
Søren Kierkegaard would not usually be considered a shaper of modern Roman Catholic theology. Yet this excellently researched and well-written study presents a convincing case that his importance to many of its key figures has been unjustly overlooked. Moreover, Joshua Furnal persuasively argues that Kierkegaard may be deployed to correct Hans Urs von Balthasar's theological aesthetics and that the key to a Catholic understanding of Kierkegaard may be the oeuvre of Cornelio Fabro, of which English language scholars are largely ignorant. In the course of his study, Furnal pursues three objectives: to develop an ecumenical reading of Kierkegaard, to challenge assumptions about his insignificance for Catholic theology, and to appraise the theological resources that his writings provide in anthropology, aesthetics, and philosophy. Furnal thereby poses a fundamental challenge to the secular readings of Kierkegaard that migrated from German philosophy into the Anglophone ‘death of God’ movement and continental atheist existentialism. Among the interpreters from whom an alternative account is drawn are the Germans Theodor Haecker, Romano Guardini, and Erich Przywara, James Collins in the United States, and Louis Dupré in France.

Some interpreters have speculated that, had Kierkegaard not died young from spinal tuberculosis, he might have converted to Roman Catholicism. Needless to say, the man himself left no clear indication of his intention in this regard. In any case, Furnal contends that a proper appraisal of his Lutheranism, which has mystical undertones traceable back to Tauler and Eckhart, promotes ecumenical engagement rather than foreclosing it. Kierkegaard, he argues, brings important insights for understanding the relation between disposition, love, and faith and is a critic not of the church as such but of the reality of the church life and belief of his own day, and above all, of the failure to witness to the true paradox of Christian existence. His work couples a strong theology of giftedness with an affirmation of the natural human desire for the given. This suggests that despair is not a sin but a virtue, being a valid expression of the human predicament in its openness to the divine.

The book’s third chapter examines the theology of Henri de Lubac, which, Furnal argues, is ‘distinctively shaped by Kierkegaard’s writings’ (p. 105). Taking inwardness seriously in order to correct models of faith that place excessive reliance on either reason or ecclesial belonging, de Lubac recognized the paradoxical character of human knowledge of the divine and presented the God–human relation using abyssal imagery. At least as significant was his literary style, including the use of fragment and postscript to resist closure. Kierkegaard, Furnal argues, helped de Lubac attend to the existential dimension of life, as well as contributing to his theology of the supernatural and to his associated contestation of the theology of pure nature.

In the fourth chapter, Furnal turns to the different task of deploying Kierkegaard to repair the work of a Catholic theologian. Impelled by his theological aesthetics of divine glory, Hans Urs von Balthasar dismissed Kierkegaard’s positive appraisal of anxiety, viewing it as a symptom of sin rather than as an aspect of its overcoming and potentially as a call to a truth beyond the mundane. In so doing, he failed to take account of an important aspect of the spiritual life. This anthropological shortcoming, Furnal argues, has as its doctrinal corollary a christology with Nestorian tendencies. Because of his unwillingness to thematize distance, Balthasar tended to subsume the suffering of humanity into a higher unity, rather than wrestling with its full reality and paradox.

Notwithstanding what has so far been presented, the part of Furnal’s study with greatest potential for English scholarship may be his exposition, in the fifth chapter, of Kierkegaard’s Italian Catholic translator and expositor, Cornelio Fabro. Known, if at all, for his Neoplatonic, participationist reading of Aquinas against rationalist neo-scholastic renditions - which, in the 1940s, was daring - Fabro was among the periti at the Second Vatican Council as well as serving on its Preparatory Theological Commission. Yet most of his writings remain unavailable in English. Furnal argues for the importance of his Mariology, drawn from Kierkegaard, as opening onto a theology of expectancy. Fabro accounted for this following research into Kierkegaard’s library and textual annotations, where he found evidence of deep engagement with the Church Fathers. Thus for Fabro, as for de Lubac,
Kierkegaard enabled a properly theological critique of the Church, with its hiddenness in Christ more significant than its historical continuity as an institution. Furnal argues that the *ressourcement* designation should be expanded to include not just the usual French and German names but Fabro's too.

The case that ‘Kierkegaard's writings should no longer be assumed to undermine the Catholic faith, but rather be seen as an indispensable dialogue partner for investigating and articulating that faith today’ (p. 215) is well made, and this book deserves to be widely read. Nevertheless, the relative importance of Kierkegaard and Blondel in providing *ressourcement* with its philosophical impetus might bear further reflection, with some of the aspects that Furnal attributes to Kierkegaard at least as easily identifiable in the work of the French Catholic lay philosopher. To take three examples, the Dane certainly promoted inwardness in the face of purely social understandings of religious belonging, but Blondel also grappled, and more systematically, with the dialectic between the individual and the range of communities—family, nation, world—of which they are a member. Kierkegaard promoted openness to the transcendent, but the implicit activity of the absolute in concrete human life was equally fundamental to Blondel. Love impelled Kierkegaardian faith, but the bond of love was a central concept in Blondel's later work too. These observations do not, however, refute the thesis that Kierkegaard was a source for *ressourcement* theologians, nor do they suggest that efforts to bring his theology into further dialogue with *ressourcement* are not needed.