

# Kierkegaard's Authorship, Critique Of Rationalism, And The Individual

Faheem Ud Din Dar<sup>1</sup>, Ambuj Sharma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India – 160014.

Email: [dinfaheem77@gmail.com](mailto:dinfaheem77@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0009-0004-5505-6586

<sup>2</sup> Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India – 160014.

Email: [ambuj13@gmail.com](mailto:ambuj13@gmail.com).

## Abstract

This research examines Søren Kierkegaard's authorship, his critique of rationalism, and his perspective on the individual within Christianity. It explores how Kierkegaard regarded his life and writings as a response to an era overshadowed by rationalism, speculative philosophy, and a decline in authentic religious experience. The study emphasises the evolution of his writings from aesthetics and speculation to Christian faith, highlighting his pseudonymous works, indirect communication, and the Socratic or maieutic method. Johannes Climacus and Anti-Climacus are presented as contrasting yet complementary expressions of his ideas. It also shows how he adapted the Socratic method through Christian revelation, focusing on faith and God as central to genuine or authentic communication and existence. The paper further discusses his views on the individual and humanity, stressing sin, responsibility, freedom, solidarity, and the individual's relationship with God and others. Ultimately, this paper analyses Kierkegaard's self-understanding as a corrective to his era through his existential and religious perspective on human life...

**Keywords:** Kierkegaard, Rationalism, Pseudonymous, Indirect communication, Socratic method, Christianity, Individual, Sin, and Freedom.

## INTRODUCTION

Kierkegaard viewed his philosophical and religious ideas as a correction to a period characterised by rebellion against God and a decline in authentic human existence. His life and writings centred on this mission, making it vital to understand both. He outlines the historical context of his work in texts such as *The Journals*, *The Attack Upon "Christendom,"* *The Point of View*, and *The Present Age*. These writings criticise rationalism as a societal trend and lay the foundation for interpreting his more philosophical texts, such as the *Philosophical Fragments* and the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. His authorship shifts from poet and aesthete to philosopher and, speculatively, to Christianity, eventually emphasising the essence of Christianity. This evolution appears in works like *Either/Or*, the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, and his explicitly Christian and devotional writings, ending with 'Discourses at Communion on Friday' and two sermons at the Church of Our Lady. Yet this development is not purely chronological; Kierkegaard saw himself mainly as a religious writer, with his aesthetic and philosophical works as stages leading to a higher religious goal. Kierkegaard shifts from poetry and philosophy on aesthetics and speculation to Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

Kierkegaard's work moves from aesthetic reflection to philosophical ideas, culminating in religious life. The *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* is pivotal in this shift, moving from systematic philosophy to a focus on Christianity. Its aim is not merely to present another philosophical framework but to explore how individuals can genuinely achieve Christian faith. Kierkegaard's development is more than chronological; he consistently identified as a religious author, evident in works such as *Two Edifying Discourses* accompanying *Either/Or* and his later devotional writings, including *The Crisis* and *The Crisis in the Life of an Actress*. Early in his career, he concentrated on religious themes and published some works pseudonymously. He viewed his aesthetic writings as a necessary phase—representing deception in service of Christianity. The *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* signals the final stage, emphasising the importance of individual faith and questioning how to become a Christian, a question central to Christian discourse.<sup>2</sup> This also marks a key shift, merging earlier aesthetic works into a broader movement and offering an alternative view of Christianity that avoids speculative philosophy and systematic logic. Its significance lies in reaching an objective philosophical conclusion and highlighting the existential challenge involved.

### The Transition from Aesthetics and Philosophy to Christianity

This shift from philosophy to religion closely parallels the move from writing poetry to entering a religious vocation, revealing a similar transformation in a different context. However, the next statement offers deeper insight into the relationship's complexity. In the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, he notes that he previously used a pseudonymous aesthetic to illustrate how someone might convert to Christianity by distancing themselves from that aesthetic. Now he employs a different method, breaking away from the system, speculation, and similar influences to genuinely become a Christian.<sup>3</sup> A fundamental aspect of Kierkegaard's early writings is his use of pseudonyms and indirect communication, which are essential to understanding his philosophical concepts. He held that the mode of expression shapes how ideas are interpreted and understood. His methodology aimed to distance both himself and his readership from aestheticism, intellectualism, Hegelian philosophy and rationalism.<sup>4</sup> Kierkegaard used pseudonyms to avoid directly influencing readers and to encourage active engagement. Each pseudonym embodies a different personality, presenting personal viewpoints that prompt introspection and responsibility. This approach lets readers explore diverse perspectives and form their own moral judgements rather than passively accepting teachings. This discussion highlights Kierkegaard's perspective on the strong connection between the aesthetic and the speculative. It suggests that the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* fundamentally changes the aesthetic framework to serve its purpose, while also portraying the opposing concept, the speculative, as an aesthetic form. However, this interpretation overlooks a key point: the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* marks a crucial turning point in Kierkegaard's entire body of work. It misses that the work not only presents an alternative path to Christianity but, in Kierkegaard's view, is the only legitimate route. Additionally, it neglects that the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* is not merely about authorship but is vital to addressing this issue. This work is a key part of Kierkegaard's early pseudonymous writings and serves as the final section. Johannes Climacus clarifies misunderstandings about the relationship between speculative philosophy and Christianity, building on earlier indirect criticisms of speculative thought. Climacus views the primary problem as a misunderstanding of existence and inner life. He observes that acquiring more knowledge may lead people to lose sight of life's purpose. Therefore, indirect communication becomes essential, because truth, particularly moral truth, cannot be conveyed effectively through direct expression. The aim is to influence the reader's life beyond an intellectual challenge. It shows that rationalism falls short in existential situations and motivates the individual, rather than merely criticising a philosophical system.

Initially, we examined the development of early authorship from aesthetic and philosophical viewpoints. We can now analyse how his use of pseudonyms and indirect style connects to his critique of rationalism. This is important because, in many of Kierkegaard's writings, content and form are deeply connected. He saw indirect communication as a way to free himself and his readers from aestheticism, intellectualism, Hegelianism, and rationalism. Although the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* was originally the concluding section of a religious text, it now serves as the central part of a broader Christian anthology. Later devotional and Christian writings support, rather than change, this work's importance. This structure also highlights the importance of earlier texts. Analysing their organisation, this work is the most sophisticated example of a fundamentally Socratic style and represents a unique Christian perspective. This supports Kierkegaard's critique of rationalism, highlighting the close connection between what is said and how it is presented. Most early works are published under pseudonyms, except for *Edifying Discourses*; furthermore, all but *The Concept of Dread* use indirect communication. Kierkegaard notes that this authorship began as a maieutic method centred on aesthetic works, and that all pseudonymous writings follow this approach. As a result, they were published under pseudonyms.<sup>5</sup> Kierkegaard shows that these two aspects are linked, each showcasing different sides of the same fundamental problem. Pseudonyms helped him separate himself from his writing, while indirect communication let him connect with readers and build a relationship through his works. Understanding this connection is key to grasping his philosophical approach. Kierkegaard's early works use pseudonyms and indirect approaches, which were vital for expressing his thoughts. He held that how ideas are presented influences their significance. These methods help him and his readers avoid aestheticism, intellectualism, Hegelianism, and rationalism. Pseudonyms let him distance himself from authority, allowing the personas to speak more freely. They also encourage exploration of different viewpoints and moral decisions rather than adherence to rigid doctrines. Kierkegaard's idea of indirect communication emphasises internalising ethical and religious truths personally. It focuses on individual existence rather than just sharing information. The maieutic method promotes self-reflection and personal growth, guiding the reader towards transformation through an existential connection with truth. Kierkegaard saw himself as a religious writer, not an aesthetic one. He emphasised that pseudonymous texts do not reflect his words and urged proper attribution. Confusing

## Kierkegaard's Authorship, Critique Of Rationalism, And The Individual

himself with pseudonyms risks distorting his views, as seen in *The Point of View* and Climacus, which warn against turning abstract ideas into dogmas and stripping them of their essential features. The form of pseudonymous writing is crucial to their meaning, and ignoring this can cause misunderstanding.<sup>6</sup> Patrick's analysis shows that confusing the author's form can lead to mistaking pseudonymous remarks for true ideas. He advises always including the author's name with pseudonymous works, as Kierkegaard does. However, his misunderstanding of indirect communication's importance suggests he has not fully grasped it, as shown by his failure to mention pseudonyms or indirect communication. This might cause him to see pseudonymous works as mere exposure. While he discusses his style in relation to Johannes Climacus's works, influenced by Kierkegaard's *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, this may conflict with their true purpose.<sup>7</sup> These edits clarify and soften the dense, poetic signs, which are nearly as lyrical as the authorship they seek to portray. Authorship is of supreme significance; dismissing it as mere eccentricity or a simple tool limits proper understanding. Misinterpreting Kierkegaard's warning damages the connection with both readers and texts. This is especially clear with pseudonyms, which are closely connected to Kierkegaard himself. Clarifying his position is vital, as viewing all pseudonymous works as merely his ideas diminishes their importance, and ignoring their purpose overlooks their significance. It is essential to clearly connect pseudonyms to his fundamental philosophical perspective.

### Kierkegaard as a Socratic Correction

Kierkegaard's early works adopt a Socratic method, likening Christianity to Socrates of Athens. Like Socrates, he seeks to prompt individuals to move from complacency to deep inward reflection. These writings deliberately avoid providing direct answers, emphasising ignorance, indirect methods, and self-examination. This approach aims to inspire personal reflection and responsibility, serving as a Socratic critique of rationalism. Kierkegaard's pseudonyms challenge his authority by encouraging readers to take responsibility for their personal growth rather than relying on him. They are crafted to avoid a direct intellectual connection, promoting personal, reflective engagement. While each pseudonym functions as a distinct character with unique thoughts and voices, they all emphasise the importance of moral judgement. They employ a Socratic method, viewing inwardness as a path to liberation rather than merely a means of control through knowledge. Ultimately, their aim aligns with Kierkegaard's goal of guiding individuals to discover their own truth.<sup>8</sup> Kierkegaard saw indirect communication as the most effective way to express intentions. While objective knowledge can be shared directly, Climacus notes that this is not true communication, as it only conveys facts without human experience. This shifts the focus from the personal to abstract ideas, making expression an end in itself. Because Kierkegaard emphasises that ethical and religious knowledge requires personal commitment, communication is secondary; active listener participation indicates true understanding. Objective appeals resonate more with the emotive will than with the intellect.<sup>9</sup> To avoid his works being seen as mere knowledge aimed at provoking reflection and challenging Christian identities via pseudonyms, Kierkegaard used the maieutic method, ensuring authentic communication and safeguarding the individual's relationship with God. Kierkegaard's later works modify the Socratic method by highlighting a more subtle form of communication through Johannes Anti-Climacus. While Socratic dialogue usually depends on maieutic instruction and self-examination, Christianity introduces divine revelation, making God the ultimate source of truth. This represents a departure from the traditional Socratic approach, as truth is now seen as a gift from God rather than something individually discovered. As a result, faith becomes more important than personal insight, focusing on a relationship with God. Although maieutic methods aim to foster personal change, their current purpose is to support Christian faith and communion with the divine. The *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* is the most thorough example of early pseudonymous writing and marks the peak of an evolving interpretative approach to Kierkegaard's philosophy. Although its full importance will become clearer through comparison with similar developments in later works, it is essential to acknowledge the unique significance of The Postscript and its pseudonymous author, Johannes Climacus.

The various subtle indicators highlight Climacus's importance and his writings. This is evident in the three-part structure of his authorship and the Postscript's distinctive placement. It also suggests that, although Climacus, speaking in the third person, claimed only to understand the purpose of his work, he still drew insights from, critiqued aesthetic works, and made minor adjustments.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Kierkegaard initially planned to end his authorship with the Postscript, as its title indicates. His name appears on Climacus's writings but not on his aesthetic texts, supporting the idea that the Fragments and Postscript aimed to critique a philosophy Kierkegaard viewed as a reflection of its era. Finally, there is a clear connection

between the initial view of Johannes Climacus as an autobiographical narrator and the Climacus who examined Kierkegaard's core struggle, originally seen as a conflict between philosophy and Christianity, later as a contest between man and God. The importance of *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* is evident in both its content and its method of communication. Like earlier anonymous works, it maintains a consistent stance, using indirect language to clarify through negation. At the same time, it explores a more intricate, layered realm, gently guiding readers without limiting their freedom and subtly alluding to ideas reminiscent of religious texts. Both in fact and in poetic expression, it marks a significant point in the author's body of work. Climacus viewed his role as identifying the root cause of the misunderstanding between speculative philosophy and Christianity. He cited earlier pseudonymous writers who focused on existence, thereby indirectly criticising speculative philosophy. Although his perspective was more sophisticated, his approach closely resembled that of these earlier authors. His chosen method remains relevant because he ultimately believes that issues in speculative philosophy stem largely from broader societal trends. Our increased knowledge has led many to forget the true essence of existence and the importance of inwardness. Addressing this may require a nuanced approach, as genuine inwardness implies that some outcomes are trivial and not worth conflict. Sharing results can seem unnatural because every individual is a spiritual being, with their truth rooted in personal self-activity, something that sharing results might upset. If someone dismisses this as mere declamation, irony, or dialectics, I wonder: what else can truly communicate ethics? Should it be presented objectively with formal structure, risking inconsistency? For me, irony, pathos, and dialectics effectively fulfil the need to demonstrate ethics.<sup>11</sup> The *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, like other pseudonymous works, doesn't aim to critique speculative philosophy or argue that Hegelianism needs correction. Instead, it helps readers free themselves from that philosophy's moral and spiritual influence. Concerning rationalism, it aims to change the reader's view by depicting rationalism as flawed.

Although the pseudonymous authors primarily addressed Christianity, their focus often extended to related subjects. Their approach remained largely Socratic, as Kierkegaard intentionally developed. Christianity could benefit from having a Socrates, someone who openly admits ignorance and employs a transparent, dialectical manner. Kierkegaard likened the problems in Christendom to those of Socrates, noting that the anonymous crowd worsened the situation. Although he kept his concerns private, he believed that publishing could empower the public and foster independent thought. He aimed to imitate Socrates by using pseudonyms to encourage reflection.

#### Climacus and Anti-Climacus

Johannes Climacus and Johannes Anti-Climacus embody contrasting yet interconnected aspects of Kierkegaard's philosophy. Climacus claims he is not a Christian, whereas Anti-Climacus demonstrates Christian dedication. Kierkegaard perceived this as a reflection of his own identity, with their complex relationship revealing different facets of his personal and spiritual self. Their writings explore existential and Christian themes, often under pseudonyms. Additionally, Kierkegaard's later devotional works are crucial for understanding his religious beliefs, providing an earnest spiritual perspective that complements the philosophical ideas of Climacus and Anti-Climacus. These writings exhibit a deeper engagement with existential questions. Pseudonymous authorship often suggests ignorance or helplessness, encouraging reflection rather than definitive answers. It acts as an internalised form of religion, mainly through Socratic critique of rationalism. After 1848, Kierkegaard recognised that the indirect method depends on human intelligence. Later, Christian authorship appeared, leading to the *Postscript*. Figures like Johannes Anti-Climacus demonstrate a more profound form of indirect communication, which differs markedly from Kierkegaard's approach. Grasping both perspectives is essential. Let's examine Anti-Climacus as a pseudonymous author. Walter Lowrie mainly considers Kierkegaard's early use of pseudonyms and indirect communication from a psychological perspective. While acknowledging the maieutic aspect of the authorship, this is not its primary focus. He views the Easter experience as a key moment that allows Kierkegaard to communicate more openly, ending pseudonymous writings and speaking directly. Furthermore, he suggests that Kierkegaard personally authored all later works and intended to publish them under his real name. In this context, Anti-Climacus appears more as a secondary character.<sup>12</sup> The *Journals* of Kierkegaard support this view but offer a broader perspective, treating the psychological explanation as a minor factor. Kierkegaard's philosophy suggests that his indirect communication isn't merely due to introversion. He saw himself as a Socrates within Christian society, challenging the focus on extraversion, both personal and societal, to foster authentic dialogue in a period he believed had lost its true human essence.

## Kierkegaard's Authorship, Critique Of Rationalism, And The Individual

Lowrie states that the Easter experience was a turning point, after which he ceased using indirect communication or pseudonyms as before.<sup>13</sup> While this is true, it doesn't fully support the idea that his subsequent works are entirely non-pseudonymous and straightforward. Although this event prompted Kierkegaard to definitively drop his previous style, the statement needs more context. Central to Christianity is bearing witness, as relying only on the maieutic method is insufficient. For Christians, truth isn't an inward discovery like Socrates believed but a revelation that must be communicated.<sup>14</sup> The Easter of 1848 did not change his outlook. Over a year later, he reflected on his past and future, saying: But nothing about my personality as an author.<sup>15</sup> Despite this, the pseudonyms remain meaningful in Kierkegaard's life; they represent different aspects of his true self. Interestingly, two of these pseudonyms were quite similar to his real identity, serving as reflections. Kierkegaard uses pseudonyms like Climacus and Anti-Climacus to reflect different facets of his identity, embodying a dialectical balance of opposites that protect his reality and connect to his core thoughts. Climacus claims he is not a Christian, while Anti-Climacus is devout. He says that he is a simple Christian, and this opposition reveals a core secret.<sup>16</sup> These figures and their writings are autobiographical, illustrating his evolving view of authorship culminating in the Postscript. Both are approximations meeting at infinity, with devotional works adding spiritual depth. For Kierkegaard, devotional writings surpass the intellectual, forming the core of his authorship, as Swenson notes.<sup>17</sup> This challenges Geismar's ranking, which typically assigns lower value to early pseudonymous works and perceives Kierkegaard as having a consistent personality. The structure underpins this perspective. I disagree with Hirsch's argument that if Johannes de Silentio's and Climacus's ideas can't be directly connected to Kierkegaard, then Vigilius Haufniensis and Anti-Climacus's ideas must be.<sup>18</sup> While not all ideas are definitively linked, Johannes de Silentio's thoughts influenced Kierkegaard's decision not to reconcile with Regine. We've analysed Climacus and Anti-Climacus, their relation to Kierkegaard's broader thought, and their connections. The assertion that Vigilius Haufniensis's ideas belong to Kierkegaard is inaccurate, as these were not originally his.

### Individual and Race

Kierkegaard views the individual as both a unique entity and part of humanity, neither isolated nor absorbed into a universal system. He believes that achieving human perfection requires maintaining personal identity while engaging with the collective. This connection between personal and collective histories offers people a fresh start and an opportunity to advance humanity. The ongoing exchange between the individual and the race emphasises the importance of understanding both within the broader context of human existence. Kierkegaard sees sin as fundamental to understanding personal identity and morality. In Christian belief, everyone is inherently sinful, which fosters true freedom and authenticity. Human solidarity rests on shared sinfulness and a connection to God, going beyond mere philosophy. His critique of rationalism shifts from Hegelian ideas toward Christian notions of sin and faith. He views his spiritual journey as part of humanity's collective growth. His writings reflect personal development and aim to revitalise religious life, as he considers himself a reformer of his era. Ultimately, he seeks to understand oneself in relation to humanity, time, and God. Kierkegaard argued that his life couldn't be fully understood through aesthetic or intellectual views alone, as he grounded his existence in religious meaning beyond those perspectives. He focused on Christian ideas such as sin, salvation, sacrifice, and responsibility. His influence spans eras, emphasising the importance of developing a unique individual.

Kierkegaard saw himself as an independent thinker shaped by personal experience and often wrote under pseudonyms. He emphasised that his philosophy centres on the relationship between the individual and the community, highlighting personal freedom and responsibility. He argued that individuals should seek their own freedom without infringing on others' rights, a principle often neglected today. Contemporary views often underestimate the value of shifting perspectives to understand life beyond purely rationalist or romantic approaches. Unlike the Renaissance emphasis on individual liberty or Hegel's belief that reality is entirely personal, Kierkegaard saw the individual as both oneself and the entire human race. He considered this duality essential to human perfection, which he described as a state of being. Human life, he argued, involves authentic existence and maintaining a continuous connection with all humanity through mutual sharing. Humans differ from animals because they go beyond their species. Achieving wholeness means recognising oneself as part of the race, representing full participation. This connects an individual's history with that of the race: everyone is influenced by the race's past, and the race is shaped by individual lives. As history progresses, each person begins anew, embodying both self and race, and integrating personal history into the broader racial continuum. The bond between individual and race is akin to Adam's connection to humanity; both are themselves and part of the race at the same time.<sup>19</sup> Since Adam's explanation includes

the race, the individual's explanation does too, and vice versa.

Kierkegaard believed his era lacked sufficient religious education. He saw himself as personally educated and explored Christian identity.<sup>20</sup> While these quotes reflect his early view of the era's needs and his Socratic method, they don't capture his later view that more was required. He realised that what was truly needed were individuals who rediscovered humanity's core, people who, in their lives, linked Dam and Christ to their time and testified to sin and salvation. Ultimately, such people would view their age through human history, see themselves from a human perspective, and thereby truly understand their era. Humankind, like individuals, relies on evaluators to foster progress. Geniuses act as these evaluators, advancing incrementally as they explore vital aspects of life. They are key drivers of change. Although geniuses might predict future trends, their insights are grounded in a deep understanding of history. Genuine progress requires reexamining core truths rather than reverting to the past, thereby showcasing true originality.<sup>21</sup> He understood he must transform into someone who, through self-awareness of his race, can link the era to his community and to God. His unclear relationship with Regine exemplifies life's inherent ambiguity. While interpretations vary, Kierkegaard mainly saw their relationship through a religious lens, emphasising religion's significance beyond just aesthetic or intellectual interests. Religion encompasses and goes beyond these elements, rooted in communal life and upheld by God.<sup>22</sup> Focusing only on aesthetic and intellectual views cannot fully capture the profundity of such a life.

This passage examines the Platonic idea of good genealogy, tracing a shift from Genesis to a myth of understanding. It notes that Socrates was institutionalised, whereas Christ was accepted. As the sense of the absolute declined, the importance of sin lessened, and grace became part of daily life. The individual was born in 1813, during Hegel's critique of Descartes. Coming from a low-vitality family, influenced by a melancholic father and an unwanted mother, their union favoured connection over marriage. He spent much of his life in Denmark, observing Europe's moral decline. Disillusioned, he turned inward to reconnect with family, race, and God. Dying in 1855, he fulfilled his destiny as a writer, afflicted by illness, longing for eternity, and seeking to thank God.

#### Conclusion

Kierkegaard's work is best understood as a sincere pursuit of religious and existential aims. It highlights the need to resist reducing human life to aesthetics, abstract philosophy, rationalism, or systematic thought. His clever use of pseudonyms, indirect communication, and the maieutic method are key strategies for encouraging readers to see Christianity and ethical life as more than objective facts. The shift from Johannes Climacus to Anti-Climacus illustrates how the Socratic method is carefully adapted within a Christian context, where divine revelation replaces Socratic ignorance, and inwardness emphasises each person's unique relationship with God. As a result, the individual plays a central role in Kierkegaard's critique of rationalism. His view of the individual reflects his broader perspective on humanity: each person is both herself and part of the larger human community, with responsibilities towards others. Sin makes each person unique; however, recognising shared sinfulness as Christians promotes solidarity, freedom, and genuine humanity. Kierkegaard saw his life as a religious mission: to become an authentic individual, to engage meaningfully with his time, and to inspire others to live faithfully before God. His critique of rationalism is not merely philosophical but a heartfelt call to pursue authentic existence, a personal inward journey, responsibility, and a conscious awareness of God. His lasting importance lies in the fundamental truth that each person must face their own existence directly, rather than hiding behind superficial systems, abstract ideas, or the impersonal authority of their era..

#### REFERENCES

1. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 146
2. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 149
3. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 42
4. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1945). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (David Ferdinand Swenson, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 224
5. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 148
6. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1945). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (David Ferdinand Swenson, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 252

## Kierkegaard's Authorship, Critique Of Rationalism, And The Individual

7. Patrick, D. G. M. (1947). *Pascal and Kierkegaard* (Vol. 2). Lutterworth Press. p.251
8. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1945). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (David Ferdinand Swenson, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 74
9. Swenson, D. F. (1945). *Something About Kierkegaard*. Augsburg Press. p. 238
10. Thomte, R. (1948). *Kierkegaard's Philosophy of Religion*. Princeton University Press. p.37
11. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1945). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (David Ferdinand Swenson, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p. 137
12. Lowrie, W (1946). *A Short Life of Kierkegaard*. Princeton University Press. p. 217
13. Lowrie, W (1946). *A Short Life of Kierkegaard*. Princeton University Press. p. 208
14. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1938). (A. Dru, Trans.). *The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard*. p.809
15. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1938). (A. Dru, Trans.). *The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard*. p.936
16. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1938). (A. Dru, Trans.). *The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard*. p.1000
17. Swenson, D. F. (1945). *Something about Kierkegaard*. Augsburg Press. p.xxvii
18. Wahl, J.A. (1938). *Études Kierkegaardiennes*. Fernand Aubier. p. 52-54
19. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1946). *The Concept of Dread* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p.26-27
20. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p.75
21. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1938). (A. Dru, Trans.). *The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard*. p.1003
22. Kierkegaard, S. A. (1939). *The Point of View* (W. Lowrie, Trans.). Oxford University Press. p.103

.