

Discussion Questions

1. What, if anything, would you say in response to Kierkegaard's view or any aspect of it?

For example, do you have any comments, can you see any problems?

2. Why is he regarded as founder of existentialism, do you think?
3. Do you think K is right when he says that there are aspects of personal experience that cannot be properly understood the objective way?
4. Is the knowledge that we call 'objective truth', such as $2 + 2 = 4$, different from the truth of religion? If so, how is it different?
5. The subjective truth K talks of is 'not a truth of the intellect but of a whole man. Strictly speaking, subjective truth is not a truth that I have, but a truth that I am' (William Barrett, *Irrational Man*).

Is this a fair characterization of K's view?
6. How should we define truth?
7. K suggests that we should try to understand truth anew (in the ancient sense – the ancient Greeks accept their ignorance in the quest for truth). But is the ancient Greek's quest for truth very different from K's?
8. K says that subjectivity is essentially passion. Is it not possible that someone could be just as passionate about objective affairs, as about subjective ones such as one's religious faith?