

a particular highlight, as it speaks to a debate that will continue to gather participants in the coming years. M. concludes by looking at the metaphoric force of James Cone's *The Cross and the Lynching Tree* as a satisfying way to see how metaphor allows for the understanding of a saving God.

This superb book is well written and achieves a difficult task. This work could issue in a new era of insight for theology. Masson has done a great service for ecumenical dialogue and for the cultural significance of theology. His humility and posture will also serve to further the acceptance of his findings.

Brendon Neilson
Red Deer, Alberta, Canada

Hermeneutics and the Philosophy of Religion. The Legacy of Paul Ricoeur. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Marlene A. Block. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. Pp. ix + 291. €84.

This book is composed of papers and the responses to them which were presented at the Claremont Studies in the Philosophy of Religion Conference. The conference took place in 2013 and was dedicated to the legacy of Paul Ricoeur. The papers were given by professors from Europe and the United States, while the responses were provided mostly by doctoral students from the Claremont Graduate University in California. As expected, almost all of the papers are outstanding; perhaps less expected, so are almost all of the responses. The focus here must be limited to six of the most interesting papers.

The title is "Hermeneutics" but the contributors discuss many different types of hermeneutics. These include "philosophical hermeneutics," "hermeneutics of life," "hermeneutics of the self," and "hermeneutics of suspicion." These types reveal differing aspects of "hermeneutics," but as the contributors make clear, R. not only had different conceptions regarding what hermeneutics was about, but also regarding hermeneutics itself.

David Tracy discusses R.'s "hermeneutics with detours" (11) by tracing the influences from various people, including Gabriel Marcel, Karl Jaspers, and Sigmund Freud, but also Aristotle and Kant. Hegel's influence is also seen in R.'s concern with dialectics. Tracy characterizes R.'s preoccupation with each of these thinkers as a type of detour; he does not regard these as dead ends, but as crucial stages in R.'s "long philosophical journey" (33).

Walter Schweidler suggests that for R. "ontological" is not primarily about method but rather about objects, or better, about the interpretations of objects (81). They are answers to our questions, but the answers themselves are also questions, thus we are continuously "led back" to where we began (92). R. believed there was a paradox about returning to the "unrepeatable origin of human understanding," which implied that the solution to the hermeneutical circle is primarily a religious one (91).

Carsten Pallesen takes up the theme of dialectics and expressly links it to R.'s great interest in Hegel. Pallesen notes that R. preferred Hegel's speculative philosophy of religion to Schleiermacher's "reconstruction hermeneutics" (106, 132). This seems to be based on the fact that R. follows Hegel's "dialectic of presence and distance" in

conjunction with God (129). But, it also is based upon the distance between Jesus and God, which is indicated by Jesus's "questioning lament" on the cross (133).

Anselm Min's paper is a kind of dialectic between R. and Hegel, noting that R. believed that we can no longer think like Hegel and thus we must refute him. However, he also believed that "Hegel cannot be refuted with arguments" (143), but we must confront him by some other means. R.'s complaint about Hegel's philosophy is explained in detail, but Min's major point is that R.'s emphasis on human plurality conflicted with Hegel's notion of "*history as history of a collective singular*" (145). R. also emphasized the "three modes of time, past, present, and future," and he regarded Hegel as a "necessary detour" on his way back to Kant (153–54).

Pierre Bühler focuses on R.'s philosophy of religion and notes that Luther's insistent "Here I stand" is an important indication of R.'s "hermeneutics of the self" (185). For him, faith is a form of "nevertheless" and reflects the tension between belief and unbelief.

Christina Gschwandtner also examines a type of dialectic but one she refers to as a movement between "text and action," thus between life and narrative (231, 233–34, 246). She also emphasizes R.'s constant questioning and notes that it is a "hermeneutics of suspicion" (234). She recalls his insistence that we are always left with the "conflict of interpretations" (236 n. 23), indicating that we can never arrive at the definitive answer or interpretation. Instead, the "world of the text" invites the reader to conduct one's own personal investigation. This does not imply that these are empty stories; rather, R. reminded us of "the importance of remembering for the sake of justice" (246; see also 270). Ricoeur was often concerned with the past, but Gschwandtner reminds us that he was just as preoccupied with the future: "Hope is religion's response to the reality of evil" (260).

In his introduction Ingolf Dalferth emphasizes that "hermeneutics is an art—the art of the detour to understanding" (1), a claim which nicely sums up the contents of this collection of essays. Deviations from the intended path are not only to be tolerated, but should be embraced, because hermeneutics is not a goal-oriented science, but is similar to a type of travel. Because of R.'s fervent belief in detours and his rich theological insights, this book will not only be of interest to those concerned with Ricoeur's philosophy, but with the relationship between hermeneutics and the philosophy of religion.

Christopher Adair-Toteff
University of South Florida/University of Kent

A Trinitarian Anthropology: Adrienne Von Speyr and Hans Urs von Balthasar in Dialogue with Thomas Aquinas. By Michele M. Schumacher. Washington: Catholic University of America, 2014. Pp. xiii + 451. \$79.95.

This book brings Thomas Aquinas and Hans Urs von Balthasar into frank confrontation on trinitarian theology, an issue that champions of both theologians point to as particularly divisive and in need of exploration. S. performs this task without sidestepping any of the difficulties that it would be tempting to bracket, notably the influence