

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

on Balthasar of mystic Adrienne von Speyr. S. not only refuses to avoid the question of Speyr's visions and writings, but puts it on center stage. This serves to address directly the anxiety of many Thomists regarding Balthasar's theology, namely, the metaphorical and occasionally anthropomorphic language that he uses to describe the trinitarian Persons, an approach he derives principally from Adrienne's visions.

Though a few of the seven chapters focus more on Balthasar, Speyr is the main subject of the book and the main voice in the conversation. It is not quite a three-way conversation, and, as in real life, the amount of time each speaks is asymmetrical. Speyr has the dominant voice, and Balthasar echoes her initial insights, sometimes fairly transparently and sometimes with a heavy extrapolation. Aquinas here is less of a dialogue partner and more of an eavesdropper. He is listening in, contributing mostly in the footnotes, either by way of affirmation or offering a word of caution, and only speaks for himself when he thinks either Speyr or Balthasar could use some assistance. S. also has no qualms about adding her own voice in order to critique Balthasar's use of Speyr, especially in the fifth chapter, where she offers an alternative reading of the importance of Speyr's visions of Christ's abandonment by the Father.

This is the order set for the first six chapters, which read as an adroit summary and synthesis of Speyr's thought on an impressive range of topics: the relationship between nature and grace, the unity of the body and soul, the individual vis-à-vis community, and the complementarity of the sexes. It could seem to be a random choice of Speyrian themes, but S. manages to show how each of these topics helps to bring to light both trinitarian theology and anthropology, and more importantly, their interrelation without confusion. S. does this by navigating the corpus of both Speyr and Balthasar with incredible ease, employing the untranslated works as readily as those in English. This allows her to have Speyr and Balthasar speak for themselves and even correct themselves, avoiding many of the misunderstandings that can occur when attending to only their more sensational passages.

Throughout these first six chapters S. demonstrates rather than argues for a reading of Balthasar/Speyr in harmony with Aquinas and with church tradition more broadly construed. Indeed, this appears to be *the* intention of the book: to present us with the option of a Balthasar whose trinitarian speculation can be seen as conforming to his own intention of orthodoxy, and a Speyr whose more extravagant mystical statements are tempered and brought into greater clarity when attending to her broader corpus. In chapter 7 and the general conclusion, which are the real heart of this book, S. makes this intention explicit. She gives us two interpretive tools: first, we should believe Balthasar when he qualifies all theological language as standing under the rule of the *maior dissimilitudo* between the Creator and creation, and second and similarly, that Balthasar's "katalogy" is a reasoning that moves from archetype to image, which preserves God as the primary analogate (346). We thus learn what a human person is from what we know of the Divine Persons as given in God's own self-revelation, and not vice versa, as Balthasar's use of dramatic imagery might lead us to believe (for instance, allowing for "surprise" in the Trinity).

S. concludes her excellent monograph with an appeal for theologians to adopt a generous and truly Catholic spirit when analyzing these two Swiss authors. Thus,

while Aquinas, functioning more as a symbol of Catholic doctrine than anything else, regulates and interprets Speyr's and Balthasar's specific doctrinal positions, it is Balthasar's "method" of symphonic truth that is S.'s response to Thomist objections. The contribution of S.'s research is that of a peacemaker, mediating between the devoted Balthasarians and Thomists. To the former she encourages interpretations that favor orthodoxy over novelty, and thus to attend carefully to the variety of objections that have been raised; to the latter she exhorts charity and openness to alternate formulations regarding the one truth. The most valuable aspect of this book may be that it presents us with a method of engaging theological difference that makes cuts and divisions when necessary, but never departs from a truly Catholic understanding of orthodoxy and always keeps an eye towards ecclesial harmony.

Jonathan Martin Ciraulo
University of Notre Dame

Modern Orthodox Thinkers: From the Philokalia to the Present. By Andrew Louth. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015. Pp. xvi + 383. \$ 29.70.

In 2004, the University of Notre Dame Press published Michael Plekon's *Living Icons: Persons of Faith in the Eastern Church*, which included biographical essays on a sample of prominent Orthodox figures from the last century. Some of these figures, such as Paul Evdokimov, Alexander Schmemmann, and Maria Skobtsova, find their way into Louth's latest volume, which similarly seeks to present an all-encompassing picture of modern Orthodoxy via a series of reflections on significant Orthodox thinkers, scholars, and practitioners. L.'s volume differs from Plekon's work as the latter's tone was more pronouncedly hagiographical, whereas L., though sensitive to the spiritual vision of his subjects, chooses to explore their theological legacy at greater length. L. also adopts a wider chronological frame, setting out to trace the influence of the *Philokalia* on the development of Orthodox thought from the late 18th century until the present. The result is a work of great erudition that introduces its readers to a gallery of inspiring and often colorful characters, while also offering a concise account of some of the more contested issues in contemporary Orthodox theology, such as the nature and purpose of the neo-patristic synthesis adumbrated by Georges Florovsky or the sources of John Zizioulas's highly controversial trinitarian theology of *koinonia* and personhood.

L. opens the volume with a short discussion of the *Philokalia*, the anthology of early Christian writers assembled in the late eighteenth century by Nicodemus the Hagiorite and Macarius of Corinth. The history of the dissemination of this collection and its impact on speculative reflection both in the Russian and in the Greek-speaking world is one of the leitmotifs of this volume, and in fact two of the *Philokalia*'s English translators, Philip Sherrard and Metropolitan Kallistos Ware, are also the subject of two of L.'s most detailed biographical essays. The Slavonic, and later the Russian version of the *Philokalia*, played an important role in the nineteenth-century renaissance of Russian