement, 181); *SKS* 27, 277, *Papir* 283:2 / *JP* 3, 2351; *SKS* 27, 285, *Papir* 302 / *JP* 5, 5712; and *SKS* 4, 336-40 / *CA*, 30-4; *SKS* 18, 303, JJ:492 / *KJN* 2, 279.

⁷Cf. *SKS* 19, 406, Not13:41b / *KJN* 3, 404.

⁸Cf. *SKS* 27, 267, *Papir* 277:1 / *JP* 1, 261.

⁹Cf. *SKS* 7, 21 / *CUPI*, 11.

¹⁰Cf. *SKS* 4, 273-5 / *PF*, 73-5; *SKS* 19, 395, Not13:27 / *KJN* 3, 393; *SKS* 27, 276, *Papir* 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2348.

existence. This new determination is fully present from the very moment of its appearance, without any degree of qualification.¹¹

An essential moment of every leap, therefore, is its suddenness¹² as the “complete abstraction from continuity,”¹³ where the role of this sudden happening in a human life varies according to the significance of *what it is* that is happening. As an “existence-category,”¹⁴ the leap belongs essentially in the “realm of freedom.”¹⁵ Its “substance” is “pathos,”¹⁶ and so Kierkegaard can use the phrase “pathos-laden transition”¹⁷ to refer to the leap that passion both makes possible and accompanies. The leap does not come about by virtue of an infinitesimal approach to it (that is, as exceeding or transcending a limit that is approached by approximation along a continuum, so that the zone of origin paves the way for the target zone), but rather takes place when *I myself* leap by my own power and at my own initiative, in a movement all my own. This gives the act of leaping its active, decisive character.¹⁸

As a category of the realm of determinations that are governed by “being,” the leap lies “outside of immanent thought,”¹⁹ and thus also cannot be grasped by “pure thinking” in the sense of Hegel’s logic. In the leap—unlike in an approximating synthesis and its quantitating proposition²⁰—something new emerges that can neither be derived from its own constituting elements nor be explained by its previous development.²¹ This *novum*, the proposition of a new quality, is not the presupposition *for*, but rather a *pre*-supposition *to*, its

¹¹Cf. *SKS* 4, 337-8 / *CA*, 30-2.

¹²Cf. *SKS* 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2345; *SKS* 4, 337 / *CA*, 30; *SKS* 4, 384ff. / *CA*, 81ff.; *SKS* 18, 172f., *JJ*:104 / *KJN* 2, 160.

¹³*SKS* 4, 433 / *CA*, 132.

¹⁴Cf. *Pap.* V B 150:21 / *JP* 3, 2344.

¹⁵*Pap.* V C 12 / *JP* 3, 2352.

¹⁶*Pap.* V B 49:14 / *JP* 3, 2343. On the leap in the situation of existence, and as an expression of despair, see *SKS* 17, 35, AA:18 / *KJN* 1, 29; *SKS* 19, 187, Not5:33 / *KJN* 3, 183; *SKS* 2, 304 / *EOI*, 314.

¹⁷*SKS* 19, 386, Not13:8a / *KJN* 3, 384 (emphasis removed); cf. *SKS* 18, 241, *JJ*:318 / *KJN* 2, 221; *SKS* 19, 375, Not12:4 / *KJN* 3, 373; *SKS* 19, 386, Not13:8c / *KJN* 3, 384; *SKS* 27, 399, Papir 365:24 / *JP* 1, 649; *SKS* 27, 408, Papir 368:2b / *JP* 1, 653; *SKS* 7, 234 / *CUP1*, 258.

¹⁸Cf. *SKS* 5, 397 / *TD*, 15; *SKS* 7, 97 / *CUP1*, 99; *SKS* 7, 333 / *CUP1*, 365; *SKS* 7, 350 / *CUP1*, 384; *SKS* 8, 69 / *TA*, 71; *SKS* 26, 9, NB31:2 / *JP* 4, 4806; *SKS* 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2349.

¹⁹*SKS* 27, 269, Papir 277:1 / *JP* 1, 196; cf. *SKS* 15, 256 / *BA*, 99.

²⁰*Pro-position* in the literal sense of “setting forth.”

²¹Cf. *SKS* 4, 388 / *CA*, 85.

further development. The leap makes no reference to a ground state from within which one could gain some purchase on it; rather, by its very appearance, the leap wards off all inquiries into its ground. Though the leap does presuppose its precedent state as existent, it implies a break in the chain of precedents—and so does not proceed from its precedent state without further ado.²²

Loose Paper 283, mentioned above, presents a taxonomy of leaps.²³ This follows a brief introduction²⁴ and an articulation of two basic, non-mutually-reducible theses about leaps—“Every quality...arises through a leap”²⁵ and there is “a qualitative difference between leaps”²⁶—with respective consequences for the particular problem areas at issue. The various leaps are then classified²⁷ as (1) leaps in nature, which can be grasped as natural phenomena (for example, “[t]he leap by which water turns to ice”²⁸); (2) leaps in understanding, with which we are familiar from inner experience (for example, “the leap by which I understand an author”²⁹); or (3) the self-determinations of freedom, in which the self is transformed to the extent that *it* is at issue (for example, the transition from eudaemonism to the concepts of duty and virtue, inasmuch as the choice of the good does not follow from intellectual considerations, but emerges only “in the moment of decision”³⁰). This last category also includes the leap by which “the thought of God”³¹ emerges, or that by which “the resulting

²²Cf. *SKS* 19, 390-1, Not13:23 / *KJN* 3, 388 (see note 74 below).

²³On the interpretation of *SKS* 27, 275-7, Papir 283 / *JP* 3, 2345-2351, see Klaus Schäfer, *Untersuchungen zu ontologischen Problemen in den Climacus-Schriften Sören Kierkegaards*, Dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1966, pp. 40-2 and pp. 51-3 (explanatory notes).

²⁴Cf. *SKS* 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2345. This suggests that Kierkegaard may have planned a monograph on the subject; on this see also *SKS* 27, 285, Papir 302 / *JP* 5, 5712.

²⁵*SKS* 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2345 (translation slightly altered).

²⁶*Ibid.* (translation slightly altered).

²⁷The remarks in *SKS* 27, 276-7, Papir 283:1 and *SKS* 27, 277, Papir 283:2 are additions that can fit into this taxonomy. In what follows, *examples* of clear references to Loose Paper 283 will be adduced, as will (occasionally) *examples* of similar usages of “leap” in both Kierkegaard’s published and private writings.

²⁸Cf. *SKS* 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2345.

²⁹*Ibid.*; cf. *SKS* 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2347.

³⁰Cf. *SKS* 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2349; see also *SKS* 7, 313 / *CUPI*, 342f.

³¹*SKS* 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2349.

[conclusion] (*resultare*, to leap backwards) occurs in the proofs for the existence of God.”³²

As Kierkegaard argues in *Philosophical Fragments*, the existence of God (indeed, the existence of anything whatsoever³³) cannot be proven but only presupposed, because God's existence cannot emerge as long as I “continue to be the one who is demonstrating”³⁴ it.

God's existence appears only once I let go of the proof. This letting go is “*meine Zuthat* [my contribution],”³⁵ and thus must be brought into focus, even if it is nothing but a tiny moment—“a leap.” That existence itself emerges from the proof “by a leap” is, in sum, “the *reservatio finalis*”³⁶ of every proof of God's existence.

The above three categories do not exhaust Kierkegaard's list. We also have (4) leaps in a philosophical context, such as (a) in the inquiry into philosophy's absolute beginning,³⁷ which must be understood, *qua* absolute beginning, as a presuppositionless proposition rather than a “wrenching oneself free”³⁸ of something in the context of the dialectic of approach and takeoff; (b) specifically in logic³⁹ (for example, in the passing over of a concept into its opposite⁴⁰), even if, in that context, the leap is “mendaciously omitted”;⁴¹ (c) in the theory of motion⁴² (especially in regard to “[t]he transition from possibility to actuality”⁴³) and similarly (d) in epistemology⁴⁴ (for example, in “[t]he transition from probability to truth”⁴⁵).

³²SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2349 (my translation); on this compare, in Kierkegaard's lecture notes, SKS 19, 251, Not9:1 / KJN 3, 245.

³³Cf. SKS 4, 245f. / PF, 40f.; see also SKS 7, 45 / CUP1, 39n.

³⁴SKS 4, 248 / PF, 42 (my translation).

³⁵SKS 4, 248 / PF, 43; cf. SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345.

³⁶SKS 4, 248 / PF, 43.

³⁷Cf. SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345 (with SKS 15, 41 / JC, 149); SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2346; SKS 7, 111f. / CUP1, 115.

³⁸SKS 15, 32 / JC, 138 (my translation).

³⁹Compare SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345; SKS 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2349; SKS 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2350; SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 (not in JP) with SKS 4, 337 / CA, 30; and SKS 18, 225, JJ:266 / KJN 2, 206; SKS 18, 241, JJ:318 / KJN 2, 221 with Pap. VI B 13 / JP 5, 5787.

⁴⁰See SKS 15, 32 / JC, 138; SKS 15, 233 / BA, 286 (cf. Pap. VII-2 B 261:22); furthermore SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2346.

⁴¹SKS 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2350 (my translation); cf. also SKS 4, 337n. / CA, 30n.

⁴²Cf. SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2348.

⁴³SKS 7, 313 / CUP1, 342; cf. SKS 4, 385 / CA, 82; SKS 19, 396, Not13:27 / KJN 3, 393; SKS 19, 420, Not13:55 / KJN 3, 418; SKS 4, 273-5 / PF, 73-5.

⁴⁴Compare SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2348 with SKS 4, 244, / PF, 38.

⁴⁵SKS 27, 276, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2348; see notes 63 and 68-70 below.

Gerhard Schreiber: „Leap“, in: Kierkegaard's Concepts, hg. von Steven M. Emmanuel, William McDonald und Jon Stewart, Tome IV, Farnham und Burlington: Ashgate 2014 (Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception and Resources, Bd. 15), S. 71-78.

The leap concept is also used (5) to interpret the transition between various “stages”⁴⁶ or “spheres”⁴⁷ of existence (that is, between various possible ways in which a person can relate to himself *qua* existing human being), be it the transition “from esthetics to ethics”⁴⁸ or that “from ethics to religion.”⁴⁹ As existence, human being is essentially movement—process—rather than completed, immutable being.⁵⁰ Existing happens neither by itself, that is, without the human being’s own initiative, nor as a continual cycle. It is a perpetual leaping⁵¹ through which the antitheses that are constitutive of human being are momentarily (that is, at the relevant moment of decision, and so at the risk of possible failure) reconciled, meaning that it is the human being’s task “to transform the leap in life to a gait.”⁵² Similarly, the transitions between the various stages of existence do not occur in a series of immanent changes.⁵³ They have the character of leaps, that is, they imply “a break with immanence.”⁵⁴

Similarly, the leap is used to account for (6) the transitions between various states of consciousness, such as “the leap of sin-consciousness” or “the leap of reconciliation.”⁵⁵ Above all, however, the leap for Kierkegaard stands for both (7) the structurally paradoxical encounter between the human being and the absolute⁵⁶ and (8) Christianity’s personal call as a historical mode of existence, not only inasmuch as “Christianity’s entry into the world” was carried out as “the paradox,”⁵⁷ but also in the sense that each individual’s entry into Christianity requires a leap, since every Christian must “have come into Christianity by a

⁴⁶SKS 7, 262 / CUP1, 287.

⁴⁷SKS 6, 439 / SLW, 476; cf. SKS 7, 455 / CUP1, 501.

⁴⁸SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345; cf. SKS 19, 375, Not12:4 / KJN 3, 373; SKS 22, 236, NB12:148 / KJN 6, 237; SKS 22, 315, NB13:68 / KJN 6, 317; furthermore SKS 21, 332, NB10:152 / KJN 5, 343.

⁴⁹SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345; cf. SKS 7, 238 / CUP1, 262; furthermore Pap. VII-2 B 241:7 / BA, Supplement, 218; SKS 15, 256 / BA, 99; Pap. IX B 10, p. 310 / BA, Supplement, 230; SKS 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2350.

⁵⁰Cf. SKS 7, 281 / CUP1, 308f.

⁵¹Cf. SKS 4, 136 / FT, 41 (cf. FTP, 70); SKS 4, 137 / FT, 42 (cf. FTP, 71).

⁵²SKS 4, 136 / FTP, 70.

⁵³Cf. SKS 7, 269 / CUP1, 295.

⁵⁴SKS 7, 269 / CUPH, 247 (cf. CUP1, 295); cf. SKS 7, 309 / CUP1, 338; SKS 7, 313 / CUP1, 342; Pap. V B 49:14 / JP 3, 2343.

⁵⁵SKS 27, 277, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2349; cf. SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345.

⁵⁶Cf. SKS 27, 275, Papir 283:1 / JP 3, 2345.

⁵⁷Ibid. (my translation); see also note 70 below.

paradox.”⁵⁸ Kierkegaard addresses this point most directly in the Climacus writings (especially in his discussion of Lessing⁵⁹), where he insists “that there is no direct and immediate transition to Christianity”⁶⁰ or “faith”⁶¹ (for example, by taking recourse to “historical reliability”⁶² or by making use of the “probability proof”⁶³), but only “the qualitative transition of the leap from unbeliever to believer.”⁶⁴ Against every such attempt “to quantify oneself into faith”⁶⁵ (that is, “into a qualitative decision”⁶⁶ as “the decision of faith”⁶⁷) with the aid of approximation,⁶⁸ Climacus urges that faith cannot be replaced by or even be partial to “probabilities and guarantees.”⁶⁹ Because the fact that God became man in Jesus Christ is “the absolute paradox, all that comes later is no help, because this remains for all eternity the consequences of a paradox and thus just as definitively improbable as the paradox.”⁷⁰ Historical knowledge can only attain to a lesser or greater degree of probability, and can become no more than an approximation for a person’s “infinite interest...in his own eternal happiness.”⁷¹ To base such eternal happiness upon “something historical, the story of Jesus Christ,”⁷² thus marks “a μετάβασις εις άλλο γένος..., a leap for both the contemporary and the one who comes later.”⁷³ Because of the “desultory element of the paradox, which

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Cf. *SKS* 7, 92-102 / *CUPI*, 93-105 as well as *Pap.* V B 1:3 / *JP* 3, 2342; *Pap.* VI B 13 / *JP* 5, 5787 and *Pap.* VI B 95, p. 177 / *CUP2*, 13 together with *SKS* 27, 277, *Papir* 283:1 / *JP* 3, 2349; *SKS* 23, 51f., NB15:75 / *JP* 1, 73.

⁶⁰*SKS* 7, 54 / *CUPI*, 48.

⁶¹*SKS* 4, 291 / *PF*, 94; cf. *SKS* 22, 40, NB11:63 / *KJN* 6, 36.

⁶²*SKS* 7, 94 / *CUPI*, 95.

⁶³*SKS* 4, 291f. / *PF*, 94f.

⁶⁴*SKS* 7, 21 / *CUPI*, 12; cf. *SKS* 7, 332f. / *CUPI*, 365f.; *SKS* 7, 347 / *CUPI*, 381; *SKS* 7, 350 / *CUPI*, 384; *SKS* 22, 40, NB11:63 / *KJN* 6, 36; furthermore *Pap.* IX B 10, p. 310 / *BA*, Supplement, 230.

⁶⁵*SKS* 7, 21 / *CUPI*, 11 (emphasis removed); cf. *SKS* 7, 35 / *CUPI*, 28.

⁶⁶*SKS* 7, 94 / *CUPI*, 95.

⁶⁷*SKS* 7, 24 / *CUPI*, 15.

⁶⁸Cf. *SKS* 4, 289-291 / *PF*, 92f.; *SKS* 7, 21 / *CUPI*, 11; *SKS* 7, 30 / *CUPI*, 23; *SKS* 7, 139 / *CUPI*, 149f.; *SKS* 7, 522 / *CUPI*, 574.

⁶⁹*SKS* 7, 21 / *CUPI*, 11

⁷⁰*SKS* 4, 292 / *PF*, 94f. (translation slightly altered); cf. *SKS* 18, 158f., JJ:58 / *KJN* 2, 147; *SKS* 18, 162f., JJ:73 / *KJN* 2, 150f.; *SKS* 18, 176, JJ:111 / *KJN* 2, 163; *SKS* 19, 390f., Not13:23 / *KJN* 3, 388; *SKS* 19, 418, Not13:53 / *KJN* 3, 416; *SKS* 7, 238 / *CUPI*, 262.

⁷¹*SKS* 7, 25 / *CUPI*, 16.

⁷²*SKS* 23, 51, NB15:75 / *JP* 1, 73.

⁷³*SKS* 7, 96f. / *CUPI*, 98; cf. *SKS* 22, 40, NB11:63 / *KJN* 6, 36.

lacks continuity or, at any rate, only has retrospective continuity”—as Kierkegaard remarks elsewhere—“faith cannot be *proven, grounded, comprehended*.”⁷⁴

It is evident that the set of examples in Loose Paper 283 comes to center on Christianity as the primary model for understanding the leap, in relation to which the other modes of leaping are represented as deficient. Kierkegaard has a very specific process and setting in mind when he contemplates the leap: the transition from non-Christian to Christian. When we take into account the full spectrum of uses of “leap” in Kierkegaard’s authorship, however, it must be noted that Kierkegaard elsewhere thematizes leap phenomena (often metaphorically) that emphasize aspects of the leap not treated in Loose Paper 283.⁷⁵ For example, the leap also represents (9) the transition to infinity⁷⁶ or—primarily as a paraphrase for death—the (final) transition to eternity.⁷⁷ Most important, however, is Kierkegaard’s deployment of the leap-concept in order to characterize (10) the Fall in *The Concept of Anxiety*. As mentioned above, the leap generates something qualitatively new. The same holds for “the qualitative leap which posits sin,”⁷⁸ that is to say, “an unwarranted actuality.”⁷⁹ The individual’s fall cannot be explained by the sinfulness of the race, which from Adam onward continues to proceed “in quantitative determinations.”⁸⁰ For the individual participates in the sinfulness of the race only “by the qualitative leap,”⁸¹ that is, only inasmuch as he *qua*

⁷⁴SKS 19, 390f, Not13:23 / KJN 3, 388; cf. *Pap.* X-6 B 85 / JP 6, 6405; see also SKS 4, 433 / CA, 132.

⁷⁵Not to mention the use of “leap” in the sense of *bodily* action (for example, the leap of a dancer, cf. SKS 4, 44 / R, 170; SKS 4, 135 / FT, 41; SKS 8, 343 / UD, 243—but see SKS 7, 332f. / CUP1, 365), or of composite verbs like “to skip over” (*at overspringe*)—(used figuratively) as of an essay (cf. SKS 1, 14 / EPW, 60), a stage in personality development (cf. SKS 1, 26 / EPW, 70; SKS 16, 63 / PV, 84; SKS 17, 119, CC:12.4 / KJN 1, 190), a component in life (cf. SKS 17, 232, DD:31 / KJN 1, 223; SKS 2, 160 / EOI, 162) or of “the intervening causes to reach God” (SKS 5, 242 / EUD, 243; cf. SKS 18, 202, JJ:192 / KJN 2, 186)—as well as of expressions like “being on the point of [doing something]” (*at staae paa Springet*) (cf. SKS 15, 279 / BA, 126), “jumping for joy” (*at springe af Glæde*) (cf. SKS 26, 325, NB34:13 / JP 3, 2624, p. 143) or “salto mortale” (cf. SKS 4, 62 / R, 193; SKS 7, 98f. / CUP1, 100-2 (with SKS 27, 277, / JP 3, 2349); SKS 20, 170, NB2:69 / KJN 4, 168).

⁷⁶Cf. SKS 2, 379f. / EOI, 392f.

⁷⁷Cf. SKS 4, 137 / FT, 42; SKS 21, 338, NB10:166 / KJN 5, 349; see also SKS 8, 85 / TA, 89; SKS 8, 102f. / TA, 108f.

⁷⁸*Pap.* V B 55:26 / CA, Supplement, 200; cf. SKS 4, 352 / CA, 47; SKS 4, 353 / CA, 48; SKS 4, 413 / CA, 111; *Pap.* V B 72:11.

⁷⁹SKS 4, 413 / CA, 111; SKS 4, 415 / CA, 113.

⁸⁰SKS 4, 340 / CA, 33; cf. SKS 4, 344 / CA, 37; SKS 4, 362 / CA, 57.

⁸¹SKS 4, 340 / CA, 33.

individual posits sin.⁸² The first sin (not only that of Adam, but also that of every subsequent human being) is a determination of quality, and thus is not the result of a quantitative determination from which the first sin proceeded, as it were, “through a *generatio aequivoca*.”⁸³ In the particular individual, sinfulness may express itself as a greater or lesser disposition,⁸⁴ and to that extent “as preliminary runs to the leap”,⁸⁵ but this is merely a quantitative determination that is incapable of explaining the fall into sin⁸⁶ (“a ‘more’ cannot bring forth the leap”⁸⁷), which is neither an arbitrary thing, nor a matter of succession, nor a product of natural necessity.⁸⁸ Even as the leap or “as the sudden,”⁸⁹ the fall into sin remains unreachable and inexplicable—which serves only to emphasize “that sin presupposes itself, that sin comes into the world in such a way that by the fact that it is, it is presupposed.”⁹⁰ The qualitative leap of sin “stands outside of all ambiguity,”⁹¹ and despite every “psychological approximation”⁹² to it that can be made with the aid of the “intermediate term”⁹³ anxiety (which is “altogether ambiguous”⁹⁴)—psychology, which explores the “predisposing presupposition”⁹⁵ or “the real possibility of sin,”⁹⁶ cannot explain it.⁹⁷

See also Beginning; Being/Becoming; Category; Christ; Existence/Existential; Faith; God; Happiness; Paradox; Reason; Sin; Transition.

⁸²Cf. *SKS* 4, 352 / *CA*, 47.

⁸³*SKS* 4, 337 / *CA*, 31.

⁸⁴Cf. *SKS* 4, 344 / *CA*, 37; *SKS* 4, 366 / *CA*, 62.

⁸⁵*SKS* 4, 338n. / *CA*, 31n.

⁸⁶Cf. *ibid.*; *SKS* 4, 349 / *CA*, 43; *Pap.* V B 55:15 / *CA*, Supplement, 199.

⁸⁷*SKS* 4, 365 / *CA*, 60; cf. *SKS* 4, 394 / *CA*, 91.

⁸⁸Cf. *SKS* 4, 338 / *CA*, 32; *SKS* 4, 346 / *CA*, 40; *SKS* 4, 354 / *CA*, 49.

⁸⁹*SKS* 4, 338 / *CA*, 32; see notes 12 and 13 above.

⁹⁰*SKS* 4, 338 / *CA*, 32; cf. *SKS* 4, 338 / *CA*, 32; *SKS* 4, 366 / *CA*, 62.

⁹¹*SKS* 4, 349 / *CA*, 43.

⁹²*SKS* 4, 394 / *CA*, 91; *SKS* 4, 415 / *CA*, 113; *SKS* 4, 417 / *CA*, 115.

⁹³*SKS* 4, 353 / *CA*, 49.

⁹⁴*SKS* 4, 349f. / *CA*, 43.

⁹⁵*SKS* 4, 329 / *CA*, 21.

⁹⁶*SKS* 4, 330 / *CA*, 23.

⁹⁷Cf. *SKS* 4, 353f. / *CA*, 48f; see also note 87 above.