Yixuan Huang

Before talking about Gellman’s reading, I think I have to explain what the Abraham test is about first. Abraham test is recorded in Genesis 22; God testes Abraham, so he asked Abraham to take his son, Isaac, and sacrificed him as a burnt on a mountain. When Abraham reached out his hand and took the knife to slay his son, the angel of the LORD called out to him, and said “ do not do anything to him; now I know that you fear God, because you have not withheld from me your son, your only son” Abraham looked up and found a ram in a thicket, so he took the ram and sacrificed it as a burnt offering instead of Isaac(Genesis 22) .

In Kierkegaard *Fear and Trembling*, he clearly wants to portray Abraham as “knight of faith” through using Abraham test. But Gellman gives us a different way of reading Kierkegaard’s work; Gellman propose that for Kierkegaard the story of Abraham is not a tale about a moral rule, instead, the story of Abraham and Isaac is a metaphor for the struggle between the two kinds of self-definition, as a father and as an individual, and has precious little to do with the “morality” and “religion” of the standard interpretation of *Fear and Trembling*, which is assumed by many philosophers who have raised problems with Kierkegaard’s book. Of the problems raised two pf them seem to be the most serious: the problem of hearing, and the problem of choice. Gellman believes that the standard interpretation is not the correct interpretation and gives another understanding in his paper.

For me, I personal understand what Gellman’s explanation, and consider that he provides us with a coherent, logical, and believable interpretation. Comparing to the standard interpretation, I will support Gellman’s explanation, and now I will give my reason.

Gellman, in my opinion, perfectly defend what he calls allegorical interpretation of *Fear and Trembling*. Different from the standard interpretation, he tries to understand Kierkegaard in an allegorical way. Our idea is consistent; I do not think that we can simply analyze *Fear and Trembling* from the surface and only care about the ethical and moral problem in Abraham's test. And for Gellman, what Abraham is called upon to do, is to renounce and transcend his definition of himself as determined by his position in the family, not simply killed his son .

After that, Gellman also points out that if the ethical aspect of the story is the moral prohibition of act of murder, there would be no significance in Abraham being asked to precisely kill his son. Moreover, if God's command is really commanding murder, and the real issue is the prominence of God's word over the ethical, then there would be no reason why the act should not be carried out, and Abraham's hand should not be stayed at all. However, if the moral question is about Abraham's most basic self-respect, then the fact that his son was murdered is crucial to the story. If Abraham is called self-defined and does not depend on his social role, then "commanding" "murdering" his son simply requires as invocation such self-definition, not belonging to any particular act, but a willingness to withdraw from the definition of family and become individual, symbolizing his willingness to "kill" his own son. In my opinion, that can possibly show that Abraham’s story is a theological metaphor, and the “voice of God” merely calls upon Abraham to become an individual beyond universal ethics. This is what Abraham meant when he prepared to sacrifice his son for God; in other words, be able to regard himself as an individual as subjectively priori to regard himself as a father. Moreover, by defining himself as an individual rather than a father, Abraham gets Isaac back, and he can continue to live within the ethical and be a father as before, but now does not affect his personality integrity .

Besides, Gellman also carefully explain where the “fear and trembling” are in all this. One source of fear and trembling is that you must have the courage to step out of the Hegelian reality and into individuality, a solitary individuality, in which there is no comfort. The other source is that fear and trembling are in themselves symptoms of holding an ethical view of a person and defining oneself as a person becomes an inevitable act.

In fact, Gellman interpreted Kierkegaard from a completely different perspective. He used a clever way to respond the standard interpretation and the questions raised in. “I think those previous views all are wrong.” Gellman says, “so let us re-understand Kierkegaard from another angle.” This is also what I think Gellman does not totally succeed. How does he respond to the problem of hearing in the last several paragraphs? He thinks that the readers should not simply understand Kierkegaard's story about Abraham from the surface, and then he has summarized his views, and shows them again as the answer to the questions. In my opinion, even if I support Gellman's point of view so much, I still think that he does not seem to answer the standard interpretation question positively. The problem of hearing seems to be not just from the perspective of Kierkegaard’s story about Abraham; it is more like a question of the Genesis 22 itself, and Gellman just explains that this understanding is problematic in Kierkegaard’s article.

Nevertheless, as we overall read his article again, we should admit that the whole structure of Gellman article is progressive layer by layer, each part is guided from the previous part, so this article is believable, and after discussing his views, he turns his attention back to the two questions he mentions at the beginning of the paper; the problem of hearing, and the problem of choice; and answered these two questions based on his own views; even though the answer may not satisfy everyone, the answer itself makes the article more coherent and complete. And from a personal point of view, as I have said before, I agree with Gellman’s arguments, and I think Gellman's paper contains very innovative ideas, and this view is very convincing.