Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion

Alison Scott-Baumann

continuum

Continuum International Publishing Group
The Tower Building
11 York Road
London SE1 7NX

80 Maiden Lane
Suite 704
New York NY 10038

www.continuumbooks.com

© Alison Scott-Baumann 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-8470-6188-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by Newgen Imaging Systems Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed in Great Britain by the MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

For my husband Mike,
and our children
Lizzie and James, and
in memory of my wonderful parents
Scottie and Francis

Contents

Acknowledgements viii
Abbreviations and bibliographic note ix

Introduction 1

1 Cartesian doubt 7

2 Ricœur's hermeneutics I: the archaeology of suspicion 22

3 Ricœur's masters of suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche and Freud 40

4 On the use and abuse of the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' 59

5 Ricœur's hermeneutics II: the theory of interpretation 78

6 Linguistic analysis 97

7 Methodological dialectics 115

8 Philosophical anthropology 135

9 Ricœur's hermeneutics III: recovery 153

10 Conclusion 170

Notes 185

Bibliography 217

Index 225

Acknowledgements

This book was made possible by Mike, Lizzie and James. I have also received detailed advice and support from colleagues and friends who have been extremely generous with their ideas and their time as expert readers: in the early stages, Chris Norris, Karl Simms and Stephen Clark, then later Manuel Barbeito, Stephen H. Clark, Stevie and James Coutts, Harry Cowen, Catherine Goldenstein, Don Ihde, John Lotherington, Mireille Delbraccio, Chris Norris and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann. Robert Fisk read Chapter 9 and gave his specialist input as eyewitness reporter and Middle East analyst. I have benefited considerably from conversations about Ricœur with David Pellauer and with Richard Kearney in Paris and Chicago.

Catherine Goldenstein, Fonds Ricœur archivist, is immensely knowledgeable and supportive and I am very grateful for her support and for that of Olivier Abel, with their vision of Ricœur studies in the future. Olivier has been encouraging me with this work since 2004, when I started visiting the Institut Protestant de Théologie, to attend seminars on Ricœur's work. Mireille Delbraccio has inspired me and given me some new perspectives on my writing. With Nicola Stricker, as well as intellectual support, I have enjoyed speaking German as well as French; and I have enjoyed discussions with Pamela Anderson about Ricœur. In November 2007 I visited Eileen Brennan and Angelo Bottone in Dublin to talk about Ricœur and translation. Both my goddaughter Theodora James and Stevie Coutts help me with translation work.

The University of Gloucestershire has given me travel bursaries that enabled me to attend the Ricœur conference in Chicago in 2007 and visit the Fonds Ricœur in Paris in 2008. Finally I wish to thank the editorial team at Continuum Newgen, especially Murali, Bhavana Nair, Josh Paul and Ajith Salvankar for their unfailing support and attention to detail.

Abbreviations and bibliographic note

I have put two dates in the brackets for Ricœur's translated books/papers; the year of first publication in French followed by the year of publication in English, except for exceptions e.g. *Love and Justice* has been published many times, first in German. I cite it in Kearney's *The Hermeneutics of Action* and the latest French version, published according to Ricœur's wishes. Vansina's 2008 bibliography is the most comprehensive, especially for tracking the many different sites, languages and dates of publication. For Ricœur texts that occur frequently I have provided an abbreviation e.g. *Freedom and Nature*: *FAN*. In the book itself I reference dates and supporting texts that I believe to be worth noting: this is by no means exhaustive, given the great range of Ricœur's knowledge. I have used the Fonds Ricœur system in the bibliography section on manuscripts.

A Key to Edmund Husserl's *Ideas* 1950/1996 (originally published with Ricœur's translation into French of Husserl's *Ideen*, a text I refer to but do not use).

Philosophy of the Will 1

FAN	*The Voluntary and the Involuntary: Freedom and Nature* 1950/1966

Philosophy of the Will 2

FM	*Finitude and Culpability: Fallible Man* 1960/1965
SOE	*Finitude and Culpability: The Symbolism of Evil* 1960/ 1967

HAT	*History and Truth* 1955/1965
FAP	*Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* 1965/1970
HAP	*Husserl. An Analysis of His Phenomenology* English 1967, essays published separately in French 1949–1957
COI	*The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics* 1969/1974
PASE	*Political and Social Essays*, essays published separately in French 1956–1973
BH	*Biblical Hermeneutics* 1975
IT	*Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* 1976, English only

ROM	*The Rule of Metaphor* 1975/1977
	The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur eds. Reagan and Stewart 1978
HHS	*Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* 1981
TAN	*Time and Narrative.* 3 Volumes. (Vol. 1 1983/1984, Vol. 2 1985/1985, Vol. 3 1985/1988)
LIU	*Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* 1986/1997
CAC	*Critique and Conviction* 1995/1998
FTTA	*From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II* 1986/1991
OAA	*Oneself as Another* 1990/1992
FS	*Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative and Imagination* 1995
	Love and Justice 1996/*Amour et Justice* 2008
TJ	*The Just* 1995/2000
TB	*Thinking Biblically* 1998/1998
MHF	*Memory, History, Forgetting* 2000/2004
COR	*The Course of Recognition* 2004/2005
OT	*On Translation* 2004/2006
	Reflections on the Just 2001/2007
	What Makes Us Think? *A Neuroscientist and a Philosopher Argue about Ethics, Human Nature and the Brain* (with J-P Changeux) 1998/2000
	Vivant jusqu'à la mort 2007

Introduction

The writing of this book was prompted by my interest in the work of Paul Ricœur and by the intriguing discrepancies surrounding the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion': it is often used in isolation from his work, mostly attributed inaccurately and often attached to some general argument that resembles postmodern trends of a pessimistic tenor, which he himself rejected. This misunderstanding does not seem to exist in corresponding French literature. My discussion of the 'masters of suspicion' will contextualize the debate about conscious meaning for those who have a general interest in philosophy as well as a specialist interest in Ricœur. Paul Ricœur (1913–2005) was one of the greatest Western philosophers of the twentieth century and his work spans many disciplines and schools of thought. He was an intellectual, a philosopher and a Christian, steeped in the Judaeo-Christian tradition of Western Europe, and also at ease in the USA where he taught for many years.

Making use of existentialist, phenomenological and hermeneutical analysis, Ricœur's philosophical approach covers major issues in psychology, psychoanalysis, historiography, linguistics, literature, politics, law, ethics, theology and science. Ricœur's style can seem technical and abstract, yet his thought has a social immediacy on a number of levels: common political identity for the European Union, ethics of tolerance and inclusion and issues of justice, punishment and forgiveness. Throughout his life he took political positions against fascism and colonialism. He actively opposed Russian oppression of intellectuals in Czechoslovakia and the war in Algeria, and commented with critical interest upon issues such as the secular culture of France and even developments in neuroscience.[1] His work has been a great inspiration and source of guidance to me in my work on social justice with British Muslim groups at a time when 'the Muslim' is often seen as the alien Other. At various points in the text I sketch synergies between his writing and its effect on my work.

Given his massive *oeuvre*, this book is highly selective. In Chapter 1, an overview of Ricœur's work on suspicion opens a significant debate about meaning and doubt that will form the backbone of this text. Cartesian doubt provides a way into the work of the human in seeking a world of meaning and ethical strength. Ricœur's early life's work is summarized in Chapter 2. Chapters 3 and 4 analyse definitions and uses of the terms 'the masters of suspicion' and 'the hermeneutics of suspicion' respectively. Chapter 5 summarizes the work of his middle period. Chapters 6, 7 and 8 focus on three approaches that he used for resolving issues regarding suspicion, doubt and struggles for meaning. The first approach is linguistic analysis expressed in pre-critical naivety, secondly methodological dialectics that helps us to become critical (but we risk over-doing criticality with excessive suspicion) and thirdly philosophical anthropology that leads us into a second naivety. Chapter 9 looks at some of his major late work. Chapter 10 draws conclusions about Ricœur's replacement of the hermeneutics of suspicion with a range of methods.

Ricœur in translation

Ricœur was a translator from Greek, German, Italian and he translated fluently into English. He wrote much of his work in French, a great deal of which has been translated by American academics. He wrote and delivered many of his lectures and seminars in English and French, giving them in parallel in Paris and Chicago and elsewhere in Europe and the USA. The best bibliographic guide is that of Frans Vansina, updated 2008.[2] Vansina charts the complex details of primary and secondary publication including the multiple publication sites of many of his essays, which I only mention when I think it is important to my argument. Ricœur used 'man' (l'homme) as a term that describes 'humans', yet that also creates 'he/him' as a dominant pronoun. In the last thirty years of his life he also wrote about 'she'. I will attempt to use the impersonal 'they'.

The Fonds Ricœur

Ricœur donated his library and his manuscripts to the Protestant Theological College in Paris. Mme Catherine Goldenstein is the archivist, whose guidance and inspiration is invaluable, as is the leadership and vision of Professor Olivier Abel in spearheading the building of a new library to house the archive. In writing this book I have been given access to the archives and received a travel bursary from the University of Gloucestershire. The archives give us insight into Ricœur's work from hitherto inaccessible and largely unresearched material, including notes he took in lectures as a teenager, his own lecture notes in both French and English, and draft materials for books and articles. He kept his notes, organized and updated them over many years. Before, during and after the Second World War, he often worked on thin, postcard size paper (A6) and sometimes had no ink, using aniline ink dye. By the 1960s he was working on A5 paper and from the 1970s, with paper no longer a luxury item, he used A4.[3]

For the first time, I use archive sources to illuminate and clarify Ricœur's work using his own material.

Chapter 1 Cartesian doubt

Descartes' analysis of sceptical doubt has influenced modern philosophy, including Kant. Through Husserl's work on Descartes, Ricœur demonstrates the importance of phenomenology, a way of concentrating on consciousness as a source of direct experience. Descartes' thinking person becomes Husserl's phenomenologist, yet neither has the capacity to understand their own desires and the effect their desires have upon their perception of the world, or the other person and their viewpoint. Subjectivity as a problem was first raised by Kant and led to irreconcilable disputes between reason and the will. Ricœur attempts to mediate with a blend of phenomenology, hermeneutics and existentialism.

Chapter 2 Ricœur's hermeneutics I: the archaeology of suspicion

Against the tide of structuralism, Ricœur offers a critical defence of phenomenology. Several key texts will show his study of will and passion (*Freedom and Nature* (1950/1966)), of the shortcomings of scientific and other human endeavours (*History and Truth* (1955/1964)), of the debate about evil and human fallibility (*Fallible Man* (1960/1965)) and the study of religion and the love of phenomena that we can only think about through symbolic representation (*The Symbolism of Evil* (1960/1967)). I believe there is much to be gained from analysing our own behaviour regarding cultural symbols such as the hijab (the Muslim scarf) in ways that draw upon Ricœur's example.

Chapter 3 Ricœur's masters of suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche and Freud

Ricœur felt indebted to Marx, Freud and Nietzsche because they transformed the hermeneutic answer by creating a fundamental challenge to Cartesian dualism. For Ricœur, all three challenge religion, particularly Christianity, in ways that are a good antidote to the abuse of power that we may find in religious hegemonies. However, because they refuse to give credence to the possibility of faith, he finds their critique of religion unhelpful in challenging the ways in which meanings are embedded in belief systems. Of the three, Freud's work is the main influence on Ricœur and his writing is based mainly on Freud's texts, much less on secondary literature. He analyses Freud from a philosophical viewpoint, and finds Freud's work ultimately unable to provide methodologies for analysing meaning in language.

Chapter 4 On the use and abuse of the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion'

The phrase hermeneutics of suspicion is often used in philosophy and literary theory; the phrase has a history, is much quoted, usually not referenced properly and frequently mis-used. It has a wide currency in philosophy and in literary studies, yet is seldom contextualized as part of the significant debate about meaning that Ricœur conducted. This chapter discusses the various contrasting analyses of the hermeneutics of suspicion. Even more striking is the failure to connect the phrase convincingly with Ricœur's work beyond his analysis of the masters of suspicion and to acknowledge or analyse his subsequent abandonment of the term. He describes it as an overly powerful mechanism for suspecting others, which is what we do when we believe we know more than others do. Ricœur develops other techniques using suspicion that are based on the belief that we can never know enough.

Chapter 5 Ricœur's hermeneutics II: the theory of interpretation

This chapter provides a brief chronology of ideas and texts in 1965–1985. He uses structuralism to show that to explain more is to understand better. *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* are written as a consequence of his challenge to what he calls Heidegger's 'short cut' to understanding Being and of Ricœur's own linguistic turn, accepting the need to analyse language as the most significant bearer of meaning for humans and remaining Kantian. Ricœur sees Kant, then Fichte and finally Nietzsche, transforming man as subject into man as will. Influenced by Husserl, he studies Husserl's *Rückfrage*, the method of questioning backwards into the accumulated layers of meaning that comprise a text. Key issues for the phenomenology of meaning will be summarized from *Time and Narrative* (1983–1988). His work on ethical action will be exemplified in *From Text to Action* (1991).

The next three chapters (6, 7 and 8) give detailed analyses of three main devices that he developed, each of which provided a partial solution to the need for critical challenge without excessive use of suspicion.

Chapter 6 Linguistic analysis

It is vitally important to understand the ethical demands that Ricœur placed upon text, and the possibility of 'reading' action as if it were a sort of readable text. We can choose to make new and creative meanings, through tropes, as argued in *The Rule of Metaphor* (1977). We can use a device not dissimilar to the tension created within a metaphor, to shock the reader – 'semantic impertinence' – as seen in the often exaggerated plots of parables and we can use *mimesis* (development as well as imitation of life) (*Semeia* (1975)). He discusses the failure of Husserl's intentional person. Ricœur also emphasizes the importance of translation (*On Translation* (2006)).

Chapter 7 Methodological dialectics

Ricœur approaches structuralism, semiotics and Derrida's deconstruction as toolboxes for linguistic analysis *not* as wholesale or self-sufficient philosophies. He criticizes the dichotomy that Dilthey created between Explaining (scientific) and Understanding (social scientific) approaches and argues, through his critique of Dilthey, Habermas and Gadamer, for a combination of the two approaches, not a split. This argument serves him well to attempt to reconcile analytical and continental philosophy, although it is also clear that they don't necessarily want to be reconciled to each other. He also considers the difficulties experienced by the social sciences in their excessive attachment to method and the methodological difficulties this can give rise to (*Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (1981)). His last published book, *The Course of Recognition* (2004/2005), represents his final discussion of dialectical approaches.

Chapter 8 Philosophical anthropology

This chapter will investigate the tension that Ricœur perceives between secular and theological arguments and will place his work within the context that he created himself, with unusual blending of, for example, ordinary language philosophers and continental philosophy arguments. The philosopher is a responsible thinker, Ricœur believes, and must remain suspended between atheism and faith, and attempt to mediate between religion and faith by means of atheism.[4] Several key texts are analysed in the context of his attempts to provide various alternatives to suspicion; *The Socius and the Neighbour* (1955/1965), *The Erosion of Tolerance* (1996) and *The Just* (1995/2000). This chapter will also show how Ricœur revisits ideas from the 1950s and 1960s in *Oneself as Another* (1990/1992), and discusses the strength of his work for social justice: bearing witness and asserting that we can act well.

Chapter 9 Ricœur's hermeneutics III: recovery

This chapter covers Ricœur's last phase, mainly *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2000/2004) and *The Course of Recognition* (2004/2005), the latter also receiving coverage in Chapter 7. In the hermeneutics of recovery each methodology has a correlate in a state of mind in which we may find ourselves, either as a form of atrophy or, and Ricœur finds this preferable, part of a developmental journey. They are (1) linguistic analysis, experienced as a pre-critical naivety; (2) methodological dialectics, experienced as critical interpretation (including the hermeneutics of suspicion, and potentially where we may get stuck in ironic disbelief); and (3) philosophical anthropology leading to second naivety, a state of mind in which we are able to judge and choose, but after being battered about by life.

In *Memory, History, Forgetting,* he bears witness to the terrors suffered by ethnic minorities, among others the Jews of Europe. In this chapter the advice of Robert Fisk, Middle East war correspondent, has been valuable in helping me to respond to some of Ricœur's concerns about eyewitness accounts and the need to continue to be a witness to history.

Chapter 10 Conclusion

Marx, Freud and Nietzsche gave us new interpretative powers, but they are powers based on doubt about the self. Ricœur used the masters of suspicion and others and attempted (for over seventy years) to recover the self by deciphering the signs of civilization. He offered such interpretation through language, metaphor, narrative, translation, memory and forgetting and proposed active choices that involve moral risks; a wager about the self and the other. Like Husserl, he was bound to fail because of the conflicted nature of being a human, and the inevitability of failure was of great significance to him as a regulative idea. He used the methods of the masters of suspicion, but he rejected their conclusions as too deterministic, and developed other methods, hoping to give us some confidence in our limited powers to think and act well. His late work on the Song of Solomon provides a response to Cartesian dualism and an exemplar of much that is best in his work during a life of ninety-two years that spanned two centuries and two world wars.

Chapter 1

Cartesian doubt

As a teenager Paul Ricœur began his intellectual journey, which was to last over seventy years, by focusing on human perception and its relationship with ethical behaviour: how does what we perceive affect what we believe and vice versa? This started in phenomenology and developed into hermeneutics. The hermeneutics of suspicion was a key idea in his work in this area and his work on related issues such as scepticism and doubt started in his high-school classes. Definitions are important. I believe 'suspicion' is generally used to refer to doubt about the motives of others, much as Kant describes it;

> The man who is asked whether or not he intends to speak truthfully in the statement that he is now to make and who does not receive the very question with indignation as regards the suspicion thereby expressed that he might be a liar, but who instead asks permission to think first about possible exceptions – that man is already a liar.[1]

However, we will see that there are crucial differences in the ways in which Ricœur develops the term. He kept his philosophy notes, starting in 1930, when he was about 17 and inspired by his tutor Dalbiez ('I was dazzled, a vast new world opened').[2] He was exposed early to doubt by Dalbiez, Leroux and other teachers; the scepticism of Aenesidemus (1st century BC), Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhonism, Spinoza, Descartes, Hume and others.[3] Doubt has become dominant as a philosophical approach and life in the twenty-first century can give the impression of being dominated by heightened scepticism and suspiciousness.[4] What about scepticism? Ricœur rarely uses the term scepticism, but does so broadly as Kant does i.e. as a conservative and stultifying *stopping* of criticality; 'Yet even he [Hume] did not suspect such a formal science, but ran his ship ashore, for safety's sake, landing on skepticism, there to let it lie and rot.'[5] Norris, with his appeal to critical realism, argues that post-structuralist thought 'has condemned itself, cheerfully enough, to an outlook of last-ditch cognitive scepticism'.[6] If this is true, then why is scepticism not a more effective tool for Ricœur than suspicion?

Ricœur was designated an 'orphan of the nation', his mother having died shortly after his birth and his father having died in action in the First World War. He studied Descartes' deployment of sceptical doubt at the Sorbonne (1933–1934) and then studied Descartes through the work of Husserl (1859–1938): between 1939 and 1944, Ricœur served five years as a prisoner of war and translated Husserl's *Ideas* into French, writing in the margin of his copy of the text, because of lack of paper.[7] In OFLAG 11D he and several colleagues, including Mikel Dufrenne (whose friendship lasted long after the war) set up a university in the prison and built up a library of 4,000 books for fellow prisoners. At that time he also faced up to his own naivety, admitting that he had been seduced by Petainism for the first year of the war, until, in fact, he and his fellow prisoners were able to hear, clandestinely, about the contents of the BBC radio bulletins.[8] The need to know when to be suspicious, and to what degree to doubt the motives of others, was a dominant feature of Europe at war, and Ricœur sought the basis for an intellectual – and pragmatic – solution in the lineage from Descartes to Kant and Husserl, in which the human will becomes more and more central, more deceptively omniscient and correspondingly flawed in its attempts to act upon its understanding of the world. Will and knowledge: can we have what we know about and does it exist in the way we think it does?

Cartesian philosophy is predicated upon our capacity for conscious thought, and was further developed by Kant for whom there was the possibility of knowledge and of right judgement. Kant's cogito is embedded in his three questions: what can I know? What must I do? What may I hope for? Kant opened a debate about the *limits* to our intellect and the ways in which we structure our understanding of the world by our own perceptions, and this debate lives on. As a Kantian, Ricœur took a calculated risk and later utilized Freud, Marx and Nietzsche in their challenge to Descartes. All three rise up as 'protagonists of suspicion who rip away masks and pose the novel problem of the lie of consciousness and consciousness as a lie'.[9] All three radically put into question something that appears to the cogito, as the core of all meaning: consciousness itself. Ricœur was greatly impressed by the cogito of Descartes, Kant and Husserl. He was also interested in Heidegger (1889–1976) with his rejection of the individual consciousness as an ultimate ground of appeal; Heidegger's argument that we enter reality not as the central knowing subject of our own world, but at a much lower level of thought, just being here/there, *Dasein*, thrown into the world. Ricœur is indebted to Heidegger for his view in *Being and Time* (1927) that hermeneutics is not textual analysis, it is ontology: the profound meaning about being human. Heidegger's approach to ontology proves profoundly unsatisfactory for Ricœur, whose rejection of Heidegger's approach to the self will be important to our understanding of his qualified deployment of suspicion.

Ricœur's masters of suspicion

Ricœur called Marx (1818–1883), Nietzsche (1844–1900) and Freud (1856–1939) the 'masters of suspicion' and explored their assertion that we deceive others and not only others, but also ourselves, about our beliefs, motives and actions. Moreover, we are deceived by our own perceptions; misperceptions arise because of desire, narcissism and past memories (fictional or not). We are indebted to these thinkers for transforming our thinking. Yet they also assert their authority by asserting 'objective' truths that Ricœur suggests have bogus elements: each insisted upon the absolute truth of their own cognitive framework which Ricœur challenges (Freud's dynamics of the psyche, Nietzsche's biologism and Marx's economic determinism). Ricœur also develops and uses the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' at around the same time, and I will show how that differs from the masters of suspicion.

Ricœur's 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is a dialectical device that he developed and then abandoned within a ten-year span (broadly 1965–1975). I call it 'dialectical' because there is an inbuilt tension created by pairing the two terms; hermeneutics assumes that there is meaning to be found and that it is life enhancing to seek such meaning; suspicion assumes that we should doubt the human motives behind the meanings we find, and the very act of suspicion presumes a loss of trust that may be irrevocable. The term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' overlaps with his treatment of the masters of suspicion exemplified in his work on Freud, and is often seen as coterminous with that. I believe this is misleading, and also risks obscuring the iterative, repetitive and spiralling process that characterizes his work for over seventy years, which shows how he was developing a similar core idea to that of the hermeneutics of suspicion long before he used that term and long after he abandoned it.

Ricœur continued to find suspicion useful up to and including his very last work, although uncoupled from hermeneutics. The features of this core idea include the following: an analysis of doubt and of negativity, a development of dialectical tension that facilitates exploration of as many options as possible before closure, frequent use of apparently incompatible philosophical arguments, most obviously between analytic and continental philosophy and the assertion that it is possible to deconstruct philosophical approaches in order to reveal the almost, yet not quite inextricably linked method and content of each. We see these features most dramatically with structuralist thinking, where Ricœur retains and makes extensive use of the linguistic tools of structuralism, while also strenuously refusing to accept structuralist epistemology. Structuralism, with its unique blend of linguistics and anthropology, dominated French thought from the 1950s to 1980s and deserves re-examination with its still powerful legacy of doubt and suspicion about established thought, history and culture and, above all, meaning.[10]

I will argue that the hermeneutics of suspicion is *not* a highly significant feature of Ricœur's work; more important, I believe, is that he uses ways of arguing in different contexts and with different terms that are analogous to, and yet significantly different from, the hermeneutics of suspicion. He also makes consistent long-term use of the term 'suspicion'. By careful analysis I will show both why he abandoned the term and why the intellectual mechanism that underpins it remains so central to his work. This analysis will also involve consideration of the process involved in the use of the hermeneutics of suspicion and related phenomena. Much of Ricœur's work explores and develops the dialectic that he finds very important when contrasting the philosophies of the self of Descartes and Husserl with the scepticism of thinkers such as those he named the 'masters of suspicion'. Scepticism is well defined by Cavell, (1926–) with his scholarship of scepticism in Shakespeare as 'the question whether I know with certainty of the existence of the external world and of myself and others in it'. I will show connections and differences between Cavell's work on scepticism and Ricœur's work on suspicion.[11] Cavell was trained in the analytic philosophy tradition and also engages with the continental schools that, like Rockmore, I take to be broadly Husserlian in origin.[12]

There is another level of suspicion dealt with in this book, which is the presently widespread suspicion of religion; Ricœur attempts to separate his religious from his secular writings, yet he accepts that 'One always philosophizes from somewhere' and that a major source for his own philosophy comes from 'the religious experience expressed in stories, symbols and figures'.[13] The religious strand will accompany the major arguments in this book, albeit in a subordinate role. He made a significant contribution to theological hermeneutics and also established ongoing conversation with the perceived secularization of modern Western thought. He describes secularism as 'an estrangement from the kerygmatic situation itself', defining kerygma as an announcement, a proclamation, a message.[14] Hence he believes the secular mind denies that there is any special message about being human that we should transmit, share and be witness to, be it from God or any belief system that is more important than the individual. This denial can manifest itself in world-weary suspicion about faith. Readers of this book will have their own views on these matters, which will influence their approach to Ricœur.

Husserl and Cartesian scepticism as the basis for modern doubt

Husserl (1859–1938) developed the foundational belief of Descartes (1596–1650), which endorsed the power of the mind to think and prove our existence, and Husserl achieved this while leaving God (Descartes' foundational belief) out of his arguments. By taking subjectivity very seriously, Husserl was able to move to a position where he could argue that we construct the world in our own minds, and that *we are* the enquirers who can be objective about our subjective perceptions. This desire to go beyond subjective thought comes from Kant, but even more importantly for Husserl, it also comes from Hume. Husserl felt that Kant failed to see the truly challenging aspect of Hume, 'the cogito radicalised by Hume's scepticism', because Hume, by pressing scepticism to a self-refuting extreme, indicated 'the bankruptcy of philosophy and the sciences' although he saw history, economics and social psychology as useful. He shows us what an enigma the world is, and how difficult that makes it to trust our own judgement about anything we think we know.[15] Ricœur wrote a series of essays about Husserl between 1949 and 1957, collected in an English edition in 1967, and I use this source with particular emphasis on Husserl's Fifth Cartesian Meditation.[16] Ricœur's translation of Husserl's *Ideen* and commentary inspired Derrida (1930–2004), who describes Ricœur as a great reader (i.e. interpreter) of Husserl, more rigorous than Sartre or Merleau-Ponty, and describes the 'clarity, elegance, demonstrable power, authority without authority, engagement with thought' of watching Ricœur speaking in 1953, although Derrida asserted that he did not meet him until 1960.[17]

Later Ricœur challenges phenomenology, through Freud and Nietzsche, Marx and Hegel, starting with his unfinished Philosophy of the Will series from the 1950s, his much better-known book on Freud, and also in collections of essays such as *The Conflict of Interpretations*. We will see how Ricœur also seeks some sort of recuperative position after loss of innocence followed by doubt, a second naivety as he calls it.[18]

Ricœur develops a critical hermeneutics that returns repeatedly to phenomenology. Phenomenology focuses on the struggle of the self to identify itself through its perception of the world and of the other person. The ensuing conflicts of interpretation become the subject matter of hermeneutics: for Ricœur this is a method that includes juxtaposing explanatory and interpretative analysis, and uses dialectical approaches. He attempts to acknowledge problems both from outside and from within philosophy; both by admitting that knowledge is contextualized and must therefore be provisional and also by asserting that method is at the very heart of knowledge seeking. He believes that the method we use will determine the results we achieve. If, as Ricœur argues, the question we ask will determine the answer, then we must use philosophical language to contrast and dismantle the philosophical assumptions of the different methodologies and then reconstruct them after applying *reductio ad absurdum* techniques. Theoretical knowledge, both scientific and other, creates models as well as recording reality, so there can be no neutral epistemology (the facts we accept as valid and useful). Self-knowledge depends no longer on immediate relationships with the world or the other but, crucially, on the passage through culture, which requires analysis and interpretation. Besides the conflict of interpretations, the other major debate is about the self and the other; Baudrillard (1929–2007), a postmodern thinker who tells us that we have demanded and then deliberately denied and abandoned the individuality that is relatively recent in modern thought, represents a very negative view compared with Ricœur: Baudrillard tells us that we believe our responsibility to ourselves and to others becomes a matter of choice rather than obligation. Cavell, in contrast with Baudrillard is much more hopeful, yet his powerful model of scepticism will be useful in working on suspicion; Cavell describes, for example, Othello's violence based on scepticism when he believes he knows too much about Desdemona.[19]

Ricœur has written one or more major texts about each of these issues, and Cartesian doubt provides a good entry point: Descartes' resolution of doubt by the conscious mind's belief in God, was dealt a body blow by Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, with their challenge to the idea of conscious thought, and it can be argued that postmodern thought developed from this tradition. Ricœur challenges the belief that rational argument can only be used to critique itself, as in science and logic, and insists that hermeneutic and phenomenological philosophy should be allowed to use such methods too, and upon their own terms; for example he celebrates the tools made available by structuralism, valid within their own domain while limited beyond it. He also deploys Hegel's dialectical technique throughout his writing life; the negativity that Hegel relished and Husserl avoided provides Ricœur with a writing style as well as a way of thinking that ensures dynamism.

Descartes, Kant and Husserl

Scepticism is doubt about ideas, a philosophical position about truth. Suspicion is doubt about the motives of people including, quite possibly, one's own.

Descartes' struggle with scepticism, and the version of it that is filtered through Husserl, provides Ricœur with the initial context within which to understand modern philosophy, from Hume and Kant to Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger, and some important side glances to Spinoza and Leibniz, Schopenhauer and Kierkegaard.[20] We will return to Kant and Hegel whom Ricœur often juxtaposes against each other; Kant who opened the doors to scepticism more than he could possibly have imagined or wanted, and Hegel with his potentially totalizing speculative thought about the human as the means to an always better end of history. Certainly Kant created doubts for Nietzsche and Marx about the exact whereabouts of the human, between not being a means and only being an end in oneself. In order to set the scene for suspicion, we need to look at Descartes. Scepticism, an approach that casts doubt on truth claims and systems of knowledge but does not doubt human motives (which the hermeneutics of suspicion does), formed a vital part of Descartes' approach; a challenge to accepted, usually unchallenged beliefs, in order to see what makes these beliefs vulnerable after all. For Cavell, however, scepticism does challenge human motives, which is of interest when analysing Ricœur's use of the term suspicion.

Was Descartes really a Cartesian?

Clarke tells us that Descartes informed his confidant Mersenne that it was only possible to show that the mind and the body are *distinct* from each other, not that the location and nature of the soul are necessarily clear and proven. Perhaps what is important is how Husserl construed Descartes – and the sceptical argument is still very attractive.[21] Even if we accept that Descartes, (who feared being denounced by the Church authorities) expressed his ideas more conservatively than he may have liked, it still seems that he believed in the validity of scientific, anatomical research to establish at least the possibility that the mind could be immortal. His clumsy exploration into anatomy of mammals allowed him to conjecture that the mind was sufficiently different from the body for immortality to be possible. Clarke recommends that we should be studying Descartes' methods, rather than the dualism theory, which occupied a very small part of his work. Even now we may have to accept that dualism is alive and kicking; we can argue that Descartes may not have been a dualist, but many people are. Dualism is innate, a natural idea for children and perhaps more covertly, for adults too.[22] Husserl was not able to resolve this issue, creating an almost disembodied consciousness, but his efforts were invaluable to Ricœur.

Husserl's verb – but without a body to act

Ricœur decides that Husserl added a third element to the Cartesian subject-object dualism, reminiscent of Kant. This third element is to be found in the verb; Husserl concentrates on the *thinking* by which we perceive the object for ourselves, we intend it, we imagine it. Between subject and object is the action of thought. The subject *intends/ imagines/ has* an eidetic sense of an object: an intense perception that is so vivid it makes both abstract thought and the imagined object seem real. Our perception shows us the rich complexity of the world and reveals how 'living goes beyond judging' into the conscious experiencing of perception.[23] Modern philosophy came thus to the 'being-in-the-world' in Husserl's later phenomenology, in Heidegger's work and that of the French existentialists. This approach makes a 'frontal attack' upon all those who follow Galileo the scientist: for Husserl and all those who developed his legacy, the fundamental truths of the world are not objective and scientific; they are those of subjective perception and then, later, of science based upon perception. Husserl's great challenge to the human mind is the attempt to 'bracket off' the multiple distractions of daily life and also reject the assumption of the philosophical tradition based on subject-object dualism. The approach provides the focus for the mind to become conscious of itself, and self-reflective in a way that should, ideally, help us to see the world around us more clearly. Such efforts represent a voluntary harnessing of the intellectual powers of the mind; for Husserl the mind is transcendent, able to project beyond physicality.

Husserl is difficult to understand, according to Ricœur, for many reasons, and importantly because phenomenology does not come naturally to us as a way of understanding the world. We need to overcome many of our natural impulses in order to see that though we are indeed the centres of the world, this is not at all in the narcissistic way, as we may usually think. We need to perceive that we are in fact the foundation of the world because we make its meaning. For Sartre (1905–1980) and Levinas (1906–1995) this is a great contribution by Husserl. (Levinas attended Heidegger's and Husserl's classes in 1928–1929.) For Husserl it is all about subjectivity, leading to a 'natural, unreflective, naive grasp of things' although that may seem to encourage the very subjectivism that Husserl challenged.[24] Husserl developed a *method* that influenced many psychologists as well as philosophers. For Ricœur this dedication to method is just what he needs, after the influence of his mentor Gabriel Marcel (1889–1973), who was much more impressionistic. (The challenge by Marcel, Heidegger and Jaspers to subject-object dualism helps Ricœur to see the importance of Husserl.)[25] Husserl's method developed from Socratic approaches to examining one's life seriously, constantly and sceptically, in order to try and think clearly. It led to his beliefs about intentionality as lucid consciousness; every conscious thought is a consciousness *of something*, not only a conscious state. Heidegger, having been a pupil of Husserl's, later rejected this. Part of Heidegger's project in *Being and Time* was to provide a more grounded description of our categorization of objects – it is our everyday perceptions in context that really matter.

Ricœur takes issue with Husserl's inability or refusal to deal with the fact that the mind resides in a body and must be influenced by desire, the bodily, the passionate and the involuntary. In his work on Freud Ricœur develops the possibility that this tension may generate doubt and suspicion about what it is exactly that we experience. Husserl's phenomenology of perception embodies a desire to think clearly; Ricœur becomes interested in Freud, with an inverse relationship between desires and thoughts in which desire dominates thought. Ricœur admires Merleau Ponty's corrective efforts to postulate an 'operative intentionality' that manages our movements and our sexuality, and sees in Freud a more radical challenge.

In Freud's work, thought is about desire, and therefore involves placing censorship laws on our own thought processes in order that we can conform. We send into the unconscious mind our involuntary desires and their fantasies. They emerge involuntarily in dreams, slips of the tongue and neurotic symptoms. Wishing that Husserl's approach could lead us to try and resolve the problem of the involuntary, but finding it wanting, Ricœur proposes a form of phenomenology that begins where Husserl believed that it ends: with the struggle between the will and the bodily desires. *Freedom and Nature*, a phenomenological text published in French in 1950, and one-third of his project on the will, shows how Ricœur rejects Husserl's attempt to combine purely perceptual phenomenology with a descriptive transcendental phenomenology of consciousness, instead focusing on human action. In *Freedom and Nature* there is some discussion of Freud, less of Nietzsche and no mention of Marx. Much later, in *Freud and Philosophy*, Ricœur brings Husserl's phenomenology to bear on Freud's psychoanalysis, to be discussed in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4.[26]

Who and where is Husserl's other person?

In comparing phenomenology and psychoanalysis, Ricœur finds that Husserl does not account for the object of our desire, which is often the other person.[27] Husserl's philosophy was theoretical, a secondary activity dependent on science, which he saw as the primary activity.[28] However, with his *Crisis*, Husserl rectified this imbalance and showed how the sciences are cultural activities and not primary after all, but secondary.[29] Heidegger concluded that the human is the vehicle through which language speaks. Much later, in the 1950s, following Saussure (1857–1913), the structuralist movement developed structures that seemed to have a scientific feel to them, while actively rejecting the meaning, the referent, even the individual, who is written out of the system.[30] Husserl transcended the ego with the alter ego, whereas Descartes transcended the ego with God.[31] For Ricœur, Cartesian dualism involves the body becoming the object of the mind's thoughts. Descartes' ego was empty, impersonal, as was the Kantian and Neo-Kantian subject. Perhaps both Descartes and Husserl remained trapped in their 'circle' of argument: Descartes remained committed to divine arbitration and Husserl remained committed to an ego and alter ego who could not relate to each other, so that we are still stuck with the problem of other minds.[32]

Derrida (1931–2005) attributes his deep engagement with Levinas partly to Ricœur; while walking in the garden at Châtenay-Malabry, the family home, in 1962, Ricœur told Derrida that Levinas' doctoral thesis would become a great book; *Totality and Infinity*.[33]As a result of this conversation Derrida read it and then wrote *Violence and Metaphysics*. Here Derrida defends Husserl against Levinas' strictures on the impossibility of knowing whether we are in any way similar to that other person. In so doing Derrida highlights an area of dispute between modern and postmodern thinkers: ethics, and more specifically an ethics based on radical alterity, the absolute otherness of people who are not me.[34] (The other major area of debate between modern and postmodern thought is the absolute or relative nature of epistemology; how much do we believe in the truth of purported facts?) Husserl took a less extreme view on otherness to Levinas. From the problem being 'me', unable to empathize fully with other egos, the 'me' becomes the solution, as Husserl's individual absorbed into themselves, as an internal difficulty, all the understanding they needed in order to understand others. The problem remains however, as each of us still has to grasp the different, unique otherness of the Other and Ricœur finds Husserl more satisfactory at an intellectual than an emotional level. First, the other person sees from a different place, just as each of us sees the other from our own position and each of us has equal 'right' to our viewpoint. Secondly the world is a public arena, not only a private viewpoint, and objectivity plays a significant role here. Thirdly, the objects that make up our world are there for all of us, not just for me. Derrida endorses Husserl's approach as potentially more useful in resolving these problems than Levinas' ethics that can lead to postulating radical otherness, an approach that Norris sees as 'a morally pernicious doctrine'.[35] I see an extension of this in my work with Muslim groups who are perceived as radically other, incomprehensible and hence alien. Although Ricœur did not address these issues in much depth, his philosophy is crucial to me in my work on social justice at an interpersonal level, as epitomized in *Oneself as Another* (Chapter 8).

Intersubjective reduction: aliens proliferate

For Husserl the Other is a special object of our gaze. This gaze is achieved by the method of reduction; stripping away unreliable information.[36] Ricœur differentiates between Kant's great question about the search for validity for a possible transcendentally valid consciousness, and Husserl's great question about the search for the origin of the world.[37] The question cannot be understood until Husserl has developed the 'methodological movement' that describes it, and this takes up most of *Ideas 1*.[38]

Reduction is an ingenious device by Husserl that shows the extraordinary importance of the body in the end and Ricœur writes about it in his phenomenological idiolect, thus emphasizing the first person: "It is only after I have self-consciously comprehended that I am *me*, physically embedded in my own body, that I see that others are *not* me. There is something alien because there is something [that is my] own, and not conversely" which Ricœur sees as reminiscent of the Hegelian problem of the doubling of consciousness into self-consciousness.[39] Hegel brought the consciousness into self-consciousness in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, with the master-slave dialectic, stoicism and scepticism and the unhappy consciousness. These doublings all require the negative, so this differentiates Hegel from Husserl who avoided the negative. This is moreover not only a perceived situating of my point of view, it is also an abstraction of ideas about the self, achieved by back questioning to see how I compare with others, and also to see how I become part of the world, a positive event, not just not-alien. Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961), whom Ricœur held in high regard, disagreed and developed an 'ontology of the flesh'. He attended Husserl's lectures that became the Cartesian Meditations, and developed work based on 'embodied' consciousness: the solidity of my body that tells me I exist, I am, must both precede and follow the thinking me. In contrast, although clothed in flesh, Husserl's individual seemed to Ricœur to be ultimately anyone, i.e. no-one at all in fact, not a particular person with intersubjectivity, with empathy.[40]

Husserl's writing is at its most attractive when he points out his own difficulties; he argues that this cannot be the final solution because of the ultimate exclusivity of 'my here and the over there of the Other'. 'I cannot really understand what it is like to be that person because I am not *over there.* I am *here* and that is paramount because Husserl was a "methodological solipsist", giving emphasis to *me*, here.'[41] 'Aliens proliferate' as Kearney puts it.[42] The problem is therefore still unresolved: we cannot reconcile the empirical realism of real live humans in communities, with the ideas of transcendental realism, in which 'all being-sense is drawn from the ego.'[43] The problem remains that there are two consciousnesses (mine and yours) but not two worlds in which to act out our desires.

The turbulent youngest son

In order to accept the full responsibility of actions, the individual has to look into their own motives, by becoming conscious of themselves and by undertaking a process similar to Descartes' proof of the world by proving the existence of the self through the existence of God. (Later we shall see how Ricœur relishes, yet is also wary of, the dismantling of this Cartesian argument by the masters of suspicion.) Even with this Cartesian process, however, Ricœur sees problems, using the first-person form of speech in *Freedom and Nature* in his attempt to blend phenomenology and existentialism. This idiolect of phenomenological thought is later replaced by 'we' but serves Ricœur in his early writings to invite us to *read* as Husserl *thought*: "I risk a loss of innocence and entrap myself in an endless return to my own self, my own motives and, for Marcel, possible betrayal by my 'baser' self." This 'project of the self' entails a partial loss of faith in oneself, an anxious insecurity that leads to taking action while in doubt about whether it is the right action.[44]

Here is another paradox about desire and rationality. We act by using our willpower, and must, Ricœur believes, explore a range of cultural beliefs about the self: that the will is a form of desire in a Nietzschean manner, yet also some sort of rational phenomenon, guided by understanding in a Kantian manner (knowing, acting, feeling).[45] Descartes placed the subject's act as both the first and last word of subjectivity so I can doubt the veracity of what I perceive in order then to decide that God would not choose to deceive me, and thus I can accept my perceptions as accurate.[46] Phenomenology begins with a 'wounding of the knowledge belonging to immediate consciousness' and, in a more extreme statement from 1950; there is no end to reaching the starting point where the cogito *is*.[47] I cannot reach true self-understanding because it is too complex, and I am thus unable to understand myself, as Ricœur argues;

> I am responsible only because I am two and because the second is concealed (as in Gabriel Marcel's fine analysis of fidelity: I promise something only about things which I do not control absolutely. I am my own sagacious elder and my own turbulent youngest son).[48]

For Husserl there cannot be a pure ego that is subject but never object to itself; there is an interior life of thinking and perceiving, and we have to analyse our selves as rigorously as we can. This is Kantian, and Husserl takes it further by questioning the division between subject and object much more radically than Kant ever did; to Husserl it seems that subjectivity, which is the source of our interpretation of the world, can be analysed and used objectively, but only when subject and object are quite close; cautious parent and delinquent self are too far apart.

In a change of emphasis, Husserl's late work shows interest in historical, or what he called 'historico-genetic' explanations, as he realized that the natural condition of being in the world, and the scientific disciplines, both depend upon prior historical events, and build towards some teleological outcomes. Husserl's *Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1954) derives from his belief that the scientific worldview has become too dominant, and that subjectivity must become the force that seeks to analyse rational thought; subjectivity thus is, as ever, a force for good with Husserl, yet his ideas inspired more negative approaches in Heidegger and Sartre.[49]

Husserl's legacy and the history of an error

Like Husserl, Ricœur's approach is different from that of many modern and postmodern continental philosophers. Although he hardly uses the term 'post-modern', he writes about scepticism with interest (if not commitment) to the ideas of his contemporaries, and we will consider how and why he engages with their ideas, and why he seems to maintain a distance from them, while becoming deeply engaged in debate with, among others, Althusser, Habermas, Gadamer and, on occasion, Foucault and Derrida.[50] They were his contemporaries and he outlived most of them, except Lévi Strauss (who was one hundred years old in 2008).

The relationship between Cartesian doubt and postmodern thought is complex, not least because of the possibility, as argued by Clarke (2006) that Descartes was not a Cartesian himself, suggesting a modern tendency to make more of dualism than Descartes did himself. A strong tension develops between apparently mutually opposed and yet symbiotically interdependent pairs of ideas during the course of the twentieth century. There is a form of nihilism such as we see in Sartre; things come into being without a cause and we have to decide to make one up. There is an even more extreme form of nihilism as seen in Baudrillard, a contemporary of Ricœur's, who asserts that we have destroyed meaning. This has a genealogy in Nietzsche's '*How the "true world" finally became a fable. The History of an error*', an error which Nietzsche blames partly on Kant and partly on positivism.[51]

Husserl was interested in attempting to make subjectivity objective and in taking responsibility for modern epistemologies of science; Ricœur is interested in those areas and also in ethical action, and in pursuing these areas he signally does not engage with the term postmodern. Lyotard saw it as a positive way forward towards challenging the metanarratives such as history, science, politics and religion, in order to make a better world, yet the term is often used as 'a very deep-laid scepticism about the possibility of knowledge and truth'.[52] Habermas, in asserting that the project of modernity is not yet finished, would suggest that Lyotard, and many others, gave up too soon on modernity. Ricœur does not engage with Lyotard's view that we are never in a position to judge between rival and conflicting models of reality, although believing, like Lyotard, that there are no definitive true metanarratives. Yet Ricœur's strong religious belief gives him some form of ethical narrative throughout his life. It will be important to consider why Ricœur hardly used the term postmodern, given that he much enjoyed, and frequently created dialectical and dicotyledonous tensions between and also within apparently opposed elements of thought.

We can see how Ricœur's contemporaries challenged existing philosophical arguments about Heidegger, who rejected his tutor Husserl's transcendental ego as the human means to understand and implement intentional relationships with the world. Heidegger developed a philosophy that combines phenomenology, existentialism and hermeneutics, in order to create ordinary everydayness as the analysis of our lives. He meant to go beyond the phenomenology of this, but never wrote the existential sequel to his phenomenological work. Foucault (1926–1984) developed Nietzschean ideas about genealogy to analyse societal creation and maintenance of deviance, sexuality and punishment. Foucault describes the human to whom these things are done as the object, no longer the subject of their own life and therefore the idea of the individual is an obsolescent concept that is becoming a surface feature in a dominant culture. This is an assault upon the Cartesian cogito, although Foucault's *History of Sexuality* looks at how humans can again become subjects of their lives, cognitively and bodily.[53] Physicality is also considered central to this endeavour for Merleau-Ponty who developed the importance of the body, flesh and skin, touching and being touched, as well as language, thereby developing ideas that were implicit in, but not fully developed by, Husserl and Heidegger. Derrida proposes that any apparently foundational truth must have already required the elimination of another truth, which lies hidden. There are certain parallels here with the way Ricœur explores apparently opposing approaches and shows similarities that were hidden. For his part, Derrida admired Husserl, yet challenged the 'metaphysic of presence', arguing that Western philosophy has to look at what it excludes from its definitions of reality.[54]

Conclusions

The analysis of Husserl presented in this book is a Ricœurian one: in an essay from his Husserl collection *Existential Phenomenology* Ricœur analyses existential phenomenology as a blend of Husserlian phenomenology and the philosophy of existence, which includes three components.[55] First there is the 'owned body' of Merleau-Ponty. Secondly there is the idea of freedom as the nihilation of the past, the negativity of being. This owes its strength to Hegel, who 'took possession' of the negative and integrated it fully into his philosophy as a creative force. As Ricœur points out, Husserl then 'lost the key' to negativity by refusing to countenance its presence in his philosophy. Thirdly there is the Sartrean idea of the Other. Sartre, writing at the same time as Ricœur in the 1950s, had a dark vision: experiencing the Other means 'the experience of being seen, of being caught by a gaze which freezes me in my tracks, reduces me to the condition of an object, steals my world from me and takes away my freedom along with my subject position'.[56] This is a challenge to the existential thought that Marcel developed and which Ricœur adopted; is it possible to be oneself and also reduce the distance between oneself and the other person in such a way that we can co-exist well? Ricœur issues this challenge in 1957, when the essay on existential phenomenology was first published in French, and continues to work on it for the rest of his life. In the phase between the mid-1940s to the late 1960s, we see his attempt to answer the problem: as well as publishing his translation of Husserl's *Ideas* in 1950, he develops a textual idiolect, i.e. using the first person, to put into practice Husserl's phenomenology and publishes it in the same year as *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary* (1950/1966).

Ricœur develops Husserl's version of Cartesian scepticism in the cause of helping us to think more clearly about our world, using a similar mechanism, with some significant differences, in the hermeneutics of suspicion. He sees Husserl's bracketing of our sensation-based, naturalistic view of the world in order to harness our intentional, interpretative relationship to what we perceive, as both the strength and the weakness of phenomenology. In order that we can try to explore true consciousness, the reality that is within ourselves, unadulterated by superficial manifestations of reality, Ricœur sees the need to develop a different kind of phenomenology, and later a form of hermeneutics, and he does this without using the term postmodern.

Spinoza makes a cumulative impression as some sort of tutelary presence for Ricœur, yet without much explicit discussion: in fact Ricœur puts much exegetical effort into his study of Spinoza, starting with making notes in class in 1932 and teaching courses on him in 1949, 1951 up to 1965, initially in French and latterly in English too. Ricœur peppers his writings gently yet insistently with mention of Spinoza, and occasionally Leibniz. Spinoza rejects traditional religion because of its reliance on religious texts that he finds interesting yet not ultimately credible – a sceptical approach. Yet Spinoza also refutes scepticism in the context of personal belief, arguing that a believer will know when his faith in God is true and good.

We will also see how effective Marx, Nietzsche and Freud were, in Ricœur's view, in popping the balloon of our ego, and how this event challenges meaning: what does life mean and what meaning remains to us as deflated objects of our own narcissistic desire? This greatly raises the stakes in the process of hermeneutical thought and what we can expect of it. I believe it is possible to trace a persistent self-undermining from within the existential and hermeneutic condition. This self-denial is partly related to negativity, attempting to go beyond the challenge of subject-object doubt, and beyond the challenge to conscious thought. The attempt to defeat the dominance of the subject-object paradigm creates productive tensions, and may make possible the constructive use of suspicion. This self-undermining must also be seen in the context of Ricœur's religious and ethical beliefs, which allow him to be intensely committed to the possibility of finding meaning in life. Of considerable interest to me is this thread of work about negation and negativity; Ricœur returns repeatedly to negation, negativity and unthinkable nothingness through Hegel, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, even Sartre and going right back to Parmenides and Aristotle, in 1953–1954, 1958–1959. This will inform his work on suspicion and also on time both as negation (it's past and therefore finished) and subjectivity (variations in perception of time).[57]

Increasingly we will see that Ricœur is interested not in an impersonal model of subjectivity but in the living individual embedded in specific historico-political contexts. Ricœur's work emerges from the debates about doubt that go back to the ancients, and cannot be understood without some familiarity with them, and his intellectual writing and teaching develops alongside contemporaries who we also need to take into account at various points. Yet I believe Ricœur continues to provide us with a more direct and rewarding legacy as a political, religious and ethical philosopher, for whom the hermeneutics of suspicion is a relay station rather than an end point.

Chapter 2

Ricœur's hermeneutics I: the archaeology of suspicion

In just over twenty years, Europe went from the debilitating Second World War, (1939–1945) to May 1968, when students enjoyed the privilege of becoming suspicious of academic knowledge and marched through the streets of Paris in triumphant protest. Their response was late compared with that of their lecturers, as the French academic establishment had been grappling with the revolt thrown up by high classic structuralism during much of the childhood of those students. Two world wars, the Holocaust, fear of the Russian gulag, Berlin in 1953, Hungary in 1956 and Prague in 1968 made twentieth-century European history a living nightmare, which structuralism resolved by downplaying the relevance of history, and we see Ricœur still fighting against that trend later with *Time and Narrative.* In 1948, aged 36, Ricœur moved with his wife Simone and their five children for an eight-year sojourn in Strasbourg, possibly their happiest time together as a family.[1] Between 1956 and 1967 Ricœur lectured at the Sorbonne in Paris on general philosophy, and shared a seminar on phenomenology with Derrida (until Derrida left for the École Normale Supérieure in 1960).[2] In 1967 Ricœur was generating great interest by teaching the ideas of Saussure, Benveniste and Hjelmslev as well as Austin and Searle and often providing a broader diet than those who were committed structuralists.[3] During the 1960s the structuralist movement became dominant in France, and Ricœur took issue publicly with its ideas in 1963, while at the same time arguing that 'it will never be possible to do hermeneutics without structuralism.'[4] In order to understand how Ricœur reached this apparently contradictory conclusion and to see how it relates to his work on suspicion, we need to go right back to 1930, and build up a picture of his work on phenomenology, existentialism and structuralism.

The archaeology of suspicion

In 1930, aged 17–18, Ricœur summarized from Dalbiez' class his master's critique of the determinist potential in Freudian theory; 'we exaggerate now in 1930 the idea of constitution,' suggesting then that we may behave as if we possess immutable personality traits that require psychoanalysis.[5] In *Critique and Conviction* (and elsewhere) Ricœur pays tribute to Dalbiez, who taught Ricœur at high school from 1929–1933, and wrote the first French monograph on Freud.[6] Dalbiez envisaged a 'biological' Freud and emphasized the realist idea of the unconscious, which he then used to refute the Cartesian illusion of accurate self-consciousness, and of people's belief that their personal representation of the world is the true one. Dalbiez lectured to Ricœur on symbolism, on hysteria, on modern methods and the study of the individual, evil, formal logic, magic, Western philosophy from Aristotle and modern thinkers including Durkheim and Bergson. We will see his influence in the thread of negation that goes through Ricœur's early phenomenological phases from the 1940s to the 1960s, summarized here as the stage that led to the work in the 1960s on suspicion.

This phase shows four great preoccupations of Ricœur. The first is the Cartesian conviction that the cogito, the thinking person, can unify reality; this involves Husserl, phenomenology, and putting the body back into Cartesianism, discussed in Chapter 1. Leading out of the study of the cogito is existentialism, his second preoccupation; this also involves work on Husserl, Marcel, Jaspers, the possibility of doing evil and the experience of evil through symbols and myths. Jaspers (1893–1969) originally a psychiatrist, moved towards Christianity via existentialism, working within a Kantian framework on Kierkegaard's theory of crisis. Gabriel Marcel (1889–1973), playwright and critic who baulked at being described as a Christian existentialist, gave Ricœur a sense of wonder at the mysteries of life that science turns into problems to solve, and contact with a writing style that is intensely individual.

Ricœur's third preoccupation is phenomenology which 'discovers' the great importance of intentionality; what we think we mean becomes the determining factor in the way we perceive the world. This insight transforms subject-object dualism by showing our influence on our relationship with our world and also affects how we decide to act. Mind-body dualism becomes the test case for subject-object dualism. The Hegelian legacy of negativity, shunned by Husserl, becomes increasingly important in helping Ricœur to understand how we perceive objects and others and how we differentiate between various factors in order to avoid or 'do evil'. Ricœur's fourth preoccupation is hermeneutics; it reveals the ways in which we use mediating terms such as myth and symbol in order to interpret the human world through language. Hermeneutics shapes many of his major works and provides a linguistic framework for the return of phenomenology.

These four phases: Cartesianism, existentialism, phenomenology and hermeneutics will continue to be an integral part of Ricœur's work for the rest of his life, supporting and informing the hermeneutic interpretation of signs, symbols, narrative and memory. After the war he also resumes contact with Emmanuel Mounier, a Catholic who set up a Christian socialist and pacifist journal, *Esprit*. After Mounier's untimely death Ricœur continues to write and work for *Esprit.*[7] The relationship between Ricœur and *Esprit* is very important to both parties and yet not without crises over the next twenty years.[8]

Phenomenology and naivety

Phenomenology, for Ricœur at this time, provides an opportunity to re-find a personal naivety, challenging our belief that we have access to our immediate consciousness and showing us that, under the best circumstances, we will act within local constraints, attempting to be actively receptive to our surroundings. Phenomenology is thus a way of focusing as deeply as humanly possible on the self as *subject.* The approach is pure reflection and yet endeavouring to gain access to our capacity for uncontaminated thinking is in fact impossible.

Ricœur summarizes his three phenomenological books (*Freedom and Nature* (1950/1966), *Fallible Man* (1960/1965) and *The Symbolism of Evil* (1960/1967), which comprise the three volumes of the *Philosophy of the Will*) in the first essay in Reagan and Stewart (eds) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur: An Anthology of His Work* (1978).[9] Chronologically in between is *History and Truth* (1955/sec. Fr edn. 1964/1965), a set of essays on a range of topics that seek to raise the historical debate about human actions from epistemology to truth.[10] Freud plays little part in these early texts although Ricœur discusses Freud's work in *Freedom and Nature* and in parallel to his work on the last two (*Fallible Man* and *The Symbolism of Evil*), Ricœur was attending Lacan's lectures on Freud, was preparing the Bonneval lecture on Freud that he delivered in 1960 and was beginning to prepare his great text, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* (1965/1970).

The hermeneutical turn begins for Ricœur at the end of *Fallible Man,* where he deliberately shows the limitations of phenomenology, because it can only facilitate the possibility of discussing the nature of evil. The next step is shown in *The Symbolism of Evil,* with the confrontation between the human and the symbols that show us that we, flawed as we are, can go beyond potential for wrong and actually do wrong. In fact, in order to get to grips with the ways in which we hurt others and ourselves, he needs to make his 'linguistic turn', which is initiated by his work on Freud. Hermeneutics after Freud approaches the object of our desire; this will include text, the world and the self as reflected in others. This is achieved (only ever partially, imperfectly and by self-undermining arguments, as with all of Ricœur's approaches) through analysis of meanings by linguistic and textual means, which Ricœur did not find in Husserl.

Friday afternoon tea and existentialism

Throughout Ricœur's work he shows us the problems created by subject-object dualism, starting with Descartes, then Husserl. Before moving away from the

Husserlian form of phenomenology, and developing his theory about Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, Ricœur was influenced by Marcel, who as an existentialist and a Christian developed a sense of dialectical tension between opposites as created by us having body and soul, the involuntary and the voluntary. Ricœur enjoyed Marcel's Friday afternoons, an open house for discussing philosophy, such as the fact of having a body being a mystery rather than a philosophical problem, an idea taken from Marcel. This is a sort of existential thought with naturalist undertones; from as early as the early 1930s, with Dalbiez, Ricœur saw Freudian theory as naturalistic. He accepted that the unconscious is a part of the natural world, a natural fact: it is there.[11] This naturalist attitude appreciates the holism of nature and rejects substance dualism, in the mind-body dualist argument. The conscious mind is the object of the unconscious mind's activities, in terms of the objects of desire, censorship of them, and the intertwined relationship between censorship and desire. (As developed later by Derrida, I can have something only by rejecting its opposite e.g. sex or chastity, food or hunger, satisfaction or need.) Ricœur also learns about the philosophy of Karl Jaspers from Marcel, and writes on Jaspers with his fellow ex-prisoner of war, Mikel Dufrenne.[12] Ricœur adopted Jaspers' term Transcendence, which refers to the capacity to think *beyond* the limit experiences of death, suffering and guilt. The problem is to think in this way without objectifying the experience from one's privileged position as the subject and thereby falling back into subject-object dualism, which is what we do when we use myth and symbol. Later, in *The Symbolism of Evil*, Ricœur researches both the great richness of imagery that we use to make sense of evil, and also the difficulties that attend such objectification, such as disconnection of personal responsibility and the belief that evil is out there, not in me.

Ricœur's work on Husserl depicts the extension of Kant's doubts about our ability to be objective, and Husserl's attempt to show us the scientific nature of thought and then to show us that this thought resides in and emanates from us and therefore we are the scientists *and* we are subjective. Later Husserl concluded that science is in fact a secondary activity. This starts in modern philosophy, of course, with Descartes and his mind-body dualism. Whether Descartes was, or was not a Cartesian dualist, we are indebted to him for taking a positive view of our intellectual capacities.[13]

In the first four of Husserl's *Cartesian Meditations* it seems to Ricœur that Husserl read Descartes like a Neo-Kantian i.e. seeing Descartes as having developed a philosophy that is both a science in itself and also the core of all sciences.[14] In Husserl's Fifth Cartesian meditation there is a change of emphasis to time as an element that creates consistency. The cogito becomes the subject who can transcend time, the person who can think clearly about reality from outside, as if looking in on the world while also being part of it. Thus 'being' goes beyond consciousness, beyond awareness of the here and now. For Husserl the world is there all the time but the ego is not part of the natural world, and by the attempt at reduction to core experience I shed all my physical and psychological experiences and grasp pure essence. There is also the embodied ego, which is practical and everyday in its relevance, as in the work of Levinas and Merleau-Ponty.

Phenomenology asserts our privilege and desire to be true to our own choices and not to the opinion of others, less out of wilfulness than out of sincerity, and a conviction that, in a Kantian way, we are thinking beings first and foremost. Kant saw reason as the response to desire and will through the categorical imperative, yet Ricœur saw reason as part of the involuntary. When we act we do so rationally and also with desire. The voluntary (freedom) and the involuntary (nature) function within the will at this point in his work; will is constrained from full functioning by what we want, yet remains reasonably autonomous. In *Freedom and Nature* and also in *History and Truth* Ricœur develops his ideas about negative force. In *Freedom and Nature* he pays tribute to Nabert (1881–1960) with his determination to use Kantian arguments to face up to the idea and the fact of radical evil. We shall see how ways of defining difference start with negation as purely descriptive and end as judgemental: 'This is different from that' becomes 'this is not that', which develops a value judgement 'this is better than that' and finally a denial; 'this *cannot* be that.' Negation can thereby become a decision to refuse to understand, an assertion of non-commitment. This negative force can be seen described in his *Political and Social Essays* (1974) and his later work on violence in politics.

History, truth and negation

History and Truth (Second Edition 1964) is a group of Ricœur's essays that spans a period of c. fifteen years 1949–1964 (and overlaps with *Freedom and Nature* and with *Fallible Man* and *The Symbolism of Evil*). In the early 1960s, still Kantian in outlook, he was not part of the group of thinkers who asserted that they were breaking away from Enlightenment philosophy; Althusser, Lacan, Barthes, Foucault and Bourdieu. Dosse interviewed one of Ricœur's students from that time who describes how Bourdieu viewed Ricœur scornfully as a 'spiritualiste'.[15] In *Freedom and Nature* the individual struggles alone to make sense of how to be, how to exist. In *History and Truth* the person is more a social agent who seeks to understand their own point of view and therefore must reject Hegelian ideas of absolute truth. Social justice is a red thread throughout Ricœur's life and work, exemplified in Olivier Mongin's book.[16] Ricœur analyses the differences between material that is already considered history and used as 'truth' by historians, and material that is not yet accorded such status and has to develop into 'truth'. He returns to this twenty years later with *Time and Narrative* and forty years later with *Memory, History, Forgetting*.[17] There is a tension to be identified and analysed there, as ever with Ricœur, and to be kept in stasis for as long as possible, while seeking a just-about tolerable equilibrium of unresolved tension, of irresolution that does not distort or privilege one pole of the argument more than the other. We see this in *History and Truth* in the essay called 'The Socius and the Neighbour' (an analysis of the Good Samaritan) and in the essay called 'Civilisation and National Cultures'.

Since Hegel, negation (taking three main forms; identifying lack, saying no and understanding limitations) has seemed to be an integral part of reflecting upon the human condition. In order to develop secure meaning we must *negate* one point of view in order to exert another view. Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* had shown us a different way of looking at the first of Husserl's *Logical Investigations*; truth and certainty negate each other.[18] The movement from consciousness to self-consciousness is an illusion 'which is only maintained by a secularized theology wherein all negations flow from the very movement of the Absolute which limits itself and denies itself by determining itself so as to surmount its negation in the thought of its other'.[19] Hegel's 'doubling of the self-conscious' depicts a person ill at ease with themselves, as they alternately both deny the importance of others *and* identify with others at the cost of their own independence. For Ricœur it is not viable to postulate a person who cancels out their relationship with others and also their own importance. (This is a theme that he explores in great detail in the 1980s–1990s with *Oneself as Another*. If we can think less negatively, negation can move from otherness to identity, and later with *The Course of Recognition* to recognition.) He develops Hegel's ideas by looking at five types of possibility; wanting, experiencing, receiving (perception), expressing and ability. He concentrates on perception, following Kant. "In perceiving objects in the world, I have a point of view. I always perceive 'there' from my viewpoint 'here.'" He rejects the phenomenology of perception that he believes is Husserl's; 'in which the moment of saying is postponed and the reciprocity of saying and seeing destroyed, is, in the last analysis, a hopeless venture'.[20]

Adopting the first person, Ricœur creates an idiolect for phenomenological thought, and uses this method of writing to attempt to override subject-object dualism. In this book I will use this phenomenological idiolect to give a sense of the style, in this way and with double speech marks: "I am both subject and object of my own existence." (Chapter 7 will contextualize this within his repertoire of methods.) "Given that I always see things from a limited point of view, my perception cannot be good enough to allow me to transcend my own perspective. Thus, by the limitations of my own perception I am forced to negate the possibility of truth. When I think in a transcendent way and seek to think away from my point of view, I am not what I am." He invokes Kant; "it is not sensitivity to our surroundings which limits reason (which resembles Husserl's approach), but reason that limits sensitivity in its pretension to give phenomena the status of things-in-themselves that are not distorted by my view of them."

This will become a component of the hermeneutics of suspicion, a doubt about oneself and one's limitations that is dangerous, yet vitally important.

Negation also takes a much simpler form of otherness, before we start to think of finitude/infinitude; 'this is different from that' is also the simple binary negation of the other, whatever the other may be.[21] Marcel, a great influence on Ricœur, takes this further in *Man Against Mass Society*, where he depicts such binary thinking as being reductionist, depreciative and passionately resentful about the integrity and vitality of life.[22]

Negation dominates our limitations: squashing flies

Why, Ricœur asks, does negation come to dominate finitude? 'When I want something, I express it as a loss or even a wound inflicted; "I don't have it", "the let-down over something lost, the wound inflicted by the loss of an irreplaceable being" instead of accepting, remembering, respecting, not striving against, the otherness of what we desire.'[23] More often, however, negation is companion to 'lack or need, regret, impatience, anguish', resembling the Spinozist 'sadness', a lessening of existence. In the English titles of Ricœur's major phenomenological texts we lose the emphasis on finitude: *Fallible Man* and *The Symbolism of Evil* are also called *Finitude et Culpabilité* I and II respectively. For Ricœur negativity is of enormous importance and must be the middle term in the sequence of Finitude, Negativity, Affirmation, which forms the title of lectures he delivers in Louvain in 1955.[24] This is very similar to Buddhist meditational practice, in which the loss is striven for and accepted. In 1959 he delivers a series of lectures on *La Négation* and works them into a much bigger, unfinished text of the same name, which concludes with *La Négation et la voie apophatique*, knowledge of God gained through negation. In 1958 he also delivers lectures in America on *Guilt*, which I will comment on in Chapter 3.

Taking this negation to an irrevocable depth of negativity would preclude affirmation, which is the choice Sartre makes (1905–1980); his versions of the negative are doubt, anguish and rejection of the other, positive validation of negative psychological states, as in Kierkegaard. For Sartre, reflection is a form of negation because it is the same as refusing to act. From 1957–1964 Ricœur taught at the Sorbonne, and one of his regular courses (Theatre and Philosophy) was on Sartre's writings, including *The Flies* and *Huis Clos* (the play *No Exit* whence the slogan 'Hell is other people').[25] In his lectures in America in the 1970s he explains how he sees Sartre interiorizing the Kierkegaardian anxiety about extreme nothingness in relation to oneself. Nothingness means despair, with Kierkegaard as the unhappy consciousness who is free for no purpose except meaninglessness. Nietzsche is there too with a negative concept of nihilism, although Nietzsche grants some sort of existential status to that which is denied.[26] Ricœur regrets that the determination to act often means narrowing one's choices with a choice made earlier and acting pre-emptively 'in an eternally petrified gesture'.[27] We see this, for example, in our domestic arguments in our kitchens, in which we often adopt a way of arguing that gives immediate pleasure yet leads to impasse or worse. Ricœur invokes Descartes and his view that the will to live must be a double negative; "I can negate the finitude (negative) of my ordinary confined life and *refuse to deny* (double negative) the finitude of life and assert some sort of potential to act well. Such a possibility to act well must be unconfined by negativity which manifests itself in 'moments of inertia, sudden, striking changes or slow digestion.'"[28] At this point we are offered a double negative that gives us a positive approach, affirmation through denying that we will accept limits, while *at the same time acknowledging their power.*

This is not Sartre's way; Sartre takes the connection that Descartes established between doubt and freedom and asserts that freedom is the goal, starting out from a nihilistic approach, combining Stoic suspension of judgement with Husserlian withdrawal from the physical, factual world. For Ricœur, Sartrean existence is brute fact about being here, right now and as such being inadequate and limited, 'a sort of compression, of sedimentation, of relapse into the slumber of the mineral'.[29] Sartre's human is free to act as they see fit, but will suffer the hubristic flaw that Kierkegaard identified, and that Heidegger described in seeking authenticity, looking for 'being as Being'. In Sartre's work negation as an act of will is an end in itself; existence before essence. Sartre always rejected the Freudian idea of the unconscious, the other within us, asserting that we are validated by our actions: his contemporary Lévi-Strauss (1908–), on the contrary, focused on the idea of the other as culturally diverse and proposed a system of mathematically and linguistically managed systems for understanding societies.

Ricœur avoids these mathematical models and poses the great wager of primary affirmation; 'do we have the courage to believe that there is an infinite truth that we can believe in and which can give us affirmation of original purity and goodness?'[30] Ricœur argues that since Hegel, this has become much harder – negation has become the core idea that defines us; and we see an extreme and depressingly circular form of this in Sartre, for whom freedom is created by the nothingness that gives me freedom to act.[31] If we look back to the pre-Socratics (Ricœur cites Anaximander), they argue for being alive as characterized by being able to think, and particularly by being able to think about the infinite beginning that created us, and that can never have an ending, as that would make it finite. If we can grasp that we are finite as compared with that infinitude of creation, this is a sort of primary affirmation. He argues that this only works, however, if we challenge the confusing approach that the real (where we are) and the ideal (where we can never be) represent fact and value respectively. On the contrary our ontology – our belief system – must strive to contain both, and seek to avoid the rupture and split between fact and value. (The more conventional definition of ontology is the study of the nature of being.) We have to believe in the ideal as a value system to strive for (Plato's

Forms are only one way of looking at this). But because I know that I am finite and must forego the purity of idealism, I lose the primary, absolute affirmation, harmony with everything good. So primary affirmation must jiggle and teeter on the edge of determining who I am and knowing that I can only be undetermined, as I will never attain true unity with whatever it is that matters. What matters is this ontology that I strive to realize; 'I know that I am here' measured against my acceptance that I am not going to attain true standpointless thinking, philosophy without an absolute.[32] *Fallible Man* elaborates further upon this sadness, the fallibility of my personality that makes it impossible that I can live according to my values.

Fallible Man and potential for error

Fallible Man is the second of three books in Ricœur's phenomenology of the will. It is the middle of the three and the first in the pair subsumed under the title *Finitude and Guilt.* Main protagonists here are the verb as human agency encapsulated in language, the person as linguistic mediator (although this idea comes into its own much later, with *On Translation* (2004/2006), see Chapter 6) and, waiting just out of sight, the self-conscious person who can transcend barriers between finite and infinite aspects of our lives in order to make each comprehensible to the other: aware, self-critical yet self-effacing – but this comes later in Ricœur's development. *Fallible Man* is characterized by Ricœur's magnificent analysis of Kant, and attempts an exploration of our potential for wrongdoing in order to clarify why it is so difficult to be a human being. One, and perhaps the dominant, conclusion is that each of us is destined to be at odds with our own self. This takes many forms, such as our being trapped in the here and now, while having aspirations to achieve extraordinary feats, summed up by Schaldenbrand as 'the productive imagination that brings kinship from conflict'. Indeed we *must* exist in a dysfunctional tension between our real lives and our desires, because otherwise we will not understand what it means to have dreams of magnificent states which contrast with the reality of being trapped in our bodies. Husserl's emphasis on perception is now inadequate for Ricœur and replaced by Kant's model of the interlocked nature of perception and knowing.[33] This in turn will become deficient in failing to take account of desire.

In *Fallible Man* Ricœur uses the image of fallibility in an almost geological sense, *la faille* having the possible meaning in French of a fault line, a fissure, a rift between two parts of the same thing.[34] Hence each of us is one body, but split, irremediably, not simply between body and mind, but also between finite and infinite, between action and possibilities and between egoism and altruism. How can we think beyond our personal point of view? We cannot, because we are trapped. Moreover, Kant denies any possibility of thinking about ourselves in the way we tend to think about the self now i.e. self-directed and entitled to be egotistical: according to many postmodern thinkers, the Enlightenment has let us down and we must fend for ourselves in a godless world. Kant's individual is viewed as an end in himself who must act in certain ways in order to discharge his duty to others. But, in Kant's world we can *think about* what it would be like to think beyond our duty, except that we cannot think that way or have any adequate conception of what that would mean. I will show later how suspicion forms a vital role in enabling us to oscillate between what we can know and what we cannot know.

Ricœur gives an account in *Fallible Man* of Kant's views on what it is to be human. Rational knowing is the starting point, a Kantian position, and one in which we are able to judge the appearance of something according to concepts that will allow us to understand the world around us. Within the concept that we use to make sense of what we perceive, Kant differentiates between higher-order categories (e.g. quantity) and lower-order schema (e.g. number). Ricœur values, and will use on many occasions, imagination's act of mediating between appearance and category that is a transcendental schema which 'completely exhausts itself in the act of constituting objectivity' because imagination's workings are obscure to us and represent a 'hidden art in the depths of the human soul'.[35] Yet Kant presupposes a fallen sensibility, and this itself presupposes the possibility of a not fallen sensibility, as a result of which tension humans have already become divided and 'fallen'.[36] For Ricœur this is less than adequate; possibility of failure must be transformed into feeling, which in turn must be transformed into action. Ricœur goes beyond Kant and develops in *Fallible Man* a sense of Eros, a sense of Love that anticipates happiness in being consciously in love with another person, having a sense of direction and of belonging.[37] Almost forty years later he develops this in more detail in his beautiful paper 'The Nuptial Metaphor', of which more in Chapter 10.[38] In contrast, existential negation of a Sartrean sort appears first as a difference between me and another, then as a difference internal to me, then as a sad finitude, a blocking of possibilities.[39] Instead I should accept several different ways of being conscious of myself and of others: through 'the understanding of language, the communication of culture and the communion of persons'. 'Thereby another is not only an other, but my like.'[40] Derrida endorses this shared understanding, which he discusses as being denied us by Levinas' radical alterity.

Ricœur takes a risk in introducing Kant's thinking person to desire, which Kant would see as a contaminant, and Ricœur offers a dialectical contrast by proposing to us that we use respect, as a way of moderating our desire; if we desire another person we should respect them as another person, not simply as the object of our desire. Kantian humans are thus each an end in themselves, because of the humanity in each of us. In chapter 3 of *Fallible Man* Ricœur uses Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* to emphasize the practical synthesis that takes me from "I think" to "I will": I desire, I take my pleasure, I am proven finite because this process shows how bound I am to physicality by following my desires (even beautiful music stimulates the brain physiologically). I do not notice how affective my view is, I am absorbed in what I do. Through the image of what I desire, motivation develops. 'The body cannot be a pure mediator but is also immediately for itself' and thus closes off its intended openness.[41]

Returning to the debate in *Freedom and Nature* about a motive not being a cause, Ricœur looks at the huge tension between the two; I decide upon my motive and that affects the causality that I use to justify my actions – if I change my motive, I must change the causal reasoning that I use. Motives may appear to influence causes but this is a willed illusion – causes of events may be beyond our control. He seeks an existential will to act, as a way of living that can be more positive than Sartre's way, and can embody the value of deciding to act to affirm life and not destroy it, to support others and not weaken them and – above all – to cope with the distress and disorientation caused by being limited in how much I can achieve and in how much I can justify *wanting* and *having* those things and people that I want. Moreover, even when I resist the status quo, this can be an affirmation of life and a de-negation of the downsides to being mortal. Such affirmation involves motivation; I need to have reasons for what I do. Motives may appear to affect causes, but this is an illusion. It is a major theme of Ricœur's work, that we should accept responsibility for what we do, even if there are unintended consequences.

Later (in the late 1960s – see Chapter 6) he rejects Davidson's approach to action as an event, arguing that this leads us to 'an agentless semantics of action' i.e. the belief that the outcomes of action become separated from their perpetrator and become reified; events, with no responsibility held. This seems harsh: if Davidson were really saying this, we would be able to deny causality, which attributes responsibility to us. Ricœur finds Davidson helpful for *appearing* to argue that we may choose to deny causality, in order to avoid personal suffering through guilt. This theme is visible in a different way in Freud's work on dreams, slips of the tongue and neuroses: Ricœur is grateful to Freud for taking these acts of the unconscious mind seriously, because they show that we make meaning in rich and complex ways, and that apparently random behaviour has a pattern and *is* a response to the experienced world.

Ricœur seems to be seeking equilibrium between tensions that go beyond the attempted balance between pleasure and avoidance of suffering. This necessitates facing up to the desire in the human to take on challenges that are difficult: a Nietzschean passionate, irascible arousal of the desire to be right. If the 'irascible' realizes itself in ambition, violence and domination, then these are the points of least resistance for the base drives of the human search for some difficult challenge. This search can find outlet in mistakes, excesses that 'the fascinated consciousness realises in the fault'. (This is a hint of the progression from *Fallible Man* (who sees the possibility of wrongdoing) to *The Symbolism of Evil* (in which we go further than possibility; our actual understanding and experience of evil is explored through symbol and myth).) Yet if, for Nietzsche, these struggles are the excesses that he wishes to encourage, Ricœur finds that this is denial of the possibility of some sort of necessary equilibrium between desire and the possible.

Developing work on guilty knowledge

Ricœur suggests that the Kantian sequence of having, power and worth are related to knowing, acting and feeling respectively. Thus they reveal themselves in avarice, tyranny and vainglory respectively. If we put the triads together in pairs, knowing is paired with avarice, then acting is paired with tyranny and feeling is paired with vainglory. The Pascalian pair seems surprising – they are not that similar. This reveals, however, the sense in which Ricœur cautions us about the Kantian sequence; thinking and knowing have the potential to be possessive, territorial and potentially avaricious acts that can allow us to perceive the world as we wish to see it. Kant, with his universality, showed us that our viewpoint and our perceptions are determined by the way we are, what we already know. Ricœur, with his partiality absorbs all this and takes it even further by emphasizing the potency of knowing, its capacity to posit and to submit to desire in certain circumstances. I am imperfect and therefore should not be surprised if I err; in such circumstances evil arises from weakness because we posit it.[42] Ricœur wishes to show that this is not inevitable, although it may seem so with a concept such as original sin. As already argued, we will only understand life in dualisms, because each of us is destined to be out of step with ourselves, so here as ever, I only understand goodness if I understand evil. The risk is that I must be able to recognize evil and may then succumb to it by recognizing it; the possibility of collusion renders me no longer naïve. This is a debate about guilty knowledge that Ricœur finds impossible to contain within phenomenology; in wanting to resolve it, he has to develop more assertive techniques to do with interpretation, hermeneutics of symbolic meaning.

It is in language that we can find the key to meaning and understand ourselves better. This will be his linguistic turn, and it happens at a time when Saussure's linguistics and then Lévi-Strauss' development of Saussure's work into anthropology are offering French academics an opportunity to break free of classical traditions. One consequence of this is that phenomenology (and existentialism and Marxism) came under fire with structuralism providing the ammunition. Saussure's work was used in the 1960s to show how written language could be analysed by paying attention to structural features that indicate subterranean systems within language, systems that show how human thought is determined by language, not vice versa. The complete separation of spoken language and written language is often attributed to Saussure.[43] In fact he did not make such a strong distinction and he was also notably ambivalent concerning the supposed priority of verbal language over other modes or systems of thought. He saw both signifier and signified as purely psychological forms, not substance.

Symbolizing evil and guilty knowledge

The Symbolism of Evil represents a move away from phenomenology, although Ricœur arguably never stops being a phenomenologist. Towards the end of the 1950s, while writing it, he begins to use Kant's conditions of possibility in a neo-Kantian way, as a function of textual mediation. Ricœur has adopted Kant's ideas, through deep reflection, after pushing phenomenology to its outer limits in *Fallible Man*, finding that it facilitated discussion about the possibility of sin, through deep reflection. He stops short of the reality of evil, because Kant's and Husserl's phenomenology is disconnected from the body we use to carry out acts. This formal level, of fallibility, needs connecting with the level of life and the experience of evil. *The Symbolism of Evil* is an exploration of how we get to grips with evil; the possibility (fallibility) becomes reality (fault). We need to make a detour through myth and symbol in order to have the resources to deal with evil. The method used in the work is no longer pure reflection. Ricœur discusses this with Reagan in terms that indicate the importance of his change in method in *The Symbolism of Evil*: Ricœur ascribes the impetus for this change to 'fundamental experiences revolving around what could be called bad will' (conversation 1991, published 1996:124), symbols of evil, more than interest in language and the emotions portrayed by language.[44] He cites the first article in *From Text to Action* (1986/1991) as the, much later, description of what he calls this 'grafting of hermeneutics onto phenomenology'.[45] The method used in *The Symbolism of Evil* involves immersion in the full richness of language and culture in order to develop a hermeneutics of evil, as we represent it to ourselves in myth, symbol and sign. Evil predates us (as we see with the serpent, the evil other that was there before Adam and Eve). Evil also cannot be grasped in its essence but only by representation; defilement, sin and guilt are the three ideas, and they occur in verbal imagery such as the stain, the fall and blinding respectively: 'Life is a symbol, an image, before being experienced and lived' and the work now is to decipher the wrongdoing wrapped up in the symbol.[46]

The guilty person is both responsible *and* captive. This is a change of emphasis in Ricœur; a sense of sin turns towards the feeling of guilt. Guilt is the anticipated chastisement.[47] This introduces also issues regarding just punishment. Job disputes that every man dies for his own crime. Guilt is graduated and this enables development of graduated punishments. Ricœur discusses the Oedipus myth here and returns at length to it in *Freud and Philosophy*, and *Course of Recognition*, where we will see that he disagrees with Freud's interpretation.

It is not coincidental that this discussion of sin sounds Biblical and draws on Biblical examples. Ricœur reminds us that St Paul expressed this dilemma in his analysis of the curse of the law in Galatians 3 & 4. Humans are not able to satisfy all the demands of the law as 'perfection is infinite and the commandments are unlimited in number.' Paul's great discovery is that the law itself is a source of sin.[48] Pellauer deals very briefly with this. Long before Nietzsche – 'who nevertheless thought he was blasting the first "theologian"'– St Paul himself 'dismounted the spring of that infernal machine'.[49] The law and sin have a deadly circularity. Division and conflict are described in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The individual is split into the 'I' who acknowledges and the 'I' who disowns him/herself, and says s/he is not the one acting.[50]

Defilement becomes a robust symbol when it no longer suggests a real stain, but represents the servile will, sullied by its submission to desire.[51] Evil has to be undergone, evil is also already there, like the serpent in the garden. Evil has to be understood as internalized in order to be dealt with – it is not over there, out there, it is here, now, in me. Contagion and contamination emphasize the outside world that is seductive, that leads me on and that leads me to become servile.[52] Defilement becomes the language of the servile will, but can only explain itself through mythical symbols and speculative symbols.[53] The Muslim woman and her hijab are seen as symbolizing a range of different and often conflicting polarities involving oppression versus modesty. In this context it may be naive of Ricœur to argue that modern man sees history and myth separated because we know that male-female relationships, and not only those in Muslim cultures, may be based on myth, without recourse to history. Narration will become the new element that distinguishes myth from symbol, once he has read Von Rad's narrative theology and structural narrative of the parable.[54] The introduction of narrative will herald a long and fruitful writing strand for Ricœur, leading to *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative.*

Ricœur is strongly influenced by the phenomenology of religion (Van de Leeuw, Leenhardt, Eliade), which seems at first to be about the mind adopting a partially Hegelian state of mind that connects affectively and practically to the 'whole of things'. For phenomenology of religion, myth is an expression in language, myth is symbol taking the form of narration (perhaps structural, like parable) and myth is the almost tangible product of life as it is felt and lived before being formulated. Ritual action and mythical language, together, form imitations of the archetypal act of being. Phenomenology of religion has thus influenced study of myth greatly, by proposing that myths relate back to the core essences of human being such as for example, participation, and relation to the Sacred. Ricœur argues that prehistorical man was already sundered from his wholeness with the cosmos, and that myth in fact recreates, at lest partially, this unity, when in fact what we experience daily, outside myth, is separation. Myth is an antidote to phenomenological distress because humans are already anxious and uneasy in their conscience, as in Kafka's work. Myth cannot achieve what it sets out to do: it is myriad little splintered stories and experiences, because it has not the resources to create the unity we crave within our world.

Myth can only exist within narrative because mythology is otherwise an incomprehensible collection of events. Myth refers to plenitude, completeness, but one that is established, lost and then re-established painfully at a symbolic level, as in the Oedipus myth. The primordial drama of the beginning and the end of evil sets the tone for the myths that Ricœur studies in the second half of *The Symbolism of Evil*, and can be summed up with a very Ricœurian phrase: 'The relation, or the tension, is an integral part of the experience; or, rather, the experience subsists only in connection with *symbols* that place fault in a totality which is not perceived, not experienced, but signified, aimed at, conjured up.'[55] Thus we can distance ourselves from our mistakes by creating the object that represents evil. Later he has to modify this again and integrate it into language, metaphor and narrative, and all this in the feverish atmosphere of structuralism.

Structuralism

Levinas commented in 1992 that he could never see the attraction of structuralism, particularly for Ricœur, who Levinas described as the best thinker of that epoch.[56]

A significant feature of structuralism is its negation of the human voice in language and its argument that the structures of language are powerful as systems with their own rules and do not need to take account of the referent (the real life object to which the language refers). Derrida, as we know, defines modern metaphysical philosophy as being constructed of binary pairs, of which one is dominant, and functions as the centre of the system. Derrida develops deconstruction, a way of dismantling what we already have, because it is impossible to get rid of it, yet vital to critique it from within. What is the attraction of structuralism for Ricœur? It claims to provide a unifying model of objective knowledge throughout the human sciences, and Ricœur teaches structural linguistics as a valid subject; he sees it as an indispensable component of interpretation yet also attacks its descendant when presented as structuralism, a worldview. He believes that hermeneutics needs the structure of structuralism, but not the philosophy of structuralism.[57] Ricœur uses a range of thinkers for his dialectical philosophy, in his belief that we cannot solve problems from one viewpoint or by one method alone. He draws on Benveniste for analysing language in order to create dialectal tension (later evident with metaphor and parable). Austin and Searle give him ways of developing arguments about speech as an act, which, contrary to their main focus, allow him to bring the human voice back into language, after its banishment by structuralism, and the savaging of structuralism and speech act theory by Derrida, who refused dialogue yet remained deeply indebted to it, with his 'difference' as a play of terms within a system that has no fixed referent.

Pure reflection (phenomenology) is a direct exercise of rationality, an intellectual act, and as such makes no appeal to myth or symbol and is not clearly articulated in language. Such reflection cannot grasp the idea or the reality of evil, and is not related to real life, in which we are enslaved to our passions. The confession of sins makes use of different language, symbolic language. In *The Symbolism of Evil* we learn that the symbol gives rise to thought.[58] Can we return to pure reflection after the symbolics of evil and enrich it with all that we have learned about ourselves through symbolic language? The polysemy of language renders pure reflection problematic and it is this very complex and contradictory task that delights and sustains Ricœur. Language can lead us astray as we can use it wrongly: 'It is through misunderstanding and lying that the primordial structure of speech reveals the identity and otherness of minds.'[59] This is another early hint of the hermeneutics of suspicion, which manifested itself in many different ways in the prevailing mood in France at that time.

Ricœur lives through structuralism, building on the work of Saussure and Lévi-Strauss and concludes that structuralist techniques are vital, because understanding a text 'is entirely mediated by the whole of explanatory procedures that precede it and accompany it'.[60] Saussure drew our attention to the word as signifier (the physical form and sound) with the word as signified (the meaning), and his work was interpreted to preclude the referent, (the object referred to), so language becomes hermetically sealed from reality. This was not Saussure's approach; it was Lévi-Strauss who took structure to be the signifier, so he created a system that was sealed and somehow scientific in its predictability. Lévi-Strauss was also influenced by Comte's desire for systems that facilitate a totalizing approach. For Ricœur the symbol cannot be abandoned, because the symbol brings together the signifier, the concept and the special meaning it gains through use, as he sees in the symbolism of evil. Gadamer's book *Truth and Method* was published in 1960, the same year as *The Symbolism of Evil*, and Ricœur subsequently assimilates some key points from Gadamer that affect his work on language; he finds in Gadamer that the symbol is a necessary yet not sufficient aspect of hermeneutics. He is influenced also by Gadamer's concept of distanciation and incorporates that into his textual theories: distance is necessary in order to make a reasonable judgement, yet must also be balanced by the intimacy of acknowledging personal involvement in meaning.[61]

Conclusions

From Anaximander to Kant there is the idea that we think dialectically in spite of, or perhaps because of negation. Ricœur's phenomenological idiolect reminds us that "I attempt to go beyond my limited point of view and fail", (first negation: "I don't understand"), then I deny that I can do this (second negation, a double negative: "I don't accept that I don't understand") and then I discover that my failure and denial lead to some understanding of who I really am: "I accept that I can't understand properly, and keep trying anyway to the best of my abilities." This is my primary affirmation.[62] Here we find resonances with Kant's *Analytic of the Sublime, Third Critique, The Critique of Judgement,* which is about much more than aesthetic judgement. Whereas in *The First Critique* Kant sees the aesthetic as 'a hidden art in the depths of the human soul', in *The Third Critique* he tries to explain that our attempt to grasp the sublime, the pure, the morally harmonious to which we should all strive is mediated by imagination and reason.

Kant's attempt itself acknowledges that our faculties enable us to comprehend and interpret nature, because we are both physical creatures constrained by natural laws *and also* agents who respond to the dictates of our moral consciences. However we cannot fully understand how that is possible. In order to grapple with this dilemma, Ricœur asserts that all classic philosophies are philosophies of *form*, and he wants philosophies of *act*, in which "my actions are an affirmation of my motivation to act well, despite my understanding that I can't really understand; I can't have what I want, I have this which is not (as good as) that". In moving away from phenomenology he will reach a point at which 'The hermeneutic becomes an existential act because interpretation is a matter of the very definition of man.'[63] He will see language, and later narrative, as act in text and text as a form of action, and suspicion will help to act by defining the discrepancies between imagination and reason.

Hegel is vital for the development of Ricœur's thought from this point on, for giving us the possibility of negation that Husserl refuses to give us. Hegel is also dangerous, for the same reason, and it turns out that Freud needs to re-emerge from the shadows, because of his ability to give credence to the phenomena that we negate: our fantasies, our myths, our symbolic representations of our world and our desires. We will see later what the dangers posed by Freud are, in his role as Ricœur's Old Testament, yet also we can confirm the respect and admiration which Ricœur has for Freud.

The archaeology is as clear as digging can ever be; having attended Dalbiez's lectures on Freud in the late 1920s, and having researched Freud from the mid-1930s, Ricœur then immerses himself in Husserl while a prisoner of war, and later separates Freud from his search to understand how we construct meaning about our weaknesses in *Fallible Man* and *The Symbolism of Evil.* At the same time, however, he is still writing about Freud and lecturing on Freud and he gives the famous Bonneval lecture in 1960, which formalizes the rupture between his thoughts and those of Lacan. In the development of his ideas for the 1965 book *Freud and Philosophy,* he brings together again his work on Freud and on human thought. In *Fallible Man* we are faced with our weaknesses. In *The Symbolism of Evil* we are faced with our inability to imagine and address evil except through symbolic representation, myth and symbol. It is as if he needed to separate out the various components of the problem he was trying to solve and then bring them together again, and Freud proved, after all, to be the master of suspicion who could facilitate understanding about meaning, about desire, about the use of language and actions in the pursuit of desire and about the fatal weakness in the Cartesian cogito (its inability to see its own limitations), that does not, however, reduce its importance. These strands come together in the semantics of desire, narcissism and our capacity for self-deception, and Freud is drawn in to play a central role in moving beyond Kant. Chapter 6 will show more about the way Ricœur uses language in the late 1960s and after; in Chapter 3 we will see already the potential for using language to go beyond phenomenology, which, in its Husserlian form, is too ego-focused and needs to become able to articulate negative thought. He also uses Biblical language to show how important religion is, even if for many nowadays the influence of the Bible may seem cultural more than spiritual.

Chapter 3

Ricœur's masters of suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche and Freud

Ricœur's philosophical analysis of Freud's psychoanalytical theory dominates his work on how we make meaning in the triumvirate of Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, and the three together are also important because at that time in France the structuralists were citing Freud, Nietzsche and Saussure for their cause and Marxist ideas were pervasive (not least through Althusser). Dosse describes how the twentieth century was contaminated by suspicion about human motivation: the extermination camps, fascism and communism and the bloody French civil war in Algeria: 'Technological modernity became a steamroller, a planetary death machine enmeshed in an ideology of suspicion.'[1] Yet Ricœur does not develop the theme of the masters of suspicion to any great depth and comments in his eighties on 'Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, with respect to whom the overly facile expression "masters of suspicion" is in danger of failing to do justice.'[2] We see in Chapter 4 when we analyse the hermeneutics of suspicion, the tendency on the part of many writers to combine the masters of suspicion with the hermeneutics of suspicion. This is both inaccurate and, I will argue, misleading. We also need to clarify each term: why suspicion and not scepticism? For Ricœur scepticism is sweeping in its rejection of possibilities about truth and understanding and all accepted opinions.[3] In this chapter we look at the masters of suspicion, who challenged our personal beliefs about ourselves, yet believed strongly in their own ideologies.

Initially, however, I want to look at the immediate stimulus that led to the work on Ricœur's major Freud book, as it reveals the Ricœurian habit of helping a phoenix to rise from the ashes of previous writing; in this case, *The Symbolism of Evil*.[4] Indeed, Gerhart calls *Freud and Philosophy* the third book of Volume Two of Ricœur's philosophy, in sequence after *The Symbolism of Evil*.[5] Ricœur makes a little joke in his autobiographical set of interviews *Critique and Conviction* that the process of writing his big book on Freud provided a form of 'self-analysis on the cheap'.[6] Fortunately there is much more to Ricœur's work on Freud than self-analysis, not least of which is his much publicized falling out with Lacan and his writing of a companion text to *Freud and Philosophy*, the excellent set of essays *The Conflict of Interpretations.*[7] These twenty-two essays were written between 1960 and 1969, overlapping with the writing of *Freud and Philosophy.* These essays, as Ihde comments, give a more succinct view of Ricœur's thinking about Freud than the Freud book itself, although the latter is still the major source for Ricœur's discussions of Marx, Nietzsche and Freud. Some of his Freud essays have only recently been published in French. It is also useful to consider Ricœur's early work on Freud. Having studied Freud in the early 1930s, by 1948 he was developing his ideas on Freud, casting the unconscious as the blind spot of the conscious mind, within that which is absolutely involuntary and which has three components; life itself (being alive), character and the unconscious.

Early work on Freud

Ricœur lectured and wrote extensively about Freud into the 1950s with no reference to the role he was to ascribe to Freud in the 1960s and 1970s of a master of suspicion who deprived us of our complacency that we are conscious, clever, superior beings. In *Freedom and Nature* (1950/1966) Ricœur is unconvinced by Freud's determination to challenge the conscious mind, and asserts that he will address these issues by 'a constant return to myself', rather than going to a consulting room or a clinic.[8] He proposes a phenomenological solution to the problem of the unconscious, suggesting that the phenomenon of thought can be understood even with the hidden components of lies, because we can unearth them. The deep wells of the unconscious, however, contain material that we do not have any thought of, as they are so deeply buried and can only emerge through analysis. He prefers to think that he can sort out his own unconscious, rather than seeking therapy.[9] Consistent with his belief that the question we ask will determine the answer we get, Ricœur deals carefully with the epistemological issues and refuses to measure psychoanalysis against psychology. Comparison would be futile, because of fundamentally different premises: psychology turns acts into facts, and evades the complexity of relationships by focusing on what is measurable. Ricœur argues that there are no facts in psychoanalysis, only interpretation.[10]

Freedom and Nature contains a substantial section on the unconscious in the chapter entitled 'Experienced Necessity', influenced by Dalbiez and Marcel, in which Ricœur begins to explore the challenge set for Descartes by Freud.[11] We can see ideas about suspicion developing as a potent force for seeking accurate answers to life's questions in 1950, where Ricœur describes how, through Freud, we learn that consciousness may suspect itself to be a disguise of its own unconscious, where there are infantile, sexual, even ancestral thoughts hiding.[12] While insisting that Freud's doctrine of determinism should be rejected, because it denies us the freedom to act, Ricœur agrees that the Freudian model of regressive analysis is valuable for challenging us to act well and with meaning, in the face of our own suspicion:

> This assurance, infected with the suspicion that I am acting out a comedy on the stage of a mythical opera and am the dupe of a conjuration of hidden forces in some mysterious wings of existence – this assurance, that 'I' which I was tempted to sacrifice into the hands of the decipherers of enigmas, must be won back constantly in the *sursum* of freedom. I confront the unconscious as Descartes confronted the great deceiver: I save myself by the affirmation of the cogito and the refusal to make my thought conform to something, which is not *also* consciousness.[13]

This is an early working of the later idea about second naivety but at this stage he is not using Freud's psychoanalysis as a cipher for truth seeking, which comes later, in *Freud and Philosophy*.[14] It is significant that Ricœur used early writings by Freud, such as *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* in *Freedom and Nature*, and later Freud, such as *Civilisation and its Discontents* in *Freud and Philosophy*. He finds the later work more useful for analysing cultural issues. He seems to have kept Freud's thought separate from his texts *History and Truth* (1955/1965), *Fallible Man* (1960/1965) and *The Symbolism of Evil* (1960 /1967) but Ricœur sees that he still has unfinished business.[15] His work on human frailty, culpability and the symbolism of evil is an attempt to develop his ideas from analysis of the essence of the will to an understanding of the symbolism and mythologies of evil, and in his lecturing we see explicit working of Freud into these areas. In 1958 he lectures at Columbia University, New York on *Guilt*; unresolved areas that require Freud's ideas are those of 'infantile, archaic pathological culpability'.[16] He realizes he is becoming aware of human suffering and areas of human thought that are unresponsive to phenomenological analysis, and which are also not clarified by the myths of Greek tragedy and of Biblical stories. In Part III of this lecture series, for example, entitled *Guilt and the Function of Myth*, he analyses 'the tragic type of myth' and comments that 'Freud discusses the function of "projection" of the repressed in the symbol, where symbol means symptom.' Secondly Freud's work offers an alternative to phenomenology, taking Dalbiez's approach as a starting point, namely that psychoanalysis is a branch of the philosophy of nature, looking at humans in the light of the natural world that is part of them; instincts for example. In his daily life Ricœur also protests against the use of torture in Algeria in the 1950s: human activity that is abhorrent and cannot be resolved by myth.

In *Freedom and Nature* he writes that the unconscious exists, is part of nature and has to be acknowledged, an idea to which he returns in the 1960s, and which complements his idea of the unconscious as an act of interpretation, deciphering symbols.[17] After his final profoundly phenomenological text, *The Symbolism of Evil*, he is interested in Freud's interpretation of meaning through myth, symbol and social transgression.[18] He is thus following a line similar to that of Eliade, whose work he admires as a phenomenology of religion. Using Popperian ideas of falsification, and from the position of a phenomenologist who is seeking an alternative approach, he begins asking himself whether psychoanalysis can falsify phenomenology.[19] This enables him to bring his current phenomenological thinking, with its emphasis on direct consciousness, into direct contact with psychoanalysis, with its deep distrust of consciousness. Later (Chapter 7) we will see how he believes that it is impossible to integrate psychoanalysis and phenomenology; phenomenology has its 'other', and its 'other' is psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis looks at all the factors that phenomenology works to block out. Ricœur also sees a new challenge; Freud, Marx and Nietzsche offered 'an opposing thought that I had to come to terms with'.[20]

Influences on Ricœur's interpretation of Freud

Who were the main influences on Ricœur in his work on Freud? He insists that his work is based mostly on Freud and not on Freud's contemporaries or followers, and that he is looking at Freud as an interpreter of human ills, of cultural phenomena and as one who can ask questions such as; 'why is man unsatisfied, unhappy as a cultural being?'[21] Dosse describes how Dalbiez's separation of Freudian doctrine from Freudian methodology influenced Ricœur, who was later to do the same.[22]

In 1960, five years before *Freud and Philosophy* was published, Ricœur was invited to a conference at Bonneval on the unconscious, organized by Ey.[23] At Bonneval Ricœur made no reference to Lacan's theories. Subsequently Ricœur was very clear that he did not understand Lacan's work on Freud, despite working alongside Lacan frequently until 1964.[24] Structuralism was, like psychoanalysis, a powerful movement. Dosse helpfully contextualizes the major importance of structuralism for 1960s intellectuals and academics in France, because it challenges the classical scholars in a way that they find irrefutable; the premises are different and no debate is possible. Later we shall see how Ricœur adopts the methods of analysis from structuralism, but decisively rejects structuralist ideas as a basis for philosophy (Chapter 6). Dosse describes the way Lacan initially fawned upon Ricœur publicly and how he later treated Ricœur rudely and was disgusted at *Freud and Philosophy*. Dosse and Simms chronicle the attack by Lacan and his followers upon Ricœur for writing *Freud and Philosophy*.[25]

Six years after Bonneval, in 1966, the conference proceedings were published in *L'inconscient*, by Merleau-Ponty, including the Ricœur article called '*Le conscient et l'inconscient*'.[26] This paper ('Consciousness and the Unconscious') was reprinted in English in *The Conflict of Interpretations* (1974), almost ten years after Ricœur delivered it as a lecture; it seems that this essay is in fact the first 'outing' of the masters of suspicion, and they appear on the very first page of the essay, yet it wasn't published in French until 1966, after *De L'interprétation* (*Freud and Philosophy*) in 1965. This essay 'Consciousness and the Unconscious' proposes that contemporary philosophers should study Freud, Nietzsche and Marx together for their work on suspicion, and not treat Freud as a special case, although that is in fact exactly what Ricœur does himself.

Marx, Nietzsche and Freud: bigger boys came

Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, and especially Freud, give Ricœur new methods of interrogating and challenging cultural norms, certain ways of looking at symbolism and interpreting symbols – problems he has endeavoured to resolve in earlier works. In *Freud and Philosophy* Ricœur creates the context for his new thinking in the short, much cited section in which he attempts to bring the three great thinkers together, initially looking at their differences.[27] In 1917 Freud had lined himself up with two earlier great destroyers of narcissistic belief: Copernicus denied our centrality in the universe, Darwin denied our centrality in the animal kingdom and Freud denied our centrality even in our own minds.[28] The entity that we call consciousness, is in fact 'false consciousness'.[29] At the least philosophers must accept the vacillation of the conscious mind, and analyse this problem with a new sort of hermeneutics. In opposition to Descartes we are faced with the possibility that the mind and the body are not separable and thus they may get together and create desires that are hopeless, either because they are insatiable or because they are considered wrong, or both. These desires are fed by both mind and body and can become invincible, especially when they are hidden in the unconscious from our conscious knowledge. The three masters of suspicion gave us also the tools for working on this problem of false consciousness, because they 'taught us to unmask its tricks'.[30] As our teachers they show us three types of deception, not three types of suspicion.[31] David Pellauer has reminded me that the term *maître* in French also means teacher, and indicated that this sense must also be taken into account.[32] From these teachers Ricœur learnt how to be suspicious, and this formulation emphasizes the skill required, rather than the usual interpretation of 'masters of suspicion' who are the experts. It will become clear that Ricœur wants us to become expert in exercising suspicion.

This 'wounding' of our self-love can be accounted for through study of Freud's own work, although for Ricœur it also went well beyond Freud's conscious intention. He believes that we define Marx, Nietzsche and Freud more according to the differences between them 'and to the limitations that the prejudices of their time impose upon their successors even more than upon themselves'. Thus he believes we often interpret these three great thinkers not entirely fairly: Marx is relegated to economics and what Ricœur considers the absurd theory of the reflex consciousness; Nietzsche is depicted within biologism and a perspectivism incapable of expressing itself without contradiction; Freud is restricted to psychiatry and dressed up in a simplistic pansexualism. Yet there is a common interest that is highly significant: if we go back to the intention they had in common, we find in it the decision to look upon immediate consciousness primarily as 'false' consciousness. They thereby take up again, each in a different manner, the problem of Cartesian doubt, in order to investigate it at the very core of the Cartesian system.

All three hope to clear the horizon for a more authentic world, not only by means of a destructive critique, but also by the invention of a new art of interpreting. Descartes triumphed over our doubts about *things* by the evidence of consciousness; the material world exists because I know I am conscious of it. Marx, Nietzsche and Freud triumph over our doubts about *consciousness* by challenging our ideas about how we find meaning. Descartes' triumph is triumph for us all, but the masters of suspicion triumph at our expense, as we are disorientated and undone. Whereas Husserl's phenomenology is the reduction *to* consciousness, Freudian psychoanalysis is the reduction *of* consciousness, an *epoché* in reverse. *Epoché* is the attempt to bracket our apparently superficial responses, to suspend them in order to concentrate on significant perceptions, and Freud tries to reverse this: he brings forward these apparently unimportant responses and recommends that they have meaning after all. With many phenomena, such as dreams and *Fehlleistungen* (slips of the tongue) we may be disturbed by what they tell us about our thoughts. Marx, Nietzsche and Freud placed doubt in our minds, but unlike Descartes they did not remove it, they deliberately left it there. Much later, in *Memory, History, Forgetting* Ricœur shows us the difference between Cartesian consciousness and the self, as we know it today; Descartes was offering us an 'exemplary ego', idealized, who is a good example for us to follow.[33]

It seems to Ricœur that Marx, Nietzsche and Freud begin their work with the premise that conscious thought should be regarded with suspicion and is an illusion that requires demystification. Guile must be used to approach the guile of the conscious mind: it conceals its complex and often amoral workings from itself and from others. There are 'three convergent procedures of demystification' represented by Marx, Nietzsche and Freud. Marx's theory of ideologies shows us the alienation of labour, false consciousness and the need for popular revolution. Nietzsche's genealogy of morals analyses the master-slave morality and the consequent bad conscience. Freud's theory of ideals and illusions shows the discrepancies between Enlightenment ideals and irrational urges.[34] For Ricœur all three go even further, challenging the deceptions in consciousness. Yet rather than being determined to dismantle the idea of consciousness, they wish to extend the possibilities of consciousness if we can tolerate being disorientated; Marx proposes that we understand that emancipation of thought processes is essential to free up labour and demystify consciousness.[35] Freud hopes that, by undergoing analysis, the individual can become clearer about the meanings hidden in her/his subconscious, thereby reducing some personal conflicts and possibly being able to live a better life. Nietzsche desires the conscious increase of the individual's power, by means of ideas such as 'superman', 'eternal return' and 'Dionysius', and no longer deceiving ourselves with false humility.[36]

Ricœur believed that hermeneutics had originally been about the question; 'under what circumstances can I say that I have understood this text?' His work shows us that hermeneutics is transformed by Marx, Nietzsche and Freud so that it is actually about the self, identity and self-deception. This follows on from *The Symbolism of Evil*; understanding ourselves through the detour of understanding the founding texts of our culture. These three thinkers tell us that we are not in control of our thoughts and actions, nor are we virtuous, and that all is not what it seems. In fact, we are motivated by money, power and sex respectively and they also warn us against religion, particularly Christianity. Ricœur believes that they transform the hermeneutic issue by creating a fundamental challenge to Cartesian dualism, seeing both body and mind as complicit in our drive for money, power and sex. They raise the hermeneutical stakes so that they are higher than if this were a purely textual debate, and thereby prepare us for attempting this sort of answer; 'I will uncover deep and difficult truths through understanding this text – the self – and *try* to become free of deceit.' Here text can be a manifestation of human actions and for Ricœur, text increasingly facilitates a revolutionary ethical debate about the nature of the human mind and about morals, because of his enduring belief in our ability to make ethical decisions, a constant theme for Ricœur. Through Freud, the consciousness becomes a problem *and also* a task, and the genuine cogito must be gained through recognition of the false cogitos that influence the ways in which we act and in which we explain our actions to ourselves and to others. However, Ricœur feels himself rebelling against the predetermined direction of the Freudian thinking as well as the assertiveness of the Cartesian cogito. The groundwork for this is laid in Dalbiez' class in 1930–1933, with the denial of the will that characterizes Dalbiez' interpretation of Freud.[37]

Ricœur and Freud

Ricœur comes to see Freud as a vitally important thinker; an iconoclast with a capacity to challenge our most profound ideas about what we think is true. He welcomes the emancipatory effect of *knowing that* we are governed by repressed and unconscious desires. However, as a consistent theme, he retains his original belief that Freud's deterministic and drive-based theories could be degrading and disabling if taken seriously as predictive measures of human action. Thus, even as early as the 1950s, Ricœur wishes to create a clear, perhaps perverse and contradictory connection between Freud's beliefs and their possible effect on our attempts to be a 'responsible agent'; a personal sense of responsibility, our hopes of free choice, our judgements about right and wrong and our decision-making.[38] He depicts us as taking such decisions against the backdrop of lives that are meaningless or obscure, and states that this may necessitate, in extreme cases, seeking 'a midwife of my freedom in a master of deciphering'. This phrase is an early reference to the role of controversial truth seeker that Freud is seen to play in *Freud and Philosophy*. In Ricœur's work, Freud becomes the master of demystification who plays the role of a midwife in bringing to a live birth our partial freedom, threatened as it is by desire and animal instinct, in a Nietzschean echo of the genealogy of morals. Ricœur concludes that there is a shadowy animal element in all of us that needs to be acknowledged and somehow accommodated, yet not given its head as that would create a dangerous level of excitement and recklessness;

> In dealing with these invincible shadows, I shall refrain from making them speak the language of men, but I shall consent to shelter, at the foot of the tower of free choice, an animal periphery sensed without complaisance and intuited without terror, which only becomes fascinating when the spell of passions gives it form and fatality.[39]

Such text is too messy for structuralism, although structuralism in the 1960s in Paris showed similarities to Freudian thought: the idea that linguistic forms are structured in some way that is beyond our control. Lacan saw the unconscious itself as structured like a language and endeavoured to move away from Freud and Simms shows us how he failed.[40] Derrida, in his turn, needed Freudian thinking for deconstruction, because he was challenging the idea of normal, the possibilities of consciousness and the undermining of surface meaning. For Ricœur, Freud is above all a cultural figure, seeking to interpret the layers of cultural meaning with which we surround ourselves.

Conditions of possibility

Ricœur sees psychoanalysis more as a cultural and historical than an observational scientific approach, because it cannot provide proof and can be compared with phenomenology (as we will see in Chapter 7). Psychoanalysis emphasizes regressive tendencies and the archaeology of a person's thinking that may lead to trauma being perpetuated. He endorses the less easily quantifiable evidence that persuasive narratives may help to heal and lead to beneficial outcomes. He also argues that psychoanalysis is differentiated from history by what he calls the semantics of desire, and applies Kant's idea of conditions of possibility for knowledge and experience in general, to order and systematize his interpretation of Freud's approach.[41] What are these conditions of possibility, in other words, which concepts does Ricœur believe Freud's psychoanalytic theory would be unthinkable without? Here are several answers. With the concept of the double functioning of the psychic apparatus, the pleasure principle and the reality principle stay constant (this starts with Freud's project of 1895, which Ricœur works on a great deal, and which is arousing new interest in the twenty-first century).[42] Freud was always a dualist; the contrasts between polarities became more marked later with his development of Eros and Thanatos, but Ricœur felt that there was never a proper resolution of the differences and similarities between these two pairs, perhaps because Freud moved from psychic (pleasure and reality principles) to more cultural debates (Eros and Thanatos). Narcissism is another core concept, as the development of the false invincibility of the conscious mind, which needs to be unmasked in a way which is anti-Cartesian, and which is complicated by 'a pseudo-knowledge on the part of the unconscious', thinking it knows itself through dreams and outbursts of passion which are in fact only the surface layer.[43] The definitive condition of possibility is the duality between desire and reality 'because of the invincible unawareness of self that characterises intentionality in act'.[44] "I don't know why I act as I do, but I *think* I know." When we remain in ignorance of this we are trapped in delusion. Spinoza describes this well, and this relationship that Spinoza presents between motives and causes is of great interest to Ricœur:

> So experience itself, no less clearly than reason, teaches that men believe themselves free because they are conscious of their own actions, and ignorant of the causes by which they are determined, that the decisions of the mind are nothing but the appetites themselves, which therefore vary as the disposition of the body varies.[45]

If we deploy suspicion to reveal the duality of desire and reality we can become at least partially enlightened.

Kettle logic and the semantics of desire

Desire mystifies us, by inviting us to develop false motives for seeking pleasure, and for Freud there is an incestuous core to neurosis, which is typified by the Oedipus myth. Reality demystifies desire; 'The reality principle is desire demystified'.[46] On the way to some sort of reasonably realistic perception, suspicion is used to generate a form of disillusion with loved objects, idols and icons of desire. In this complex network of wanting what we cannot or should not have, which Ricœur calls the semantics of desire, Freud develops many interlocking and sometimes contradictory theories; they relate to mourning, to psychosomatic manifestations of psychological trauma and to the self-defeating urge to repeat mistakes, longings etc., which leads to the dualistic standoff between Eros and Thanatos, love and death. As an example with a lighter touch, Freud reports a 'joke' about a kettle, in which excuses are given that contradict each other and show unsound motives. This entertains Derrida and he calls it kettle logic. Upon returning a kettle broken, A's defence was: 'First, I never borrowed a kettle from B at all; secondly the kettle had a hole in it already when I got it from him; and thirdly I gave him back his kettle undamaged.'[47]

As well as kettle logic we use symbolic language to obfuscate, yet the richness of puns, slips of the tongue and verbal games may prove facile and in themselves not help us: Doctor I have this Ricœuring dream – should I go left, should I go right, dare I walk on the grass in the middle . . . ? Ricœur wishes symbol to give us new ways of thinking, with which to move forward. The symbol as sign becomes vitally important in helping us to articulate unconscious forms, because we think in metaphors and imagery that can be creative. Ricœur explores the example of Oedipus, with a less sexualized interpretation than Freud's and one that has more to do with wisdom; once blinded, Oedipus can 'see' what he did, like Tiresias. What we should be working on is the hinge that binds together signifier and signified to reveal how we think. The conscious mind is the signifier and the unconscious mind the signified, in a way that can only become clear if repression is identified and released.[48] According to Freud we erect barriers between signifier and signified and create also a barrier between dynamic systems and these barriers stop us from perceiving the referent as the actual object in the real world and moving on in our lives. When an obsession ceases we are surprised that we were ever obsessed with the object of our desires. In *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricœur reminds us of the signifier 'spot' which can become the sign that endows 'stain' with the signification of evil, so that 'defilement . . . is itself a symbol of evil.'[49] Locked inside such a signifier: signified pairing is the referent i.e. the meaning in the real world which, in this example, may be original sin. Such a web of meaning becomes difficult if not impossible to challenge, even if we sense that the referent is not real at all.

Narcissism

Narcissism, as the excess of attention to oneself that also, inevitably, causes inattention to the other person and to the world around us, interprets reality on its own terms; truth hurts precisely because it reminds us that there are other viewpoints – such as those of the loved object itself – and that the one we love must be released from our longing, for a variety of reasons, such as overbearing egotism, unrealistic expectations and even loss of the loved one through death, as mourning can become narcissistic. Narcissism itself can provide consolation for loss, but at a price: Ricœur analyses the evolution of Freud's theory as the introduction of narcissism into instinct and the new and enduring topography of id, ego and superego.[50] Increasingly Freud's writings, for Ricœur, show the increase in emphasis on the reality principle, whereby the diplomatic ego attempts to attract and regulate the attention and allegiance of the id, and also sees the necessity on occasions, of modifying the excessive restrictions of the superego. For the later Freud the ego offers itself as a love object to the id, and attempts to offer security to the id's libido without however currying favour with the id, just as the psychoanalyst attempts to maintain distance and offers the analysand anchorage by representing and mediating the real world. Ricœur calls the reality principle the prudence principle; it involves the ego and the analyst taking considerable risks and may involve sycophancy and collusion, yet its aim is to help the person to live in the real world honestly and morally, and Ricœur identifies it with the ethics of psychoanalysis.[51] The pleasure principle is dangerous, and the reality principle embodies that which is useful, which 'represents the organism's true and proper interests'.[52] These interests rest on adaptation to time and to the demands of society, which should be both realistic and reasonable. Freud excludes religion from this, arguing that science is all we can rely upon.

Death and the archaeology of desire

What about the death drive, which has become Freud's trump card and yet cannot win the argument for him? Desire is convinced of its invincibility, especially when it is in love with itself, like Narcissus who disregards the possibility of death. Living a sensible life, on the other hand, with muted desires and no risk taking, becomes impoverished because we refuse to wager life, the highest prize, against death. Hence neither risky desires nor safe clean living can provide us with a true sense of the necessity, as Heidegger proposed it (and according to Heidegger most of us are inauthentic and do not achieve this) of living in attendance upon one's own death.[53] We see this in Freud too; he argues that inauthenticity characterizes our views of death, such as our feelings of guilt about wishing or causing or failing to prevent death.[54] Ricœur discusses what may be beyond the pleasure principle and concludes that the pleasure principle functions as a watchman over life, better than watching over death, but still a restrictive role that sketches determinism.[55] Ricœur concludes that Freud does not successfully connect his early life view of the pleasure principle alternating with the reality principle, with his later view of Eros and Thanatos; love of life and freedom from illusion remain separate and incompatible, because ultimately the two dualities cannot integrate the neurotic and the real in a way that satisfies Ricœur.[56] Moreover he doubts Freud's apparent rejection of religion, for Ricœur sees religion as reflecting a crucial part of the human mind.

In the final section of *Freud and Philosophy* and in the essay 'A Philosophical Interpretation of Freud' in *The Conflict of Interpretations* we encounter Ricœur's attempt to show that reflective philosophy can function alongside psychoanalysis, to help us see that the symbol is the key to creative human thought; this is the relevance of psychoanalysis to hermeneutics. This process of developing an understanding of the centrality of symbols can only begin once we accept psychoanalysis' main tenet, that 'Consciousness must be lost in order that the subject may be found. The subject is not what we think it is.'[57] Ricœur summarizes his application of the term archaeology to Freud's work, to emphasize the regressive movement of so many of Freud's assertions; the human response to desire, a form of unanswered demand that is regressive, is to retrace one's steps to an early stage in one's life and repeat the episode of the frustration of desire, again and again. This vicious circle shows how we try to console ourselves with repetition: this repetition can sometimes be interrupted, through the talking cure of psychoanalysis, if the analysand becomes able to articulate in words the repressed desire that has become an obsession. Psychoanalysis itself is, in Freud's own terms, 'regressive decomposition'.[58]

Ricœur and Nietzsche

In his early work, *Freedom and Nature,* Ricœur describes Nietzsche and Freud, but not yet Marx (partly perhaps because of his enduring concern, from the 1930s onwards, that communism has become unable to look beyond the oppression of the workers by the bosses).[59] In *Freedom and Nature* he summarizes the ideas that we have needs and we seek pleasure. The desire to be safe and comfortable is what *homo economicus* represents; sensualist and empirical, criticized by Nietzsche as desiring not only conservation of that which makes us feel good, but also expansion and domination. Freud tends to systematize vital energies under the concept of libido – sexual drive and also pleasure seeking in general. Nietzsche proposes the will to power as the dominant organizing mechanism of humans, and subsumes within that idea both the idea of will as realization of deciding, moving, consenting (that Ricœur focuses on in *Freedom and Nature*) and also the passions of the will. Ricœur feels that Nietzsche's analysis is not compatible with the ideas that Ricœur himself was developing at that time, regarding the will and also the needs that organic life has, because Nietzsche does not entertain the ideas of balance and adaptation that are crucial to biologists.

Ricœur sees Nietzsche and Freud as much more closely related to each other's ideas than Marx and Freud, or Marx and Nietzsche. He ascribes to Nietzsche and Freud a new critique of religion, completely different to the British empiricists and the French positivists in their challenges to proofs of God's existence.[60] Nietzsche and Freud write about religion as disguised symptoms of desire and fear, as an illusion that is cultural and can only be tackled with suspicion and critical scrutiny. He describes their hermeneutics as similarly reductive, having been developed by each in parallel to the other, and comprising both a sort of philology (interpreting the 'text' hidden beneath our apparent explanation of ourselves), and a sort of genealogy (tracing our desires back to their source in forces and drives). Ricœur argues that when we locate it, we will find this source to be empty; he interprets Nietzsche's 'will to power' and Freud's 'libido' as both based on an (apparently nihilistic) celebration of life, vitality and strength. Nietzsche's critique of religion leads well into Freud's 'superego', as both are secondary effects of human thought.[61] Freud adds something else, a pathology of duty that results from the masochism of the neurotic being combined with a sociology of culture.

Ricœur uses Nietzsche's thinking to explain the role of the philosopher: as a responsible thinker the philosopher cannot simply be either a reductive iconoclast, or a naïve believer. Ricœur believes we must speak from somewhere and that it is probably impossible to understand another religion. Instead, characteristically oscillating between poles, the philosopher should endeavour to mediate between religion and faith by means of atheist thought, often taking detours a little like Heidegger's *Holzwege* (forest paths – that take us off the beaten track). Thus the only way to think ethically is first to think unethically. Ricœur casts doubt on the Kantian approach to ethics, where obligation (the *a priori* of the will) is opposed to and separated from, desire, which Kant saw as 'pathological' in his pietist, very moralizing vocabulary. Ricœur believes that desire should not be excluded from the sphere of ethics, which is also an Aristotelian position.[62] Kantian formalism is seen by Nietzsche and Freud as a form of rationalization, which threatens to overemphasize the importance of duty at the cost of failing to ask the Spinozist question of just exactly how it is that we endeavour to free ourselves from enslavement to desire in order to feel purposeful. Kant founded ethics upon a rational basis and avoided the difficulties of desire.

In this context the utility of atheism, for Ricœur, is its ability to destroy the patriarchal god figure that demands dependency by both protecting and punishing, and Nietzsche does this particularly effectively, as do Spinoza and Freud. Such atheism *could* then lead us towards a new sort of tragic faith that has to accept, as Nietzsche tells us, that the motivation behind the theodocies is a weak will that seeks to rationalize its weakness.[63] Instead, Ricœur would prefer exposure of false genealogies in order to liberate possibilities of present action. For Ricœur, however, it seems that Nietzsche accuses accusation itself and thus becomes trapped in a circular version of his own argument, resenting those who are resentful.[64] Nietzsche's way out of this is to proclaim the absence of guilt i.e. 'the absence of the ethical character of all being' through the myth of superman/overman and other myths.[65] Ricœur believes this is a misplaced romanticism that he also detects in Freud's argument that Eros will conquer Death. While rejecting this solution, Ricœur nevertheless takes it seriously and asks what sort of faith can be possible after the Freudian and Nietzschean critiques of ethics?

Nietzsche follows Kant and Fichte in pushing the human onto centre stage; the star of life becomes the human will, and the world around becomes passive, full of objects, which the subject must imbue with meaning and value. In this way the meaning of life becomes a human's choice, a narrative at each person's disposal. Ricœur argues that the only way forward, is to try and reduce the gap between subject and object, between the person and the world by rejecting Nietzsche's 'superman' who is both self-empowering but also vengeful in his capacity to punish mediocrity and therefore capable of creating suffering. Language, the word and its symbolic meaning that affects the referent (the real-life phenomenon) will help to provide an alternative solution. Here also, in the 1960s, we see the beginning of his profound interest in language as an ethical phenomenon, the potency of narrative and he urges us towards some sort of reconciliation between individual egotism and the general good of a community, by using the facility of language to help us develop an ethical narrative.

Ricœur and Marx

In the middle of the nineteenth century Marxism became an integral part of the debate in Protestant theological departments as well as secular culture and Marx belongs, for Ricœur, to both Western culture and Western theology. *History and Truth* contains a note and several essays that relate to Marx and Marxism. When we read this material, written in the 1960s for the second edition of *History and Truth*, we see how Ricœur found it necessary, after Budapest in 1956, when Hungary's attempt at autonomy was crushed by overwhelming Russian military force, to reject Marx's belief that political alienation can be resolved. For Ricœur political alienation is with us always, whether we live in a capitalist or a socialist country. For him there were other factors closer to home, such as the resistance of the French communist party to destalinization. The French communist party was the largest outside Russia during Ricœur's young adult life, and he says he suffered from the dominance of communist rhetoric among his academic colleagues. Their hegemony was such that the journal *Esprit*, to which Ricœur was a significant contributor, is defined by Barbara Day, author of *The Velvet Philosophers*, as representing 'the non-Communist Left'.[66] Through academic friendships, however, he was able to support Jan Patočka, the Czech philosopher who Ricœur knew well in Paris between the wars. Patočka was the principal author of Charta 77 and died from injuries both physical and psychological after extensive interrogations at the hands of the Czech police.[67]

In 'The Political Paradox', 1964 (in *History and Truth*), perhaps Ricœur's best-known political essay, he differentiates between Marx and Marxism; Marxism as Ricœur experienced it 'falls back upon fable and moralising criticism' whereas Marx's greatness was that he was not a moralist. He values highly Marx's analysis of 'capital as a structure which is ignorant of itself as a creator of false values' and endorses this 'critique of the great money fetish' as the key to Marx's attack on religion.[68] Secondly he praises Marx, for having defined alienation as 'a retrogression of human nature to the inhuman' on the level of social structures. Yet Ricœur rejects Marxism's reduction of all alienations to economic and social alienation.[69] For Ricœur there are other alienations: personal, narcissistic, spiritual.[70] The invasion of Budapest and the October Revolution in Warsaw shocked him and made him think about absolute emotion and also about relative needs and consideration. Techniques change, human relationships evolve depending upon things, and yet power reveals the same paradox, 'that of a twofold progress in rationality and in possibilities for perversion'.[71]

In 'The Political Paradox' there is an important translator's footnote: *le politique*means polity, *la politique*means politics.[72] Polity is rational and comprises the organization and administration of civil government in a state. Because polity is rational, it can lead to political evil: Aristotle, Rousseau and Hegel aim to make 'man's humanity pass through legality and civil restraint', when in fact man's humanity is aiming towards happiness and will conflict with rational decrees. Such beliefs are in tension with the violence and untruth of power, seen in Plato's critique of the tyrant, Machiavelli's prince and Marx's political alienation. The greatest evil adheres to the greatest rationality and political alienation occurs because polity is relatively autonomous.[73] Similarly untruth can easily slip into polity, which is prone to untruth because 'the political bond has the reality of ideality; this ideality is the equality of each before all others.' The crux of the problem is that State is Will. The State, even if it became identified with legitimacy through law of force would still be the power of the few over the many. Polity is rational organization, whereas politics involves decisions. Politics therefore poses the problem of evil inherent in polity. He endorses Machiavelli's assertion about politics and violence; that all nations, all powers, come into being by limited and calculated use of violence.[74]

Ricœur enjoys Marx's challenge to Hegel's belief that the state represents each person in it, in his critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* (1821). The state is not real, but an unreal world, the power of which lies in law systems that are in contradiction with humans' real relationships to each other. There is a radical contradiction between the universality espoused by the State and the State's actual specific and capricious acting out of their universal laws, and Ricœur is conscious particularly of Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe. Yet, for Ricœur, Marx did not see how absolute, radical and permanent this contradiction is between aspirations and actualities of the State. 'I believe it must be maintained, against Marx and Lenin, that political alienation is not reducible to another, but is constitutive of human existence . . . the political mode of existence entails the breach between the citizen's abstract life and the concrete life of the family and of work.'[75]

For Ricœur this reduction of political alienation to economic alienation is the weak point of Marxist political theory, and has been substituted by another, even worse problem; that of the *withering away* of the State. This is doubly disastrous, first because it imagines an indefinite future, instead of dealing with the power abuses in the present and secondly because it refuses to deal with the injustices of the present and actually endorses them, by justifying terrorism and the dictatorship of the proletariat and thereby forming the essence of totalitarianism. The idea is a rationalization, that the State – being merely an organ of repression – stemming from class antagonisms and the domination of one class, will disappear along with the dominant class when it vanishes.[76] Yet in fact it was possible for Stalin to order killing of peasant farmers in the name of collectivization, because of a denial of the perennial problem of abuses of power by the State, of any type. Moreover Ricœur argues that the State cannot wither away, arguing that when, in our thinking, we reduce the political form of alienation to one explainable by economic factors, we are indirectly responsible for the myth of the withering away of the State.

After this phase in which he works on the three masters of suspicion, he works on Marx and Marxism and gives lectures in Chicago on *Ideology and Utopia*.[77] Given the influence of communist ideas in France, it is easier for him to lecture on this subject in the USA. Here, as Clark points out, he attempts to counter Althusserian interpretation by asking whether it is possible to find a place from which we could debate ideology free from ideological constraints, which he defines as intangible. He points out how difficult it is to avoid the rationalization that obscures reality.[78] He feels that structuralist Marxists theorized Marxism in such a way that it became untenable to consider the horrors of the Soviet gulags. We can see the problem as one of structural insistence upon scientific methods, which we then reject, yet actually continue to use in order to make a break between science and ideology e.g. deciding that society is comprised of two social classes becomes no longer a useful rule, but an obstruction to moving ahead into better understanding of post-Marxist society.

From *Ideology and Utopia*, Clark points to the way in which Ricœur discusses self-realization through individual action yet holds back from insisting upon 'a parallel between labour and the Kantian synthesis of the categories of consciousness'.[79] Ricœur differentiates between Marxism and communism, turning against communism as a result of the 1949 Kravchenko affair, in which Kravchenko was wrongly accused by the Russians of being a CIA spy.[80] His differences of opinion in France with communist groups, which he perceived as dogmatic, made open debate impractical. For Althusser as structuralist, phenomenology seemed naively humanist and overly trusting about the possibility of consciousness. He challenged Ricœur from the 1950s onwards, and his disciples attacked Ricœur in *Les temps Modernes* in 1965.[81] Their differences were never resolved, exaggerating the more phenomenological views of Ricœur against the more systematic theorizing of Althusser.[82]

Ricœur, Apel and Habermas have created a critical hermeneutics that revives the importance of Hegel, Marx and critical theory for establishing a dialectical relationship between science and society, within which both politics and religion, in Marx's view, are contaminants.[83] Ricœur warns us of the increasing formalism of explanatory apparatus, which can violate the density of explanatory framework and lead to false conclusions.[84] We will see how Ricœur deals with this; he develops a bifurcating pathway, one theological, and the other philosophical, an approach recommended by Spinoza – however, Ricœur brings profound ethical issues into *all* his writings and sees one of our greatest challenges as the one posed by secularism to religion. Dosse believes him vindicated when, by 1973, European economies suffer a slowdown and Althusserian ideas about reproduction and a strong economy seem to lose their justification.[85]

Conclusions

Freud gave us a critique of culture focused on sex, Marx on money and Nietzsche on power: their impact on our culture is irreversible and only makes sense for Ricœur 'if we take them together'. Otherwise each of their interpretations seems narrow; Freud with his cultural taboos that constrain human desire, Marx with the class struggle as the key to delusion and Nietzsche with false consciousness as resentment of the weak towards the strong.[86] Yet Freud clearly is the dominant of the three for Ricœur in his writings. In 1950 in *Freedom and Nature* Ricœur writes about Freud as a complex figure whose problematization of the conscious mind was fascinating and valuable, yet worryingly deterministic. In his 1960 talk on Freud, 'Consciousness and the Unconscious', Ricœur states that 'Consciousness is not a given but a task' and by that time is becoming more interested in using language analysis in combinations of ethical and epistemological interpretation. Five years later, in *Freud and Philosophy* he presents a detailed and immensely respectful analysis, from which he concludes that psychoanalysis is just as powerful as phenomenology in 'contesting the illusion of immediate self-knowledge'.[87] However, the determinism of Freudian psychoanalysis is to be avoided. 'It would deny us any sort of freewill.' Thus Ricœur welcomes the hermeneutics of suspicion that Freud developed in order to create an understanding of the unconscious mind, while rejecting the worldview that emerged from Freud.

Ricœur comments that Freud brought his ideas to non-analysts and made the revealing of human secrets into a significant cultural event. We see this mechanism popularized by, for example, Andy Warhol in his short films that suggest to us that we may be witnessing sexual gratification, through our own narcissistic voyeuristic gaze.[88] Freud and others (including Marx and Nietzsche) made demystification into a global phenomenon. The intentionality of the unconscious mind has to be concealed from the ego most of the time, because the desires of the unconscious mind need to be censored, for social and cultural reasons. Intentionality is the theme of phenomenology as a study of perception, yet phenomenology does not penetrate the unconscious mind to which Freud drew our attention, so Ricœur concludes that he, as a philosopher, must develop thinking that is more hermeneutical (verbalizing) than eidetic (visualizing, perceptual). Eidetic images will always be present as well, as we see from his metaphors.

The mechanics of the psychoanalyst's toolbox are balanced by the apparently down to earth yet self-deluding realism of the instincts, characterized as they are by 'the invincibly narcissistic libido' in its single-minded pursuit of the object of desire, which itself is another desire.[89] Kant preceded Marx, Nietzsche and Freud in showing us that illusion is a necessity of which we need to be aware: Freud's unmasking of the metaphysical object is a necessary yet not sufficient condition for working life out to some level of satisfaction. Freud is good at unmasking concealed truths; now we need to complete the act of interpretation with a discovery of new possibilities.[90] Not only does Freud make us sceptical of our ability to rise out of our interest in our faeces, our sexual obsessions and our desire to kill our father and sleep with our mother but Freud also shows us how counterproductive yet prevalent our tendency is to repeat these and other desires. By recommending caution about Freud's examples, yet endorsing the mechanism of repetition Ricœur handles the issue of repetition with caution, as it too frequently takes a negative turn. Ricœur is also more interested in certain examples that he wishes to develop; he cites the way Freud emphasizes parricide, yet does not emphasize the benefits that parricide brings of uniting brothers, thereby avoiding fratricide and reducing the likelihood of subsequent parricides.[91]

At the end of *Freud and Philosophy* Ricœur concludes that there is another fundamental weakness in Freud's vision: the poorly sketched religious ideas where the paternal, religious figure is dominant and has only a vague relationship with religious themes that in themselves represent naïve religion. Ricœur chooses to see religion as more sophisticated, and as an integral part of culture. It is culture and not primeval instincts that cause the symbolic relations to be formed within language; we must explore these symbolic relations because they can help us to interpret the meaning of our lives. He gives us an example of how to overcome what he considers to be Freud's blinkered approach to faith; the challenge is to reopen the path between guilt and consolation – a path that Freud sees as vitally important, yet assumes to be blocked.

Ricœur draws on his work in *The Symbolism of Evil* to provide two alternatives to Freud's prototype of guilt, the Oedipus myth. For Ricœur, guilt has to cross two thresholds: the fear of being unjust (and he sees this as being worse than a Freudian fear of being castrated) and the fear of doing wrong (even good people may sin). In Chapter 8 we will consider briefly some of his work on justice, which Dauenhauer has explored in depth. Symbolic thought develops from our attempts to codify bad or servile will, and can facilitate our attempts to be suspicious of guilt, which too easily develops the 'false prestige' of culpability as described in *Fallible Man* and then *The Symbolism of Evil*. Ricœur shows us that we have the potential to do wrong, and that this may amount to evil, and he comments thirty years after first developing the masters of suspicion that suspicion can be well used to analyse self-deception about being innocent or even about being guilty.[92] We describe and ratify definitions of evil through symbolism, myth, parable etc., and rigidify our thought processes by recourse to these phenomena instead of to the referent, the real thing in front of us. Freudian frameworks can replace outmoded ways of thinking, but may become as rigid in their own way. By returning to this work by a long detour through Freud, he concludes that he must go beyond Freud and immerse himself in language in order to try to understand how humans think, and how they can think more clearly. He concludes that Marx, Nietzsche and Freud can help with diagnosis but cannot help with cure. If not understood properly they offer what Cavell describes as a key characteristic of scepticism, its power to stop us thinking with the false protection of 'the stake in scepticism, its presentation of the collapse of a "best case" of knowledge'.[93]

Chapter 4

On the use and abuse of the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion'

The phrase 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is often used in philosophy, theology and literature, yet frequently misunderstood: it is usually mistakenly attributed to Ricœur's book on Freud and seen as almost synonymous with the phrase 'masters of suspicion'. Why did Ricœur use and then abandon this term 'hermeneutics of suspicion'? From La Rochefoucauld, Montaigne and then Kant, through Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Marx and Freud, then to Foucault there is an identifiable continuity. This chapter proposes to elucidate the meaning of the term within Ricœur's work, with his use of figures such as Mannheim. The phrase is seldom contextualized as part of the significant debate about meaning that Ricœur conducted. Cavell's analysis of scepticism resembles the extreme negative manifestation of Ricœur's 'suspicion' as a narcissistic 'denial of existence shared with others' under a claim to certainty, for which I provide illustrative evidence from the British media coverage of 'Islamic culture'.[1]

Clark (1990) and Thiselton (1991) are unusual in discussing the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' in depth. There is frequent failure in attribution and we find inaccurate use of it as an iconic term. Even more striking is the failure to connect the phrase convincingly with Ricœur's work beyond his analysis of the masters of suspicion (Leiter).[2] Is any of this misattribution important? This will be considered in the context of the hermeneutics of suspicion as limit situation or as a condition of possibility. I will argue that we are in debt to Marx, Freud and Nietzsche because they created the conditions for the hermeneutics of suspicion to develop. However they did not show the development and maintenance of dialectical asymmetry that Ricœur wants us all to cultivate, a condition of possibility.

This is a Kantian project: Ricœur discusses his main beliefs about Kant's philosophy in the essay 'Freedom in the Light of Hope', in *The Conflict of Interpretations*.[3] Kant's will is a limit idea that attempts to unify our potential to be free within the constraints of nature, yet Ricœur hopes that the involuntary and the voluntary can be compatible. Religious faith can, perhaps, liberate the limited will in its love of Christ. In the second half of the essay he describes how Kant sowed the seeds for the hermeneutics of suspicion in three significant ways: first in terms of doubt about the self, secondly with doubts about the limits of reason and thirdly with doubts about institutional religion.[4]

Marx, Nietzsche and Freud gave us three significant phenomena of which the first provided reasons to be suspicious of ourselves and of others. Secondly they (especially Freud) gave us a methodology for unmasking the deceit that makes us suspicious about the reasons we and other people give for our actions, and thirdly they each expounded a profound suspicion about organized religion. They told us more than we knew before about ourselves, and possibly more than we wanted to know. Ricœur dubs them the masters of suspicion, as discussed in Chapter 3, and incorporates into his thinking about them his already existing interest in moving away from phenomenology (which can only help him to decipher symbols within a naïve hermeneutics) towards a hermeneutics that offers a linguistic turn. Rather than the attentive listening and looking that characterizes the phenomenological technique, he moves away from 'letting the meaning come out, towards taking it [meaning] back to its causes and functions'. He is however still driven by the key question of phenomenology: what is consciousness? Husserl's reduction of meaning *to* consciousness was then displaced by Freud's even more radical reduction *of* consciousness. As Ricœur explains to Reagan he found Freud helpful when attempting to look at symbolic thought as if it were all in the imagination and realized that there are non-textual events that could not be deciphered like symbols.[5]

Hermeneutics and Freud

For Ricœur, psychoanalysis is a type of hermeneutics. Derrida, for his part, believed that hermeneutics was a method of totalization, a way in which philosophy believed that it could gather up all meaning captured in writing, in a Hegelian manner.[6] Foucault sought to move beyond the tradition of hermeneutics by 'claiming that there is no "deep reality" at work'.[7] For Ricœur, Freud's work made it possible to use hermeneutics to think the impossible i.e. that we are not in control of what we think, nor by implication, are we in control of what we do and cannot respect the belief granted us by a hermeneutics of faith.[8] He believes the same to be true of Marx and Nietzsche, although he uses Marx less and less. As early as the 1929–1930 Dalbiez lectures, Ricœur learns about Freud. In the 1950s he is incorporating Freud's work in his university teaching and ends his writing life in 2005 still using Freud in his thought and writing (*Memory, History, Forgetting* and *The Course of Recognition*). He discusses Marx, Nietzsche and Freud in 1960 in his paper at Bonneval, 'Consciousness and the Unconscious', and 1963, in his excellent paper for the *International Notebooks of Symbolism*.[9] During the 1960s he keeps the triumvirate together, insisting that it is the confluence of the three that shows us definitively that 'illusion is a cultural structure, a dimension of our social discourse.'[10] The three are still together in the essays that comprise *The Conflict of Interpretations*, written between 1960 and 1969, and joined by Hegel, who is offset against Freud and Kant among others.

These essays are significant for exploration of many issues that will stay with Ricœur until the end of his writing, and that prefigure some of the tussles and problems of his later work: suspicion and recovery, psychoanalysis and the Cartesian cogito, phenomenology and hermeneutics, structuralism and linguistics, and religion and faith. Ritivoi believes that *The Conflict of Interpretations* 'revolves around the central theme of *suspicion* as a premise of the interpretive endeavour' – the word suspicion does not appear in the index of *The Conflict of Interpretations*, either under 'hermeneutics', or in its own right, yet he uses it and it is present as an indispensable player in the conflict of interpretations.[11] Hegel becomes as dominant in these essays as the masters of suspicion themselves, if not more. Marx is less emphasized although he has a major presence in Ricœur's American *oeuvre*, a decade later in his 1975 lectures, published as the essays *Ideology and Utopia* (1986).[12] The masters of suspicion – and Hegel – have a potent effect on the way we think and they also raise the expectations that we have of hermeneutics. Such suspicion insists on doubting cultural surface features; 'Not to share the illusion of an epoch is to look behind or, as the Germans say, *hinterfragen*, to question behind.' (This is also called 'back questioning', Husserl's *Rückfrage*.)[13]

By 1982, in an interview with Charles Reagan, Ricœur is calling hermeneutics 'a kind of learned word for the task of interpretation', and outlining three characteristics of hermeneutics that include the interpretation of action, as analysed in the essay 'The Model of the Text'.[14] He describes negative features of hermeneutics as stemming from 'a kind of mourning of the immediate' because, by self-consciously interpreting meaning we show that we mistrust the possibility of recovering any sort of intuitive spontaneity. If we accept that our thoughts are often hidden, then immediate responses and interpretations are suspect, and we have to reject Platonist and Cartesian ideas that 'we could be without distance to ourselves'. Such a state of mind is what Husserl strove to reject, in its daily sense, and replace with a pure form of immediacy. Neither is possible. Secondly, more positively, hermeneutics helps us to understand ourselves through signs and symbols, which mediate our identity through cultural systems. Thirdly, hermeneutics attempts to help us obtain access to the ontological significance of these sign systems, if ontology involves the values that will relieve our phenomenological distress, as it does for Ricœur.

Phenomenological distress

In 1969 in *The Conflict of Interpretations* Ricœur calls the self-doubt of not knowing what or how I think, phenomenological distress.[15] Back in 1950, in *Freedom and Nature*, Ricœur begins this process by analysing Freud as the thinker who challenged Descartes, and this view of Freud becomes even more pronounced in *Freud and Philosophy*. Lacan 'co-opts' Descartes to his version of Freudianism, as Simms tells us.[16] Ricœur, as so often, does his balancing act; he balances Freud's interpretation against that of Descartes. According to Freud the cogito is not what it believes itself to be: the consciousness that believes itself to be generous and in control, bestowing meaning and becoming the recipient and guardian of values, begins to doubt its integrity – both literally and morally.[17] Marx, Freud and Nietzsche developed a methodology for investigating the limits of reason that, for Ricœur, hinged on finding a resolution to the phenomenological distress, as he called the state of mind identified by the masters of suspicion.[18] Marx, Freud and Nietzsche issued a challenge that triggers phenomenological distress: the protagonists of suspicion create suspicion about consciousness's claim to original self-knowledge. This is a shock for a philosopher, who has to make two confessions; "I cannot understand the unconscious from what I know about consciousness or even preconsciousness" and "I no longer even understand what consciousness is". Can I use suspicion to rethink and reground the conscious mind so that it and the unconscious can be each other's other?

The hermeneutics of suspicion

Let us sample some of the significant voices on this topic: Anderson turns the term against Ricœur the Kantian, applying a hermeneutics of suspicion to show that he fails to address radical feminist challenges to God the Father as hegemonic patriarch.[19] This is indeed a major lack, as it is in Kant. Ritivoi believes that Ricœur is best known for creating a 'hermeneutics of suspicion', proposing distanciation as a way of attempting to see a text dispassionately, and Ricœur did this with Kant, Husserl, Freud and others. Yet much of the work of reading the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' has been done by others, not by Ricœur.[20] There is a genealogy created by writers about the source of this phrase. They refer to the section covering pages 32–6 in *Freud and Philosophy* called *Interpretation as exercise of suspicion*, but the phrase 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is not there.[21] (We will see later how important the overlooked term 'exercise of suspicion' can be.)

Kearney and Rainwater give the consensus view.[22] Indeed Ricœur himself looks back in the mid-1990s to comment; 'I saw Freud take his place within an easily identifiable tradition, that of a hermeneutics of suspicion continuing the line of Feuerbach, Marx and Nietzsche.'[23] He then discards the term and refers back to it, when asked, on rare occasions in the 1980s and 1990s as a term he previously used and one linked inextricably with the use of suspicion in the way we discuss it here.[24] Ricœur makes reference to the connection between hermeneutics and suspicion in *The Conflict of Interpretations*; 'Nietzsche was the first to make a connection between suspicion and interpretation.'[25] Being conscious of oneself must become knowledge of the self, knowledge that is 'indirect, mediate and suspicious knowledge of the self'. Such suspicious knowledge must 'lose itself in order to find itself'.

Where is the term?

Don Ihde's 1971 book, *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur,* has a preface by Ricœur that contains Ricœur's own first clear and published analysis of the term 'the hermeneutics of suspicion' and he discusses this phenomenon as inextricably involved with the recovery of meaning.[26] Ricœur indicates his interest in hermeneutics, casting his net of language wider than symbol (as in *The Symbolism of Evil* and *Freud and Philosophy*). He describes a conflict at the start of modern hermeneutics comprising a battle between 'the hermeneutics of suspicion of the Freudian type and the restoration of symbols'.[27] Of the three masters of suspicion, Ricœur only mentions Freud in this Preface. Yet it is here, in 1971, in tribute to Ihde's work on Ricœur, that he signals his linguistic turn, and also reminds us of how strongly Kantian his work remains.

When Ihde writes the introduction to the English language publication of Ricœur's essays in *The Conflict of Interpretations,* he uses the term hermeneutics of suspicion to refer to Freud and Hegel, to 'the hidden depth meaning of a text which the hermeneutics of suspicion allows to emerge' and to the dialectical opposition between the hermeneutics of suspicion and phenomenology.[28] This is several years after Ricœur first uses the term, and he is about to abandon it. Ihde also discusses the opposition that he sees in Ricœur between the hermeneutics of suspicion, and the hermeneutics of belief, with the former chastising the latter. He makes an indirect connection between the hermeneutics of suspicion and the difficulties that modern people have with faith. Ihde sees the way in which Ricœur's work on suspicion increased his emphasis on the 'other'.[29] Both Freud and Hegel facilitate, even encourage an attack on *immediate* subjectivity, especially the Cartesian sort that believes I know myself, but they do it in opposite directions. Dispossession of immediacy is the key in both, and they make explicit the layers of significance beneath the surface of the person's life.

Ihde describes how Freud develops a detour backwards, an archaeological dig into the unconscious mind of the child inside the adult. Hegel on the contrary, moves forward into the future, creating a teleology of the thinking subject. This is a progressive interpretation in which current thoughts are revealed to hold within them the new ideas for the future. Ricœur uses these backward and forward movements, and demythologizes Freud and Hegel in the process. He rejects Freud's realism and Hegel's idealism, yet accepts the utility of this backward and forward movement. We have to doubt ourselves in terms of our repressed past and our spiritual future and this enables us to develop the hermeneutics of suspicion that leads us to self-doubt. Ricœur uses a blend of phenomenological and hermeneutic method to develop this challenge to the self to see itself as text, and the hermeneutics of suspicion, as Ihde calls it, a particularly astringent form of hermeneutics, will be harsh on phenomenology; Husserl's self does not really know itself and thus will be set aside, but in the process should come to some better self-understanding. Thus direct, naïve self-knowledge will be challenged by the hermeneutics of suspicion. In turn, phenomenology comes to seem like some sort of system of belief in the self (albeit evanescent) in contrast with this bruising, doubting hermeneutic of suspicion.

Ihde notes that the Hegelian stitch is the herringbone one of moving forward by using a dialectical tension between opposing forces. The Kantian backstitch communicates the aspect of hope despite the limitations of going backwards – Kant has always been a limiting figure for Ricœur, yet in *The Conflict of Interpretations* we see the Kant of 'What can I hope for?' and also the Kant who indicates that faith has been diminished by reason and needs hope to keep it going. Ricœur partially follows Hegel with this, in the idea that history will fulfil itself with superabundance and things can get better. Faith may have been displaced from centre stage by hope, but faith remains, hidden within hope. In this way Ricœur stands against Sartrean existential thinking with its disbelief in any point for doing anything, but how can he resist being too Hegelian, too overbearingly optimistic, in the end?

This introduction by Ihde to *The Conflict of Interpretations* is also reprinted at the back of Ihde's 1971 essays, *Hermeneutic Phenomenology* (with one side of text missing), with Ricœur's preface at the front.[30] It seems to me as if Ihde wrote more about the hermeneutics of suspicion than Ricœur, whose own perception of the relationship between hermeneutics and suspicion seems increasingly to be oblique;

> Hermeneutics seems to me to be animated by this double motivation: willingness to suspect, willingness to listen; vow of rigour, vow of obedience. . . . It may be that extreme iconoclasm belongs to the restoration of meaning.[31]

In his long essay on 'Biblical Hermeneutics' (1975) Ricœur provides a rare contextualized reference to the hermeneutics of suspicion within his social and religious concerns:

> To-day, at the time of the hermeneutics of suspicion, the tension is not only between two sources, but *within* the self-understanding of Christian experience and discourse in face of the radical contestation which a significant part of 'modern' culture addresses to any religious interpretation of human experience. The 'conflict of interpretations' seems to be the unavoidable existential trait, which a 'method of correlation' assumes to-day. The first 'naïveté' is lost and the second 'naïveté' – if it is available – necessarily bears the stigmata of the post-critical age.[32]

Biblical Hermeneutics is a crucial text: it makes connections between secular and religious writings and shows the development of metaphor at the narrative level of parable. We will return to first and second naivety in Chapters 6 to 10. Here it is important to note Ricœur's concerns in the context of a hermeneutics of suspicion, about the tension between modern, even postmodern culture and Christianity – there are interesting resonances of this in his 1967 essay 'Urbanisation and Secularisation'.[33] At around the same time, Ricœur uses the phrase the hermeneutics of suspicion in a different context, that of linguistic analysis and the potency of metaphor for following the long detour to self-understanding through language that he believes Heidegger eschewed:[34]

> A simple inspection of discourse in its explicit intention, a simple interpretation through the game of question and answer, is no longer sufficient. Heideggerian deconstruction must now take on Nietzschean genealogy, Freudian psychoanalysis, the Marxist critique of ideology, that is, the weapons of the hermeneutics of suspicion. Armed in this way, the critique is capable of unmasking the *unthought* conjunction of hidden metaphysics and *worn-out* metaphor.[35]

In 1975, in a tape-recorded debate in the Centre for Hermeneutical Studies at Berkeley, California (subsequently transcribed) Ricœur states that 'a "hermeneutics of suspicion" is an integral part of all appropriation of meaning. And with it follows the "de-construction" of prejudgements which "impede our letting the world of the text be."' He cites the post-Marxist debate about ideology and utopia as an example of 'such a hermeneutics of suspicion incorporated in self-understanding', arguing that Christianity contains elements of both ideology and utopia, and that these elements in turn must be seen as both negative and positive, but that these polarities can only be kept together with the use of faith.[36] However, he also sees that 'hermeneutics ultimately claims to set itself up as a critique of critique, or meta-critique.'[37] Thus a hermeneutics *with suspicion* added in would be a three-wave attack, and could cause either cynicism or distress, or simply *stuckness* (remember Kant... 'ran his ship ashore, for safety's sake, landing on skepticism, there to let it lie and rot'?). I believe he abandons the term because it inhibits faith, belief in anything. In 1982, in the first of four interviews, Ricœur comments that he no longer uses the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion';

> Maybe the conflict of interpretations implies, also includes, what we mean by criteria and what is at stake with the concept of criteria. For example, if we consider the tradition of suspicion – what I called in the past 'the hermeneutics of suspicion' – this is precisely what is at stake. If you take Nietzsche, Freud and maybe also Marx – in spite of the fact that Marx finally belongs more to the tradition of rationalism than Freud and Nietzsche – they put in

> question the very idea of criteria, that is, of solving the problem by a good criteriology. That is why the conflict they initiate is so embarrassing, so puzzling, because it includes the rules of the game that do not belong to the conflict itself. This is why we cannot escape the seriousness of conflicts of interpretation, but also why we must try to find a way out through a strategy that keeps together the two poles.[38]

Here, as in other brief references to the hermeneutics of suspicion, Ricœur links this cultural phenomenon closely with suspicion and with the conflict of interpretations.[39] In Valdes (1991), in a discussion with Gadamer, Ricœur cites the need to bridge 'a hermeneutic of suspicion and a hermeneutic of re-enactment'.[40] Keeping together the two poles (of suspicion and recovery) is *not* what the masters of suspicion do; we have seen how Ricœur felt the need to balance Freud with Hegel, deconstructing each to show us the deterministic looking backwards by Freud to our more instinctual compulsions, and Hegel's hubristic looking forward to constantly improving destinies for the human race. Their legacy rests in the process they set in motion. Their methodology is based on the capacity to challenge the very idea of criteria, as Ricœur comments above and, in contrasting this process with sobriety, to 'use the most 'nihilistic', destructive, iconoclastic movement so as to *let speak* what once, what each time, was *said*, when meaning appeared anew, when meaning was at its fullest'.[41] Thiselton shows us how Ricœur rejects Freud's worldview as one based on symbols that can lead to idols and emphasizes Ricœur's desire to balance the hermeneutics of suspicion with the hermeneutics of recovery.[42] I argue that Ricœur rejected Freud's hermeneutics of suspicion more than Thiselton sees to be the case.[43]

There is in fact more activity outside Ricœur's texts on the use of this term, than within his texts and there is a lack of evidence of close reading that can contextualize the hermeneutics of suspicion within Ricœur's work: Leiter, for example, describes Ricœur as opposing the hermeneutic of suspicion to a 'fairly crude philosophy of science'.[44] Leiter believes that the masters of suspicion propose 'a naturalistic explanation of the world, i.e. an explanation that is continuous with both the results and the methods of the sciences' yet Clark reminds us, citing Saussure as another such master, that a characteristic for Ricœur of these masters of suspicion is their *assault* on the 'natural' position, an assault which Ricœur applauds.[45] Even Clark's use of Saussure may not fit this, however, as Ricœur argues that it was the way structuralism evolved *after* Saussure that was problematic; 'it was not as a hermeneutics of suspicion that structuralism appeared to me to question the notion of the subject, but as an objectifying abstraction, through which language was reduced to the functioning of a system of sign without any anchor in the subject.'[46]

O'Connell describes how Foucault fits, broadly speaking, into Ricœur's hermeneutics of suspicion, a hermeneutics that 'seeks to discover a hidden reality operative under appearances' yet Foucault 'aspires to move beyond that tradition by claiming that there is no "deep reality at work"'. Assertions like this, which are not uncommon, could well also have contributed to Ricœur's abandonment of the use of the term: he was interested in the later work of Foucault but he disagreed with Foucault's deconstructive Nietzschean approach, and would not have seen Foucault as a protagonist of the hermeneutics of suspicion in the oscillating, tentative way that Ricœur envisaged.[47]

Suspicion as hubris

In addition to the sparse work by Ricœur on the hermeneutics of suspicion, there is another related yet distinct thread throughout Ricœur's work, a thread that develops a narrative about suspicion and trust, disbelief and belief, conviction and doubt. I believe it is worth drawing attention to his use of this word 'suspicion', which occurs in Ricœur's work before *Freud and Philosophy* and will stay there until *Memory, History, Forgetting* and the penultimate page of *The Course of Recognition*, the last work published in his lifetime. His use of the word 'suspicion' always comes as a surprise, seeming to be out of character with a measured, controlled style; its intrusion is both insistent and consistent and we will find this to the very end, in his last books, as in his early texts:

> Man asks himself: since I experience this failure, this sickness, this evil, what sin have I committed? Suspicion is born; the appearance of acts is called in question; a trial of veracity is begun; the project of a total confession, totally revealing the hidden meaning of one's acts, if not yet of one's intentions, appears at the heart of the humblest 'confession of sins.'[48]

Here suspicion shows reflective self-doubt, weighed down by what it knows. A paradox becomes clear: where we often see suspicion as an instrument of doubt, Ricœur also draws our attention to the possibility that suspicion can be a manifestation of supreme confidence in what Derrida calls the 'onto theological tradition'. This is a confidence in one singular viewpoint of superiority that denies other possibilities, one that can create a false sense of omnipotence, and I will draw a connection later between this and Cavell's use of scepticism:

> The one who is all seeing and suspicious, may wish to take action on what he knows about, and this can create the dualism of the moral agent, who also carries out moral evil.[49]

This is suspicion with the potential for feelings of superiority. How can we exemplify this in our daily lives? Here is a sample of suspicion that we see currently promulgated in the British media: The Greater London Authority commissioned Insted's (2007) survey of treatment of Muslims in the media: the team of Insted researchers who analysed English newspapers in a typical week, 8–14 May 2006, found 97 per cent of tabloid coverage and 89 per cent of broadsheet coverage to be negative towards Islam.[50] It would also be untenable, given the weight of evidence, to be suspicious about the fact that the Holocaust happened, although we should be suspicious about the use of the Holocaust memories to justify modern-day atrocities. Ricœur recognizes that suspicion can function to endorse our beliefs, and we become unquestioningly suspicious and unwilling to learn by avoiding conversations with 'the Other'. This can happen when two polarities are postulated such as faith versus secularism or Islam versus the West. Ricœur encourages a hermeneutics of suspicion, which is "an integral part of an appropriation of meaning", the "'deconstruction' of prejudices, which prevent the world of the text from being allowed to be."[51] Here we see the phenomenon analysed in its destructive form, such as the media may adopt:

> Absolute seeing is pitiless, merciless, all seeing. If we are suspicious we doubt all and we see through everything and everybody. This is a curse. Job hated 'absolute seeing' and believed that it drove him to his death. This form of omniscient seeing can become punitive, no longer giving rise to self-awareness, but to the Hunter who lets fly the arrow.[52]

How can we establish a balance between creative and destructive suspicion? Well, it must be a fluctuating, active oscillation, never a steady equilibrium. The exercise of suspicion, as he calls it in his 1961 paper 'The Conflict of Hermeneutics: Epistemology of Interpretations', is part of a hermeneutics that is of necessity destructive, 'like a sort of Puritanism of the symbol'.[53] He uses active verbs and indeed the active 'exercise of suspicion' is an integral part of *Freud and Philosophy*. The reality principle is 'desire demystified; the giving up of archaic objects is now expressed in the exercise of suspicion, in the movement of disillusion, in the death of idols'.[54] This desire to move on, to be active in using verbs that critique the past and describe possibilities for action, is balanced by the hermeneutic of recollection, of reconstruction, the desire to rebuild. Ricœur will develop this idea of recollection in great detail in *Memory, History, Forgetting* and *The Course of Recognition*, his last two major books.

Gadamer, in his essay by the title: 'The hermeneutics of suspicion' (1984), ascribes the term and its meaning to Ricœur and suggests that every form of hermeneutics is a form of overcoming an awareness of suspicion, a suspicion that our initial, pre-scientific methods are impressionistic and that we therefore need scientific methods to help us.[55] Gadamer refers us back to Schleiermacher and Dilthey, asserting that the hermeneutics of suspicion creates a dichotomy between a text as it is presented and the possible deeper meanings of that text that go beyond what the author intended. For Gadamer this dichotomy is too troublesome to allow Ricœur or us to solve it. He summarizes the tension between Husserl's attempt to experience the world without interpretation, and Heidegger's assertion that we interpret everything, and experience nothing as essence. Gadamer does not accept what he sees as the bipolar view of Ricœur, with a hermeneutics of respect and a hermeneutics of suspicion, because he sees this dichotomy as too divisive. He may be right.

Suspicion as negative/positive poles

In his seminal paper 'Consciousness and the Unconscious', given in 1960 at the Bonneval conference (see Chapter 3), Ricœur tells us about the two types of hermeneutic, the negative and then the positive; 'One is oriented toward the resurgence of archaic symbols and the other toward the emergence of new symbols and ascending figures.'[56] He insists that they are clearly different and also part of the same phenomenon; for him, separating them would be like giving Freud and Hegel half a personality each. They are very different yet Ricœur shows they must attempt to become complementary: this is not, however, a melding, but an insistence upon the creation and maintenance of 'the most complete opposition between consciousness as history and the unconscious as fate'.[57] 'Where the "Id" was, the "I" must come to be.' These great masters of suspicion, with Marx to a lesser extent, follow a tradition from Montaigne (and Pascal in some ways) and La Rochefoucauld to develop 'the great art of suspicion'. On one side of the struggle there is the will to power, and the libido, and on the other there is the 'ruse' of deciphering enigmas and the great art of suspicion. '"Consciousness" of the self must become "knowledge" of the self i.e. indirect, mediate, and suspicious knowledge of the self.'[58]

Ricœur takes for granted the cultural illusions that are an integral part of our social institutions, summed up for him by the idea most commonly associated with Marx of 'false consciousness' and leading to state-managed ideology; he cites the dishonest responses by France to its critics when Algeria was lost.[59] For Ricœur the meaning of such a response can only be identified by the 'exercise of suspicion':[60]

> I call suspicion the act of dispute exactly proportional to the expressions of false consciousness. The problem of false consciousness is the object, the correlative of the act of suspicion. Out of it is born the quality of doubt, a type of doubt which is totally new and different from Cartesian doubt.[61]

Whereas for Descartes consciousness is what it is, it is what it says, it says what it is, after Marx, Freud and Nietzsche we are faced with the doubt caused by false consciousness and this necessitates a hermeneutics for uncovering what was covered and removing the mask, in an almost Nietzschean destruction of

Western ideologies.[62] Reagan discusses this briefly and Thiselton ascribes to the hermeneutics of suspicion the success in managing 'false consciousness' in Freudian theory, yet Ricœur himself ascribes such success to others.[63] For Ricœur the idea of false consciousness has a long and reputable pedigree. In *Ideology and Utopia*, he discusses Mannheim's 'history of the suspicion of false consciousness', citing Mannheim's example of the false prophet of the Old Testament as the origin of suspicion. Mannheim attributes to Marx the discovery that an ideology is not merely distortion at an epistemological, i.e. knowledge-based level, but becomes a 'total structure of the mind characteristic of a concrete historical formation, including a class'. Unfortunately this concept has escaped the confines of Marxist theory and rampages freely and destructively; 'suspicion is now applied not to one specific group or class but to the entire theoretical frame of reference in a chain reaction that cannot be stopped.'[64]

Exactly proportional

Ricœur's phrase 'exactly proportional' provides the cautionary note for much of this discussion; he explains the dangers both of an excess of suspicion and a dearth of suspicion to challenge our cultural lives. Suspicion is necessary in psychoanalysis to challenge the illusions of consciousness and thus psychoanalysis is a 'modification of the Spinozist critique of free will'; 'whereby the subject is made a slave equal to his true bondage'.[65] For Rorty, the 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is an extreme state of suspicion, summed up by the approach of Horkheimer and Adorno with their 'constant awareness that any new theoretical proposal was likely to be one more excuse for maintaining the status quo'.[66] Use of 'hermeneutics of suspicion' in this way suggests why Ricœur abandons it – he has no desire to be so negative and pessimistic – and yet he continues to use the term 'suspicion'. More accurate perhaps for Ricœur is his discussion of accusation as counterproductive. Freud shows us how we can expose accusation and show it how 'the cruelty of superego would yield to the severity of love'.[67]

Suspicion must not rampage in accusatory fashion through every proof I give regardless of its acceptability; it must be discerning, for, as we saw above, 'I call suspicion the act of dispute exactly proportional to the expressions of false consciousness'.[68] Yet what happens when 'In a situation of intellectual collapse, we are caught in a reciprocal process of suspicion' as Mannheim believed to be the case? This resembles Ricœur's analysis of the masters of suspicion whereby 'Guile will be met by double guile . . . the man of suspicion carries out in reverse the work of falsification of the man of guile.'[69] Something else has to enter this sort of balance, new factors. Ricœur attempts to provide a potentially restorative alternative to suspicion;

> In conversation we have an interpretive attitude. If we speak of ideology in negative terms as distortion, then we use the tool or weapon of suspicion.

> If, however, we want to recognize a group's values on the basis of its self-understanding of these values, then we must welcome these values in a positive way, and this is to converse.[70]

This second phenomenon, then, may sound relativistic yet Ricœur hoped to develop it to facilitate a pluralistic approach. This is no longer the ideology of distortion, nor the ideology of legitimation, but the method of integration or identity, of which Ricœur writes more in *The Just* (1995).

Thiselton's essay 'The Hermeneutics of Suspicion and Retrieval', in his book *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (1992), addresses Ricœur's ideas in some detail, comparing and contrasting his ideas about suspicion and hermeneutics not only with Husserl, Gadamer and Heidegger, but also with Wittgenstein, Searle, Austin and other ordinary language philosophers and speech act theorists, and Soskice and Vanhoozer on metaphor. In his analysis Kaplan shows a to-ing and fro-ing, in proposing that hermeneutics involve both belief and suspicion.[71] I think we can go even further and postulate that suspicion itself contains two parts – it contains a negative moment of subjective doubt that is necessary to destroy idols, and it also contains an egocentricity that can take us into such a suspicious state of mind that we destroy ourselves, as Mannheim argued. Dauenhauer identifies this in Ricœur's work: 'Not only are perception, knowledge and action in dialectical interplay with each other, there is also a dialectic within each of them.'[72] I apply this to suspicion also, which is often thought of as a purely negative force, but not by Ricœur.

The hermeneutics of suspicion as a limit idea

Ricœur interprets Kant's *Paralogisms of Pure Reason* as a series of assertions that Reason limits the possibility of extending our knowledge and understanding to anything unreal and noumenal, and yet precisely this restriction – our awareness of being restricted – means that we can try to think about ideas beyond this restriction, which we would not be able to do if we were not aware of being held back.

Kantian dialectic denies the possibility of any clarity about personal existence and knowledge of the historical person, insisting that the person is only manifest as an end in itself, never as a means to an end.[73] In this there are limit ideas that stop us from doing what we want to do. In the context of Marx, Freud and Nietzsche suspicion is presented to us by Ricœur as integral to hermeneutics, and even before that as a tool for demystification. Looking back to *The Symbolism of Evil*, we are told that symbols themselves *cannot* be fully understood, as they are opaque and ambivalent. Yet this, which is the best we can hope for, is not as bad as it seems; we may attain a second naivety. The second naivety therefore would be a second Copernican revolution, whereby we set aside apparently overwhelming evidence (such as the rising and the setting of the sun) in order to explore alternative hypotheses, as Copernicus did.[74] Thus the symbol gives rise to thought, and this thought must guide us in seeing that the symbols of guilt belong to us: they are more than part of our being in the world. They open fields of experience; this is where hermeneutics and phenomenology come together. This is the beginning of the hermeneutics of suspicion, the demystification of the primeval myths and the semantics of desire explored by Ricœur in *Freud and Philosophy*. As we have seen, it started back in 1950 with *Freedom and Nature* and is always connected to a recovery system; iconoclasm must lead to reconstruction. Yet we render symbol useless if we penetrate its disguise and terminally deconstruct its meaning as in structural analysis. Structuralism is not after hidden meaning, yet it risks denying us the multivocity that creates imagery, by its emphasis on single units of meaning (theoretically these are single units, semantemes like syllables, in practice they are whole words). Symbols and tropes, metaphors and plots need to be at least partly irreducible, to protect the multiple meanings that create ambiguity:[75]

> We have already insisted that the symbol does not conceal any hidden teaching that only needs to be unmasked for the images in which it is clothed to become useless. Between these two impasses we are going to explore a third way – a creative interpretation of meaning, faithful to the impulsion, to the gift of meaning from the symbol, and faithful also to the philosopher's oath to seek understanding.[76]

Total clarity will never be either possible or desirable. The second half of 'Freedom in the Light of Hope' in *The Conflict of Interpretations* summarizes Ricœur's main approaches to Kant, and shows us how Ricœur traces the doubt about the self back beyond Nietzsche and Freud to Kant. So here we see the roots of Nietzsche's and Freud's doubt about the person: where is the person between not being a means and only being an end? Yet we also see, according to Ricœur, the Kantian concept of the transcendental illusion that is radically different from the thoughts of Freud and Feuerbach: the difference lies in the 'legitimate thought of the unconditioned', the attempt to think beyond what we understand, which must be preceded by a challenge to reason. Ricœur admires Kant's critique of human thinking; if 'hope has precisely a *fissuring* power with regard to closed systems and a power of reorganising meaning', it also has the potential for enshrining absolute ideas. 'I hope, there where I necessarily deceive myself, by forming absolute objects: self, freedom, God.'[77] Here is a sort of epistemological hubris. In the 1781 edition of Kant's *Paralogisms of Pure Reason*, Kant critiques Descartes' claim to extract knowledge of the self from a purely formal demonstration of the abstract conditions of the possibility of the self. Kant insists that we must avoid using the power of our perception to convince ourselves that our imaginings are in fact real objects; 'appearances are to be regarded as being, one and all, representations only, not things in themselves.'[78] Of course Kant's writing is not without internal contradictions, as Guyer discusses.[79] Ricœur mirrors these contradictions regarding perception, meaning and truth by insisting that we can better understand such contradictions by accepting the companionship of suspicion, yet how can we have a productive relationship with suspicion?

Suspicion as a condition of possibility

I want to consider the possibility that suspicion on its own can become a condition of possibility in a Ricœurian interpretation of Kant. The idea of freedom that Kant postulates as a condition of possibility of a categorical imperative seems the opposite of suspicion. The liberation of freedom, being able to do as we desire, is an ideal to which we aspire and suspicion has the opposite effect, constraining us to our baser motives. Yet we will see, even in his last works, how Ricœur construes suspicion as an enabler because it helps us to face up to the discrepancies, the fault lines that he sees in all of us. Consider Kant's assertion that we know as an established fact that humans should not lie. This is independent of whether they *do* lie. The lies people may tell do not affect that fact that they should not lie.[80] I believe Ricœur takes these two antinomies ("I should not lie, so maybe I do not") and inserts suspicion between them ("I should not lie but I suspect myself in order to think about why I do, in fact, lie") to make it possible for us to make sense of a world without a Kantian God, and for other reasons to do with love, justice and language that will become apparent in Chapters 9 and 10.

Kant 'understands' Hegel, Ricœur notes, even though he preceded him. It is not experience that limits reason but reason that limits the claim of our imagination to extend our own empirical, phenomenal, spatio-temporal knowledge to the noumenal order, i.e. possibility of thinking about the unthinkable. If we accept that the mind is active, within these limits, then both our perceptions and our morals are subject to *a priori* frameworks for thought. Yet it is very difficult to tell the difference between frameworks for thought and our perception of the world. Here then, at the heart of Kant's thinking, is a difficulty that Ricœur turns into the need for suspicion, not least because it is a human failing, to be suspicious, and Kant's theory precludes the flawed, warm person who has desires and should, perhaps, sometimes deploy suspicion to think beyond assertions of motive, cause and action. Ricœur makes a philosophical virtue out of human imperfections. Kantian schematism, the lower order groupings (from the *Critique of Pure Reason*) must conjoin vitally with the imagination 'at work in reflective judgment' (as in the *Third Critique*). Negativity is the impossibility of 'thinking beyond' and is an integral part of this process.[81] Striving to 'think something more', which Ricœur takes in homage from paragraph 59 of the *Critique of Judgement* is a way of describing both content and process of human thought, and must be accompanied by Hegelian negativity.

Ricœur interprets Kant as giving us the opportunity to be hopeful and to understand that we belong to a system of freedoms.[82] Ricœur rejects Freud's findings only in part, to the extent that he shows us how they confine us within the semantics of desire, the mythological man-made history of sin and defilement and a deterministic approach to human instinct. This makes the role of suspicion very complex, because of its acknowledged attributes of hubris, destruction and dismissal as well as the potential to be questioning and investigative. Ricœur also develops the idea of limit beyond freedom and nature, beyond duty and obligation.[83] He accords a positive place to desire, unlike Kant, and this allows him to go beyond Kant's *Third Critique* and take with him the Kantian theory of the productive imagination, to which he can give more freedom. Ricœur wants to provide space for Kant's practical philosophy to develop in his own work, but the price is a necessary uncoupling of suspicion from hermeneutics; Kant limits our ability to think beyond thought quite enough already, without the hermeneutics of suspicion hobbling us even more.

In order to see Ricœur looking back at the hermeneutics of suspicion, deploying a *Rückfrage*, Husserlian back questioning, we need to consult a much later work; in his reply to John Smith's paper in Hahn (1995) he considers the apparent tension within suspicion that leads first to destruction of meaning and then to restoration of meaning, in the context of Explaining (insistence upon data and positivistic evidence) and Understanding (dependence upon interpretative powers), which he has already analysed in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*.[84] First Ricœur makes it clear to Smith that, in his view, his earlier work on Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, whom he had called the masters of suspicion, does not do them justice. He does not elaborate upon this assertion, but it relates to the term 'masters of suspicion'. Ricœur then describes how he sees Explaining and Understanding as complementary, as discussed in Chapter 7, yet he sees a similarity between Explaining and suspicion that may create a negative imbalance and suggests a separation when suspicion becomes involved. Explanation is indeed the mode of all reductive enterprises, and needs to be uncoupled from Understanding if it is to serve suspicion. If left as the counterpole to Understanding, he believes that Explanation as a form of suspicion will be too destructive. Later we will see how this relates to the debates in analytic philosophy about reasons and causes. Given that this creates an insurmountable conflict of interpretations, we are left with several tentative conclusions: the world of meaning is unstable, dialectical balance is temporary and the potentially destructive effect of suspicion upon meaning must be handled carefully so that suspicion can be a condition of possibility.

This places a limitation on Ricœur's philosophical anthropology in the same way that Kant describes the desire of the human mind to find categorical, irrefutable truths that function as definitive constraints. As such, suspicion can provide one approach to challenge this. Yet within suspicion there is also a dialectic; how easy it is to destroy a relationship out of unjustifiable suspicion as Othello did. Cavell writes that Othello was determined to be sceptical because he believed he 'knew' so much about Desdemona. Suspicion if used to excess makes us feel omniscient and we can become destroyers.[85] The Kantian possibility of thinking beyond the limitations of thought is denied us by suspicion in excess. Thus I challenge the idea that 'Kant supports the hermeneutics of suspicion' unless we take it as a Kantian limit idea that constrains us and reminds us of our finitude, which we have seen Ricœur rejecting.[86] Whereas Cavell presents Othello's cogito as gripped by a desperate and narcissistic need to 'maintain its picture of itself as scepticism', with Ricœur we experience suspicion in moderation, equal to the task at hand, consistent from the 1960s onwards, with the hermeneutics of suspicion acting initially as a catalyst and then later as a corrosive force to be abandoned.[87]

Conclusions

For Cavell it is clear that historical trauma, like Shakespearean tragedy, sets 'the scene for skepticism . . . the scene in which modern philosophy finds itself'.[88] I see distinct similarities between Cavell's scepticism and Ricœur's hermeneutics of suspicion. Despite similarities, Ricœur prefers suspicion that is a 'dispute proportional to' the appropriate form of false consciousness: he sees proportional suspicion in Marx's attack on religion for its money fetish and Freud's attack on religion for its idolization tendencies, as history provides evidence for these phenomena. Yet Ricœur believes their views become disproportional when they make generalized attacks on religion. Their suspicious thinking, which Ricœur calls the hermeneutics of suspicion, thus fails itself and goes beyond proportionality, finding fault with all aspects of religion. Suspicion can require its opponent to fulfil demands of an impossibly rigorous nature. I believe that suspicion can be seen as a *limit-idea* in this example, as it can easily become an attempt at totalizing, taking an arrogant position that Cavell calls 'the conversion of metaphysical finitude into intellectual lack'.[89] Ricœur's unwillingness to link inextricably the masters and the hermeneutics of suspicion, his very rare use of it after the philosophical world has adopted the term – all these factors indicate to me his sensitivity to the dangerous potency of suspicion when linked with the idea of hermeneutics.

The term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is remarkable because it has become well known, despite Ricœur hardly using it. It is also often used in ways that are at odds with his own use of the term, and this may help to explain why he abandoned it. In surveying the currency of the phrase 'hermeneutics of suspicion' we find it used often in a variety of ways: positive engagement (Ihde, Pellauer), negative engagement (Gadamer, Leiter) and a combination of each in dialectical fashion, but not necessarily with an awareness of Ricœur moving around *within* suspicion (Anderson, Clark, Robinson, Thiselton). There is another interesting category, in which the author uses the term with no discussion of Ricœur (Williams and numerous websites). Pellauer and Muldoon are significant and unusual in focusing on suspicion in a way that is consistent with my research, and in Chapter 9 we will see Blamey using suspicion to analyse *Oneself as Another*, with what she calls the 'mandate of suspicion'.

The 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is often harnessed to postmodern thinking (which Ricœur occasionally refers to as post-critical). Ricœur hardly ever uses the word postmodern. Despite Lyotard opening the field up for liberation from old metanarratives, the idea of postmodernity often becomes an embodiment of suspicion in its most virulent form, and the hermeneutics of suspicion is thereby coupled to a concept that Ricœur rejected. Foucault challenged the hermeneutics of suspicion, asserting that uncovering meaning will only lead to more lies, joining Adorno and Horkheimer. Ricœur's work on methodological dialectics (Chapter 7) will, I hope, clarify further the dangers of this position. Suspicion should be part of critical exegesis, 'the act of dispute exactly proportional to the expressions of false consciousness', with the requirement for rigorous back questioning to identify false consciousness and other obscured areas. Suspicion is a rich and radical enough condition of possibility without being partnered with hermeneutics, which has very similar characteristics to suspicion; 'hermeneutics' and 'suspicion' prove too potent when put together.

If the three great masters of suspicion made possible the 'hermeneutics of suspicion', Ricœur clearly made very little use of the term, but that should not stop us using it. Misattribution, however, matters a great deal, as do his reasons for dropping it from his rich repertoire of memorable terms, not least because it may obscure from us the many other devices he developed to do the job that the hermeneutics of suspicion failed to do. Moreover, he makes significant use of his idea of 'suspicion' right up to and including his two last works and this requires the attention that I provide with close reading that encompasses the span of his lifetime's work. In his last two works suspicion is a condition of possibility, offering a guide to moderation and a necessary prop to friendship. He guards against the idea of a supremacy of suspicion in which 'the absolute view separates the appearance from the reality by the sharp edge of suspicion. Suspicion of myself is thus the taking up by myself of the absolute viewpoint', and interrogative thought can grow into hubris.[90]

Marx, Freud and Nietzsche told us more than we wanted to know about ourselves, and this gives us a false sense of omnipotence that Ricœur sees in the excessive use of suspicion, resonant for me with Cavell's analysis of scepticism. In Chapters 6, 7 and 8 we will encounter other approaches that Ricœur develops in order to engage with the uncertainty that he sees at the heart of the human experience. These devices will provide him with alternatives to the hermeneutics of suspicion and other excesses of suspicion as ways of reflecting the ambiguities and ambivalences inherent in our thinking. Next, Ricœur makes a linguistic turn, burrowing deep down into the multiple layers of language in order to develop mastery of the two phenomena metaphor and narrative. In Chapter 5 I summarize some of the major characteristics from Ricœur's middle period, in which he develops his interest in language against the backdrop of possible loss of meaning.

Chapter 5

Ricœur's hermeneutics II: the theory of interpretation

> *Illusion is itself a cultural function. Such a fact presupposes that the public meanings of our consciousness conceal true meanings, which can be brought to light only by adopting the attitude of suspicion and cautious critical scrutiny*[1]
>
> *Ricœur, P. (1969/1974)* The Conflict of Interpretations, *p. 442*

This chapter will focus on *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* and help us to answer this double question: how could it happen that, at the end of Book 3 of *Time and Narrative* Ricœur regretfully entertains the possibility of the irrevocable loss of meaning and does suspicion play a part in this?[2] 'In this period that some call postmodern, it may be that we no longer know what narrating means.'[3] This will involve considering Heidegger's position and the role played by Ricœur's linguistic turn. It is a process of conflict: our efforts at interpretation are caught between trust and suspicion, and in the process of trying to understand, we attempt to stabilize this conflict by mediating between conflicting meanings.[4] Here we will see the development and consolidation of Ricœur's theory of interpretation. This chapter provides a brief analysis of certain of Ricœur's key ideas and texts in 1960s–1980s including the continuing influence of Aristotle, Kant, Hegel, Freud, Schleiermacher and Dilthey, with the hermeneutics of suspicion deployed little and then even less by Ricœur. There are brief, surprisingly pivotal appearances by Sartre and Ryle. It also provides an exploration of two important methods: Ricœur's response to what he calls Heidegger's 'short cut' in hermeneutics and its relationship with phenomenology and also Husserl's back questioning, with some use of 'suspicion'.[5]

Freud and Nietzsche, and, to a lesser extent Marx, have catapulted Ricœur into 'unfolding the levels of meaning implied in the literal meaning'.[6] This is quite a rebellious definition, when we consider the structuralists' insistence, by contrast, that the *structure* of a text is where the meaning is; it is not hidden somewhere within but apparent and accessible to structural analysis. In 1966, Foucault's book *The Order of Things* challenges the idea of knowledge and meaning as illusion, even as persistent self-delusion. In 1969 the impetus of structuralism is still great, with its belief in the power of linguistic analysis to reveal the internal mechanism of text without recourse to the author or the context. Foucault, post-structuralist and an icon of structuralism despite his denial of allegiance, is elected to the Collège de France instead of Ricœur.[7] Derrida's deconstruction is strong. In 1965 and 1966 structuralism is seriously challenged. The communist party still dominates certain highly vocal sections of the intellectual community.[8]

Ricœur experiences personal and professional pain in the Nanterre X episode in 1969, as dean of the university, after Daniel Cohn Bendit leads an anarchic campaign of disruption. The university campus is finally *banalisée* i.e. taken over by the police and without Ricœur's permission. This leads to a fortress mentality among the students and much damage but no loss of life. Ricœur has a wastepaper basket rammed over his head and, feeling unsupported by colleagues, resigns soon after the whole episode. The effect on him is considerable, as discussed in Chapter 8. He continues with his French academic work, also lecturing in Canada, and from 1970 spends several months each year lecturing at the University of Chicago.[9] This brings him into contact with analytical philosophy, and his lecture series at Louvain, in Belgium, in 1970–1971, on the semantics of action, generates material that leads to *Life: A Story in Search of a Narrator*, and *Oneself as Another* as discussed in Hahn.[10] Will suspicion advance his work on illusion, if he abandons the responsible Husserlian quest for clarity in favour of hermeneutics that investigates messy conflicts of interpretation?

Freud, Lévi-Strauss, the Bible and ordinary language

In May 1971 he gives a lecture at the Divinity School of University of Chicago in which he describes four influences that clarify the moves he has made from phenomenology to hermeneutics while following his own interest in psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis helps his work on bad will and guilt, and also, increasingly, his interest in language.[11] The first influence, then, interpreting symbols by challenging them, is something he has learnt from Feuerbach, Marx, Freud and Nietzsche.

Secondly he feels he has to respond to the increasing dominance of structural linguistics in France, which asserts that language has its own powers of meaning. This argument can be used to displace the existentialist idea that the human subject has choices. In *Interpretation Theory* he clarifies that this 'power' in language is not like the Freudian unconscious, but more like a structural and cultural unconscious.[12] This approach will be increasingly Kantian in its analytical way of establishing limits to create a working space of validity. Nor does his adaptation of structuralism remove the existentialist possibility of choice; it is more that language becomes a carrier of human myth and symbol, which we then need to become aware of in order to understand ourselves afresh.

Partly through his own discussions with Lévi-Strauss, he has become better at analysing language in a structuralist way in order to understand it objectively, and also he has learnt to differentiate between his analysis of symbolic language and the way in which it is interpreted as text. Instead of asking 'what is it to interpret symbolic language?' he now asks 'What is it to interpret a text?'

Thirdly he is influenced by biblical analysts who come after Bultmann and who seek to consider how religious language functions, by going beyond demythologization and beyond the contested Diltheyan dichotomy between Explanation (more scientific) and Understanding (more interpretive) of which more in Chapters 6 and 8. Ricœur has moved his thinking from Barth to Bultmann. The latter's act of demythologizing the Bible, which Barth found irresponsible, helps Ricœur to develop the idea of second naivety, and Wallace's work on second naivety is excellent.[13]

Fourthly and finally Ricœur acknowledges the importance of ordinary language philosophy. Austin, Wittgenstein, and others reveal the inappropriateness of analysing language by the criteria of logical, ideal structures. He relishes the range of approaches that they offer (use of logic in Wittgenstein's Tractatus, later rejection thereof and systematic critique of logic in Austin for example). Unlike many of the Anglo-American philosophers, he uses ordinary language approaches in French, English, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew, as we will see in his late work *Thinking Biblically* (1998/1998), and summarized in *On Translation* (2004/2006). Ricœur hopes for some form of union between phenomenology and ordinary language philosophy. Through this union, both may benefit.

Structural linguistics and structuralism

During this time Ricœur is working on so many different areas that it is difficult to develop a clear narrative. *Interpretation Theory* (1976) is a detailed exploration of literary language as an ethical task, a work, a holistic approach and one that gives a personal self to the ego.[14] Finally the historical elements of hermeneutics reach a long drawn out and difficult climax in phenomenology of historiography, literary criticisms etc. in the three volumes of *Time and Narrative* (1983–1988), and the essay collection *From Text to Action* (1991) especially the essay 'Ideology and Utopia'.[15] He develops *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* as a pair, because we can create semantic innovation with both metaphor and narrative, despite significant differences.[16]

In Chapters 3 and 4 we looked at the masters of suspicion and the hermeneutics of suspicion respectively and now we need to see what happened after *Freud and Philosophy*, which is the beginning of Ricœur's hermeneutical journey. After *The Symbolism of Evil*, Freud seems to be necessary for Ricœur's move into hermeneutics. Freud's ability to develop connections between myth and memory and longing is also of great importance to Ricœur, and is explored in *The Conflict of Interpretations* with regard to the earlier issues of sin and faith in relation to psychoanalysis, to be followed up much later in *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2000). One reason for the importance of psychoanalysis to the development of hermeneutics, as we have seen, is the capacity of Freud's theories to deal with suspicion and with scepticism, partly by their assumption that concealment and self-deceit are normal and may indeed be healthy. Ricœur retains Freud's ideas on memory up to and including his last two books, where he reminds us of Freud's view that remembering is, among other things, a labour that can pre-empt compulsive behaviour. At this earlier stage, the 1960s–1980s, instead of looking back to remember, Ricœur creates a sense of *innovation*; this is the linguistic turn, the creation of new possibilities through tropes such as metaphor and structural features of narrative. In fact it is clear from material in the archives that Ricœur was engaged in a linguistic turn before this: in his 1958 lecture series in New York on Guilt, for example, he writes in his English lecture notes in blue fountain pen 'Perhaps, in my paper have I too much emphasized the power of language', indicating the privileged position he accords language even before his linguistic turn. At some later date, using black biro he crosses out the first nine words and writes these eight words in the margin '*We must not fear to emphasise too much* the power of language'.[17]

The metaphor gains more and more status in his language theory and he summarizes his book *The Rule of Metaphor* in an essay called 'Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics' (1974).[18] Through devices such as metaphor and *mimesis* (imitation broadly speaking), he creates the idea of a world in front of the text that gives us new ideas for a better life. This will lead him to argue by the mid-1980s that 'action and text mutually interpret one another.' We will see the tension this creates when he uses structural linguistics to graft the hermeneutic problem onto the phenomenological problem because of the incompatibility between the three.[19] Of course, in the history of Western thought hermeneutics predates phenomenology and structural linguistics and for Ricœur it is vitally important to test the limits of this hybrid model.

For Ricœur 'to speak is to say something about something to someone', and he wants us to consider the analysis of language of both Frege (logical) and Husserl (phenomenological).[20] He interprets Frege's importance as rooted in the identification of two aims of language; for Ricœur these are first an ideal sense that is *not in* the real world, and secondly a reference *to* the real world. Thus Ricœur argues that it can seem that the passage from semantic analysis to deep human meaning *is the same phenomenon* as the relation between sense and reference that Frege offered us. Husserl argued for something very similar. In both cases, this is a filtering of various possible meanings as a result of the context of the sentence. Progressive refinement of meaning takes place within the structure of the sentence. Structural linguistics inherits this legacy yet denies the crucial relation between the 'what' (its sense) and the 'about what' (to what does the language refer in the real world?). Thus linguistics provides a structure for analysing language that Ricœur finds useful, but overvalued because it is unable to consider the hermeneutical issues about polysemy; linguistics cannot consider how and why various semantic possibilities still 'float around the words as possibilities not completely eliminated'?[21]

Ricœur disapproves of the separation caused by structural linguistics between different levels of meaning in language. He doubts that the structural laws that work at a phonological level will work so well at other levels of meaning, i.e. semantics, yet also feels liberated by what he calls Lévi-Strauss' 'transcendentalism without the transcendental subject'.[22] The event of speaking takes place in a context and thus has more meaning than the actual system or structure, as the system is only one part of the act of communicating.[23] He will conclude that the methodology of interpretation must follow the hermeneutic circle, rejecting Heidegger's vicious circle, in which subject and object are mutually implicated.[24] By contrast, Ricœur stresses such a relationship as establishing conflict that is beneficial. Only in conflicting interpretations between hermeneutics will we see the possible development of some sort of sense of self. We can never achieve a full and harmonious ontology i.e. a way of being that is balanced, hence we need to enhance contradictions and conflicts in order to try and understand ourselves. The self is 'the most archaic of all objects' and we need to free ourselves from our narcissistic self-absorption.[25] We will follow a track opened to us by psychoanalysis, which offers us a dismissal of subject as consciousness and the regression from meaning to desire. Struggling against narcissism shows how deeply language is rooted in desire, in wanting to be as one with the objects of our desire, including ourselves. This creates a need to release oneself from personal narcissism in order to try and free oneself from a life controlled by desire. Ricœur will use the idea of double meanings in symbols and metaphors to show us the inherent weaknesses in ourselves and in structural linguistics, which, like the acting human, cannot take account of the several potential meanings in anything the person says. A dialectical process will be necessary to achieve this: For Ricœur the hermeneutic circle thus becomes 'the correlation between explaining and understanding, between understanding and explanation'.[26] Through the hermeneutic circle the very process of hermeneutics will facilitate better understanding, because explanation creates distance and understanding creates empathy.

For Ricœur, it seems that Heidegger took the short route to grafting hermeneutics onto phenomenology, asking not 'On what condition can a knowing object (i.e. individual) understand a text or history?' but 'What kind of being is it whose being consists of understanding?' The hermeneutic problem thus becomes an analysis of being alive, experiencing daily life and the potential for subjectivity that is collective, not individual – the *Dasein* as Heidegger called it (literally being here/there). Ricœur sees Heidegger's work as compatible with his own ontology of understanding. Yet Ricœur takes much longer than

Heidegger to even describe, let alone resolve the problem of what it means to be human, using also semantics in part III and reflection in part IV of *Time and Narrative*. Ricœur's criticism of Heidegger's notion of the relationships between time and history is profound, and particularly in *Memory, History, Forgetting* (see Chapter 9). Ricœur has a desire for an ontology of understanding, a way of understanding what is right and important for us. Instead of a linguistic philosophy like Wittgenstein's or a reflective neo-Kantian type of philosophy like structural linguistics, he explores multidisciplinary influences, to enhance analysis of history, psychoanalysis, literary theory and religion.

In *Interpretation Theory* (1976) Ricœur looks at ways of using structuralist techniques to analyse written text. He believes structuralism reduces the value of the text which will end up with no generalizable meaning, only a sense of internal structure. He cites Lévi-Strauss on myths, with constituent units like phonemes, morphemes, sememes, and known as mythemes. Here we lose meaning in favour of structure, and we can explain the myth but not interpret it.[27] Ricœur finds that the reduction of a narrative into component parts such as 'promising, betraying, hindering, aiding etc.' can only provide explanation, not interpretation, because the narrative becomes fragmented.[28] In order to provide interpretation, we must go beyond structural analysis and analyse the text holistically, looking from sense to reference, from what the text says, to what it talks about. In the conclusion to *Interpretation Theory* Ricœur argues that there is a great need for distanciation, a sort of hands-off approach that facilitates dispassionate yet not alienated analysis. Structural analysis produces a residue that must be understood symbolically as evidence of pre-understanding, deep meaning. As Dilthey argued, Explanation can provide both analysis of and distance from these deep currents, and Understanding can provide immersion, another tension created. In *The Hermeneutics of the Human Sciences* Ricœur develops this further, and aligns structural linguistics on the one hand with Explanation, and hermeneutical philosophy on the other hand with Understanding and interpretation.

Dosse points out how important structural linguistics was for intellectuals in France in the 1960s and 1970s, as it created a discourse that could challenge existing academic disciplines in 'la vieille Sorbonne' and it also seemed to afford the humanities the status of science.[29] Structural linguistics seems in a way to be a further stage in the process by which modern philosophy developed with elements of both classical philosophy and the historical sciences. The development from Schleiermacher to Dilthey and then Heidegger indicates a move towards hermeneutics as a basis for modern humanities, although Heidegger resisted that move. Dilthey's 1900 essay tries to give human sciences a validity comparable to that of the natural sciences, i.e. an epistemological problem, seeking a model as strong as Kant's critique of metaphysics. Ricœur has no choice but to deal with structuralism; he takes what he finds useful from this model, in order to develop his turn towards language. Even then he also sets up a distance between himself and his proposed solution as we see in his development of metaphor and narrative.

The Rule of Metaphor

For Ricœur, all language is metaphorical in the sense that it reflects life and imitates human action. Through metaphor we can create new ideas, new ways of looking. I wish to look at two aspects of his work on metaphor; his understanding of the metaphor within the sentence and his work on the metaphor as part of sustained discourse. What do we mean by metaphor? Metaphor suggests a similarity between two elements that are different; connecting them with an intensity that is weakened in the simile by its use of 'like'. For Aristotle, 'Achilles is a lion' is a metaphor, whereas 'Achilles is like a lion' is a simile. A metaphor invites us to see something familiar in a new light, by creating what Ricœur calls 'semantic impertinence', which resembles the Russian Formalists' concept of 'defamiliarization', putting together two items whose similarity is outweighed by, but also enhanced by, their differences. The metaphor does not draw attention to itself as a trope, which similes do with 'like' and 'as'. While agreeing with the importance placed by Aristotle upon metaphor, Ricœur goes beyond Aristotle's view of metaphor as a dynamic episode created between words. Ricœur sees the shockwaves of metaphor as being created in the whole sentence and thus looks not only at the clash between two words, but also at the whole linguistic structure that creates, surrounds and sustains the metaphor.

Nietzsche doubted the potential of metaphor to excite us, seeing more of the 'dead' metaphor that suffuses our language with meaning in a way that we no longer notice and therefore its influence, if there is indeed any residual effect, will be covert, deceitful and underhand. Ricœur is surprised at Heidegger's denial that metaphor could serve thought when Heidegger claims that 'the metaphorical exists only within the metaphysical', and notes that Heidegger himself frequently uses metaphor.[30] In contrast, Freud's analysis of the dream as a vehicle for a symbolic working through of our hopes and fears gives Ricœur a profound respect for Freud's emphasis on the unconscious workings of the mind. To see repression and symbol as one and the same phenomenon is a partially accurate explanation for Ricœur, because the symbol contains hidden meanings locked inside it, as can happen with images that contain repressed ideas in dreams, for example. However, repressed images are condensed and may cease to resemble their stimulus, so Ricœur rejects the Lacanian attempt to see metaphor in terms of condensation. Linguistic analysis cannot explain the repression itself, which distances ordinary language from the unconscious with its version of language. He believes that we must also see the metaphor of a repressed desire or fear as a way in which the patient's concerns can be expressed and therefore have the potential to go beyond censorship into the semantics of desire (see Chapter 3).

Ricœur himself seems to use a 'power of distanciation' to step back from his own conclusions; Clark notes that he does this repeatedly in his writing. Anderson describes Ricœur's 'calm, even existentially hopeful view of the teleological structure of narrative', yet there is almost a Humean flavour to his concession; at the end of *Time and Narrative* Book 3 we see him apparently relinquishing his hard won position that narrative is ethical, because he concedes that narrative does indeed have fatal flaws. Like Hume, he sees the human ability to attribute causality where there may be none, and asserts that philosophy does not have any compulsion to adopt narrative, despite its many humanly rich attributes.[31] So here, with metaphor, as Clark points out, Ricœur does it again; he denies the power of metaphor to get philosophy out of difficulties. The possibility to create a brave new world in front of the text that will save us seems over-optimistic.[32] Clark believes that when Ricœur shifts register into the Aristotelian-scholastic notion of levels of being, this creates a new set of problems.[33] Ultimately of course Ricœur is reminding us that we cannot take shelter in any one set of ideas or methods, but must take control of our own thinking, of which metaphor and narrative can and should form a part. Our project is more complex than that, however, if we wish to live a moral life for ourselves, with others and within just institutions:

> My philosophical project is to show how human language is inventive despite the objective limits and codes which govern it, to reveal the diversity and potentiality of language which the erosion of the everyday, conditioned by technocratic and political interests, never ceases to obscure.[34]

This is a Kantian distinction between the empirical and the transcendental and requires us to be able to assert the dependence of linguistic action upon moral action. In other words I need to be able to ensure that my use of language influences the meaning of my actions and, indeed, shows those actions to mean more than the surface features of the action itself. Hermeneutics can be used here to strengthen the analytic philosophical sense of self that can otherwise seem purely phenomenalist.[35] Kant's reason prohibits the claim of objective knowledge to absolutize itself. Ricœur decries both the search for absolute certainty and the prohibition thereof, and finds a partial solution in the metaphor. Metaphor does not show how things are, but rather shows what they are like and provides the sense of potential and possibility that sidesteps Kant's limit conditions to suggest how things can be and may become. Metaphor also negotiates negation; by saying what something *is like*, the metaphor also says what something *is not* like. If we want to be able to accept the destabilizing effect of metaphor, that can help us transcend humdrum or sterile ways of thinking and acting, we need a set of guiding principles against which to offset these dangers. Structurally, Ricœur believes that metaphorical function of language provides 'appropriate speculative language' for understanding new meanings evoked by metaphor. For Ricœur there are also the principles of his

Protestant faith, and his profound and critical understanding of Western philosophical traditions.

Derrida responded to *The Rule of Metaphor* in his essay 'White Mythology' and this provoked a response from Ricœur, to which Derrida in turn answered to support Heidegger's argument that the metaphorical only exists within the metaphysical. As Heidegger rejects metaphysics in the early writings, so metaphor is also rejected by association with metaphysics. For Ricœur it is necessary to be reckless and argue that 'metaphoricity is absolutely uncontrollable'; whether dead metaphor or living, we must even use metaphor to describe metaphor. He uses imagery of the sun to demonstrate how inescapable metaphor is; far from being burnt out, metaphor exists on an ontological dimension, giving meaning to our texts. This is 'the baffling fecundity of dead metaphor'; (I choose at random the familiar metaphors in skyscraper, urban jungle, supercilious and crestfallen).[36] Ricœur agrees with Derrida that philosophy is based on the assumption that meaning both precedes and goes beyond metaphor. He interprets Heidegger and Derrida as asserting that the metaphorical combination between proper meaning and figurative meaning colludes with the metaphysical combination between visible and invisible, and rejects that.[37]

If I may bring in Sartre and Ryle at this point, his work on them summarizes for me the impetus for the linguistic turn: Ricœur works in the late 1960s and early 1970s on structuralism and British analytical philosophy, and brings together Sartre (representing phenomenology) and Ryle (representing linguistic analytical thought). Despite their differences, he sees both Sartre and Ryle as refusing to deviate from the paradigm of reproductive imagination, and both insisting upon the fundamental 'speakability' of lived experience. Ricœur teaches Sartre's dramatic work intensively in the 1960s, studies Sartre's philosophical writings and teaches Sartre's work in comparison with Ryle in the 1970s as we see from the archives.[38] In 1981 he formalizes this in *Sartre and Ryle on the Imagination*.[39]

Ricœur concludes that the linguistic turn is necessary: we must move away from misleadingly straightforward measures of perception and therefore move on from the visual imagery conjured up by Sartre describing how he imagines his friend in Berlin, and Ryle describing how he visualizes the mountain Helvellyn. For Ricœur, such discussions about replicating reality are ultimately futile – much more useful will be the complex polysemy of meanings embedded inside language. The theory of metaphor will provide a starting point in looking at meanings in language and generating the emergence of new images. In this way metaphor may help to counter the contaminating effect of reproductive thought: Kant believed that the mind distorts that upon which it insists on imposing its own interpretations. Yet for Ricœur metaphor can provide precisely the opportunity we need for dealing with antinomies; here we have

Ricœur proposing that language avoids such possessive distortion by generating new images that lead to new ideas, the transformation of reality, its metamorphosis. Hence metaphor may help us to be true to Kant's vision. Metaphor and narrative are best employed to create new possibilities, and yet these innovations occur from within the sedimentation of previous meanings, as with narrative paradigms. This is the truly creative strength of human language.

Time and Narrative

'Narratives are literary schemas which create figures for human time' according to Wood.[40] Narrative shapes time because 'speculation on time is an inconclusive rumination to which narrative activity alone can respond.'[41] In *The Rule of Metaphor* (1975) and *Time and Narrative* (mid-1980s) he focuses on literary and historical models and says relatively little about personal narrative identity, but he begins to develop these ideas later in *Oneself as Another*. This assertion that we live a life that we narrate is based on Ricœur's conviction that we live our lives through symbol, imitation and created form (such as narrative) and can at best only approach truth indirectly. He asserts that we know the difference between good and evil and know how to act ethically although we may choose not to. His multidisciplinary argument about narrative combines three forms; history, literary criticism and phenomenological philosophy. According to Ricœur these three normally ignore each other and he proposes to change that, using Aristotle.[42]

First it is important to consider Ricœur's development of Aristotle's *mimesis*. Aristotle develops the idea more narrowly than Plato. For Plato *mimesis* is boundless and suspect, imitating nature which itself imitates the very principle of things. Aristotle, 'will have none of this'.[43] For him, it is the structure of plots that constitutes *mimesis*, which means that *mimesis* reflects action, the action of plots whereby one action leads to the next stage of the plot. Moreover that means that *mimesis* composes and reconstructs the very thing it imitates; it is not a copy, but is in fact poetry, *poeisis*, the creative act:

> It is in the composition of the fable or plot that the reference to human action, which is in this case the nature being imitated, must become apparent.[44]

Some years later, in *Time and Narrative* (1984) Ricœur presents *mimesis* as an imitation of action that has a threefold layering: *mimesis* 2, emplotment, is the vital mediator between *mimesis* 1 (a partially intuitive process) and 3 (the reception of a plot by the reader). *Mimesis* 1 is our understanding of how actions hang together, signalled by our use of temporal order words like before, while, during, after, then, etc.[45] This is some sort of (partially intuitive) understanding that we have about beginnings, middles and ends. In *mimesis* 2 we find understanding of the events themselves, which show relationships between means and ends, agents and effects. Where once there may have been some intuitive understanding of cause and effect, as in *mimesis* 1, now there is clear emplotment of tragic consequence and causal sequences in hitherto episodic incidents.[46] In *mimesis* 3 we find the relationship between the text and the reader. This must be understood as a capacity to invite consideration of a 'world in front of the text', which must have both a past to remember and a future to hope for.[47] Ricœur will return to this in *Oneself as Another* and in *Memory, History, Forgetting* to consider such issues as 'whose memory is it?'

Time

Ricœur's main interlocutor in *Time and Narrative* is Heidegger, and he is not easy to challenge, not least because Ricœur feels himself much indebted to Heidegger's analysis of time.[48] Ricœur explains how Heidegger's analysis of how we construe time resembles that of the ordinary language philosophers: if language is, as Austin sees it, the place where we keep traces of what makes us human, rather than records of the objects we love, then language describes Heidegger's *Sorge*, Care, but only as a moment, now, in time, not a succession of 'nows', but an intensity, an immediacy that shows we care about being alive.[49] Ricœur admires Heidegger's creation in *Being and Time* of a hermeneutic phenomenology that refuses the subject/object dichotomy of Aristotle and Augustine and is based in the intense immediacy of *Dasein*, being-in-the-world.[50] Time as an idea is thus dependent on *Dasein*, but this will never be enough.

Before *Time and Narrative*, in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (1981) Ricœur looks closely at Heidegger and admires the preoccupation that Heidegger had with his own use of hermeneutics; his desire to go beyond epistemological debates about facts, and into ontological discussions in which the meaning of life becomes the interpretation of the *world*, not of the *individual*.[51] However Ricœur sees a sort of pre-emptive foreclosure here; by refusing to engage in debate with the natural sciences, as Heidegger does, we lose the possibility of developing a useful critique of the human sciences/humanities. By denying the importance of the sciences, we lose the opportunity to understand them and thus cannot interpret them. Even more serious is the charge that a philosophy cannot critique itself when it refuses to consider the scientific world.[52] Ricœur sees Heidegger as stuck between epistemology and ontology, because Heidegger's deconstruction of metaphysics leaves him with no means of analysing knowledge in the sciences and the human sciences.[53] Heidegger's ontology is thus isolated and not surprisingly leads him back into metaphysics in his later writings. Not only is Heidegger's ontology depersonalized, but also becomes increasingly passive and receptive of the word, rather than shaping language creatively, especially in his later work. Ricœur, forever much influenced by Heidegger, describes how we can 'become the narrator and the hero of our own story, without actually becoming the author of our own life'.[54] Vanhoozer sees the enduring influence of Kant and Heidegger here and concludes that Ricœur's work on language and literature transforms Kant's creative imagination and Heidegger's idea of human temporality, by facilitating detailed work on method and by introducing the social element.[55] In Ricœur the person is present as a phenomenological voice, with that distinctive idiolect that I use in this text periodically (between speech marks) as a narrator within philosophy or as an interlocutor with other disciplines, such as history.

Back questioning and relay stations

Back questioning (*rückfragen*), developed by Husserl in his *Crisis*, and discussed by Ricœur in chapter 6 of *Time and Narrative* Book 1, facilitates discussion of the indirect connection between narrative and history.[56] Causality is what historians have to 'prove' by arguing that one explanation is better than another, and narrative 'proves' it by emplotment. A feature shared by history and narrative has been the importance of key figures like Hegel's 'great figures' of world history.[57] With Braudel and others of the Annales School of history, great social forces replaced these great figures and thus the Annales accounts lost any claim to being narratives, despite their focus on the lives of 'little' people. There is still a kind of emplotment however; as Ricœur points out, Braudel's Mediterranean becomes almost like a character in a narrative.

During the turn towards language in the 1960s–1980s, Ricœur harnesses Husserlian methodology to analyse what *mimesis* achieves within history. Back questioning is the method that Husserl used to investigate what he called a genetic phenomenology; Husserl means by this a genesis of meaning, development of meaning. Earlier, in *The Rule of Metaphor*, Ricœur pays tribute to Nietzsche's genealogical method of questioning because it is based on suspicion about 'motives and self-interests' behind philosophers' declared intentions.[58] He prefers investigation that reveals hidden presuppositions, which shows the '"un-thought" of philosophy anticipating the "un-said" of metaphor'. Ricœur uses back questioning to consider the paradox of history as narrative – that it exists at a point between that which happened and that which has not yet happened. In addition to this pivotal position that history and narrative occupy between the past and the future, they also have to mediate between explaining and understanding – although Ricœur prefers to move away from these terms coined by Dilthey and uses the terms 'nomological explanation' (which asserts *laws* of causal connection) and 'explanation by emplotment' (which is about understanding and first-order entities; peoples, nations, civilizations and all their actions, their praxis).[59] This is a tightly interlinked relationship, as most narrative reference back to primary entities, like leaders, events etc., is done by singular causal imputation: i.e. single causes such as Ricœur's example of Weber's idea of the Protestant work ethic.[60]

Ricœur wishes to find a method for establishing more than one main cause to a historical event and identifies three pathways for questioning back. The first starts with scientific history of *facts* and tracks back to the power of the plot behind such factual assertions. The second starts with the *characters* created by historians and tracks back to the characters in the narratives, before historians described them. The third examines the many different *time spans* of history (long swathes and brief episodes) and compares them with time within narratives. Each path attempts to track back from historical discourse to the underlying narrative that he believes to be our human attempt to make sense of the people and events of the past in the light of causal imputation. He uses the term 'relay station' to conjure up the idea of a journey during which we need to pause to check how conditions change; characters in a narrative become historical figures, and back questioning shows how historical figures were indeed once characters in a narrative which they created for themselves.[61] Mary Queen of Scots, for example, belonged to and created many different and conflicting narratives about her power, her role and her womanhood, not all of which have survived the historians' analysis. Husserl's genetic phenomenology uses back questioning to tease out the origins of the big ideas that historians present us with; *mimesis* 1 denotes the core essence of action, providing a relay station, a pausing point, from which narrative characters emerge in *mimesis* 2.[62] Back questioning is necessary because it reminds us that ideas such as imperialism have come from ideas about individual actors and events, which seem more authoritative than they may be, when we receive them from the historian as text; this text is at the level of *mimesis* 3. Ricœur devotes much of *Memory, History, Forgetting* to this issue, in his consideration of what sorts of text and what sorts of other evidence are convincing and reliable.

Narrative

For Ricœur text is not static, rather it has the potential to suggest previously un-thought of possibilities for ethico-practical action:

> If it is true that fiction cannot be completed other than life, and that life cannot be understood other than through stories we tell about it, then we are led to say that a life *examined*, in the sense borrowed from Socrates, is a life *narrated*.[63]

In the context of narrative we must also understand Ricœur's work with Aristotle's concept of the good life, in which actions are carried out because they are good. Ricœur develops from Aristotle the vital importance of action (*praxis*) as ethical, action that is good in its own right. Ricœur also adopts an Aristotelian sense of *phronesis* as practical wisdom that he hopes has a more human form than Kant's *Moralität*. Our definition of good actions must be determined by our attempt to be true to ourselves, yet constrained by solicitude for our neighbour and motivated by seeking justice for others. However, he expresses insoluble doubts on the last page of Book 3 of *Time and Narrative* about the limitations of narrative, which he expresses in a classically Kantian positing of limits:

> It ought not to be said that our eulogy to narrative unthinkingly has given life again to the claims of the constituting subject to master all meaning. On the contrary, it is fitting that every mode of thought should verify the validity of its employment in the domain assigned to it, by taking an exact measure of the limits to its employment.[64]

He continues by asserting that narrative is limited in the same ways that time is limited by its inscrutability, not unlike myth. Because he sees the mystery of time as providing the very creative tension that helps us to develop understanding of a story, Ricœur urges us to develop the narrative identity that will characterize each of us. At a deeper level we need to look at Ricœur's ideas about the individual as reflected in different philosophical texts. He sees the reflective position of hermeneutics as showing limitations to the self as perceived within analytic philosophy, yet finds this a very productive tension, using linguistics to work on attestation. Attestation becomes a central idea; I bear witness, I stand up for what I believe in, and this proves that I am serious about my beliefs, which, however, I still and constantly have to prove to be worthy. In *Oneself as Another* he debates this difficulty at length.[65]

Ricœur sees the need to explain *Time and Narrative* in various papers written after all three volumes were published and the conclusions vary somewhat (including the *Pretext* paper to which I have referred already). Another is a paper he gave on 15 April 1987 in the Department of Philosophy of Haverford College USA.[66] This unpublished paper, entitled 'Mimesis, Reference and Refiguration in Time and Narrative', emphasizes the progression from *The Rule of Metaphor* to *Time and Narrative* in terms of the transition between narrative *con*figuration and narrative *re*figuration. Narrative configuration is the internal organization of a narrative text as the basis of codes identifiable by structural analysis. Refiguration is such narrative text's capacity for reorganizing our temporal experience, in the dual sense of uncovering the depths of experience and also transforming its orientation. Ricœur requests that we make the distinction between analysis internal to texts and a discussion of the texts' capacity for discovery and transformation beyond themselves. This is an amplification of the earlier debate about sense and reference: as discussed, the passage from semantic analysis to deep human meaning seems to Ricœur to be *the same phenomenon* as the concept of reference that Frege offers us. Yet in fact this Fregean approach would give priority to descriptive discourse over *The Rule of Metaphor*'s '*re*descriptive discourse'. *Time and Narrative* adds a detailed analysis of *re*description to the story developed in *The Rule of Metaphor*. Hence Ricœur agrees that Frege's reference does not give us the same ideas about referential meaning at all, and admits that he is using a very open analogy that is indicative of his determination to see synergies between analytical and hermeneutical philosophical ideas.

Metaphor and poetic language generally are a redescription of our experience of reality: in a phenomenological manner we describe reality as we experience it, before language. Even our sense of being has to be taken metaphorically insofar as 'being-as' is related to 'seeing-as'. Narrative has the function of articulating our experience of time. Narrative brings time to language, this is narrative's mimetic function, and it recreates time in text. 'I thoroughly explore the gap between signs and things by pushing the self-structuring of narrative on the basis of its internal codes and norms to the extreme.'[67] Ricœur sees a very close relationship between *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative*, although each book ends up in a very different place.

For Ricœur there are no ultimate, truth-defining metanarratives. He has worked through Hegel's mediating and totalizing narrative and by the mid-1950s decides to leave it behind and improve upon it with a more tentative approach.[68] Ricœur finds the arguments of many of Hegel's detractors unattractive, yet, like them, believes it necessary to reject Hegel's view of history. This is one of the reasons why narrative is such an important theme for Ricœur; Hegel uses narrative to draw together scattered events in human history and ascribes to them some totalizing plot that reflects the will of humanity, the unity of the Spirit. Later Ricœur will also reject Lyotard's wholesale refusal of metanarratives, as that would preclude getting to grips with both ideology and utopia.

The stakes are so high that Ricœur deploys suspicion to challenge the Hegelian idea that the past can be contained in the present and can also be used to develop a future that learns from the mistakes of that past: 'Our suspicion finds an initial handhold in the final equating of the *Stufengang der Entwicklung* [step-by-step progress] and the eternal present.'[69] In other words, we cannot accept Hegel's vision of the development of history: the past was a European one, and Ricœur argues that Hegel fixed his ideas upon precisely those elements of European history that have subsequently 'come undone' and have thereby shown his theory to be as temporally specific as it could possibly be. Too many 'differences' have set themselves against 'development': Europe destroyed many of its own ideals in the First World War, decolonization and the growing gaps between the industrialized nations and others, and the withdrawal of Europe from the world stage have all created too many deviations from the progression of history to justify Hegel's *Stufengang*. Regretfully, almost gently, Ricœur has shown that his great interest in narrative is also best deployed to show up the weaknesses inherent in the grand narratives of Hegel. Ricœur is moving towards a hermeneutical phenomenology: hermeneutics now goes beyond the Biblical exegesis and classical philology that once characterized it and it is an exploration of the hidden meaning of all experience and the self, given courage by the masters of suspicion.[70]

Hermeneutics begins when we reach the point at which we want to interrupt the way in which we belong to transmitted tradition and begin self-consciously to signify it i.e. to show what we mean by it, yet without losing the polysemy of meanings. Hermeneutics comes back to phenomenology via the core problem, the *epoché* of trying to bracket off superfluities yet still being unable to see clearly because we can never know the world accurately. Negativity exists naturally and not in a bad way when we agree that the linguistic sign can only stand for something when it is not that thing: an inky squiggle of text is not the thing it describes. Similarly hermeneutics begins when we 'interrupt the relation of belonging in order to signify it.' (Belonging is what Hegel called the 'substance' of moral life.) Hermeneutical distanciation is to belonging as, in phenomenology, the *epoché* is to lived experience. This analogy emphasizes the 'critical moment, a moment of suspicion, from which the critique of ideology, psychoanalysis and so on, can proceed'.[71]

'Suspicio': looking underneath to find what is concealed in metaphor

Ricœur uses the word suspicion very seldom, and it seems incompatible with his generally measured tone – yet in fact it fits well with his iconoclasm, doubt and the need to challenge the status quo in order to find a better way forward. Ricœur emphasizes suspicion while he is analysing Derrida and Heidegger and he proposes that suspicion must be specifically targeted; it must be less a general suspicion about metaphysics, more a heightened, specific suspicion, a desire to uncover 'what in metaphor is left unsaid.'[72] As he shows in his analysis of Saussure's work on similarities between linguistic and monetary value, this type of metaphor can and should be pushed to its limit; using a coin and wearing it down through use turns into the term usury, a form of exploitation. Deconstructing the hidden meaning of 'dead' metaphors shows us how potent language really is. He proposes that Heidegger's form of deconstruction must be used to challenge Freud, Nietzsche and Marx, as he emphasizes with one of his rare uses of the term 'the hermeneutics of suspicion'.[73]

Ricœur sees *The Rule of Metaphor* as helping him to think about the polysemy of language, which emerged from the problem of being limited and capable of wronging others in *Fallible Man* (the first half of *Finitude and Culpability*). We have a direct language of talking about what we want to do, but we use indirect language (symbols, metaphors and other tropes), to talk about wrongdoing, as discussed in *The Symbolism of Evil.* Such language is only comprehensible to us if we also understand the old myths about how evil came about. Thus, direct reflection upon my motives and desires will only succeed if I deliberately take an indirect path via hermeneutics, which will provide the tools for translating the complex ways in which I conceal my own thoughts from myself. I can immunize myself against evil by failing to identify with the potential for evil described in old stories, and letting them ward off evil on my behalf. I do not need to act against evil if myth does it for me, just as Jesus died for me. This can lead to rigidification of thought processes.

In that early phase in *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricœur emphasizes the role of hermeneutics in unravelling secret and cultural meanings; by the early 1970s he is clear and categorical that hermeneutics is about more than that, i.e. about general problems regarding language and text. Heidegger suggests the possibility of getting to the core of meaning by using the hermeneutic circle but Ricœur takes this much further: he shows us that we must take both the oscillating distancing and intimacy of the hermeneutic circle and use devices like the distanciation that Marx explained with the concept of alienation, in order to be critical of texts.[74] By concluding that language is at the core of these issues, with its capacity for symbolic representation, for concealment and also for creative acts that develop a potential new reality (as in metaphor and in narrative), Ricœur offers a way to challenge analytical philosophy's desires to replicate reality accurately and to challenge structural linguistics analysis with hermeneutics. He hopes by this means to show that unearthing deep currents of meaning in text should not lead to suspicion that is an endpoint, but suspicion that leads us back up to the surface of the text with better understanding. However, we pay a price for this.

We create tensions in order to think more clearly; we tolerate the tension between the linguistic terms of a statement (structuralist issues), the tension between literal and metaphorical interpretation and the tension between being and not being; between 'is' and its negative 'is not'.[75] New conditions of possibility are created by these tensions, which make it possible to speculate about new ways of thinking. I speculate about the true relationship between two entities brought together violently by a metaphor. It is vital for Ricœur that similarity is emphasized more than difference by the metaphorical structure that insists, impertinently, on resemblance in the face of difference. Negatives can facilitate more open accommodation of the other person; you are different from me and that is a reaffirmation of me recognizing that I am *not you,* rather than me rejecting you. Metaphor contains a similar mechanism with its semantic impertinence. This technique is potentially more productive than the emphasis of difference, as overemphasis on difference can lead to the negativity Ricœur explored in depth in *Freedom and Nature.*

Narrative can make sense of the passing of time, time that is inscrutable and impossible to represent, using devices that resemble Aristotle's emplotment, and Ricœur creates a three-level model of *mimesis.* Most importantly, Ricœur goes on to investigate another possibility, finding meaning for our lives through our relationships with others, in *Oneself as Another*, "I can only understand myself by understanding how you are not me, and yet that you reflect me" (see chapter 8 of *Oneself as Another*). The shortest route to the self is the long detour through the other, and this will also take us into the realm of law, with *The Just.* In *Thinking Biblically* we see a further working out of the idea of the surplus of meaning; Biblical exegesis is seen as 'a world of discourse where the metaphorical language of poetry is the closest secular equivalent'.[76]

Ricœur also believes that history shows the insoluble problems at the core of this enterprise; historiography pushes emplotment close to breaking point and both history and the novel may no longer support our search for narrative meaning: 'In this period that some call postmodern, it may be that we no longer know what narrating means.'[77] Is this merely a loss of nerve that can be recovered or an impassable aporia? These tensions are as dangerous as they are creative and Ricœur sees that if we exercise our right to explore a plurality of interpretations, this may invite irrationality or simply be too complicated. Alternatively we may select negativity of a rigid suspicious sort, as we experience with prejudice, racism and other approaches that deny the other's similarities to us and reduce them to something inferior.

Conclusions

Towards the end of this period (1960s–1980s) Baudrillard will tell us soon that we have murdered the sign and meaning is gone. After their attacks on classical modes of thought in the 1960s, the four musketeers, as Dosse calls them (Lévi-Strauss, Barthes, Lacan and Foucault) still exert a powerful influence. Ricœur comments favourably on Foucault's discussion of decentring, according it a similar importance to the decentring of the thinking subject brought about by Marx, Freud and Nietzsche.[78] He also acknowledges the importance of Foucault's attempt to show the danger of allowing history to control historical memory, to which Ricœur will return in *Memory, History, Forgetting.*

Structuralism in France, having been spectacularly successful in the 1960s and later in influencing the *Annales* writing of modern history such as Ladurie's study of Montaillou, loses its impetus by the mid-1970s yet also continues to be influential through those who react against it, such as the post-structuralists. Barthes, Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault and Kristeva are often thought of as post-structuralist, yet this can be refuted, as a characteristic of post-structuralism is wariness about labelling. The 'author', whom Barthes and others had banished, is now back on the scene; in 1975 Barthes publishes *Roland Barthes on Roland Barthes,* discussing himself, even though in the third person. Ricœur has come to insist upon intersubjectivity and a dialogue between the writer and the reader.[79] Here the relationship between the two becomes in some respects like that of the individual who is trying to understand another person and Ricœur hopes that he can use Husserl's determination to see interactions between and among individuals in order to overcome Hegel's use of negativities. In addition, Kristeva's work on intertextuality and the new research on semiotics all add to the impression that structuralism can no longer hold in all the richness that is language, and meaning.[80]

Yet structuralism's deep scepticism about meaning still dominates the debate: if the meaning of the sign is ebbing away, there will soon be no meaningful link between cause and effect, between action and outcome. This is a long way from Husserl's work on the sign. Ricœur's suspicion is still present, he has freed it from hermeneutics and it seems to be constructive when working as a condition of possibility within three phenomena; the fecundity of metaphor, the power of narrative to shape time and the phenomenology of sign. We still have to think more about reality by using philosophy, and linguistic structures like metaphor, narrative and parable can help us, but they cannot do it for us. In Chapter 6 we look again at some of these texts and personalities: they are relevant to an understanding of the first of Ricœur's three methodological developments for facilitating clear perception and clear thinking. The first of these three methods is linguistic analysis.

Chapter 6

Linguistic analysis

'Consciousness is not a given but a task' and to this end Ricœur develops methodologies for helping us to puzzle out the way we think and act and how to do it better.[1] The next three chapters (6, 7 and 8) give detailed analyses of three major devices that Ricœur sees as offering a solution to the dilemma posed by the profusion of possibilities about what to believe, and he moves beyond the hermeneutics of suspicion; hermeneutics assumes that there is meaning to be found and that it is worth seeking even if our findings are provisional, yet suspicion doubts all that. Throughout his writing he developed methods for working systematically with the tension this creates and there are three major methodologies: linguistic analysis, methodological dialectics and philosophical anthropology. Ricœur's linguistic analysis arose from Kantian morality and Freudian hermeneutics; with the ideas of Saussure, Benveniste, Lévi-Strauss and others he develops his own version of linguistic structuralism and places more focus on the role of the reader who becomes an ethical agent by interpreting text. As Norris argues: 'Kant and Freud both maintain (unlike Foucault) an attitude of principled respect for the truth-telling virtues of enlightened thought, its capacity to bring forth redemptive self knowledge from the chaos of instinctual drives.'[2]

In this chapter I look at linguistic analysis, including metaphor, parable, narrative and translation. I show how important it is to understand the ethical demands that Ricœur places upon text, and suggest the way this also leads to the possibility of 'reading' action as if it were a sort of readable text. The common theme is the ethical responsibility that we bear as language users, and how he uses linguistic analysis to enable us to be responsible both as language users *and* language analysts. Does ethics control language or vice versa, or both and how does this fit with structuralism, post-structuralism, postmodernity and deconstruction? Unlike structuralists, Ricœur sees the relation between language and life as a dialectical one, because whereas signs (the word, the text) are not the centres of our perceptual experience, our motivation and actions are. He explores in *The Symbolism of Evil* how the sign is a symbol that gives rise to thought, not least because it has two conflicting meanings; defilement or stain becomes the symbolic representation for sin. Following from this book

Ricœur finds, through studying psychoanalysis, how symbolic meaning can deceive the censorship of the conscious mind (*Freud and Philosophy* and *The Conflict of Interpretations*). It is not only the unconscious that is creative, of course: with our conscious grasp of language we can make new and creative meanings, through tropes, as argued in *The Rule of Metaphor* and our all-pervading use of narrative provides structure and time management. Translation interests him constantly; as an active translator himself, he sees the mediating potential and also the inevitable failure of translation. This chapter samples his extensive work on Biblical exegesis too.

His early works on structuralism, discourse and narrative have influenced Ricœur's middle period works on language and late works on translation, and we will trace some of those connections. Thiselton considers that Ricœur's dedication to structuralism has impaired his theory on textuality by causing overemphasis on explanatory techniques within the text.[3] Ricœur clearly believes it is a risk that must be taken, as long as we articulate the internal consistency of structuralism: using structuralist methods to look at myth 'we can indeed say that we have explained a myth, but not that we have interpreted it.'[4] In *Interpretation Theory* for example, Ricœur recommends a dialectical balance between Explaining and Understanding, in which Explaining provides the best analytical distanciation that structural analysis can offer and Understanding provides the appropriation that allows us to 'translate' for ourselves a text that seemed 'foreign' and now has meaning to us.[5]

Ricœur expresses surprise in *Critique and Conviction* that it took him some years to understand how crucial this mediation is between the world and language, with the help of Iser and religious exegesis, and he returns finally to narrative.[6] He concludes that narrative *is* human action and that through use of narrative we can tell the difference between the time that we measure (psychical time) and huge unimaginable time spans (cosmological time). With its emphasis on the meaning of the other person, his work on translation is also analysed here (*On Translation*, and *Thinking Biblically*). We will also look briefly at his essay 'Violence and Language' in *Political and Social Essays* (1974 individual essays spanning 1956–1973).

Structuralism and linguistic analysis

Structuralism, the belief in the power of linguistic analysis to reveal the internal mechanisms of text without recourse to the author or the context, is still dominant when Ricœur begins this work, yet thinkers are also returning to their first inspiration. Foucault lectures in 1969 to the French Philosophical Society and asks 'what is an author?' paying tribute more to 'founders of discursivity' like Freud and Marx, than to individual thinkers, and noting a recursive loop; he notes that the linguists have returned to Saussure, Althusser has returned to

Marx and Lacan is returning to Freud, all within structuralism.[7] Foucault is perhaps more prescient than he knows; by the mid-1970s structuralism is irreparably weakened, although figures like Greimas, Genette and Todorov are still active. Saussure's followers (more 'continental') argued that the text refers only to itself, and Frege's followers (more analytical) argued that the need for concrete propositions will make it possible to relate the signifier to the signified: in relative terms Derrida was closer to Saussure than he was to Frege, whereas Ricœur draws eclectically from both and will argue that 'in hermeneutics there is no closed system of the universe of signs.'[8]

In attempting to create a language model that would facilitate development of a hermeneutic philosophy, Ricœur distinguishes between system (the structure) and discourse (the meaning), finding Saussure and his followers lacking (although vitally useful) through their focus on the word. Ricœur prefers Benveniste, for whom the sentence becomes more than part of a linguistic system and is thus a carrier of semantics, rather than a more formulaic semiotic of the sign.[9] As commented already, by looking to Frege, Ricœur concludes that a sentence has both an ideal (objective meaning: the impossible ideal of translation) and a real sense (what the writer means by it, in making connections with the real world: the compromise between two languages).[10] He also draws on the work of J. L. Austin (1911–1960), whose ordinary language philosophy shows the richness of daily language. He uses Austin's 'speech-act' distinctions: locutionary (the act of saying: putting syntax into place), illocutionary (what we do in saying: a request, an order, a statement) and perlocutionary (what we do by the fact that we speak: causing affective response, e.g. fear, joy). P. F. Strawson (1919–2006) and John R. Searle (1932–) also influence Ricœur.[11]

The text creates a world of its own, with the author as the skilled worker who has no ultimate control over his intended meaning or over his translator.[12] For Ricœur discourse is a textual event, longer than a sentence and part of a literary genre just as a parable is an integral part of the Bible and its traditions, for example. Translators from one language to another, and also within their own language must be aware of this.[13] Discourse also, he argues in an early short essay, 'Violence and language', bears 'the dialectic of meaning and violence'.[14] Ricœur received a medal for activities in the war but he fought because there seemed no alternative: in this context it is the mental and emotional violence of how we can distort our rhetoric, our political jargon and random personal comments that causes distress, not a call to arms such as that of Fanon and Sartre in *The Wretched of The Earth*. Narrative is a clear example of text as heuristic, something from which we can learn. Text is thus an ethical, developing identity and this absorbs Ricœur for its potential to create new possibilities, and also its capacity to infer causality where there may be none, as we see explored in 'Biblical Hermeneutics' (1975) and *Time and Narrative* and even more in *Memory, History, Forgetting*. All this work places language firmly in the realm of ethics; we should speak as we intend to act, we should act on our promises, we should recognize the violence latent in discourse and use translation to understand others and ourselves better.

Linguistic analysis must be set against Ricœur's Kantian involvement and also against his structuralist responses to language studies. First, Kant: the intellect cannot feel emotion and the senses cannot be rational, so where we bring thought and feeling together we will be transcending both. Therefore by definition we will be in neither place, but in some third place or even some in-between place: 'This schematism of our understanding with regard to appearances and their mere form is a hidden art in the depths of the human soul.'[15] Even if I reject the polarity of absolute idealism and radical empiricism, I acknowledge that there is the need to have categories and concepts, which I can use to order my intuitions and my perceptions: this will result in a third term that benefits from both abstract and grounded thinking. If we return to *Fallible Man*, we are reminded that for Kant this third term is arrived at by deliberately denying oneself a secure base in either camp, in order to reach this third transcending place, which is also fragile: 'The third term does not exist for itself, it completely exhausts itself in the act of constituting objectivity.'[16] For Ricœur there must also be self-consciousness, the vital state of mind for dealing with this. Such self-consciousness is missing from Kant with his epistemological interpretations of problems: as a thinking person who seeks to synthesize the very different tensions between understanding and sensibility, between meaning and appearance and between speaking and looking, I must be able to reflect self-consciously on what I am doing, because it is otherwise impossible to mediate between these two irreconcilable poles. It is this characteristic of the mediating power of humans to bring together, to unite the dialectical or the local with the universal, that makes us so much in need of language for thinking through this paradox. People, in all their humanity, with all their language skills, must be able to create the third term, which otherwise remains 'obscure, hidden and blind' in Kantian transcendental thinking.[17] This identification of the human potential to mediate between infinite and finite will find expression in Ricœur's work on metaphor, with a distinct Kantian flavour, and parable, dialectical debate and translation, and it is also the beginning of a philosophical anthropology. We will see later, in Chapter 8, how this takes us beyond our initial naivety and develops into *second naivety*.

Secondly, this discussion develops with Ricœur's responses to structuralism.[18] For Frege, notably, semantics is about language being subjected to propositional logic in which the opinions of interlocutors, their identities and their motives are irrelevant. This fascinates Ricœur, and is also inadequate: in his paper 'Biblical Hermeneutics' (1975), Ricœur expresses the desire to bring structural analysis and human motivation together, and this is because he wishes to use the structuralist tools of analysis and apply them to the task of analysing deeper meaning in texts. Ricœur finds it useful to reduce the authorial influence upon discourse, in order to analyse the text, but this is only a temporary measure and does not lead to extermination of the author. In literary cultural theory the death of the author turns out to have been temporary, although other potentially biographical markers, such as the context and history of a story often become irrelevant.[19] This is consistent with structural semiotics, the studies of signs in language, being frequently anti-historical in nature (although Genette later changed his approach). It's also hard to incorporate structural analysis into historico-literary criticism, so it forms only one aspect – but a vital one – of Ricœur's work on narrative. Ricœur analyses semiotics, the signs and symbols of language and their interpretation, like those of Russian formalists (Propp) and French structuralists (Greimas, Barthes), and also Biblical semioticists like Guettgemanns in Germany, and historians like Louis Marin in France. As Ricœur comments in *Critique and Conviction*, of all the members of the structuralist school, he had the most respect for Lévi-Strauss.

Metaphor

In the 1970s Ricœur developed various techniques, discussed in Chapter 7, such as Husserlian questioning back, discussed in Chapter 5, using a push-pull technique that mirrors his dialectical approach to philosophy; in this context he challenges the authors' right to have the last word on their text, by insisting upon a 'world in front of the text' that fuses the reader's response and the writer's intention. This 'world in front of the text' is also a way of explaining referentiality. On the other hand he also insists that the text is much more than the sum of its parts and contains the narrative form that is our attempt to make sense of the world as well as to create a coherent text. 'Critical reading plays the role of deconstruction' is his view in *Pretext*, in a rare use of the word deconstruction.[20] Somehow the will to power as manifest in the author's control and the reader's control, may develop into a more responsible intellectual dialogue. In order to understand how he offers us this, we need to understand the complex and fruitful relationship that he developed with structuralism, developing from Saussure. His work on metaphor led to work on parables.

Let us re-contextualize Ricœur's work on metaphor, before looking at parables. In the seventh study of *The Rule of Metaphor* Ricœur explores the idea that metaphor can redescribe the world we live in: metaphor has the capacity to destroy literal meaning and create the possibility of a new referent for the sentence. We know that much thinking, both scientific and other, is influenced by metaphor, as Hesse shows us (1966). Beardsley, Wheelwright, Black and Hesse all explore the potency of metaphor. For Ricœur;

> What is ultimately important in the text and in the world of art in general is not the object which it depicts but the world that it generates.[21]

He sees that 'Metaphor is more than just a trope, or rhetorical ornament.'[22] He believes that metaphor (A is B) is stronger than analogy (A is to B as C is to D). Most significantly he believes that metaphor helps the Kantian attempt to exercise belief in one's own being because of its creative potential. Metaphor develops and nurtures antinomies by partially conflating opposing forces, and thus the human imagination can use metaphor in order to transform problems into resolvable, or at least comprehensible forms.

Ricœur makes use of metaphor in his writing, of which I give here three examples. The first is a metaphor in the symmetrical form of analogy. This textual image from *Fallible Man* sums up his main starting point for that book;

> The fact that the self is at variance with itself is the indefeasible worm in the fruit of the immediate.[23]

Some of his metaphors are derived directly or indirectly from the classical world, steeped as he is in Plato, Aristotle and others, as shown in his discussion in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* of the intractable dangers of allowing research methodologies to overdetermine our interpretations of reality;

> Push the rock of Sisyphus up again, restore the ontological ground that methodology has eroded away.[24]

Thirdly, when describing our need to understand our historical inheritance in terms of Plato, Aristotle, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, he writes of the wreckage of their systems through which we now try to understand the 'debris and the offspring' of these wrecked systems and the tantalizing dreams these great philosophers brought to language.[25] There is a great deal at stake in the use of such tropes, because of the hermeneutics of suspicion and the scepticism applied to the importance of considering what we mean by real experience; there is the risk that we can let these ideas simply stay in the text, distinct and distant from our real world.[26] What do we do with these metaphors? How shall we know what sense to make of this rotten apple, Sisyphus' futile task, the cultural debris and these damaged dreams?

We will see clearly what is at stake here if we contrast the pleasure Ricœur takes in polysemy and semantic impertinence, with that of Paul De Man (1919–1983), a North American contemporary of Ricœur. De Man is sometimes called a post-structuralist, and in this context we take his strongly argued position that symbol and metaphor function like synecdoche i.e. they can only show the part of something as if it is the whole and therefore can never be effective in representing the real world in language. Norris describes De Man's study of Kant as a demanding and clever challenge to various figural tropes and substitutions of Kantian style that may both support and yet also weaken fatally Kant's 'workings to the point of absolute undecidability'. Norris contrasts this view with that of Ricœur, in one of his few discussions of Ricœur's work, and finds a 'positive or redemptive hermeneutic' in Ricœur, a facility 'to construct this reassuring narrative of obstacles surmounted through deeper understanding'. Ricœur's approach may appear conciliatory, but I propose that his philosophy is much closer to post-structuralist thinking than is immediately apparent, in its constant challenge to meaning. However, Norris is absolutely right to depict Ricœur as being fundamentally opposed to dead ends and as concerned to seek a way forward, believing text to be a reflection of the world in ways that can be emancipatory and hopeful, while at the same time being unstable and dangerous.[27]

Parable as metaphor

Parables may be more explicit and stable than metaphor, with their narrative features, and can provide us with a worked example of Ricœur's approach to linguistic analysis in the Biblical context. From his writing in the 1960s on Genesis came his adaptation of mainstream narrative theology and secular readings of the Bible. This is in stark contrast to Barth, whose more literalist theological work Ricœur followed for some years before becoming more interested in Bultmann's more interpretative approach. Parables cannot be analysed only using a system like that of Frege and clearly call for historic-literary criticism, Ricœur believes, because of their roots in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Parables also require more than structuralist analysis of their meaning, because of the way in which they mean something other than what they express on the surface. For Ricœur all language has the potential to be symbolic and calls for interpretation: the dynamic energy created by the tense relationship between different levels of meaning leads us from figurative expression to conceptual expression. In 'Biblical Hermeneutics' (1975) Ricœur uses his linguistic work on tropes to look at parables; he develops an analysis of narratives that shows analogies between metaphor and story structure. That which he calls semantic impertinence – the juxtaposition of similar yet very different concepts to create a metaphor – can be developed into structural impertinence, where plot and narrative are interrupted by the shock effect of incongruous events or endings, as in parables. This provides mechanisms for ethical use of language at a narrative level. Hillis Miller, with his work on tropes, parables and performatives, writes in *The Postmodern Bible Reader* that both secular (e.g. Kafka) and religious (e.g. Biblical) parables are 'about their own efficacy'. Miller cannot decide whether or how to keep secular and Biblical parables separate; Ricœur accepts the special cultural status of the Bible, yet also wishes to analyse the heuristic effects of Bible parables using structuralist techniques.[28]

We know from Chapter 5 that Ricœur finds enormous potential in the metaphor as a transformative force that can give us new ways of thinking. He transfers this to the parable, which is very important for his work on narrative. The parable, for Ricœur, is the conjunction of narrative form and metaphorical process, in its capacity to take a familiar phenomenon (in this case a story of ordinary people) and then shock the reader by inserting an apparently incongruous, extreme and often extraordinary plot device and/or ending. Ricœur writes in 'Biblical Hermeneutics' about the heuristic extravagance of the dénouement to many famous parables i.e. the incitement to the reader to think, what would I do? He asks who would really lavish such excessive rewards on the prodigal son for his wasted life, who would go out on the street and look for strangers as guests for a feast?[29] (He discusses also the paradoxical, contradictory or hyperbolic nature of a lot of Biblical language (the Kingdom of Heaven is /unattainable/ is nigh/ is among you).) He perceives these outrageous and often contradictory proclamations as designed to unsettle the reader, and force them to think more about the nature of their own lives. The incongruity resides in the abnormal solution to ordinary problems, and shows us the possibility of a different solution to the one we might think of. Parable has a metaphorical ability to show us narrative that initially does and ultimately does not resemble our lives – tension is created by the dissimilar in the similar.

Ricœur argues that this process allows us to transcend our daily lives and think about the contradictory nature of life, the possibilities of living differently and the resemblances between the likely and unlikely, that jolt our thinking about why we act in the ways that we do. To return to metaphor; time is neither an old man with a scythe, nor a winged chariot, and it is only because I know this that I can conjure up a new image of time that helps me make the most of the time I have. This is not 'trivial advice' and 'moral platitudes', but reference to bigger life phenomena, such as reversal; finding, losing, risking.[30] A parable is the conjunction of narrative form and a metaphorical process: if we call a narrative a parable we mean that the story refers to something other than what is told, it *stands for* something else. It tells a moral tale and it is part of a bigger whole, in this case the Bible.

So what is the referent, i.e. to what does the parable refer and by doing so, what is it that it transforms?[31] The parable creates tension between the insight displayed by the fiction and our ordinary way of looking at things.[32] Self-destruction of meaning by absurdity is in fact the reverse side of an innovation of meaning. Thus metaphorical interpretation gives rise to a reinterpretation of reality itself, in spite of and thanks to the abolition of the reference which corresponds to the literal interpretation of the statement. The outrageous plot creates ethical innovation, just as metaphor creates semantic innovation: this requires structural analysis in order to understand how the ethical message is created. Ricœur does not take account of the part played by the reader until *Time and Narrative*, at which point the reader becomes an agent of change and of moral judgment and the argument moves away from interpretation of text towards deeper issues regarding probity and credibility.

He finds structural analysis of language, in particular narrative, very useful, as he shows in *Time and Narrative*, particularly Book 2. Here he analyses Frank Kermode's concerns about 'The Sense of An Ending', the deliberate insecurity evoked by the chaotic structure of the modern novel and the need to make practical use of structural analyses of plot, yet without such analyses becoming a straitjacket that precludes discussions of meaning.[33] He focuses increasingly on the reader, and in *Time and Narrative* 3 the reader is given the responsibility of recording and mediating between Explaining and Understanding, which he analysed in *Interpretation Theory* ten years earlier. Explaining and Understanding are epistemological distinctions, which he uses as methodological devices, as we will see in Chapter 7. In echoing Thiselton's concerns we need to consider whether we as readers are able to combine Explaining and Understanding as Ricœur does; can we ever read in this way as well as he does, oscillating between explanatory, more fact-based reading, and interpretative, more holistic understanding? There is more discussion of *Time and Narrative* in Chapters 7 and 9.

From Text to Action (1986/1991)

In 'On Interpretation', the first essay of this collection called *From Text to Action*, and one designed by Ricœur to show how he has become more confidently hermeneutic than he was in, say, *The Conflict of Interpretations*, he analyses the Achilles heel of phenomenology. The great discovery of phenomenology is intentionality, i.e. to be aware *of something* that becomes more significant than one's consciousness of oneself. The problem arises in managing my awareness of what I think the sense of this perception is; what does it *mean* to be aware of this object, this person, this feeling? This involves precisely the sense of self-awareness that I have denied myself in attempting to focus on perception. He argues that phenomenology is thereby trapped in 'an infinite movement of "backward questioning" in which its project of radical self-grounding fades away', which however does not mean the project is illegitimate.[34] Husserl's vision of life is 'phenomenology's paradise lost' because I constantly deny myself the immediacy of being me, so as to try and be phenomenologically pure and this gives Husserl's work its 'tragic grandeur'.

Hermeneutics has been able to 'graft itself onto phenomenology' by asking a different question, namely, instead of, 'what *sense* do I get of this text?' hermeneutics asks 'what does it mean to understand?' In order to do this, hermeneutics offers a fundamentally different definition of what meaning is; meaning is never direct, only indirect, mediated by signs and symbols. This is a radical epistemological proposal that transforms our sense of reality. Such a challenge to knowledge is a deliberate distancing of the self from Husserl's use of reduction: he attempted to abstract the 'sense' we have of the world's phenomena from the conventional way of perceiving that is our sensory perception of our world. Hermeneutics denies the possibility of this and insists upon the mediating role of language in signs, in symbols, in putting desire into words (as we witness in Hegel and then in Freud).

Yet by the early 1970s Ricœur has decided that symbols are not the answer, precisely because of the very ambiguity of symbols, their double, or more, possibilities for interpretation. Text is the thing (soon to be set aside for study of the other person as a sensual sort of text, but Ricœur returns to written text with *Memory, History, Forgetting*). Discourse, in written text, has a threefold semantic autonomy: the speaker's intention, the reception of these ideas by the audience and the social and economic context of its production.[35] By presenting text as part of a complex and multifaceted whole, Ricœur believes that he has finally finished off the 'ideal of the subject's transparence to itself' that we have inherited from Descartes, and Fichte, and to an extent, Husserl. Neither the author nor the reader has the dominant interpretation of the relationship of the self to itself, yet nor can we eliminate either from this equation. The work of the text is now the task. Ricœur admits that the point of this is his belief that text is never there for its own sake; it always has a wider message for us, about a rather Heideggerean *Being-demanding-to-be-said*. This is his ontology; the foundation of his belief system is that we seek meaning and that it is worthwhile doing so, even though we will fail. Interpretation of meaning is the struggle and the hermeneutics of suspicion easily becomes too corrosive if the emphasis is on hermeneutics *and* suspicion. This is because suspicion becomes amplified by hermeneutics, which itself is a critique of critique and may increase the gap between the reader and the text such that scepticism and irony preclude a relationship between reader and text. Spinoza's proportionality is vital, to pre-empt excess, as in Othello's tragic love.

Translation as ethical activity

Ricœur's lifelong efforts as a linguist and translator provide us with another model for the text, the overriding moral importance of the interrelationship between writer and reader as interpreter-translator. He was preparing his own lectures in English from 1954 onwards, and working in several languages, yet he did not lecture until the 1990s about the act of translating and its implications (1997–1999), in the three lectures in *On Translation* and *From Interpretation to Translation* in his collaboration with LaCocque.[36] He argues that translation is always a possibility, as it was for the first Egyptologists, however remote cuneiform script seemed, and that this means a shared human belief that 'communication is possible.'[37] Translation is an ethical paradigm for Ricœur, involving translation from one language to another, and translation of meaning *within* one's own language. Work on Ricœur's model of translation should be understood in the wider context of his work: he argues that philosophy should adopt the paradigm of translation by mediating between conflicting versions of reality both within our own language and between languages. For most of his life he attempts to mediate between analytical philosophy and continental philosophy, and he also attempts to bring together disciplines such as history, psychoanalysis and literary theory.

Here his three late essays on translation will be contextualized within some of his major work, taking account of recurrent themes that include the following: various challenges to Descartes' attempt to show the cogito as a unifying power, phenomenology with its exploration of intentionality and hermeneutics, with its interpretative narratives about asymmetry, finitude and negativity. These characteristics of human life have their analogue in the difficult and imperfect process of translation. Ricœur's work also challenges the relationship between the speaking subject, the acting subject and the subject striving for identity. In these essays he pays tribute to Benjamin, von Humboldt, Schleiermacher and Steiner and many others. He concludes that 'misunderstanding is a right, that translation is theoretically impossible and that bilinguals have to be schizophrenics.'[38]

Tableaux Parisiens

His work on translation can be organized into three main areas of ethical and political investigation; first, translation is an ethical paradigm that we can see first in 'linguistic hospitality', the desire to take care of meanings different from our own. Secondly, translation is faithful acceptance of untranslatability and thirdly, translation is tolerance: what he calls 'asceticism in exerting power'. Attempting to be fair to the meaning in another language is a sort of holding back, an ability to see another person's point of view, and shows the political importance of this model, especially in the light of poor linguistic skills among many English and Americans. These models provide both a metaphor and a real mechanism for philosophy, for explaining oneself to the other person; a paradigm for tolerance. In order to achieve European integration he argues that three aspects must be addressed; translation, shared narrative and shared forgiveness of Europe's history. Translation facilitates 'linguistic hospitality'. Europeans should learn at least two languages, in order to satisfy the compulsion that he, perhaps rather optimistically, believes we feel to translate from another language and also within our own language.

Each of these three models is suffused with negativity and thereby becomes much more significant. Here Ricœur shows his debt to Benjamin's *The Task of the Translator* and the impossibility of 'the pure language . . . that every translation carries within itself as its messianic echo'.[39] Ricœur uses psychoanalysis, for example, to explain how the translator suffers through remembering the original and through mourning the impossibility of a perfect translation. This is an aspect of the negativity and early phenomenological problems of intersubjectivity that Ricœur has explored from the 1950s onwards. Negativity is denied by Husserlian phenomenology, explored confidently by Hegel (who thought, mistakenly, that he could disarm negativity by embracing it) and it becomes a constant companion in Ricœur's philosophy.[40] We see it in translation as a form of interpretation between two languages, which, if consciously developed, can show us how to forgive other people for not being like us, for being different. We often use negative forms to define ourselves ('I am not a foreigner here') and yet negation slips easily into negativity, becoming denial of intersubjectivity, of the other's right to exist on their own terms, because it evokes negativity ('a foreigner is not as good as a person like me'). When we transcend these negative moments, Kearney shows us how an ethics of justice is touched by an ethics of pardon, without either replacing the other.[41]

Over the years Ricœur tackles this problem of our reaction to other minds by resisting negation, resisting denial of the value of difference by using translation. This takes several forms. We can do it historically, bearing witness to the historical meaning of words and the reception history of texts (the *Wirkungsgeschichte*), which he discusses in *Time and Narrative*, in *Memory, History, Forgetting* and in *The Course of Recognition*. Faith plays a vital role here. In *Thinking Biblically* he and LaCocque explore the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the Bible, and the debate about the impossibility of understanding how to describe God in Genesis 3:14. In *Figuring the Sacred* he asserts that faith can only continue to grow and change with constantly renewed hermeneutical interpretation of texts.[42] In *On Translation* and in his essays about tolerance and about Europe, we find language for overcoming negativity about interfaith and intercultural differences, and Kearney emphasizes Ricœur's hermeneutic of translation, by means of which the translator returns changed and enriched from engaging with the other.[43]

To this end Ricœur insists upon responsible ownership of language, and translation, interpretation of one's own behaviour as an ethical act although the surplus of meaning will always entail imperfect stewardship. He sees our use of language as an act we should attempt to control, as in Austin's *How To Do Things With Words*, which demonstrates the sophistication of daily language and eschews the use of logic to analyse its patterns.[44] Ricœur rejects what he calls the 'agentless semantic of action' that he sees in Davidson's analysis of language as separate from action.[45] His later work shows translation as a rich source of responsible action towards others. He attributes to others, perhaps unrealistically, his own desire and need to translate from another language and he draws on his knowledge of translation and of psychoanalysis to explain the intensity of the enterprise. If I am translating I meet resistance from the text, yet I remember that original perfect meaning and am thus plagued by remembering. As if the text were a patient in psychoanalysis, it resists my attempts to render its meaning good in another language. As in psychoanalysis, mourning inevitably takes place, because the translator mourns the inevitable loss of something during translation and has to grudgingly accept that there must be acknowledgement of deficiency. This, again, resonates with Ricœur's philosophy of tolerance; acceptance of imperfection, of negative elements and of limits to totalizing success, in a determination to face up to a life without absolutes.

Ricœur detects cultural and historical possibilities for translation between spheres of interest as well as between languages. His co-authorship with LaCocque of *Thinking Biblically* is a good example of his constant travelling backwards and forwards between the discourses of theology and secular philosophy, in order to 'translate' between them.[46] *Thinking Biblically* shows the extraordinary range of Ricœur's scholarship and provides a strong example of translating from another language as an ethical paradigm, especially in the chapter entitled 'From Interpretation to Translation'. Here Ricœur argues that all translation is immediately an interpretation as there is never an innocent translation: he believes this is true of all exegetes of the Bible, who have to take account of the history of all translation – a view which has led to criticism of Ricœur from Woltersdorff and Thiselton among others, as discussed by Simms.[47] Ricœur provides detailed analyses of the many languages that have contributed to the Bible: ancient Greek, Latin and Hebrew, scholastic use of European languages, the medieval renaissance of the Greek and Latin writers, up to Kant's approach in German, and to the modern vernaculars. Ricœur analyses the richness of the ancient Hebrew used in Exodus 3:14 (the passage often known as 'The Revelation of The Name'). Exodus 3:14 cannot be translated without the idea of the verb form 'being': there is a 'gap in meaning' in the verse, that we should accept and relish.

Mind the gap

The cultural, spiritual and theological aspects of this debate about translation should remind us that the original rich Hebrew naming of God is deliberately *incomprehensible*, to reflect the ineffability of God. It cannot be conveyed by, for example, modern German scholars using translations based on 'the Being', such as *Der Seiende, das ewige Wesen* and *der ICH BIN DA*.[48] Their efforts to bridge the gap fail and yet still also represent a search for permutation on the original root which is 'being' and Ricœur invites us to accept the polysemy, the multiple possibilities of different meanings 'at the bounds of every translation'.[49] Polysemy is a key element to his theory of a surplus of meaning that makes a sort of translation necessary *within* our own language – if we are to understand and tolerate each other's differences.[50] In translating he shows us that the only way in which the translator can achieve satisfaction as a translator is in accepting the untranslatability, the irrefutable otherness of the other text, and, by implication, the otherness of the other person. He calls this state of mind 'linguistic hospitality', in which the translator and the translated are able to cohabit and agree to be different.[51] This is an ethical obligation that resembles and must be part of the idea of universal hospitality: in *Critique and Conviction* Ricœur argues in favour of Kant's Perpetual Peace. He sees universal hospitality as being an example of a universal idea in a regulative sense.[52]

Of course for Ricœur it is again and always *the untranslatable* that is vitally important; not out of a decision *not* to act because intimidated by choice, but because it is in the gap, the tension created between options, the place where multiple meaning flourishes, that we can often discern the real.[53] However the translator does not say 'this is not worthwhile, I don't care', but instead tries and tries again, accepting partial success in the ultimate untranslatability of some of the meaning; this is the other half of the act of communicating. This approach contrasts with the kind of radical decisionism espoused by late Derrida and others, whereby decisions are made because the will is there to seek an outcome, and an element of arbitrariness may be inevitable. Ricœur resists this, hoping for principled compromise.[54]

The messy yet ethically accommodating agreement to compromise is compatible with many of Ricœur's debates as early as *Fallible Man*, and moving towards the hermeneutics of suspicion; my emotions are the site not only for feelings but also for all masks, dissimulations and mystifications, and where my emotions are, is also where questioning must take place as a vital yet corrosive process of challenging. Being suspicious is a necessary risk.[55] Ricœur also comments that we knew this through La Rochefoucauld, long before Freud and Nietzsche. We stumble on the road of suspicion in trying to find better meaning by using our feelings, in an attempt to respond to the challenges of distance created by doubt and suspicion, and to the need for empathy and affiliation with our own mental and emotional workings. Suspicion has to have some sort of mechanism for resolving itself, if hermeneutics is too potent a method. In due course Ricœur develops other mechanisms e.g. Explaining and Understanding, and highlights the tension between analytical philosophy and continental approaches, between structuralism and hermeneutics. If the quickest way to the self is through the other, as argued in *Oneself as Another* (see Chapter 8), then through translation we can learn how to work with negation textually and go beyond it to affirmation of difference.

Ricœur uses the Hegelian idea of distance to develop its correlate, the concept of appropriation (*Aneignung*). This enables readers to follow the 'direction' – *sens* – as well as meaning – *sens* – (sense) and thereby distance themselves and also draw closer to the meaning of the text.[56] This distancing and drawing near creates a gap in which the tension can tighten between my language and the other language, in which more than one interpretation can coexist while I attempt to resolve the tension, and possibly concede untranslatability as well as the ineffable asymmetry of humanity.[57] The dialogic nature of this tensile, fragile state is much more productive for Ricœur than what he sees as the Kantian monologic debate about ethics. In his last work *The Course of Recognition* Ricœur explores the ways in which we give each other credibility through recognition and challenges Hegel's apparent failure to show why misrecognition is wrong, as Pellauer comments.[58] With translation we have a conversation based on mutual recognition; faulty, lopsided, yet two-way.

It is never possible to feel a Cartesian unity of self that resembles the strong individual we would like to be, so Ricœur offers us his work on translation instead. For him this epitomizes our often schizophrenic states of mind: how can I think me and think another person too? This is part of the approach that he recommends in *The Course of Recognition* to understand ourselves by choosing to face negativity through the linguistic identities of others. He offers us various paradigms, including phenomenology reworked to take account of negativity; the dialogic binary elements that dominate our thinking (good: evil; black: white; finite: infinite etc.); the inexpressible contained in discourse and the ineffable spirituality held in YHWH the Tetragrammaton that is deliberately unpronounceable because we cannot dare to say the word that is God. Of paramount importance to Ricœur is how we will respond to negative hesitancy resulting from incomprehension, doubt and fear of the unknown, trying to become capable while always being fallible. The reader has both to mind the gap and make something of it.

The reader and the narrative text

'Reading is, first and foremost, a struggle with the text', not a 'fallacious recapitulation and identification' such as that found in *Don Quixote* and *Emma Bovary*, the eponymous protagonists who Ricœur describes as 'victims of reading, trying to live their reading directly'.[59] Structuralism helps us to avoid these excesses, yet we need to go beyond structural analysis, to a model that facilitates reference between the reader, the reading and the world of the reader. In *Critique and Conviction* Ricœur discusses the role of the reader, which he failed to address in *The Rule of Metaphor* although he had hinted at it by dealing with 'metaphorical reference', i.e. what capacity does language possess to re-organize the reader's experience?[60] He concludes that the creation of metaphor, and of parable, can re-order the way we experience life, because of the different way of seeing made possible by the metaphor. But the role of the reader is absent from *The Rule of Metaphor*. He believes he has analysed the role of the reader in the first two volumes of *Time and Narrative* through 'configuration' i.e. narrative processes at work within language, that develop characters and plots.

There are three fields of configuration: first there is *mimesis* (1–3, i.e. imitation, reconstruction and 'transformative capacity of experience'), secondly history and thirdly fiction. Only in Book Three of *Time and Narrative* does he feel he deals with redirection and reconstruction of meaning i.e. 'refiguration', and achieves this by looking at the highly controversial subject of language's capacity to restructure experience and 'produce a new manner of living in the world'.[61] Being influenced by a metaphor will usually not be a result of conscious linguistic analysis, and Ricœur sees the role for such analysis as being overplayed by structuralists, although it may have advantages analogous to those of analysing music.[62] By the 1990s he is using a very broad spectrum of texts, as we see when he censures the dangerous 'instrumentalisation of language' and hopes that 'poetry is play'.[63]

Vandevelde argues that Ricœur's emphasis on narrative, discourse and language provides a rare point of encounter between different types of philosophy: Heidegger, Gadamer, deconstruction, postmodernism, French and American literary criticism and a brand of analytic philosophy.[64] If things as they are cannot be understood directly, but only through mediation of narrative, linguistic, discursive devices, then Ricœur is the one to achieve such mediation. Ricœur himself invites analytical philosophers to become engaged in hermeneutical philosophy, and in Chapter 7 this attempt to create discussion between continental and analytic approaches to philosophy will be contextualized within his methodologies.

Ricœur's intellectual engagement with many philosophical, historiographical, psychological and literary figures takes place alongside a struggle with structuralism that we have discussed already: structuralism creates methodological energy and occasionally the friction bursts into major philosophical debate. Arguing that diversity of texts ranges between two poles i.e. that of 'servile repetition and calculated deviance', Ricœur sees 'popular stories, myths, traditional narratives in general' as more favoured by structuralism because they 'stay closer to the pole of repetition' and can therefore more easily be dissected than, for example, the modern novel.[65] We see his interest in disturbance of language patterns in his work on violence and language, a link that threatens the pact between reader and author.

'Violence and Language'

In his 1967 essay 'Violence and Language' (1974), Ricœur shows us how to understand that language and violence should be, and theoretically are, opposed to each other and yet in reality can never be, as he experienced during the Nanterre revolts.[66] We should always argue that violence and language are opposed, even when we know this cannot be maintained in every situation. By contrast, Barthes announced that language is fascist. The truth is that violence and language *are* opposed, and it is precisely this opposition that gives each of them their identity, but it does not stop them entering each other's realm. This cross-fertilization can be good or not; a violence that speaks its name is already attempting to negate itself as violence and this can lead to conciliation or to even greater injustice, as we see with the tyranny of propaganda and the words and phrases that formulate and mobilize hate, discussed in *Ideology and Utopia*.

However, it is even worse to seek to exclude from debate the person, the potentially violent subject, which we all are. Ricœur argues that this is the fundamental danger of structural analysis, which parenthesises the human subject. By putting the subject between brackets (and here Ricœur is also criticizing

Husserlian phenomenology) the act of understanding fails to give meaning to itself and thus 'is a dead intelligence, a separated intelligence'. If the subject – the person – is 'evacuated from its field of investigation' then we have an instrumental, senseless affirmation of the human potential for violence, because our will becomes excluded, unaccountable and thereby potentially omnipotent: 'Instrumental intelligence and senseless existence are the twin orphans of the death of meaning.'[67] This theme is taken up again in his 1996 essay 'The Erosion of Tolerance and the Resistance of the Intolerable', where Ricœur shows us the violence of indifference, through our deliberate refusal to mediate meaning or to use our skills of translation between people who are different.[68] Moreover 'the more our action becomes precise and technical, the more its goals become remote and elusive', in denial of polysemy and multiple meanings through technical language.[69] The 'multiplicity, diversity and hierarchy of languages' must be protected by responsible use.[70]

Conclusions

Ricœur makes use of the organizing energy of structuralism, psychoanalysis and methodologism and wages battle against their deterministic streak, while taking from them what he wants. He has a rule of conduct, namely that 'A text is a space of variations that has its own constraints; and in order to choose a different interpretation, we must always have better reasons.'[71] This would clarify the common and current concern about relativism as a result of entertaining the possibility of different interpretations. For Ricœur there are only certain possibilities in a text, so not *any* interpretation will do, although Robinson is not convinced.[72]

Ricœur gives us a clear example of a breach of this rule when he returns briefly to the 'hermeneutics of suspicion' (his inverted commas), to discuss philosophical and Biblical exegesis, in *From Text to Action.* He recommends serious consideration of Marx's, Nietzsche's and Freud's critique of religion, while warning us that their arguments are in fact not hermeneutic, they are 'the critique of ideology, the critique of other worlds and the critique of illusions'.[73] By this he means that they stood outside religion and looked in, and for him this meant that they criticized from too great a distance to have any sense of real understanding. Another example is demonstrated by the value of breaking the rule, as the masters of suspicion do; they insist on disrupting the rules of subject-object dualism, which is vital but risky. I do not believe that this resembles a Wittgensteinian justification for relativism; on the contrary it is a reminder of the need to get inside an argument, understand it fully from close up (appropriation) and attack it (distanciation) by standing back, yet from inside its own structures. Being inside presupposes for Ricœur some element of belief: in order to understand, we need to believe that we can make sense. Their approach manifests suspicion that was not well used, because it was not contained within a desire to find meaning in language, to make some sense. The backwards and forwards between distanciation and appropriation is vital if a person is to be able to do justice to the ambiguous and ambivalent complexities of all human phenomena.

The hermeneutics of suspicion can deter us from such engagement with language, because it invites us to doubt the thought processes of both the reader and the writer. Suspicion can be revelatory, but it can also be disabling, particularly if taken in conjunction with a cultural theory that takes scepticism as a clever tool for reducing the range of options about what we allow ourselves to think about. As we will see in Chapter 8, it is the capacity of suspicion to lead us towards attestation, assertion of the will to try and do good after seeing how difficult that is, that is more useful to Ricœur.

There is a lot of work here on the push and pull in linguistic analysis between distance and closeness, within language, between languages, between the text and the world, between violence and language and between the reader and the writer. Ricœur comes back repeatedly to time and narrative. Time will always generate problems; 'a gathering moment where expectation, memory and present experience coincide' combining Aristotle's physics and Augustine's psychology.[74] The time of narrative is a sort of third time, different from the physical, cosmological time and also different from mental, psychical, phenomenological time. Thus narrative holds a new interest for Ricœur, i.e. narrative identity that is created for both the characters in the story and the readers. In the Gifford lectures that became *Oneself as Another* he seeks to develop *Time and Narrative* further in order to connect the ethical problem of responsibility to the narrative structure of the person; 'the unity of a life is the unity of a told story.'[75] Yet he knows that time is not accounted for fully by narrative.

The passion he has as a translator and interpreter stays with him, as shown in the introductory sections to *Oneself as Another*, *Memory, History, Forgetting* and *The Curse of Recognition*. Linguistic analysis can help us to manage the naivety, the 'first naivety' that we bring to our world, as we attempt to make sense of it through language. One of the first significant tests of this method is our response to issues of asymmetry and space created by our fallibility and our tendency to negativity, in which to agree to be different, even to disagree with oneself: can we allow such personal uncertainty? In the next chapter we need to consider his methodological dialectics, to see whether we can use language critically, suspiciously and productively, before we look at his work on philosophical anthropology in the hope of seeing there an opportunity for second naivety.

Chapter 7

Methodological dialectics

An integral component in human thought seems to be our capacity to think in opposites: subject and object, love and hate, trust and mistrust, male and female, religion and secularism. This easily becomes a form of dualism, in which each pole is characterized by its difference from the other, which may be chosen as a counterpart for a variety of possibly irrational and certainly complex cultural, ethical and historical reasons. Structuralism saw this as a feature of text, with genre or period dualisms such as Enlightenment/ Romantic. Derrida adopts a similar device, except that he asserts and then denounces the fact that one of each pair is privileged, oppressing the other and yet symbiotically connected to it, as with Hegel's Master-Slave relationship. This lopsided pairing came to be seen as characteristic of post-structuralism, a term that is difficult to define partly because one of its major tenets is its irreducibility to categories. Derrida, Foucault, Barthes, Kristeva and Deleuze are often thought of as post-structuralist.

For the purposes of studying Ricœur, dualism goes beyond text: dualism is a key feature of the way we think, and Ricœur develops it into a method, the second of the three techniques in this suite of three chapters (6, 7 and 8). Taken at its most reduced level, Ricœur's method can usually be traced to the influence of Hegel's dialectical opposition. Yet its core is Kant's analysis of antinomies; these are dogmatic or sceptical polarities inherent to reason, which must be critically tackled without any hope of resolution. Ricœur often takes two dissimilar, usually opposed ideas, concepts or phenomena and characterizes them as similar to each other after all, then emphasizes how they are nevertheless opposed to each other, returns to their similarities to each other and finally goes beyond both ideas to find a third place, assuming the worth of some sort of mixing and matching so that we can make something new and hopefully *better*, out of the process.[1] In order to show the development of Ricœur's dialectical methods, this chapter will demonstrate five broad phases in his life's work, and will also focus on *The Course of Recognition*, while Chapter 9 is dedicated to *Memory, History, Forgetting*, as well as discussing *The Course of Recognition* to a lesser extent.

The opposition of freedom and nature creates one of the most significant pairings of opposing forces in philosophy. Ricœur sees this in Aristotle as a dichotomy, in Kant as an antinomy and in Hegel as a dialectic. Whereas Hegel envisaged an absolute reconciliation of opposites in due course, this was never how Ricœur understood the situation, and that is one reason why he refers to himself as a post-Hegelian Kantian. Pellauer provides a useful definition 'he (Ricœur) wishes to allow for a temporalized version of something like a Kantian model of reasoning, one that might reflect something such as Hegel's Phenomenology but without a Hegelian claim to attain absolute knowledge.'[2] More broadly, Ricœur relies upon the idea that we cannot understand anything without comparing it to something else and that there must be some similarity that permits dialogue, as with the metaphor in which semantic impertinence is only possible so long as there exists some agreed similarity. Metaphor 'overtly presents in the form of a conflict between sameness and difference the process which is covertly at work in the construction of all semantic fields, that is, the kinship which brings individuals under the rule of a logical class'.[3] We will see how he selects dyads that have some common ground. If we embark on this zig zag back and forth across the gap between opposed yet related phenomena, he invites us to delay our decision-making for as long as possible and also to use the hiatus created by that delay for exploring the states of indecision and the possibilities of premature closure which are revealed to us. That is to say, he introduces temporality into the relationship. The tension is not only dialectical in the sense of oppositional; it is also dialectical through the enormity of having to decide what 'better' means. This starts with negation (this is this, not that) and Ricœur develops techniques to help us make measured decisions, which avoids pushing negation into the more judgemental negativity, discussed phenomenologically in *History and Truth* and to which he returns in *The Course of Recognition*.

Defining terms

It is necessary to define terms: 'methodology' is the discussion around the use of methods; methodology helps me to decide which methods to use. For Ricœur methodology must include discussion of a phenomenon that he sees as a great danger: there is danger in adopting any particular method, because it can dominate the exploratory process, instead of serving as a toolbox to support our thinking. In *Freedom and Nature* he gives an early example, suggesting how psychology has led to a method of 'building man up like a house', starting with involuntary needs and adding the will as a higher layer – ignoring the possibility that the will may already be an integral part of the involuntary.[4] He warns us of this danger with his metaphor about trying to restore the possibility of deep understanding about ourselves that methodology has eroded away and simplified, likening our real situation to the impossible task facing Sisyphus.[5] Psychology turns 'acts into facts' and provides laws that predict how I will perceive things; this makes me a slave to the object by turning my actions into objects, instead of the more eidetic, visualizing attempt to become open to the possibilities of attending to many objects, i.e. many possibilities.

The other key term here is dialectical: by dialectical Ricœur means that our existence is shaped by polarities and also that we must seek to resolve them by incorporating previous contradictions from each extreme into new ways of thinking. This will not necessarily provide solutions that arrive somewhere in the middle between two opposites, but can guide us in incorporating features that are common to both extremes and in making something new, viable and ethically robust; a third position. In this sense the method of dialectical thinking can serve hermeneutics and structural analysis of language. Dialectics can help us to grapple with existing dualisms such as Subject-Object or body-soul, and it can also help us to identify and juggle with new pairings such as phenomenology-psychoanalysis or Explaining-Understanding, which I will demonstrate in this chapter. Dialectics can also provide ways of thinking that facilitate extended debates such as the ones that Ricœur developed over several decades in his various permutations of existentialism, phenomenology and hermeneutics. Thus he opposes and also brings together rational analytic philosophy and the continental tradition. Ricœur is steadfastly Kantian in his application of dialectics as a method, showing that Kant is not only concerned about analytical evil i.e. reduction to totalizing 'truths', but also dialectical; 'Truly human evil concerns premature syntheses, violent syntheses, short circuits in the totality.'[6] Space must be created to pre-empt such violence.

In this chapter I hope to show that his methods create such a space, a hiatus of undecidedness, which is non-dualistic and self-questioning, revelling in the incompatibility of different approaches. They even resemble, on occasion, a *reductio ad absurdum* approach in which he urges us to use philosophical language to challenge philosophy itself, and even invites the reader to relinquish all views, even if only temporarily. Pervasive in all this is the Cartesian subject-object dualism that Ricœur wishes to displace from its central position in Western thought. Marx, Freud and Nietzsche are helpful to Ricœur in this regard, as they assault the Cartesian belief that we know what we think – Ricœur describes this as embarrassing because the thinking of the masters of suspicion involves rules of the game that are not part of the conflict itself, yet he appears to find this liberating as it forces the engendering of more clarity about differences. This can become a critique of reflection as a means to self-knowledge. Such a profound attack on the foundations of knowing ourselves is immensely productive for Ricœur and, he believes, for the development of hermeneutics in helping us to face ourselves, and accept provisional truths.

Ricœur uses a blend of phenomenological and hermeneutic method to develop this challenge to the self. This develops suspicion as one aspect of what Anderson calls Ricœur's dual-aspect human; both rational and sensual, both active and passive.[7] In this process the hermeneutics of suspicion, a particularly astringent form of hermeneutics, will be harsh on phenomenology; Husserl's self does not really know itself, despite gargantuan effort, but in the process should come to some better self-understanding. Thus direct, naïve first self-knowledge will be challenged by the hermeneutics of suspicion. We know, however, that he discards the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' once he has identified the challenge posed by Marx, Nietzsche and Freud and used its insolubility as a spur.

I will argue that when suspicion is part of the hermeneutics of suspicion, it becomes a limit idea (a limitation beyond which we cannot think, although we know the barrier is there) and that Ricœur rejects this use of suspicion, as it risks restraining our creative potential by undermining arguments so they cannot be worked with. He takes suspicion more as a condition of possibility for belief and critique. He actually develops a centre between dialectical poles that creates time and space for decision-making, which he believes must be used in a balanced way, appropriate to the purpose, not too much nor too little. In *Critique and Conviction* Ricœur expresses his concern that it is always difficult to know whether it is possible to develop a third position that is workable, 'capable of holding the road' whereas Derrida concluded that we cannot escape from the binaries that haunt our thought.[8] In order to chart the development of Ricœur's dialectical methods, I propose five broad phases, presented chronologically and with the focus on features that I consider to be significant, although there is of course a great deal of overlap and omission.

PHASE ONE: Phenomenology 1930s–1960s

Ricœur's early period, as he describes it in *Critique and Conviction* (and this title itself testifies to a dialectical tension) contains several significant pairs of concepts that he sees as dialectical, leading to 'subtle blending'. On the way to the subtle and provisional blending there is tension, often creating 'an inner conflict which was exacerbated to the point of threatening to rupture the double allegiance to which, ultimately, I remained faithful'.[9] Here he is describing the tension created in post-war continental theology between the anti-philosophical Biblical readings of Karl Barth (1886–1968), whose writings (such as *Church Dogmatics*) ensure that God is 'other' and humanism is a contaminant of Biblical understanding, and the religious philosophy of Bergson (1859–1941), with his influential concept of multiplicity and his two sources of morality and religion.

Detour/return is the rhythm of my philosophical respiration[10]

Marcel's influence on Ricœur is great and enduring: his existentialism emphasizes the acting subject, one who analyses his actions by primary reflection and learns subsequently after such self-critique to use secondary, deeper reflection for guiding better actions.[11] Husserlian phenomenology insists on proceeding by way of the object, i.e. being self-conscious yet in an idealist way; Marcel acts as a corrective to this with his more existentialist expectations, and also with a faith-based approach that is different again from that of Husserl. The self must see itself both as a lived body and also stand back and see itself as an object to be regarded more critically than usual. This leads to distanciation, a detour as a characteristic turn of thought that shows the influence of Marcel on Ricœur. Phenomenology helps us to describe the world for ourselves, ideally by bracketing the unimportant and thus freeing the mind to appreciate what is important – the hardest thing for Husserl was to try and establish what is important. The benefit of Husserl here is that his bracketing enables Ricœur to take longer over the 'detour and return' than Marcel, characteristically impatient.

It is vital to understand this oscillating provisionality that characterizes Ricœur's philosophical work: in his early text, *Fallible Man*, Ricœur confronts the contradictions that characterize the human condition, embodying them in polarities like mind-body dualism, the existence of good and evil, values and facts, the finite and the infinite, the real and the ideal, free will and necessity, despair and hope. He makes explicit the tension between such polarities and, at the most intense point of dispute, attempts a reconciliation that is dialectical in character. Ihde analyses the way in which Ricœur establishes limits to phenomenology: he uses Kantian phenomenology of judgement (moral frameworks) to limit the Husserlian phenomenology of representationalism (perceptual consciousness). By seeking limits to Husserl, he also finds limitations in Kant. Ricœur hopes to find 'what justifies and founds a method'.[12] There is some similarity between Hegel and Ricœur in this use of opposing poles that strive to come to some resolution. There is a sequence in the early works: *Freedom and Nature* has an implicit third term (judgement about evil is suspended), *Fallible Man* is explicit in the possibility of evil, and in *Fallible Man* the third term is a limit idea; we limit our potential for evil actions. Ihde argues that the third term, the struggle with a postponed synthesis and the origin of the problem of hermeneutics, are all one and the same problem.[13] I suggest they are related but would not wish to conflate them.

It is necessary to avoid premature closure; mid-1950s

Methodological dialectics appear explicitly in *History and Truth* where Ricœur divides the essays into a methodological and an ethical section. The methodological involves the historian's craft, tension between objectivity and the philosophical-theological problem of the ultimate importance of history.[14] The second section is ethical; a critique of civilization, what he calls a political pedagogy and which later becomes a philosophical anthropology – big issues that he investigates later in *Time and Narrative* and in *Memory, History, Forgetting* and in *The Course of Recognition.* In *History and Truth* he shows us that method in its search for facts and ethics in its search for moral outcomes cannot, must not, be separated.[15] Thus he rejects the dichotomy between uncommitted thought (collecting facts, epistemological investigation) and committed thought (ethical endeavour). This is an early form of his work on Explaining and Understanding, which follows a similar pattern. Ricœur argues for reflective thought as a great tool for generating action, as for example in the ancient Greek contemplation of nature that led to scientific discoveries. He pleads for the dialectic between language and action to result in action, work, effort.[16]

In *History and Truth* he presents a clear description of the way he works; each of the essays in that anthology, he argues, strives desperately to reconcile opposing positions (be it in methodological or ethico-cultural analysis). Yet his arguments also display an 'empathetic distrust of premature solutions'. He describes his anatomy of judgement by showing how he uses oppositions of words in pairs, to create this tension and sustain it for as long as possible, in order eventually to attain a 'point of unresolved tension'. This is in effect a risky and surprisingly non-dualist position, as the outcome of a dualist positing of the initial Kantian antinomies. The pairs he cites are 'work: speech', 'Socius: neighbour', 'progressionist violence: non-violent resistance' and finally 'history of philosophy: history of philosophies'.[17] This pairing is one of the methods he uses in order to avoid the 'scepticism which refuses to look for meaning'; and 'the fanaticism which declares meaning prematurely', by creating places in the text he writes that invite us to 'go beyond the very thing that one understands'. We can add to this the East:West debate in the manner of Huntington's purported clash of civilizations, and Sen's measured response.[18] I believe that after the failure of Marxism as a system counter to capitalism, we may argue that those who insist upon building systems have chosen the East:West differences to create suspicion between peoples. Taking action to use the suspicion proportionately to personal experience and positively is vitally important, as I found when serving on the committee for the Siddiqui Report on *Islam in Universities in England.*[19] For Ricœur, this process offers a more organized reflection, with its carefully choreographed balancing act between, for example suspicion and trust, than his earlier phenomenological pure reflection, which lacked this patterning, this deliberately unresolved and potentially productive dialectical tension between differences.

PHASE TWO: Hermeneutics and the linguistic turn: 1960s–1970s

This is covered in some detail in Chapter 5. Ricœur has used Husserlian distanciation to try and see clearly how we think about our willpower and our capacity to take action: how does our intention to perceive something in a certain way affect our understanding? For example, the decision to perceive the wearing of a headscarf as oppressive may render it impossible for us to see the uncovering of the Western woman as possibly another type of oppression. Now Ricœur applies distanciation to phenomenology itself, critical of its dependence on visualization: to continue the above example, language will be necessary to develop this debate about clothing. He moves into hermeneutics and this is his linguistic turn.

Hermeneutics, as the analysis of meaning in texts, and seeing actions as readable, like narrative texts, can liberate phenomenology: if we think phenomenologically, we constantly strive to avoid self-absorption in the subject-object relationship that we have with our world. I am a subject, but I am also some else's object, and Heidegger's idea of *Sorge,* denoting care for our being, our surroundings and for our daily contacts, provides a way of understanding our concerned participation in the world in a much less self-conscious manner than that of phenomenology. Ricœur decides that Heidegger's approach to this provides liberation from phenomenology, but is too quick and easy to be a longer-term solution. Ricœur incorporates Freudian 'archaeology' (looking into one's past to understand present motivations) within a larger Hegelian teleology (an individual prospective ethics as well as looking forward to prepare for the development of history), and advises us to reject both, while treating each as one pole of a dialectical pair.[20]

Ricœur's 1971 essay 'The Model of the Text' creates a form of intertextuality between actions and text.[21] He shows the vital importance of language for understanding our actions and the need to use linguistic analysis: metaphor, parable and narrative. His work on metaphor shows the dialectical nature of metaphor. In Chapters 4 and 5 we see the ways in which similar yet significantly different terms can trigger a new idea, even in well-worn images such as 'time flies.' The parable adopts the same structure as metaphor, extended to adopt the form of the story, not merely a sentence. We see this intertextuality between actions and text in narrative too; as Anderson describes it, 'narrative configurations, in particular, become privileged vehicles for a dynamic redescription of the world in which new configurations are unfolded, new forms of knowledge and understanding are constituted.'[22]

Dualism is a key method in the subject-object/idealist-realist (Hegelian) debate

In 1982, Charles Reagan, friend and fellow academic, invites Ricœur to record an interview looking back to the 1970s, and published in 1996.[23] Here Heideggerian and post-Heideggerian hermeneutics represent the liberation of phenomenology from 'a certain limitation owed in the allegiance to idealism'.

Both realism and idealism are trapped in subject-object dichotomy and each is the opposite of the other only within that dichotomous relationship. Ricœur argues here that it is a function of the subject-object relationship debate, to polarize realism and idealism, and that we should resist this as a methodological function, in order to see that it is more a question of a gradual opening up between subject and object, achieved through the evolution of phenomenology into a form of hermeneutics that is still strongly phenomenological. He suggests that Husserl remains within an idealist theory of knowledge framework regarding the subject-object nexus, and that, through Heidegger, phenomenology has been gradually inserted into the real world with a more grounded hermeneutical approach. Phenomenology is partly liberated by moving from Husserlian intentionality to Heideggerian being-in-the-world. Ricœur achieves two things here; he shows the problems inherent in a method that he uses a great deal, namely dialectical polarization. He also shows why he is wary of this method and how it must be used as *part of* a process, not getting stuck so that the method, a rational tool, determines and dominates the material. He prefers to risk indeterminacy to overdetermination, and in the end he remains loyal to phenomenological methods.

Dialectics between science and humanities provide methodological structure: Dilthey and Explaining and Understanding

A major problem that Ricœur tackles in the 1960s and 1970s is the role that science offers to play as interpreter and the overbearing character that can develop. This appears foreshadowed in the early lectures in the early 1930s when he takes notes, aged about 19, on Sextus Empiricus (exploring the belief that there is no truth, there are no causes) and on Aenesidemus the Stoic. He also studies Hume and the sceptical assertion that causality ultimately depends on customary conjunction rather than logical necessity.[24] By seeming to be able to explain nature objectively, science adopts a posture of *knowing* that seems authoritative. (In the 1970s–1980s Ricœur challenges this as an oversimplified, one-sided position – yet without wishing to reject science.)

He criticizes what he sees as the regrettable dichotomy that Dilthey (1833–1911) created between Explaining (scientific) and Understanding (social scientific) and argues, through his critique of Dilthey, Habermas (1929–) and Gadamer (1900–2002), for a combination of the two approaches, not a split. His work on Habermas and Gadamer represents subtle arbitration and the determination to be fair to each side of the argument. Habermas' determination to break free from all inherited truths is balanced against Gadamer's insistence that we must remain aware of the histories that determine the way we think. Ricœur insists that each of these polarized ways of thinking must work together, in his detailed exposition in *The Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences.*

When thinking of structuralism that wishes to stay at an explanatory level and stops short of more interpretative work, he stresses that hermeneutics must not go 'against the current of structural explanation'.[25] This technique serves him well in his attempts to reconcile analytical and continental philosophy, although it is also clear that exponents of each do not necessarily want to be reconciled to each other. He also considers the difficulties experienced by the social sciences in their excessive attachment to method and the methodological difficulties to which this can give rise.[26] Such work shows an almost anarchic tendency that is often misunderstood by those who cannot reconcile such an attack on method with the intense use that he made of the methods that he wished to restrain, such as structuralism. There is a resonance here with Charles Taylor's (1931–) argument that there is an unavoidably 'hermeneutic' component in the natural sciences: we can see this not only in Dilthey, but also in Gadamer, in Ricœur's interpretation of Freud, and in Habermas' writings *Interpretation and the Sciences of Man* (1971).[27] Ricœur and Taylor admired each other's work for many years and met occasionally.[28]

Ricœur rejects both Habermas' desire to deny all ideologies and start afresh and Gadamer's desire to encourage acceptance of time- and context-bound beliefs as inevitable. He makes a recommendation that seems like a rather self-effacing compromise but which probably issues one of the best challenges available to systematic methodological approaches in both natural and human sciences. Explanation and Understanding must co-operate and balance each other out. It seems that Ricœur has identified the narcissistic nature of much that we think and do in our attempts to be right. We are in fact being subjective much more often than we realize. He accepts the inevitability of being subjective, yet recommends that we should differentiate consciously between that and being right. His use of suspicion plays a vital role here.

He seeks to create tensions, often in fact maintaining the tension for as long as possible in order to resolve differences at the most intractable point in the debate. For example, when analysing the relation between Explaining and Understanding, he seeks to reclaim Explaining for Understanding, in order to achieve interpretative powers that make use of different, almost incompatible ways of thinking. Ricœur developed this creative tension that arises through the juxtaposition of differences and the ambivalence of meanings, to help us face the ambiguities of our actions and those of others. Language is a form of action and our actions can be read as if they were text as described in *The Hermeneutics of Action* (1996). One of the defining characteristics of the human is our narrative capacity and Ricœur sees this as the way in which we can better understand ourselves through others. He sees our need to understand our history, to both alienate ourselves from and yet also to understand in a partisan, subjective way, the narrative reasons we give for our actions. Finally he offers us hope that we may be able to create various possible scenarios 'in front of the text' that will allow us to work within the complexities of life at a provisional level for as long as possible, seeking reasonable resolution. If we can pre-empt premature foreclosure we may be able to see solutions to conflicts that would otherwise be lost, in a modified Gadamerian sense of understanding the traditions behind thought.

Choose compatible opposites: psychoanalysis and phenomenology in the 1960s

Phenomenology and hermeneutics are different and yet inextricably related in a mutual almost symbiotic belonging: we see this way of thinking in Ricœur's definition of symbol, as containing within it two contradictory yet related meanings: 'stain' means dirt *and* sin. (Behaviourism and psychoanalysis, on the other hand, are too different to render dialogue possible, according to Ricœur. The former is based on observable evidence, the latter upon interpretation that cannot be directly verified.)[29] Ricœur decides that phenomenology and psychoanalysis have enough in common to merit comparison, then looks at their differences, as this example shows: whereas phenomenology aims to *challenge* reflection with respect to immediate consciousness, psychoanalysis uses *suspicion* to render the unconscious accessible through analysis. Phenomenology uses modification of Cartesian doubt about existence and psychoanalysis uses modification of the Spinozist critique of traditional conceptions of free will, whereby we hand ourselves over to the 'domineering flux of underlying motivations'. Yet within this capacity to be compared there is also tension: phenomenology proposes that the unconscious resembles the pre-conscious of analysis, and creates *a text* in the mind that goes beyond representation. For psychoanalysis, meaning is prevented from becoming clear; repression creates a barrier between the unconscious and the pre-conscious, and thus the mind's *text* is beyond representation because it is repressed. Phenomenology suggests links can be made clear between instincts and desires.

Next he reminds us of what makes them similar and also so different: phenomenology and psychoanalysis are in sympathy with each other in their approach towards truth and the search for self-understanding, but the methods they use are incompatible. Freud denies the autonomy and supremacy of the thinking subject; the cogito is reduced, which is anti-phenomenology. Ricœur argues that we must make use of the Freudian systematization, its topography and economics, as a 'discipline' aimed at making us completely homeless, at dispossessing us of that illusory cogito which at the outset occupies the place of the founding act, *I think, I am*. This denies the validity of the immediate consciousness. We can use it to provide a moment of reflection. Freud takes us from immediate consciousness towards acceptance of the unconscious as a place that has what Freud calls its own 'systemic laws' (such as primary process, timelessness and no negation).[30] In the primary process, for example, initial responses to stimuli take a quasi-hallucinogenic form, to be replaced while awake with calmer, risk-averse responses; the secondary process. This is repression and bears some analogies with our suppression of suspicion: we avoid being suspicious of each other because that risks challenging what we believe we share in common, so we exaggerate our suspicions about those who seem 'other'. This shows the need for Ricœur's development of the exercise of suspicion, which refuses to repress our mistrustful reactions to other people, in order to seek resolution. 'Consciousness ceases to be what is best known and becomes problematic', altered by the traces it contains from the unconscious mind.

PHASE THREE: *Time and Narrative*: 1970s–1980s

Structuralism in France is on the wane, and Ricœur attempts to be conciliatory with the former structuralists, some of whom are now post-structuralists, but the setting is abrasive. He begins to grapple in more depth with the possibility that there may be an ethical realm that 'is no longer hermeneutical, in the sense that it is not within interpretation ruled by reading'.[31] This work builds on his earlier detailed study of Jesus' parables in the Gospels, with their extraordinary structures, analysed in 'Biblical Hermeneutics'.[32] Linguistic analysis helps him to show how parables achieve their moral effect, but the moral questions go beyond structure. In *Time and Narrative* he creates a dialectical contrast within time, setting Aristotle's fragmented time against Augustine's more psychological time, and also developing a tension between time and narrative which helps him to investigate the narrative identity that is part of human problem solving. *Time and Narrative* crosses many subject boundaries, such as historiography, history and literature. Towards the end of *Time and Narrative* Ricœur looks at the concept of personal identity and the possibility of the character of the reader, thereby making possible the exploration of ethics and justice. Consciousness thus finds itself by orientating itself around its Other, another person: consciousness finds itself by losing itself in the Other. Here is the dialectical tension between the self and the other, which leads him to the substance of his Gifford lectures, subsequently to become *Oneself as Another*.

Multiple interpretations are necessary

Time and Narrative crosses many subject boundaries, such as historiography, history and literature, and Ricœur appears stoic about the impossibility of getting it right: 'Almost every philosopher has had a piece of the truth and none of them has had it all.'[33] Texts like *Freud and Philosophy* and *The Conflict of Interpretations* look at the diversity of language uses, yet *Interpretation Theory* seeks to analyse the unity of language. Ricœur asserts that the sentence is irreducible to the sum of its parts; hence structural analysis will never be enough. Therefore hermeneutics welcomes structuralism as part of its 'collaboration with other modes of understanding'.[34] This is a different solution from that of an analytical philosopher like Davidson, for whom Ricœur has great respect, but from whose attachment to the primacy of accuracy in language he distances himself. Later, for example in his essays on translation, we see how useful their work always is to him, in helping to decipher the complexity and resonance of ordinary language. At the core of Ricœur's approach is his desire that he developed in *The Rule of Metaphor*, that text could displace the ego's self-absorption to that of a subjective self engaged with text, influenced by and changed by text. Subjectivity is thus neither a delusion nor an illusion, but the product of our attempts to deal with who we are. In a debate with Gadamer, Ricœur tries to put this into words:

> Perhaps I cannot incorporate the other's interpretation into my own view, but I can, by a kind of imaginary sympathy, make room for it. I think that it is a part of intellectual integrity to be able to do that, to recognise the limit of my own comprehension and the plausibility of the comprehension of the other.[35]

The question determines the answer and this creates limits

Ricœur insists that 'The limits of the question imply also the limitations of the answer.'[36] In terms of philosophical approach this is also true; neither hermeneutics nor any other form of philosophy can ask the foundational questions about existence, but they can help each other to ask the questions that suit their discipline.[37] This is not to be rejected; it is necessary as a way of avoiding the false totalization of attempting to explain within one grand framework and reconcile aspects of life that are, inevitably, incompatible. This is the problematic of existence: only by setting rival hermeneutics beside each other can we 'perceive something of the being to be interpreted', such that 'each hermeneutics discovers the aspect of existence which founds it as method.'[38]

Any form of philosophy must be aware of its own limits – it becomes meaningless if it seeks to create and answer all the questions.[39] Hermeneutics cannot be omnipotent; the question limits the answer. Thus methods constrain us from the beginning and it is vital to have many other ways of thinking, to ask different questions. This can seem to endorse a relativistic approach, but in fact Ricœur is here applying his phenomenological tools to the task of investigating the multifaceted human experience of life: self-conscious reflection upon a problem releases the contradiction for discussion. He takes more than one approach, pits them against each other, finds differences and similarities and explores them exhaustively so as to show us the creative tensions between and within different approaches. If we sometimes tire of the triadic development of dialectical sequences, we do still benefit greatly from his technique of resisting conclusions for as long as possible, to prolong the fecundity of exploring different possibilities. This method is, however, usually limited to work with which he finds some empathy, so he avoids postmodern debates.

PHASE FOUR: *Oneself as Another*: 1980s–1990s

Oneself as Another is discussed in Chapter 9 in more detail; in 1991 Ricœur is acknowledged in France as an important philosopher, greatly lauded by the philosophical establishment. There is a special issue of the journal *Esprit* and a conference is held at Cerisy on him and his work.

Ricœur tries to work in the gap created between the ideology (rational control) and utopia (freedom from constraint) identified by Habermas.[40] He also looks back to *Freedom and Nature* and *From Text to Action* to work on his belief that 'the world of action is the world of the reader of the text.'[41] He looks back also to language, and, arguing against structuralism that language always has a referent outside of itself, he still sees action as one of these referents. Beginning the return to phenomenology, he seeks to uncover two types of hidden aspects of the human: first Husserl's bracketing, in which the humdrum world of objects is bracketed off and a truer sense of self is sought, uncontaminated by subject-object dualism and secondly Heidegger's uncovering of everything that is very close at hand that is the real world we live in and completely ignore. These two are not completely opposed to each other, as being-in-the-world is sought by both, albeit differently.

The other concern is about the dominant ego; instead what we want to strive towards is a situation in which we refuse to be dominated by our subjective self and 'exchange the *me*, *master* of itself, for the *self*, *disciple* of the text'.[42] The ego is not the ultimate origin, despite the emphasis placed upon the ego by Husserl and Heidegger. Ricœur sees the vital role for literature in the challenging and restoration of meaning; literature serves both to amplify and analyse the meanings that we can find in everyday language, discourse and tropes such as metaphor and here is where the meaning is to be found that can guide our moral intentions.

Continental and analytic, ordinary language philosophies: a long-term dialectic

Analytic philosophy has a contested and complex relationship with the idea of self, and, rather unusually, Ricœur sees this as facilitating a relationship between analytic and ordinary language philosophy and hermeneutical philosophy. Analytical (as represented by Frege and Husserl) and ordinary language philosophies (as represented by Wittgenstein and Austin) place limits upon the self and upon language. These limits also bestow strength on both because identity and language are thereby described as real, and therefore hermeneutics can build upon these analytical limits that, in a Kantian sense, both limit and define identity and language. For Ricœur, building on his teaching from the 1970s, the works of Strawson, Davidson and Parfit do indeed show the self as defined by ontological affirmations about who the self hopes to become, but covertly. He finds tension between analytical and more hermeneutical philosophy very productive: the default position that analytical philosophy adopts regarding 'the Other' is revelatory to him because of what it does not say, helping him to use philosophy of language to work on 'attestation'.

Attestation ("I exist, here I stand, I am responsible for my actions") is the opposite of suspicion and is predicated on trust that we can both be physically real and also have intentions.[43] He suggests that suspicion and attestation both share the same 'plane' of attempts at truthfulness, i.e. epistemological and ontological, an argument reminiscent of Bergson's two sources of morality and religion i.e. that each contains an open and a closed nature. Suspicion and attestation are both open and closed, and both seek facts *and* deep meaning. In *Oneself as Another* he attempts to develop a hermeneutic of the self that mediates between the cogito and the anti-cogito. By the anti-cogito he means the ideas of the masters of suspicion. P. F. Strawson's work *Individuals* encourages Ricœur to think about the referential requirement of semantics; 'thus the discourse concerning bodies and persons as basic particulars is from the outset a discourse *on*; the person is already that about which one is speaking.'[44]

Here Ricœur sees analytic philosophy as having realist tendencies that serve as a strong counter instance to the idealist tendencies of Descartes and the phenomenalist commitment of Hume. The notion of narrative identity is imbued with fiction and this creates potential tension with analytical philosophy, yet for Ricœur this increases the importance of the relationship. Davidson's realist emphasis on the event, although ultimately too extreme for Ricœur in its separation of event from action, gives him an initial boost in emphasizing the potency of events. Parfit, as a Humean sceptic, also helps Ricœur in his exploration of the ontology of the self; what the self as concept and as actual event can mean to us and to others. Ricœur does not use the customary pairings of realism/anti-realism, objectivism/anti-objectivism, and analytic/continental, to name some of the more common ones. Nor does he engage with those, like Baudrillard, whose views he finds too extreme regarding the impossibility of seeking a viable path between reason and unreason.

Even though Ricœur parts company with Davidson, Parfit and Strawson, the initial route that he takes towards attestation is supported, he believes, by their work in that the self, denied full selfhood, seems paradoxically more evident.[45] This attestation by the self, however, also has an impact upon the concept and process of analysis, protecting analytical philosophy from easy accusations of being limited. Of course we have always been able to distinguish, within ordinary language, between narrow, limited meanings and transcendental meanings. However, this is a Kantian distinction between the empirical and the transcendental and requires us to be able to assert the dependence of linguistic action upon ontological action. In other words Ricœur believes that I need to be able to assert that my use of language influences the meaning of my actions and, indeed, shows those actions to mean more than the surface features of the action itself. Here attestation bears witness to the individual's struggle between reflection, analysis and action. He is thereby recommending a use of hermeneutics to strengthen the analytic philosophical sense of self that can otherwise seem phenomenalist, i.e. too bound up in itself and in intentionality when we should focus more upon our attestation to the events for which we are responsible.[46]

Dialectical failure? Faith and philosophy

Ricœur also describes how his membership of the Protestant minority made him feel heretical in Rennes where Catholicism, as in most of France, was the majority religion. He describes his intellectual life as 'the sort of controlled schizophrenia that has always been my rule of thought', comprising two poles: 'a Biblical pole and a rational and critical pole'.[47] In later work there are some exceptions e.g. *Evil* and *Thinking Biblically* yet he states himself that the two should be kept separate: he asserts that he wanted to write a book which would be 'truly philosophical without any religious affiliation. . . . philosophy is autonomous activity and my own belonging to a religious tradition is based on and ruled by other criteria than those which I use in philosophy'.[48] In later life Ricœur requested that the two Gifford lectures that he excised from *Oneself as Another* should be published, together with an essay that he believed to be very important; 'Love and Justice'.[49]

Are we faced here with a limit to methodological dialectics, namely that the religious and secular cannot come together well? Ricœur himself often chose to separate his religious from his more secular writings. If the provisionality advocated by philosophy is deemed unsuitable for faith, then such provisionality seems for a short time to be well served by the hermeneutics of suspicion, as we saw in Chapter 4. Dialectical tension is thus created in Ricœur himself between his faith and his philosophy, and in Chapter 10 we can also ask ourselves whether we can be Ricœurian without faith or without some appreciation for faith? In a highly pragmatic manner Ricœur clearly distinguishes between culture and faith, in the chapter in *Critique and Conviction* discussing Education and Secularism, in which he implements the dialectical tools of avoiding premature closure, looking for similarities as well as dissimilarities and refusing artificial polarization: 'I cannot help but think there is something ridiculous in the fact that at school a Christian girl can show her buttocks while a Muslim girl is forbidden to cover her head.'[50]

PHASE FIVE: *Memory, History, Forgetting* and *The Course of Recognition*: 1990s–2005

By 2004, Derrida and Ricœur, after some years without much contact, are enjoying discussion and debate again, in mutual respect and affection. They work together on pardon, appropriately enough, and this work is reflected in *Memory, History, Forgetting*. In his deeply admiring tribute to their friendship Derrida comments that whereas he believes pardon to be impossible, Ricœur sees it as difficult.[51] There is a moving tribute to Derrida by Ricœur in the posthumously published *Vivant jusqu'à la mort*.[52]

Here we see Ricœur return to phenomenology and ordinary language philosophy, epistemology and hermeneutics in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, which mediates between *Time and Narrative* and *Oneself as Another*. He gives renewed emphasis also to Descartes, Locke, and even, in *Memory, History, Forgetting* and in *The Course of Recognition*, to Bergson, whose work he had regretted being unable to integrate into *Time and Narrative*. This late work extends phenomenology beyond its previous boundaries, and also shows us again that reductionist approaches may become vehicles for greater openness, when we are incorporating them within detours of thought and/or new ideas. His translation work from this period, in *On Translation*, has already been discussed in Chapter 6.

The Course of Recognition: 'le petit miracle de la reconnaissance'

The by now habitual use of a dialectical method is still evident, although to a lesser extent in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, and it undergoes a renaissance in *The Course of Recognition*. There are three phases (surprise!) to his hermeneutic of the self; first the "I can", secondly the detour through the object, to give the self a reflexive sense, and thirdly the dialectic between identity and otherness, continued from *Oneself as Another*.[53] We need to be aware of a dialectic of binding-unbinding, distanciation and appropriation, explanation and understanding – yet Explaining and Understanding will be rejected in *The Course of Recognition*. If we feel suspicion about versions of the past, we as the reader must take that responsibility. Unhappy history is to be avoided, where communities close in on themselves and disregard the suffering of others. We must exercise double negation, the double negative that makes a positive. This includes the balancing of forgetting that erases traces and forgetting that stays alert to the need to forget. Is forgetting a sort of forgiving? Forgiveness will often be incognito, not showing the act of forgiving openly.[54]

The Course of Recognition came from the lectures he gave in English in Vienna in the late 1990s, entitled 'Process of Recognition', which he felt expressed the dynamic aspect of recognition. Its publication history as the last book to appear in his lifetime should not be taken to presume that *The Course of Recognition* is *the* last word before his death, as this book is based on lectures that he gave in 2000–2001, around the time of the publication of *Memory, History, Forgetting.* This latter book has a panoptic scale about it that makes it more significant than its successor, and it seems to me to be his definitive statement about the cost of war and peace for France. Catherine Goldenstein, Archivist at Fonds Ricœur believes that *Memory, History, Forgetting* was his last great work: 'I spoke to Jean Greisch about it, who also believes that *Memory, History, Forgetting* marks the closure of Paul Ricœur's work.'[55] Moreover, he did not enjoy turning *The Course of Recognition* lecture notes into a book, wondering whether he had 'fait le tour de piste en trop' (gone round the track too often).[56]

When choosing the French title for *The Course of Recognition* he chose the word '*Parcours*' and Catherine Goldenstein remembers the conversation Ricœur had with her husband about this title and how it related to going out on reconnaissance expeditions as young scouts.[57] Here he considers the ways in which ambiguity of language and surplus of meaning can be harnessed to understand oneself better, developing ideas about identity and self-conscious understanding that he first worked on in *Freedom and Nature, History and Truth, Freud and Philosophy* and *Oneself as Another.* He develops these ideas by populating the debate with British empiricists and Kant, Husserl and the usual suspects. He works on recognition in modern epistemology, recognition of responsibility and finally mutual recognition. It becomes clear why this book cannot be fully incorporated into linguistic analysis, when we understand how important it is for Ricœur to identify and study the philosophical problems caused by identity that have to 'slice through the simple regulating of ordinary language in terms of its use'.[58]

He can find no unified philosophy of recognition, yet he locates three high points for *The Course of Recognition*; he starts with Kant's *recognitio* (1st edn of *Critique of Pure Reason*), which seeks the *a priori* conditions for the possibility of objective meaning. Bergson (recognition of memories) is next, with a psychological approach towards the old debate about how body and soul are related, and an attempt to understand how we remember. Finally he contrasts Hegel (*Anerkennung*, from Hegel's Jena *Realphilosophie*) with the struggle for 'real' freedom that becomes a demand for recognition, and develops this beyond Hegel to work on mutual recognition.

In *The Course of Recognition*, he returns to the necessity for ambiguity and ambivalence in language. In deep study of the etymology of the word 'recognition', he refers to the need for 'the analytical exaltation of the process of derivation'. Within *The Course of Recognition* it is the miraculous recognition of the other, of oneself in the other, that provides the only way of reducing the tyranny of violence over language. I do not mean here miracle in the sense of Ricœur's early mentor, Marcel, who emphasized the inexplicable nature of the event, although that is very important. The gift of recognition is the miracle that enters the space created by the difference between violence and language.

'Le petit miracle de la reconnaissance' was a phrase often used by Ricœur, described by Catherine Goldenstein: the real-life experience of spontaneous recognition of oneself in another.[59]

Ricœur attempts in *The Course of Recognition* to show us how recognition (identification), 'where the thinking subject claims to master meaning,' is replaced by mutual recognition and dismantles the subject-object dichotomy. Identity leads to otherness and thence to recognition and misrecognition, and the themes of memory and promise are added to the debate after *Oneself as Another*. Kantian 'reciprocal action' finds a place in the human sciences, which Kant did not predict. Narrative voice, upon which Ricœur has worked for decades, returns to remind us of the capacity of plot to weave stories together and to show relationships between plots and characters.

Conclusions

The dialectical methodology can create tension between two possibilities. This may give us creative space for deliberating about choices, or it may leave us exhausted and confused. The hermeneutics of suspicion played a valuable, indeed indispensable role for Ricœur in the 1960s, by facilitating the deconstruction of the grand narratives of conscious thought, work relationships, and the power motive, through our education at the hands of Freud, Marx and Nietzsche respectively. This destructive hermeneutics, with '*une sorte de puritanisme du symbole*,' provides one half of the act, of which the other half is 'remythisation', after this loss of innocence engendered by suspicion.[60] For Ricœur actions should be reciprocal if possible, as we see in translation, in which the translator and the translated should both give and take meaning. The hermeneutic circle is thus comprised of a first naivety and then a necessary deconstruction of belief through suspicion, followed, if we are lucky, by a second naivety, a post-critical naivety that endeavours to develop a better world to live in. Suspicion thus describes an arc within the hermeneutic circle. Yet we will see in Chapter 10 how Ricœur's refusal, in a Kantian manner, to engage dialectically with religion and philosophy together suggests that such an arc may not always work; the two most important parts of his cognitive life cannot be melded.

If we employ a dialectical method we can create a to and fro movement between phenomenology and hermeneutics, Explaining and Understanding, cogito and anti-cogito, empirical and transcendental, finite and infinite, proximity and distance. This creates a framework for both time and space to be brought into play and provide help in spreading out my thoughts and then gathering them up again. This was Milton's discovery too in *Paradise Lost*. In contrast with the sudden fall of perfect Satan, Adam and Eve are rescued by time, the nature of their imperfection.[61] I go backwards and forwards between two distinct poles. In a dialectical movement I look at differences, then similarities and then differences again, attempting to decide what each tells me about the other. This creates a gap, a pause in time and a sort of vacuum in space, which by its very activity displaces from the centre any hegemonic violence of ideas such as those revealed to us by the masters of suspicion. I gain both time and space in suspending both for the purposes of thinking more clearly. Ricœur depicts this very act as a moral position, not a sign of weakness.

Ricœur's methodological dialectics attempt to create a condition of possibility, not as fixed as Kant's 'absolute gap' between 'the transcendental and empirical points of view' on the one hand, and the fimdamental differences between sensing and understanding on the other. This is a crucial role played by the space, the gap of which Ricœur writes in detail in *The Course of Recognition* and we will see its power to mediate between sense and sensibility and also to enlist the categories of time and space to mediate between opposing aspects of our lives. Pellauer proposes that 'being is that which lies beyond the polarities, so to speak'; I agree, if we understand that the decision as to what is worth believing in is *developed in* this gap, this space, this central vacuum created by the tension of weighing up one tip of the pole against the other.[62] There are clear resonances between aspects of this approach and the third way method of Nagarjuna, but we need another option, given the incompatibility of such a meditative approach with modern living, in which much is determined by surface features regarding our capacity to undertake measurable acts that lead to measurable outcomes.[63] Moreover, the very real risk of using this dialectical method is that we will become confused, tired, bored or dedicated to some sort of postmodern relativism, and indeed some would argue that this is precisely where democracy has brought us. However, Dosse concludes his excellent two-volume history of structuralism by asserting the vital importance of Ricœur's ability to create complementarities; 'Only the dialogic relationship between what Paul Ricœur defined as the explanatory level of meaning . . . and the interpretative level . . . preserves all the important structuralist contributions and keeps criticism from sinking below the waves of the five senses.'[64]

Chapter 8 shows how Ricœur offers us a complementary approach regarding faith and secularism, without necessitating that we follow formal religious pathways, as he has always done. In *The Course of Recognition* Ricœur hopes to show how the process of recognizing is the way to be a human; the gap becomes what he calls the dialectic between people, described as being between dissymmetry and mutuality.[65] So we have a gap, a *something* between people, lopsided because of the difficulty of understanding each other and of being fair to another person, but at least a space created for communication, for *un petit miracle de reconnaissance.*

Ricœur is also already beginning to consider the law, the work of Rawls and the need to deal with the violence in the nature of people by other means than those of narrative. He is considering the creative processes within the law, when a judge must mediate between a law and an individual case, in order to try to come up with a ruling that is both just and fair. This will be explored in Chapter 8 where we will look more closely at the wide-ranging importance of *Time and Narrative* for Ricœur's philosophical anthropology, and the way he admitted in the end that time 'folds back upon itself, escaping the grasp of narrative'. This, for him, is a sort of final tribute to Heidegger; one that does not, however, reduce the problems created by Heidegger and that triggers Ricœur's development of the 'narrative identity' that is to become *Oneself as Another*.[66]

Chapter 8

Philosophical anthropology

Everywhere throughout the world, one finds the same bad movie, the same slot machines, the same plastic or aluminium atrocities, the same twisting of language by propaganda etc.

(1964) Universal Civilisation and National Cultures *in* HAT: *276*[1]

Here Ricœur chronicles the damage done by so-called civilized societies to themselves and to other cultures. Over a decade earlier, in 1952, at the invitation of UNESCO, the structuralist anthropologist Lévi-Strauss wrote an essay called 'Race and History' that was to raise the stakes regarding Europe's colonial relationship with Africa, arguing that different races are different, not inferior and that each has its own internal structures that are consistent and can easily be damaged by outside ignorance.[2] Following the typical structuralist path of criticizing history, Lévi-Strauss showed how dangerous it can be to see cultures in historical hierarchies of different levels of civilization, and how we need to see the strengths of other cultures. Dosse describes how the academician Roger Caillois challenged Lévi-Strauss and was rebuffed: the arguments are interesting, as Caillois accused Lévi-Strauss of relativism and of double standards in ascribing superiority to Eastern cultures, while Lévi-Strauss believes he is arguing for parity and pluralism.[3] Ricœur's essay from 1964, quoted above, looks at what is arguably the next phase – when we know about other civilizations, and find how difficult it is to 'remain yourself and to practice tolerance toward other civilisations'.[4] Especially when you are quiet.

Ricœur develops a different anthropology from that of Lévi-Strauss. Ricœur uses the term 'philosophical anthropology' throughout his career to discuss problems that he sees as universal to the human condition, in a Kantian way, adding of course the need to take specific contextual situations into account as we see in *Oneself as Another*. He is clearly influenced by the lessons and lectures he attended as a teenager where he covered themes such as connectivity; how are we related to each other in terms both of causality and responsibility, how do we deal with negative thought as a problem and, potentially, a solution, and how can we bring body and mind together into humane intentionality?

These lectures enable Ricœur to compare and contrast psychology, psychiatry, philosophy, sociology, history and biological sciences, in an 'anthropology of finitude'.[5] Writing later in the context of structuralism and its development with anthropology, Ricœur brings political conscience to this potent and very French admixture of disciplines, showing a passionate anger about the colonial war in Algeria, and the communist abuses of power in Eastern Europe.[6] He develops a theoretical model in response to the need to be fair, starting in *The Symbolism of Evil* with first and second naivety.[7] Second naivety provides the investigative state of mind that we may achieve if we can make use of the ideas of philosophical anthropology; chastened, confused, knowing more than we want to about ourselves and others, yet still hopeful, and making use of suspicion as a spur to clearer thought, which lasts right up to *Memory, History, Forgetting*.

In his 1960 essay 'The Antinomy of Human Reality and the Problem of Philosophical Anthropology', in Reagan and Stewart, Ricœur shows how Kant's transcendental philosophy is a 'necessary but not sufficient' first stage of a philosophical anthropology. Kant is necessary not least for providing the element of rationalism that complements the method of pure reflection, which Ricœur uses in *Fallible Man*. In *The Symbolism of Evil*, on this same theme, Ricœur moves from fallibility to fault, with an increasingly intense focus on the person. Kant is not sufficient because 'the "I" of the I think is not a person . . . it is only the project of the object' (the object being the form of the world).[8] Nor did Kant claim that the 'I' was a person in his work, and is insistent upon this in his critique of Descartes in *The Paralogisms of Pure Reason*. Ricœur wants to go beyond this to have a philosophy that contains people and that studies the social aspects of groups.

We can identify three strands in Ricœur's philosophical anthropology; the first one is based on phenomenological and then hermeneutic interest in the human being. With *History and Truth*, using Sartre's work critically, he establishes that the reasons why we act are complex and should be seen as attempts at enacting ethical, contested decisions, which we can neither simplify nor disown. In this first strand he works on the idea in *Fallible Man* that it is impossible to be at ease with oneself, and that being conscious of oneself is never ultimately possible but can be attained to a certain degree by methodical use of language and careful reflection. He begins to look at the self in the context of personal identity and narrative identity at the end of *Time and Narrative*.

There is a second strand, which appears in *Oneself as Another* and elsewhere by exploring the ways in which we can learn about ourselves through our relationships with others. The shortest way to the self is through the other: *Oneself as Another* has more of a rule-based, pragmatic tone, regarding the extent to which our behaviour towards each other can be codified and whether we can be both just and fair to each other. Can we take broad moral principles and adapt them (as little as possible) to the ethical requirements of a given situation? Even more importantly, what effect may such codification have on us? In the mid-1980s to mid-1990s, Ricœur develops the social, group aspect of being a person, as in *The Just.* Relevant texts here are 'The Socius and the Neighbour' (in *History and Truth*), *Love and Justice, The Just, Ideology and Utopia,* 'The Erosion of Tolerance' and *Reflections on the Just.*[9]

The third strand is theological, seen in early texts such as those in *Political and Social Essays* (1974), and in *Evil* (1986), *Figuring the Sacred* (1995) and *Thinking Biblically* (1998).[10] Here Ricœur is investigating issues of identity and textual ethics to see whether they can be resolved theologically. In fact, of course, distinctions between theology and secularist thought are artificial and yet he insists upon respecting them; *Fallible Man* and *The Symbolism of Evil,* for example, contain religious arguments. Biblical hermeneutics is of great importance to Ricœur, and carried over from the previous chapter will be the question of whether he places secular philosophy and theological philosophy in dialectical tension, or not. As a Christian he chooses to understand the resurrection of Jesus as the possibility of goodness in the Christian community, and sees Christianity in the context of a secular world. Hence the acts of each member of the community should reflect Christian standards: he thinks this may be because he sees himself as an apprentice theologian.[11]

First strand: the self who acts

Anthropology is the comparative study of humankind, more commonly through social or cultural milieux, and Ricœur applies certain social and cultural aspects of it to philosophy. Dauenhauer draws our attention to the essay 'The Model of the Text' in *From Text to Action,* which can provide us with the core ideas to Ricœur's theory of human interaction, and responsible action.[12] Ricœur uses it to set out the belief that we can 'read' actions as if they were text, with all the attendant issues that implies; the possibility of misreading, the reputation of the actor being at stake, the need for an owner of the action to be identified and also then, possibly to have their actions misunderstood by others. Text, for Ricœur, is usually narrative in structure.[13] All these things can happen with discourse when it becomes text, and so it is with actions. The 'human deeds are also waiting for fresh interpretations that decide their meaning' and this introduces all the risk that ordinary language philosophers seek to close down by seemingly removing the actor from the analysis in their concern to have accurate records of the event that took place.[14] Ordinary language philosophers utilize analysis that examines the semantic implications of the way the event is recounted. Ricœur applauds their perspicacity, and employs their analyses in order to understand many features of language, but he rejects what he sees as their exclusion of the person and of the attendant, messy yet necessary investigation of responsibility for actions.[15]

In its early phase phenomenology has clear ethical dimensions and contains a strong critique of other philosophies: for Sartre, if I am free to act as I see fit, I will suffer the anguish of nothingness, of having the choice to take up this or that particular project.[16] Returning to the debate in *Freedom and Nature* about a motive not being a cause, Ricœur looks at the great tension between the two; the danger of narrative is that I decide upon my motive in order to make sense of my story. That affects the causal explanation that I use to justify my actions – if I change my motive, I must change the causal reasoning that I use and this highlights the impossibility of causes and motives being the same as each other. We cannot always affect causes. Ricœur seeks an existential will to act, as a way of living that can be more positive than Sartre's negativity, and can embody the value of deciding to act to affirm life and not destroy it, to support others and not weaken them and – above all – to cope with the distress and disorientation caused by being limited in how much I can achieve and in how much I can justify *wanting* and *having* those things and people over which I want to have influence. Moreover, even when I resist the status quo, this can be an affirmation of life and a de-negation of the difficulties in being mortal. Motives may appear to affect causes, but this is an illusion because I cannot influence natural events and random or unpredictable circumstances that may cause things to happen. I am motivated to act, and I may change my motives, which are always different from causes. Here he seems to come close to Hume (1711–1776), but refuses to see it, because he is more interested in the entanglement between voluntary (motivation) and involuntary (causes), than in scepticism about human motives.

In *Fallible Man* we see that overzealously condemning our weaker acts can lend credibility to ideas about original sin, which can make it seem as if we must believe ourselves sinful. Ricœur prefers to believe that we have the *potential* to sin, yet it is not inevitable: being too suspicious of our own motives could mislead us into too evil an image of ourselves, a crippling lack of self-belief. Another reason to be wary of suspicion is that we need to accept the ambivalence of many of the signs and symbols that we use to give meaning to our world, explored in *The Symbolism of Evil.* Hence we should have doubts but we risk destroying many layers of meaning if we become too suspicious. We can and should challenge existing edifices such as the church, politics, and the law, but we should not challenge the possibility of seeking those ideals that are supposedly embodied by such structures; spiritual selflessness, some sort of codified ethics, justice, kindness, etc. Suspicion should therefore function to make us better at establishing and pursuing good ideals if we act with the proportionality that Spinoza recommends. This process can serve to render our gaze more penetrating about what it is that we have been disappointed by, and what we need to persevere with. Throughout his life Ricœur witnessed philosophical interest in religion that mostly took the form of sceptical attack.

Husserl's phenomenology failed to provide Ricœur with the active person – he writes exhaustively in *Freedom and Nature* about action, but in order to be active he has to move to the more assertive quest for meaning possible in hermeneutics – yet by the end of his life he returns to use phenomenology in order to combine it with hermeneutics, in his post-Hegelian Kantian approach. He is post-Hegelian because of his rejection of Hegel's totalizing approach to world history and the use of negation to ensure that he could not be contradicted. He is Kantian because he retains so many Kantian features as central to his work, such as the antinomy between reason and imagination.

'The Socius and the Neighbour'

In the parable of the Good Samaritan it is of course not accidental that two fellow citizens desert the injured traveller, each of whom is, in theory, in the relationship of socius to him, bound to him by custom and law. For Ricœur, living in the modern world, this means that it is precisely our shared reality of the institution and the law that can make us seem like strangers to each other, as the mechanisms of the State, not the individual, are deemed responsible for personal safety. Abel and Porée see in the socius debate an almost Hegelian concern about institutions, and remark upon Ricœur's view that untypically extreme modes of behaviour may be necessary to highlight the weaknesses of certain institutions – perhaps, I wonder, in the case of the Nanterre student revolt which highlighted weaknesses in the university system?[17]

Ricœur cites the Good Samaritan, as one who is not part of the social group of the person who needs help, and who gives physical support selflessly, without the institutional support of the laws of the land or the institutions created to implement and consolidate the rules.[18] The neighbour is a person who generates personal interest in another individual without the mechanisms described above, and may even act well. In contrast the socius really is the insider, who enjoys automatic and privileged access to that other, because they are bound together by social custom, by law, by expectation and by institutional pressures. Despite Ricœur's faith in institutions, we see tensions in this early essay: the neighbour is defined by Ricœur as the individual who makes a personal, conscious decision to do acts of goodness that go beyond the normal structures of routine within institutional and cultural constraints: 'One does not have a neighbour; I make myself someone's neighbour.'[19]

How can I become the neighbour who steps outside the social bonds of the *socius* and makes a singular gesture of support to the other? If I am constrained by laws and institutional norms that also protect my group, and me, then my actions may risk damaging the interests of my group. Ricœur writes with concern about the wolf in sheep's clothing that haunts this scene; utilitarian motives that are protectionist. He sees that the Golden Rule to 'do unto others as you would have them do unto you' can become a calculated attempt to ensure personal gain. He proposes that we overcome this utilitarian risk by ensuring that love and charity make their mark in our legislation.

In *The Socius and the Neighbour* he discusses the idea of being recognized by the State. In a later essay, 'Urbanisation and Secularisation' in *Political and Social Essays* he questions how one-to-one relationships can be developed by the state, a large bureaucracy. Ricœur asserts that the I-thou relationship, as Buber claims, is integral to Christianity, and particularly to Protestant theology; this is recognition of oneself in the other – who is originally God.[20] Having argued earlier that life in the city accelerates secularism and that humans become secularist in the city because external, public relations prevail over internal, private ones, Ricœur then shows how the neighbour and the socius problem, the I-thou issue, is not, in fact, addressed by the Good Samaritan:[21] 'The Good Samaritan of the parable did not enter into an I-thou relationship at all: he treated the man he met, if I may say so, functionally: he dressed his wounds, led him to lodging, paid the bill; no-one ever tells us he made a friend of him.'[22] This story illustrates the irresolvable tension between individuals and state.

Thus in the 1950s he writes of the individual as neighbour who subverts regulations and expectations with an act of love; in the 1970s he interprets this act more functionally and he continues his debate with clear emphasis on the role of justice systems into the 1990s. Here he returns to what he learnt from André Philip in the 1930s, that there must be a dual allegiance to religion and to politics, including the economic aspects of political justice:

> In order to provide a rational basis for socialist commitment, an economic argument is required – Marxist or other – of a different nature than moral impulse alone, that could not be deduced directly from love of one's neighbour.[23]

Ricœur concludes that the way forward is dialectical: the philosopher is a responsible thinker, and must remain suspended between atheism and faith, and attempt to mediate between religion and faith by means of atheism.[24] Atheism can help the believer to be sceptical of the church as an institution, and faith can help atheism to strengthen secular institutions.

Second strand: *Oneself as Another*

Oneself as Another is one of Ricœur's most accessible works, which he worked and reworked after giving the Gifford lectures in 1983, omitting theologically nuanced chapters and adding new sections, including a passage in memory of his thirty-nine-year-old son Olivier, who committed suicide shortly after Ricœur gave the Gifford lectures. Dosse provides personal testimony of just how intense and profound the mourning and sorrow was for Ricœur and his family.[25]

Ricœur uses Kant's ideas about the will to develop his philosophy of the will, which is, as he himself is clear in the 1980s, becoming a philosophical anthropology about what it means to be a human. Phenomenology had helped him to consider the individual and individual fallibility; hermeneutics had provided the linguistic turn that allowed him to investigate the polysemy of human meanings and the narrative nature of human understanding, and now he turns his emerging hermeneutics of the self to the subject of right behaviour in and beyond the law.

Ricœur sees it as the development of his ideas about 'the capable person', and the first six chapters are about 'I can'. He develops the idea of the self who is constant over time (*idem*) and the self who changes over time but is still recognizable (*ipse*). These two forms of identity are conjoined by narrative, as each of us is the character in the plot of a story. This gives us identity in space and time and in ethical matters. In the little ethics he alters the focus to heighten the ethical challenge and considers three different manifestations of the self, in order to focus on ethics more tightly: they are the self, the other 'who has a face' and the other who is the recipient of justice and whom I do not know.[26]

Aristotle, Heidegger and *Oneself as Another*

In *Oneself as Another* he revisits his classic themes; the fragility and fallible nature of each human, struggling to find meaning in past action, in current state and future options and in the terrible tragedies of history. His writing invites readers to explore their own minds and confront the complexities of communal life with the aid of modern hermeneutical philosophy. Ricœur puts great emphasis on that rich vein of practical knowledge that is found in the moment of meeting between memory and expectation, between what we know and what we hope for. Many such moments will lead to the practical knowledge that, as Jervolino puts it, cannot be 'spliced onto the reductive concepts of modern science'.[27] This process centres ultimately on the ineffable mystery of conscience, that part of our thinking that leads us to take responsibility for others;

> I cannot say as a philosopher where the voice of conscience comes from – that ultimate expression of otherness that haunts selfhood![28]

Ricœur sees philosophy before Descartes as reflecting a world in which the human being was part of a total cosmological picture, with meaning bound up in the understanding and acceptance of bigger forces than those of humans. Gradually, from Descartes' metaphysics onwards, the person becomes the object of his or her own representation, so that I can stand apart from my life and analyse it. I am thus both the subject and object of my own existence. Ricœur sees Kant and then Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer and finally Nietzsche transforming man as subject into man as will.[29] For Ricœur this can lead easily into nihilism, because the individual's will may become unbridled in personal wilfulness about deciding what is of value and what is not of value. We will benefit from nihilist attitudes if they make us critical, but need to pull back from irrevocably negative critique. He sees great potential for good in the power we have that allows us to control our actions in order to benefit the greater good, but the stakes are high because of the damage suffered: in *Freud and Philosophy* he writes of the 'wounded cogito', in *Oneself as Another* he quotes Nietzsche and writes of the 'shattered cogito', and in *Critique and Conviction* he discusses what he sees as the 'humiliated cogito' of Hume and Nietzsche.

Ricœur takes seriously Heidegger's question about the nature of Being. In the 'Sixth Study' of *Oneself as Another* he discusses Heidegger's concept of Care, *Sorge*, as related to his own belief that action is the fundamental basis for existence in the world, because action includes not only doing and making but also receiving and enduring, which we understand through the creation and interpretation of narrative.[30] In this he follows Heidegger's own attempt in the 1920s to use Aristotle's philosophy and create a basic correlation between *praxis* and *Sorge*, in the direction of making them both seem to be more about possibilities than practical action. Ricœur prefers a sense closer to the original Aristotelian concept of *praxis* as effective action. He hopes to be able to combine on the one hand, Heidegger's Care, *Sorge*, which gives a sense of the potential of being an individual sensate Being in the world, with, on the other hand an anthropological idea of the human in a group.[31] He hopes to use human predisposition for narrative to make sense of this world that combines the sensory and the communal. Being able to create an ethical narrative that combines desire and the other person ethically is extremely difficult; Ricœur comments that many judges see defendants in court who seem unable to associate themselves with acts they have committed or with the effects of these acts. Their evasive fabrications do not have Ricœurian narrative coherence, which should be motivated by a desire for minimal adjustment to the rules and by a constructive vision. If narrative coherence is motivated by ideas that can face up to chaos and move us on, like Proust's 'final, powerfully forward-looking pages of Remembrance of Things Past', then this encapsulates *Sorge*. Such narrative should provide a sense of the narrative unity of life. This should be highly prized, and can give form to the 'unstable mixture of fabulation and actual experience' that is real life. How do we square this with the fact that integral to Heidegger's *Sorge* is our capacity to confront our impending death? Ricœur concedes that 'fiction has a role to play in the apprenticeship of dying' and the gravity of this situation can be partially redressed if we look at his development of Aristotle's *praxis*, the active life in which we seek (yet never attain) a good life, characterized by actions that are ethical.[32] Here we see one of the most significant differences between Ricœur's and Heidegger's use of *phronesis*: it can be argued that Heidegger sees *phronesis* as descriptive, whereas for Ricœur it can be self-prescriptive.

In the 'Seventh Study' of *Oneself as Another*, ethics is shown as having to pass through the rigours of moral rulings, and yet to respond to specific details in a situation. Ricœur finds Kant's rules too rigid for living a real life, and concludes that he must return to Aristotle, and modify *praxis* of which tragedy – for Aristotle – is the highest form. Ricœur attempts to look more realistically at human fallibility. He develops a sense of modern life as built around the centrality of *praxis*, with four interrelated and hierarchized levels of functioning. At the first level, we have our jobs. At the second level, we have our life plans. At the third level, we interpret our identity by the skills, the arts that we are engaged in. At the fourth level, we seek (yet never really reach) the good life, in which we work towards good actions that are ethical. An example of this is the way I attempted with colleagues to communicate these levels in teacher education, and in citizenship education.[33]

Aristotle's *phronesis*, practical wisdom, is crucially important here. *Phronesis* is moral judgement that is made within a situation and must therefore singularize the search for good solutions, using sensible intuition yet not reductionist platitudes in order to meet the ethical problems of that particular situation. It is therefore necessary to attempt to allow maximum interpretative openness to the beliefs of the individuals involved, and the potency of our actions, our *praxis*, must never be underestimated, as we see in current debates by Dworkin et al. in jurisprudence.[34] *Phronesis* attempts to distort the general moral rule only as much as is absolutely necessary for the specific situation. It adheres to respect for persons, attempts to reconcile opposed claims and seeks to avoid arbitrariness. By such means I can try to reduce the fallibility that separates me from the way I am and the way I want to be, as Ricœur argues in *Fallible Man*. It could be argued that this approach is missing from Kant's ethical theory, and was certainly not of interest to Heidegger. In *Oneself as Another* Ricœur seeks to create the sense of a person with less emphasis on fallibility and more on action. For such a person the narrative identity is the mediating concept between sameness (*idem*) and selfhood (*ipse*). What is missing from Ricœur here, for me, is any acknowledgement of Hume's brilliant exposition of our ability to act according to our desires and justify our actions *post hoc*, as well as his analysis of the ways in which custom and habit determine the way we understand our world.[35] In *Freud and Philosophy* Ricœur shows us the power of drives and instincts, but without the Humean touch of benevolent affection (we note, however, Hume's racism) towards humans, all of whom have desires. Yet, in a manner not dissimilar to Hume, Ricœur shows us how our stories are inevitably linked to others and to the lives of others, and these 'second order' stories are ethical and yet not completely within our control, as they reflect our dependence on others. In fact, the influence of the other over the self should be a key feature of any good ethical narrative, and all narratives are ethical for Ricœur.

So Ricœur returns to the idea of taking responsibility for actions, looking again to the British analytical tradition to kick-start the debate. He believes that

Anscombe, Davidson and others have effectively written the person out of the debate about human action. Austin and Searle have created with their speech act theory what, in Davidson's case Ricœur calls an 'agentless semantics of action', in which the person and the action are separate once the action has been committed. At one level this is understandable; I cannot keep control of the outcomes of all my actions, especially the unintended consequences. However, I cannot deny responsibility for most of what I do. For Ricœur the analytical philosophy attitude makes it difficult to understand responsibility. He reintroduces the phenomenological concept of a 'lived body' as the mediator between the person as actor to whom actions can be ascribed (*ipse*), and the person as agent, physically stable and identifiable over time (*idem*). This 'lived body' is also part of a society and therefore action is, in effect, always interaction, forming part of cultural situations that create pressures and specific dilemmas. Kantian deontology, the dutiful adherence to a strict moral code, will be too rigid to provide guidance for action in all such situations.

In his paper 'The Erosion of Tolerance and the Resistance of the Intolerable' (1996) Ricœur looks at the role of the citizen, by presenting an analysis of how we deal badly with difference: he proposes that we accept the existence of a continuum comprising five levels ranging from intolerance to total tolerance of everything.[36] This five-stage model implies a collective will as well as the will of the individual, representing an attempt to balance the intrinsic contradiction between the socius and the neighbour. The model is permeated by the suggestion that we need to care enough about others to challenge them, rather than telling them we don't care to recognize them as different and yet worthy. Here's the asymmetry; we celebrate the public virtues of citizenship without being able to bring truth and justice together because of the general needs of different groups, and yet also attempt to celebrate the private virtues of the autonomous individual who is not answerable to the group. This is probably insoluble: Kant himself deploys dialectical gymnastics with the 'public' and 'private' uses of reason. We recall Ricœur's attempts to work within the tragic fact that the social group is relatively resistant to the needs of the other person, as with the Samaritan. Both the group and the individual are at odds, each busy in its needy self-preservation. This is also true of the minority group when it is in conflict with the majority group, as we see if we accept that the concept of 'minority' is not an essential feature, but a concept about a relationship connected to our understanding of the hegemonic rights of the majority group. In the 'Little Ethics' of *Oneself as Another* Ricœur seeks to show us that we need to modify these rigidities in order to accommodate specific situations, using practical wisdom, *phronesis* to moderate general rules – a privilege not allowed to classical Greek characters such as Antigone, caught as she was between King Kreon's rules about the city and her perceived familial duty to bury her dead brother.

Suspicion arises that conscience is not altruistic enough and, implicitly in Hegel, explicitly in Nietzsche, conscience is seen as 'bad conscience'. Pellauer discusses suspicion as a positive, constructive and necessary force to be met in *Oneself as Another*, we need to doubt others and ourselves, in order to work out what we really are, and this shows the position of suspicion in conscience.[37] In *Oneself as Another* Ricœur discusses the inherence of suspicion with respect to attestation; what will I bear witness to about my own self, what is true?[38] The conscience is the place where illusions about myself are inextricably bound up with my attempts to be true to myself: humans as Nietzschean animals. We promise and hope to keep our promises partly through suspecting our own motives in attempting to live well with and for others in just institutions. Ricœur proposes to show that we can develop 'attestation', our conscience that guides us in standing up for the rights within our culture that are everyone's entitlement. These rights are prone to abuse, which can make us suspicious of our fellow citizens.

Attestation and suspicion

Attestation, in brief, is the position of asserting, here I am, and I will attest to what I do, to show you that I believe in what I do: I believe I am acting ethically. Jean Greisch, strong friend and colleague of Ricœur's for many years, gives us a very powerful reading of Ricœur's late work and the place of attestation therein. Greisch offers a hermeneutics of the self, with a hidden core of attestation in Ricœur's work, alongside the hermeneutics of testimony, which we see in *Memory, History, Forgetting*.[39] Attestation, "here I am", at all the levels i.e. linguistic, praxic, narrative and prescriptive, will save the self from being turned into an object.[40] Believing in ourselves has no guarantee of reliability or validity, yet it can function as a way of holding oneself between the cogito exalted by Descartes and the shattered cogito of Nietzsche. This is not a middle way of moderation, but a fierce determination to answer with useful actions the ironic question 'And you, what will you do?' Here Ricœur is answering the accusation of whether we deserve to be alive, with the accusative case: 'It's me here', 'me voici'. I act, I suffer, I am me, and this is 'the ultimate recourse against all suspicion', even, or especially when this attestation/confirmation comes from another person, which it must often do.[41] This is no longer the hermeneutics of suspicion.

'Attestation, which is just the other side of suspicion' will enable us to develop trust 'greater than any suspicion' and establish a position in which our hermeneutical attempt to be a coherent self, stands between Descartes' privileged cogito and Nietzsche's damaged one.[42] Going through suspicion and out the other side resembles Heidegger's offer of a conscience that is the Being-Guilty, being in debt and rejecting Kant and the critical function of conscience. Ricœur finds this gravely deficient; for Heidegger 'attestation is truly a kind of understanding, but one that cannot be reduced to knowing something.' This is conscience as the voice of the Other, which is lacking in Heidegger (except the punitive 'they' who would imprison us with conventional conscience) and which Ricœur brings to us philosophically and biblically. To show the shortcomings of

Heidegger's denial that we can differentiate between good and bad conscience, Ricœur gives two examples; the plea from the Song of Songs to 'Thou, Love me!' and the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill.'[43] Spinoza describes something akin to attestation as his endeavour to carry on living with his core concept of *conatus*, effort ('Each thing, as far as it can by its own power, strives (*conatur*) to persevere in its being'[44]). Ricœur, by his own admission, never writes much on Spinoza and omits him completely from the next major text on these issues, *The Just*. Yet as early as 1932 Ricœur was attending Dalbiez' classes on Spinoza, and was influenced by him for the rest of his life. He gave a series of lectures on Spinoza in 1951 and reviewed his notes and worked on them for lectures in English in 1965.[45] Spinoza's *conatus* is difficult to conceptualize, as we do not necessarily think consciously about being alive. Dosse provides a helpful commentary; when Dosse began work with Ricœur in 1998, Ricœur commented to him one day that he (aged over 86) had lots of energy, little strength and no capacity to act (*pouvoir*). For Dosse this encapsulates the *conatus* of Ricœur by its partial absence: for Ricœur, when he was younger, all three capacities comprised Spinoza's *conatus*.[46]

At the core of all this is the Kantian conflict between freedom and nature, which Ricœur first addressed in 1950. Anderson expresses concern that Ricœur's dual-aspect account of willing 'relies upon an inevitably paradoxical account of the human subject as being temporal and non-temporal'.[47] I believe that this ambiguity is a conspicuous and conscious aspect of his work from *Freedom and Nature* onwards, sometimes analysed as negativity, sometimes as dialectical tension, sometimes presented through suspicion, and a range of other approaches that are incompatible yet mutually supportive, even in a paradoxical manner. This is life and we see it perhaps most clearly in his own assertion that each of us understands ourselves through understanding the other person. Ricœur draws on his own personal bifurcated pathway of philosophy and theology. He accepts that this gives too much responsibility to the mediating role of the Kantian imagination and thus Ricœur hopes that the mytho-poetic core of the human imagination can draw strength and meaning from poetry, as well as struggling with all the antinomies that life brings. He does not complete his planned poetics of the will, but works towards a life of praxis in which richness of symbolic meaning will seek to energize political approaches, which may be a reasonable conclusion but a difficult challenge for the future of the world.

In his middle period in 'Biblical Hermeneutics' (1975) Ricœur develops further Kant's idea of a limit concept. Central to Kant and to Ricœur is this possibility of using reasoning to limit our natural desires, in order to get some grasp on the unconditioned i.e. that which transcends proof and must form the basis for our good actions. Understanding (*Verstand*) exerts itself to establish objective, unconditioned truths, but reasoning (*Vernunft*) attempts to go beyond understanding. Ricœur argues that the limit imposed by Kant on our capacity for reason, by the concept of regulative ideas that we will never attain, means that our quest for the unconditioned puts limits on our claim of objective knowledge. This does not mean that our knowledge is necessarily limited, but Kant's reason 'prohibits' the claim of objective knowledge to absolutize itself. We try so hard to be rational that we ignore other forms of thought that may give us comparably important truths. (Mythico-poetic and religious thought are, of course, other forms of thought for Ricœur, to which he returns in his late writings such as *Thinking Biblically*.) Ricœur seeks to reduce the limits of both the quest and the prohibition. There is an apparently empty place between polarities where we seek and fail to find unconditioned, absolute truths; yet in true Kantian fashion our seeking shows we are aware of the need for truths and makes us sensitive to the idea that something new can take place in that 'empty space'.[48]

The Just and the Good

Ricœur, studying Rawls intensively, is concerned that Rawls does not differentiate between the just and the good, because he gives the just jurisdiction over the good.[49] In chapter 8, the third and final Little Ethics chapter in *Oneself as Another*, Ricœur explores the possibility of using Rawls' theory of justice to support human beings in making the right decisions within their narrative that may need modification. Rawls proposes two principles of justice. The first principle promises to protect equal freedoms of citizenship for all. The second principle has two parts. The first part proposes how we can consider certain inequalities to be less iniquitous than others, and the second part attempts to explain how issues of authority and responsibility may necessitate certain inequalities.[50] Rawls proposes a 'veil of ignorance' to ensure that those in judgement will suspend their own personal needs and views of the needs of others in order to be fair, and of course they will use that absence of bias to ensure the 'maximin', i.e. that the minimum share of everything that is considered to be the right of all, is maximized. Rawlsian fairness is scrupulously planned yet there are several difficulties, such as the fact that all societies exclude some individuals from citizenship. Inequalities will exist because different individuals make contributions of different perceived value to society. Rawls bases his work on the social contract – which is a fiction, albeit a foundational one and he follows Kant in seeking to universalize maxims. The connection that Rawls makes between the Golden Rule and the maximin rule make his theory deontological; based upon general rules of obligation. The paradox here is that our compassion is for specific individuals, not for an anonymous cipher for the human race, whereas Rawls applies Kant's Golden Rule to institutions, not individuals. This is seen in the standard communitarian critique of Rawls.[51] The law responds better to generalities, not to the specificities of a particular person's case. Somehow the needs of the individual must be reconciled with the needs of the group.

In *The Just* (1995/2000) Ricœur turns to the work of three contemporary writers: Michael Walzer, communitarian (studying the individual as responsible in cohesive communities of belief and value), and sociologist Luc Boltanski and economist Laurent Thévenot to attempt to balance group needs and individual needs. All three are very aware of the many social goods and rights that are available in modern society, but their approaches are very different. Walzer enumerates many social goods, including those within religion and the home, which makes the list of potential adjudications very long and complex so that they risk losing all specificity. He also considers political power as a separate issue, whereas Ricœur wonders whether political power is arguably the key social good that should adjudicate its own conduct and also that of the other spheres.

Boltanski and Thévenot work together, and their work can be seen as similar enough to be discussed together. In contrast to Walzer, they attempt to rationalize the list of social goods by the device of imagining six cities, each of which is dedicated to a particular type of good; religion, opinion, finance, domestic, industrial and civic (concerned with law). Each type (and they know their list is not exhaustive) can be fairly adjudicated by methods appropriate to it. Yet the civic city (where politics is practised) is different from all the others, like Walzer's distinction between political power and other forces. Hence, despite his respect for their views, Ricœur believes that Walzer's and Boltanski/Thévenot's approaches have the same fatal flaw; the inability to propose a model that can address the paradox of politics. Constraint is necessary to preserve structures that perpetuate order and fairness. Politics has the potential to be dynamic and creative yet also violent, and Ricœur wants this acknowledged.

This is again the Kantian problem of limits; political power needs to be understood and contained, yet communitarianism, as with Walzer and Boltanski/Thévenot, cannot do that because it seeks to emancipate the group, and groups may then pit themselves against each other.[52] This is also the problem of individual and group needs; individuals should only minimally adjust agreed rules, as argued in chapter 9 of *Oneself as Another.* Ricœur reflects upon the university; not everyone can have a say in managing it – here he is perhaps thinking of his traumatic and unsuccessful attempt to contain student revolts at Nanterre X in the late 1960s. He stresses the importance of public debate, so that practical wisdom, phronesis for groups, can be articulated, agreed upon and understood widely, while accepting that this does not always work and is often not a sought-after method of legal reconciliation. Even in order to fulfil the Kantian imperative, a price must be paid at each of three levels. Living well *with* others requires renouncing personal inclination. Living well *for* others requires renouncing the treatment of others as means to an end, and living together *in just institutions* requires setting aside utilitarian approaches. What is more, missing for Ricœur from this Kantian framework is the idea of compassion (even love) as a more potent force for good than duty, and potentially a stronger way to try and right the wrongs we do to others constantly: simply by being alive we act with unintended consequences.

Third strand: theological work, Hegel and evil

In the short essay 'Le Mal' (1986), Evil, Ricœur looks at evil not from the legal but the theological position. Evil is an unparalleled challenge: what can we do?[53] Should we think less or more or differently about it? He tackles the desire of religious thought to provide all-encompassing explanations for everything we know, so that we feel in control, which creates inevitable paradoxes: God is all-powerful, God is absolutely good, and evil exists. How can all three be true? Theodicy struggles with the problem that only two seem to be true; never can all three be logically or experientially compatible. The problem is posed on the understanding that there must be a solution, and there must be consistency in the solution. These propositions are sophisticated and rely on pre-Kantian thinking that fuses confessional religious language and debate about the radical origin of all things. Moreover our reasoning cannot resolve the ways in which we think about this dilemma, because our reasoning is based on non-contradiction and our interest in 'systematic totalization'. Thus it is believed that real truths cannot be contradictable. The Kantian sequence of thinking, acting and feeling is necessary. Philosophy and theology both see evil as the common root of sin and suffering and yet suffering is something that happens to us, whereas sin is a wrongdoing we commit against others. How does it happen that we see them as inextricably linked?[54] Suffering and sin seem close because even when we are doing wrong we feel somehow victims of the act. Suffering evil we also feel like victims, wondering whether all suffering may in fact be punishment for evil we have done individually or collectively. This means that evil is still mythologized in some way, and it is necessary to use Freud to describe the process of mourning lest we mythologize the lost other.[55] In his concluding section of this short essay, Ricœur uses the Kantian triad of 'thinking, acting, feeling' (as in *Fallible Man*) and uses Freud's work on mourning from the essay 'Mourning and Melancholia' in the section on feeling; mourning as gradual detachment from the lost loved object, so that we can gradually become 'free for new emotional investments'.

Hegel and history are discussed in *Evil*.[56] Ricœur highlights the irony of Hegelian philosophy of history, which negates any distinction between happiness and misfortune because of the ineluctable movement of Hegel's idea of continual progress to the ultimate stage of absolute knowledge. Husserl remains closer to Freud than Hegel can ever be, as Husserl rests his argument on the assertion that meaning will never be complete, understanding will never be completely mastered and this is quintessentially true for Freudian analysis. Hegel, on the other hand, developed the idea of the thinker as omniscient interpreter, who 'moves ahead of the unfolding of the prototypic history of the mind' and believes that there can be some complete and progressive sense of an improving world. Karl Barth argues that we have a 'broken dialectic', a broken theology, i.e. one that has renounced the attempt to present a total and omnipotent image of God, is the only sort of theology that can argue the incompatibility of evil and goodness; he refers to the impossibility of evil being reconciled with the goodness of God and the goodness of creation as *Das Nichtige*, nothingness. Terms like 'impossibility', 'evil' and 'nothingness' still represent totalizing attempts at perfect explanations and thus for Ricœur, Barth is unable to postulate brokenness.[57]

In *Evil*, Ricœur describes Hegel's analysis of evil as arising out of the 'very accusation from which the moral vision of evil stems'.[58] Hegel's idea of evil thus resembles Saint Paul's in that 'justification is born of the destruction of the judgement of condemnation', in other words it is by censure and by rules and laws that we create and describe evil. The *judgement of condemnation* about which St. Paul writes bears a family resemblance to the *hermeneutics of suspicion*, as each adopts the point of view that seems to give permission to censure and even to condemn totally, as if one ever knew enough to be in that position. I am reminded here of Ricœur's work in the 1960s on Sartre and his discussion of suspicion in *The Symbolism of Evil*, which he picks up again in *Oneself as Another*: 'the absolute view separates the appearance from the reality by the sharp edge of suspicion. Suspicion of myself is thus the taking up by myself of the absolute viewpoint.'[59]

Absolute suspicion of my own motives allows me the luxury to be fixed in my views about my own moral position: people who define themselves as poor miserable sinners have established their right to sin. Such vanity is necessary (if it leads to iconoclastic thought which facilitates openness and honesty about metanarratives etc.) and yet very dangerous if we are unaware of the aspect of hubris involved; I cannot know absolutely, my vision will always be partial, both because of the point of view that is my personal sighting of the world and also because the multilevel and multiple characteristics of 'truth' mean that I am never able to have a truly accurate view and can therefore very rarely use suspicion to judge others definitively.

Conclusions

The crisis for Ricœur is the difficulty of using theological or moral frameworks to offer guidance because of their totalizing tendencies. Moreover our capacity for evil is justified by our own conscience and therefore his philosophical anthropology is based upon the premise that all actions are potentially dangerous. He experienced this personally and painfully in his Nanterre X episode in 1968 (see Chapter 5). It is tempting to see the Nanterre episode as symptomatic of the problem at the heart of Ricœur's philosophical anthropology; some people are good, some are foolish and we all have the capacity to refuse to listen to our conscience, whatever that is. Looking back on it he tells his interviewers that he made several errors of judgement, related partly to the conflict in his own mind between the principles of the new university (Nanterre was supposed to be modern, staff would be accessible to students and the old French university was past and gone) and the principle of being in charge (which he himself was supposed to be); he feels that he failed to uphold either principle and thus failed in his duty of care to the students and to his colleagues. Clearly, at Nanterre, he was unable to put his principles into practice; discussion and debate did not help, the *Zeitgeist* of rebellion was very strong and his colleagues did not support him.

How does Ricœur seek solutions? He uses language to create fresh ideas through the revelatory power of metaphor, he analyses parabolic structures that, at the level of narrative structure, resemble that of metaphor and shock us into ethical thinking; he reworks Kant and Aristotle in order to develop a model that contains practical wisdom and he creates the possibility of dialectical tension between dichotomous models that we use to make sense of our world with judicious use of suspicion. Yet at a philosophical level it is also possible to feel that we have reached an impasse. *The Just* is a perplexed and perplexing book that admits to not being able to unite the desires of the individual and the needs of the group and shows us that Ricœur has failed to produce a robust legacy because personal conscience cannot be legislated for. However, it is interesting to note the impact that his work on law had on the French governmental scene in the 1990s. Dosse gives us an example from work on modern divorce by Irène Théry who reports in her book *Le Démariage*, that Ricœur's narrative approach in *Time and Narrative* has been very valuable in guiding women through the trauma of divorce.[60] This conjunction between divorce courts and Ricœur's ideas on justice was the result of work with French government ministers in the 1990s and led to his book *The Just* (1995/2000). Dosse also describes how French lawyers and ministers found Ricœur inspirational and helpful in launching and maintaining a national debate in the 1990s about the urgent need to reform the justice system, a move initiated by First Minister Rocard.[61] In 1991 the *Institut des Hautes Études sur la Justice* (IHEJ) was set up, to reform thinking about the French legal system. Ricœur worked alongside top lawyers, some of whom had connections, as did Ricœur, with the left wing Christian journal *Esprit*. Ricœur's work on law was successful in generating debate, galvanizing legal experts to rethink the state of French law in the light of lessons learnt, in a sort of second naivety.[62]

Philosophical anthropology may be able to both describe and help us to develop second naiveté in the light of lessons learnt: Ricœur retains suspicion as a companion, a condition of possibility for attestation – to help us bear witness to our actions. Thirty years after *The Symbolism of Evil* he writes that conscience is 'the place of an original form of the dialectic between selfhood and otherness', which can only be understood if we at least *consider* 'the claim that the attestation of selfhood is inseparable from an exercise of suspicion'.[63] Referring back to the concerns he has about Rawls' use of Kantian morals as an assumed basis for good action, he suggests that such thinking can lead to a sort of complacency that he describes as passivity; the metaphor of the voice of suspicion is the only way to help the metaphorical 'voice of conscience' to attest to right actions 'by moving against the current of moralising interpretations that actually conceal its force of discovery'.[64] Moreover, 'It is here that the test of suspicion is shown to be beneficial in order to recover the capacity for discovery belonging to the metaphor of the voice.'[65] Gradually we see that the successor to Ricœur's hermeneutic of suspicion is a modest and fragile belief in the self after all, but no longer a naïve faith, more a second naivety that comes from an informed, critical faith accompanied by suspicion. In Chapter 9 we will examine in some detail his last two major texts, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2000/2004) and *The Course of Recognition* (2004/2005) to see whether Ricœur himself believes that this work can be brought together at the end of his long and productive life, and whether we can be convinced by his decision to continue to employ suspicion.

Chapter 9

Ricœur's hermeneutics III: recovery

The hermeneutics of recovery (or retrieval) is Ricœur's attempt to answer the question of how we can become wiser and more compassionate as a result of guilt, loss and disappointment, and this is a counterbalance to suspicion. He sees the vital role that history plays, with his long view over an entire century, and the importance of eyewitness testimony. In this dialogue with history, Middle East correspondent and historian Robert Fisk has read this chapter, and as a foremost eyewitness of the last fifty years, has suggested to me how Ricœur's ideas can be exemplified and also seen in a different light. Robert Fisk has been reporting on wars in the Middle East for over thirty years, and knows well the history of each region, as well as the historian's long view of the Second World War, of Africa and of the Middle East. Even those who disagree with his interpretations, agree that he has witnessed injustice repeatedly on a large scale and has earned the right as eyewitness to tell us what he sees, lest we ignore or forget or rely too much on what the politicians tell us.

Each of the three approaches discussed in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 has its counterpart in a state of mind that we may find in ourselves, either as a form of regrettable *stuckness* or – preferably – a developmental journey leading to a mature state of being wiser, even if careworn, dog-eared and suspicious. Linguistic analysis is experienced in a pre-critical naivety (if we stop at structuralist analysis – clearly Ricœur recommends alternative hermeneutic approaches). The second phase is methodological dialectics, experienced in critical exegesis (containing hermeneutics of suspicion, and potentially a stage at which we may become stuck in ironic disbelief, as Cavell describes). Thirdly and finally we develop philosophical anthropology leading to second naivety, a state of mind in which we are able to judge and choose ethically, and thereby recover from the chaos induced by being either too trusting or too suspicious. This third stage is the culmination of the hermeneutics of recovery; it must include all the preceding stages and is by definition unstable.

Asymmetry and risk are always there; we never get the balance right. This goes back to *Fallible Man* and beyond, with the admission that 'the avowal of evil is also the condition of the consciousness of freedom.'[1] Suspicion has been with Ricœur since 1930 with Dalbiez' doubt and will stay with the argument throughout *Memory, History, Forgetting* and in the final discussion in *The Course of Recognition.*

By 2000 many of Ricœur's sparring partners are dead and he has become re-recognized, over the last twenty years, as a great French philosopher.[2] His much-loved wife Simone dies in 1998 after a long illness. He will live to be ninety-two and continues to receive many prizes, of which perhaps the most moving for him is the Paul VI prize received in person from the Pope; as a child and young adult he always felt, as a Protestant, like an outsider in Catholic France. Dosse reports that Ricœur is appreciated in the 1990s because over the last thirty years he has been 'able to preserve the dimensions of the Subject, of action, of the referent, and of ethics, which were out of vogue, while at the same time adopting whatever was positive in semiology'.[3]

Memory, History, Forgetting

The last four works published in Ricœur's lifetime are *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2000/2004), *Reflections on the Just* (2001/2007), *On Translation* (2004/2006)[4] and *The Course of Recognition* (2004/2005). As discussed in Chapter 7, *Memory, History, Forgetting* seems to be his definitive statement at this endpoint in his life, although he had further plans: he told David Pellauer about a sequel to *Memory, History, Forgetting* and discussed *The Capable Human Being* with others.[5] In *Memory, History, Forgetting* Ricœur seeks to develop a way of bringing together several already well-worked areas, from *Time and Narrative* and *Oneself as Another.* Time, space and causality are the three most prized and ever present dilemmas. He gives us some conceptual maps for our trips into the past offering us a sail in his three-masted ship of phenomenology, epistemology and hermeneutics, perhaps with a resonance of Baudelaire, who calls 'Oh death, old captain, it is time, pull up the anchor'. . . .[6] Ricœur adds to philosophy the usual multidisciplinary combination of history and sociology, with some law and politics, and always with Freud in attendance. *Memory, History, Forgetting* is memorable for his reappraisal of thinkers he has worked on for over sixty years: Heidegger is praised and scolded, Bergson is, belatedly, given a place of honour and Ricœur returns to Jaspers, Marcel and Nabert, three of his very first mentors. *Memory, History, Forgetting* is also memorable for chronicling the renewed friendship between him and Derrida, who was dying, which resonates perhaps with the major theme of the book: can we forgive, and if so, do we need to forget in order to forgive? If we remember, can our memories be relied upon? If we forget, are we failing to bear witness to past events that may need to be kept alive in memory as a way of warning those who come after us? This last question relates to the role of France and Europe during the Second World War, which he discusses in more depth here than elsewhere: this is about Vichy France.

How do we remember?

The first section of *Memory, History, Forgetting* is based upon Ricœur's phenomenological approach to the human; he returns to phenomenology because he believes it provides the best set of processes for identifying and analysing the most difficult questions about human existence, with the body as subject attempting to confront the body as lived. Phenomenology also offers insight into its own weaknesses, as he found years earlier in his work on Husserl. He is returning to themes from his own past life and writing, of which the most significant historical phenomenon is the Second World War as the French experienced it; he looks for self-understanding (developing ideas from *Oneself as Another*) through the ways in which one understands the world through history (developing ideas from *Time and Narrative*). In particular he investigates in depth for the first time in his work the ways in which we remember, forget, and forgive, although there are many examples of it throughout his work, as in 'the struggle against the forgetting of the question' which should lead to an intensive critical rethinking and the 'recollection of meaning'.[7] This work on forgetting and remembering is combined with ideas from history, historiography, philosophy, law, medicine, psychoanalysis, literary theory and sociology about archives, historical narrative, collective memory and historical memory, and personal memories. Kant and Hegel, Freud and Nietzsche are used as integral parts of Ricœur's arguments (very little Marx). Schutz, Weber and Arendt are also significant, as are many others. Hannah Arendt and Ricœur were bound together intellectually by many factors, including their work on Jaspers; they met in Chicago and admired each other's work. Bergson comes into his own in *Memory, History, Forgetting* with his theories of memory. There is a strong criticism of Heidegger in which Ricœur distances himself from Heidegger's views on the past, while still acknowledging Heidegger's greatness.[8]

How do we remember? We are reminded of Socrates in Plato's *Meno* and *Theaetetus* and the idea of memory as an imprint in a block of wax, a copy but inevitably changed. Ricœur prefers the image of an aviary of birds, trying to capture memories in flight, not knowing whether they are real memories (are they doves or not?) and the idea of counting in memory (how many doves/ memories can I capture?).[9] He wants to show that 'testimony constitutes the fundamental transitional structure between memory and history'. Transition between memory and history will be facilitated partially by association. He reminds us of Aristotle's pragmatic sense of memory as resulting from associationist learning and the statement in the *Parvia Naturalia* that 'all memory is of the past' and also takes place in the present. How can we know how accurate an account may be of events that have finished and can never be experienced again? How can we know the effects of time on the event? How do we even know that it matters to attempt such questions?

Ricœur uses many examples to show us how 'memory can be ideologised' through narrative devices and frequently focuses on the Second World War and the Holocaust, including the collaboration of Vichy France.[10] He shows us how many versions of the past are perspectival and selective and thus require critical analysis: he debates different forms; types of history, forms of archiving, types of sociological argument etc., so we can use the technique of questioning backwards to challenge sources and also to accept trustworthy ones (Husserl's *Rückfrage*, back questioning). In chapter 3 he discusses personal memories, collective memory; why can't we attribute memory to every person, even the non-persons, like 'one' and Heidegger's *Das Man*? There is rivalry between individual memory and collective memory and we should be aware of the way the past becomes solidified into discrete events that are selected as important and retold in the light of how they are interpreted.[11] These events acquire privileged status as if they really were what happened, instead of *representing* the past. One of our responsibilities then, is to question the narrative we are given; yet we will not know all the facts that are drawn upon. What we can do is be sensitive to the referential object, the interpretation that is taken as 'the overall object of historical discourse'. Historiography, the study of historical writing, will be necessary, so we can study methods used by historians, and politicians!

Historical methods: what are we talking about when we say that something happened?

Historical narrative sets itself up as 'better' than memory, by asserting expertise and deploying methods that organize and interpret material.[12] Ricœur is wary of such claims. There is a rich polysemic quality in language that survives our critical suspicion, and in order to be sensitive to this, we have to consider attempting to be less norm-dependent, less dependent on methods (which undoubtedly are useful analytical tools, but which pre-determine the structures of intelligible experience and thus foreclose on other options). Blamey, one of Ricœur's most experienced interpreters and translators, describes the 'mandate of suspicion' that runs through his work, from *Freud and Philosophy* onwards: 'the method does not eliminate doubt, the method *is* one of doubt, proceeding under the mandate of suspicion.'[13] She uses Ricœur's phrase 'the exercise of suspicion' that we discuss in Chapter 4, to explain the last few pages of *Oneself as Another*.[14] Hermeneutics must help us here to examine the past. Methodology, structuralism and psychoanalysis are valuable, yet each, in its own unique way, depends completely on its own created structures and thereby rests its future on its past. These three approaches create their own norms and then present a normative risk-avoidance strategy that defines the future more in the light of what has already occurred than in the possibility of what may yet happen.

In his discussion of archived memory Ricœur again evokes the Phaedrus section on writing in order to consider whether testimony can be accurate.

He draws upon a modern experimental situation to discuss the possibility that an observer is not objective and challenges as artificial an experimental situation in which psychologists make use of video to show how inaccurate the human viewer can be. He yet again uses the word 'suspicion'; his suspicion is that the experimenters are in control of the whole situation and can easily manipulate the viewer to give inaccurate feedback about what they think they have seen. He is not arguing that we are always accurate observers, but he adds availability, steadfastness and commitment to the confidence in the probity of the witness, seeing this as a form of promise that does not benefit from experimentation, but needs to be seen in context.[15] Ricœur is concerned about the way we may influence the future by attempts at totalizing the way we understand reality, with grand ideas and all encompassing worldviews.

Written memories

Yet Ricœur also tells us that we must challenge those who testify about the past, and written testimony may well be suspect also. Pierre Nora (1931–) with his study of French national memory exclaims; 'Archive as much as you like, something will always be left out'; it may be inaccurate, incomplete and false and traces may even be effaced.[16] Fisk, to exemplify this point, cites the way in which Attaturk made reports of the Armenian genocide inaccessible by making Roman script the national Turkish script; new generations would no longer be able to read the Arabic script of the reports, although as tourists we may welcome the opportunity to transliterate using familiar script on signposts. Stalin, in Tajikistan, forced Cyrillic script onto the people, whose past was written in Dari/Persian script, thereby denying them their history. When historiographical testimony is written, as Plato tells us, it is asked to prove itself, and to be able to respond to criticism, and of course it is silent on the page, it needs to be read and interpreted – this is even before we apply Kant's test of exploring the limits of our cognition. Ricœur differentiates between archived material and events that cannot really be archived because they are beyond the limits of what humans can conceive as possible, such as the Holocaust.

In order to come to terms with the horror and the complexity of archive as testimony, Ricœur insists that we must be doubting and suspicious and ask ourselves again and again 'what is one talking about when one says that something happened?'[17] Fisk shows us that we can, indeed must also continue to learn *after* the event, because we have a duty to ask what we mean when we say that something happened: he describes how, in the aftermath of the Sabra and Chatila massacres of Palestinians by Christian Phalangist militia groups in 1982, over a thousand Palestinian youths and men were held in a sports stadium. Fisk and Karsten Tveit of Norwegian television saw the prisoners in the stadium, and did not suspect anything. Subsequently many were reported as having disappeared. It was not until nineteen years later that Tveit and Fisk were able to work out what had happened, using old film footage from 1982 to locate eyewitnesses. The eyewitness accounts seemed trustworthy because of the similarities in the reporting by people who did not know each other, and whose men folk had disappeared at that time. Detecting discrepancies in the accounts they read, Fisk and Tveit were determined not to give up their investigations. Eventually their evidence led them to the conclusion that the men and boys were killed by Christian Phalangists, invited to the camps by the Israelis. This second wave of killing does not appear in the official version of the episode.[18] It should not go unreported that Fisk's newspaper article on the massacre was held back by the Independent newspaper because of breaking news about 9/11. Here is a tragic irony, that the apparently chance contiguity of two events reflects a causal relation.

Trustworthy witnesses

Trustworthiness is part of the social bond, the *habitus* of any community, the acquired habitual patterns of thought, behaviour and taste. Trust in others enables us to share an intersubjective world. When habitus, first defined by Aristotle and reworked by Bourdieu (1930–2002), relies too heavily upon defining as evil the Derridean less privileged one of a pair, we are faced with societal self-deception, as we see with so-called 'Islamophobia' and revival of anti-Semitism in Northern Europe and North America. Historical criticism should embody the response to suspicion, and question the testimony, which is spontaneous, oral and potentially fallible – this will create a crisis of belief, turning historical knowledge into a school of suspicion, and we will seek to avoid this by rewriting history.[19] Phaedrus returns; is the *pharmakon* remedy or poison? Socrates asserts the power of the spoken word because it can adapt to the context. Do we need documentary proof to remedy the constitutional weakness of testimony? There is the *pharmakon* tale about the god offering the king a marvellous potion that will improve memory; paying tribute to Derrida, who used this idea, Ricœur reminds us that writing knowledge down can impair the memory and make us dependent upon the written text, instead of using our memories to retain, master and use that which we know.[20] He applauds Derrida's *Of Grammatology* and the connections it makes between written and spoken word.[21] Thus history, which by definition we receive now as written work, may be remedy or poison: a dialectical pairing.

The historian bears the responsibility for collecting documentary evidence and sifting it to select the facts that count; this is problematic because of the choices that are made, but Ricœur feels that the interpretation of these facts is even more open to criticism than the collection of them; Popper's characterization of truthfulness may be applied to collection of facts with evidence but when interpreting the significance of these facts there is much room for doubt. These facts then have to 'stand for' what happened – Ricœur calls this 'representation', and advises that the process be submitted repeatedly to the question 'What is one talking about when one says that something happened?' Ricœur sees this work on representation as a vital part of the work on *Memory, History, Forgetting* and the 'polestar' of the work in *The Course of Recognition*.[22] It is a Ricœurian development of Kant's struggle to bring together 'the confrontation between the receptivity of the senses and intellectual spontaneity in one and the same act of thought'.[23] In the same passage in *The Course of Recognition*, Ricœur quotes Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* with his emphasis on the fact that judgement is the mediate, never direct knowledge of an object 'that is, the representation of a representation of it'.[24]

Tree trunks and ants' legs

There are many devices developed by historians for managing time past, one of the more useful of which is different scales, if we set them against each other. Jonathan Swift, as satirist, achieved this with exquisite effect in *Gulliver's Travels*. Variations in scale, as described by Pascal, from houses and trees to ants and ants' legs, provide different explanations for historians, whether they are the Braudelian macro-historical school, or the Annales micro-historical school. We need to be aware of them so that we can compare and contrast their different representations, and avoid the totalizing vision of adherence to one scale. If we contrast different scales, narrative can become 'a switching point between structure and event'.[25] An army marches across a bridge, and subsequently this event becomes understood as the defining moment in a battle, thus adopting a structural importance. When we use more than one scale to gain a sense of different viewpoints, this device shows how representation can be interconnected, as both an object of history (a particular scale) and a tool of history (contrasting different scales), different yet connected.[26] These tools can become too closely connected to allow for any balanced judgement; many eras, for example, have interpreted events in their time as structural evidence of modernity, thereby failing to look critically at their own practices.[27] Ricœur is challenging us to be stubbornly tentative, and to refuse to seek a false equilibrium through totalization by adherence to one particular model: he sees rationalization as an intellectual response that resembles the emotional response of internalizing fears.[28] Deliberate restriction to analysis of a culture as it sees itself, as described by Geertz, with his symbolic anthropology, is commendable but also indefensible as the only possible approach.[29] More productive approaches may be found with Halbwachs and his work on collective memory, Yerushalmi and his work on Jewish history and Nora and his work on the places of memory. These methods are discussed in a gradual shift of focus towards the '*Unheimlichkeit*' (uncanniness, strangeness) of history, a term from Freud to describe the opposite of cosy and homely, except that the word *heimlich* also means secretive, which can be cosy and snug or deceitful and suspect. As *heimlich* moves closer to *unheimlich* it lends its apparent opposite its own ambiguity. Ricœur also wants these approaches to be used to discuss death, history and memory in the context of commemorative history, which fails to eliminate 'eerie', 'weird', bad memories with its medals, speeches and plinths that populate our waking life.

In the section in *Memory, History, Forgetting* entitled 'The Historian's Representation', Ricœur explores the possibility that phenomenology, an old companion, can be used for history, so that it applies to historical matters those techniques honed in perceptual issues, and thereby also makes us aware of the perceptual, the eidetic nature of history and the way we conjure up historical images to strengthen a belief or an argument.[30] Predictably, an implicit contract between the reader and the author is different depending on whether this is fictional narrative or historical narrative. Different scales from macro (the ethics of war) to micro (the experiences of the bomber crew), for example, can be knitted together through narrative, and structures and events can be brought together, even when there is no causal link. Saussure has transformed narrative theory and affected the way we look at meaning transmitted by sentences, and yet there is still no real possibility of using history book sentences to recover historical meaning because the past is gone: 'there is history because there is an absence of things in words.'[31]

Living history through imagery and symbols

Imagery is one of the components of representation; in history we conjure up iconic images and events, such as the death of a king, to signify particular ideas, such as the end of an era or the loss of sovereign power. Fisk cites the use of language to create an unforgettable image; Richard Dimbleby flying over Hamburg and reporting the World War Two bombing from a Lancaster bomber whose propellers are audible on the recording and describing the bombing as 'a great white basin of light.'[32] This eidetic power of history, the ability to show us an idea as clearly as if we had imagined it for ourselves and could see it in front of our eyes, can be deceptively persuasive and should arouse our suspicions. Iconic memories can be drawn from our collective memory, 'the icon of the past.'[33] The historian will use different schools of thought and variations in scale, as well as particular archives and testimonies in order to create certain objects for us and not others. De Certeau shows how this can be done in historical writing to create (metaphorically speaking) cemeteries within cities, in which the dead represent the past alongside the living.[34] Phenomenology is a useful aid to thought here; it has always given us the idea of self-consciously concentrating on the imagery of the world, as we perceive it through all our senses, not only vision.

The historian conjures up imagery for us and Ricœur implores us to see history as a complex artefact, with 'the referential impulse of the historical narrative,' the function of linking parts of speech in language e.g. pronouns with verbs as the historian Mink describes it: presenting events as if they are part of a pattern can reveal a general principle, but only if positivism or scientific thought are still deemed credible, which Mink doubts.[35] It is necessary to resist the transformation of historical material into symbolic representation; symbol as being a strangely entire item where image and idea are inextricably fused, yet clearly recognizable to us (as with dirt and defilement leading to the idea of sin in *The Symbolism of Evil*). This makes symbol resistant to interpretation, and the meaning of symbols is both open and hidden and therefore highly potent. In *Allegories of Reading*, De Man discusses the possibility that rhetorical devices such as metaphor may prove immune to deconstruction, yet he also opposes the figural totalization, the possibility of using metaphor to control meaning in discourse.[36] Ricœur's idea of metaphor is a riskier, more flexible one.

For Ricœur phenomenology is more able to decipher the use of image as symbol than hermeneutics is; yet phenomenology still needs the company of suspicion. Psychoanalysis is able to operationalize this suspicion with the process of working through, *durcharbeiten*, which, as Blamey shows us, is the determining difference between phenomenology and psychoanalysis.[37] If not engaged in psychoanalysis, we should direct our suspicion towards sources and arguments, and this very suspicion, while being inevitable, also functions to strengthen our understanding of our role as citizen–reader.[38] Narrative, another old companion, returns, this time in the service of explanation, yet becoming suspect because of the potency of the language at history's disposal. We become suspicious when faced with seductive narrative; is such history true or just attractive, is it representational of historical truth or is it fiction? Ricœur wonders if history and fiction can be reconciled to each other. Robert Fisk believes that some fiction is more real than history. Despite the novelist Len Deighton's prose style being generally unexceptional, Fisk commends Deighton for his book *Bomber*, for its capacity to bring you closer to the real experience of the RAF Lancaster bomber crew than all the great history books.[39] Historical narrative, as with any narrative, must also resist the misuse (as Ricœur sees it) of the Saussurean distinction between signifier and signified, which is misused if it contains no referral to a referent, i.e. the text becoming closed in on itself, without referring to events and objects in the outside world.[40] This seems to be a misappropriation of the Saussurean terminology.

Barthes points out another problem, whereby the 'external, founding referent', the postulated event in historical time, becomes hypostatized, made as real as if it could not be denied existence, at the core of historical narrative, which precludes dissent by the reader.[41] Ricœur discusses Marin's (1931) analysis of Pascal's *Pensées*, in order to show us how wilful the human imagination can be; even when the glittering gold of the king's crown is set aside by the French Revolution, there is still – in a play on words – a sort of reigning monarchy of ideas, a hegemony of the human imagination, determined to make sense of the past as justifiable. Ricœur enjoys Marin's post-structuralist dismantling of historical devices and analysis of Pascal.[42] Ricœur asks us to consider whether we should be wary of the 'absolute blame inflicted upon Nazi politics by our moral conscience', suggesting that such blame may be as unreasonably exaggerated as the praise addressed to the monarch by his subjects, because we believe that absolute blame for Hitler exonerates us, the citizens of Europe, from blame and responsibility.[43]

History purports to be a representation *of* the past, yet it can only *stand for* the past, and even then only for some versions of the past. As in *Time and Narrative*, Ricœur stresses the roles played by narrative, rhetoric and the imaginative aspect. Yet throughout his life he sought to develop the latent power of language, reviving the art of metaphor, commending rhetoric to us and making us aware of the potential benefits of becoming aware of how we translate our lives into narrative with myths, significant plots and ethical options. There is no contradiction here; 'now we have renounced taking expression for a neutral, transparent garment thrown over a signification complete in its meaning', we can be aware of the inseparability of thought and language and make a pact with the historian so that we readers can see what the historian is doing.[44] 'And yet' . . . historical narrative is attempting to bring into the present something that is over and therefore absent. In attempting to recall something that is no longer there, distortion is inevitable. He recommends documentary proof, comprehensive explanation and representation, in a sort of triangulation. Where is the representation taking place: is the witness giving testimony, the historian or the reader, or all three? Moreover, if the history is politically charged, the representation *of* the facts is also the representation *between* the opposing parties. 'At this point the epistemology of history borders on the ontology of being-in-the-world', because all that I live is based upon that which is past, lost to me and absent from yesterday and before, and negativity is with me as a wound as well as simple absence.[45]

What does it mean to understand in the historical mode?

Ricœur asks what it is 'to understand in the historical mode?' and proposes a critical and an ontological approach.[46] The critical approach attempts to establish facts, an epistemological effort. The ontological approach attempts to develop relations between history and life: the existential – what do we believe is worth believing in? It will examine the existential essence of history as it relates to our lives; what are the conditions of possibility that facilitate the making of history that we are content to be responsible for and what is the meaning of our lives as a result of that? He will lead up to forgetting and forgiveness, each of which is related to guilt and indebtedness, and to arrive there he will journey from historical knowledge, through critical hermeneutics, to ontological hermeneutics.

Ricœur discusses Koselleck (1923–2006) who he finds making a space for the possible practice of history in modernity; Ricœur interprets Koselleck differently in *Time and Narrative*.[47] Now we find declaration of a secular religion resulting from the equation between history and reason. Would that be world history, a regulative idea in a Kantian sense, *postulating* unification of knowledge forms and reconciliation of nation states? Or would this be a predictive idea in the Hegelian mould, which *celebrates* the already achieved state of universality as an integral part of itself? Ricœur has, of course already rejected Hegel's idealistic totalizing vision of a rosy future, and expresses concern about how we can innovate – the French Revolution was a high-risk model for bringing about change, and Europe has suffered the rupture and trauma of two wars, which were immeasurably damaging. In addition, the increasing relativization of knowledge also damaged irreparably the *Heilsgeschichte*, the salvation history that seemed increasingly incredible to secular societies.

Relativist ideas lead to the peremptory question about relative viewpoint; 'Where are you speaking from?' This question 'finally turns against the one making it and becomes internalised as paralyzing suspicion'.[48] This is a use of suspicion that must be avoided, or else we will become paralysed between relativism and absolutism, instead of working towards pluralism. We are thus very self-conscious about our history and have become highly preoccupied with decline and with delegitimizing ourselves, because we cannot live up to our absolutist standards – the residue of Hegelian absolute idealism. Lyotard sees this; we risk either irreconcilable positions or insistence upon consensus that finds itself powerless to conciliate. At this point Ricœur juxtaposes judge and historian, to see whether the third party vow of impartiality can help. He sees both judge and historian as 'past masters at exposing fakes and, in this sense, both masters in the manipulation of suspicion', and accompanies this with an interesting footnote about witchcraft, in which the judges were able to convince the accused themselves that they were guilty of witchcraft.[49]

Witch-hunts still take place: Ricœur here casts doubt on modern trials that involve political situations, and I am reminded of his shock in 1927 at the unjust trial and death sentence of Sacco and Vanzetti.[50] He sees an uneasy relationship between judge and historian when each is looking at the same highly controversial issue; he cites the history of the Holocaust and the subsequent trials for crimes against humanity, and the risk of historians finding their approach to history distorted because of the hysterical hatred that can be engendered in such trials. The court should seek to apportion individual guilt and to establish a clear and plausible version of the crime; the historian will seek to consult a wider group, including bystanders and populations and a more nuanced concept of guilt. Ricœur also reminds us that there are lawyers who are unscrupulous. He emphasizes the need for those who read history to be able to work out what they *think*, to be able to apply Popper's falsification rule to the choice of documentary proof, and to see how subjective interpretation is. The greatest danger of misunderstanding is thinking we are objective when we can only be subjective and he hopes for historical dialogue in which the reader can take an active part, as Benveniste desired, and, I believe, exemplified by Fisk. Not only is Robert Fisk physically present as an eyewitness at the making of history in his dangerous work as a Middle East correspondent, he also facilitates active readership of history in the making. He takes considerable risks to be present and bear witness and also writes and travels a great deal in order to meet his readers, giving talks that facilitate dialogue, including open debate in disagreement with his conclusions.[51]

Being physically present: Heidegger's failure

Ricœur pays tribute to Heidegger's *Being and Time*, yet warns us that he will take issue with Heidegger's emphasis on the future, which seems to seek the future in the past and thereby obscure the related yet different need to really challenge the past. He states that he finds Heidegger's term 'authenticity' unintelligible and self-referential and cannot find any significance in Heidegger's term 'resoluteness'. Ricœur struggles with Heidegger's movement towards death, the being-toward-death and replaces it with 'the existential condition of possibility with respect to historical knowledge'.[52] Ricœur believes that Heidegger does not address adequately memory or recognition although he points out that we would not be able to relate to the past if the present did not contain 'its having-been', the traces of the past that are in the present.[53] Heidegger connects this idea with the 'unavailability of the manipulable', which Ricœur believes to be a shortcut that avoids discussion of how we represent to ourselves that, which is gone. Heidegger removes the moral character from the concept of debt, and this makes it possible for being-in-debt to 'constitute the existential possibility of standing for'. Ricœur sees the emphasis on death in Heidegger as a good opportunity for the historian to insist upon balancing Heidegger's being-toward-death with a being-in-the-face-of-death, against death, so we can take the work of mourning into account.[54]

Ricœur finds no physicality in Heidegger; the flesh and body of the person are not there, and this excludes desire, such as in Spinoza's conatus (the effort of every entity to persevere in its own mode of being) and Freud's libido, which resemble each other.[55] Where are the desire to be and the effort to exist, as Nabert sees them, in Heidegger's categories of *Vorhandenheit* (at hand, objectively present) and *Zuhandenheit* (handy, manipulable)? Both these definitions describe the objective presence and usefulness of the physical world without connecting them to the Da-sein, the physicality of being alive in Heidegger's world.[56] The desire that death can evoke in us, to have the lost dead back, is also absent, and thus precludes acknowledgement of the loss of self that takes place with the loss of the love object; Ricœur finds no possibility for mourning in Heidegger's hermeneutics.[57] This is symptomatic of Heidegger's short cut to being a human, which Ricœur tackled decades before (1980, with his work on narrative) and is not compatible with Ricœur's account of the task that faces historians, which contains the sense of loss and mourning as well as the desire to forgive. Heidegger's *Sorge*, Care, represents anxiety for oneself as a way of attempting to understand oneself, and is centred on the living present. Heidegger was interested in the dead past as well as the living present; he condemned inauthentic historicity as 'blind towards possibilities' but not the history of historians. (Historicity analyses the historical credibility of text.) The idea of repetition is significant in Heidegger's 'power' of the possible and Ricœur uses this concept to link section two and three of *Memory, History, Forgetting*, which is interesting, given Ricœur's earlier interest in Freud's view of repetition as a pathological compulsion.[58]

Ricœur and Heidegger are both interested in the future above anything else, but Heidegger's future seems to be a reprise of the past, whereas Ricœur seeks constantly ways of helping us to create a new, better future.

How we forget: the present is, from the moment of its appearance, its own past

In looking at the ways in which forgetting casts doubt on the reliability of our memories, Ricœur invokes again Plato's metaphor of the wax imprint that leaves traces of the original, and examines the traces he sees.[59] He sets documentary traces on one side, and concentrates on psychical and cortical memory traces building partly on his work with Pierre Changeux, a neuroscientist.[60] While a neuroscientist speaks of reactivating traces, a phenomenologist speaks of 'a persistence of the original impression'. Phenomenology is the representation of the past, and may be able to help us to think about forgetting, in combination with neurology. The neurologist will reduce everything back to brain function, and the philosopher will draw on the cognitive sciences – yet both have some recognizable correspondences. The neuroscientist must try to find out what makes it possible for me to think, and I can then come closer to understand the issues of presence, absence and distance. The reductionism of the scientist on the one hand and the hermeneutical open-endedness of the philosopher should work together to understand remembering and forgetting.

What is forgetting? The mind stays silent about it, as we are not aware that it has happened, just as we do not think consciously about ordinary remembering. However, I have reasons to be suspicious about various aspects of the working memory; it does not necessarily protect me well from 'harm, worry and suffering', and I cannot rely upon it fully.[61] Kant's model and those of others is about recognition. Bergson's model of memory provides the key to the phenomenon of recognition, by emphasizing the dichotomy between actions and representation as the ultimate reason for the dichotomy between the brain and memory. If we follow Bergson, 'practically, we perceive only the past' even though, with his emphasis on action we clearly live in the present. Representation can be approached by 'presentation', using Husserl's phenomenological techniques. With Freud, the patient repeats instead of remembering, and the individual's past is ultimately inescapable. Yet Freud's memory seems to be only of repressed memories, counting on that part of memory that is blocked by 'the bar of repression'. Blamey shows us how Ricœur repeats here the themes worked over earlier in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, linking it to Ricœur's use of Freud.[62] She connects this with his work in *Memory, History, Forgetting* on *Durcharbeiten*, Freud's term for the *working through* of psychoanalytic therapy in order to overcome one's resistance, to unblock memory and to critically evaluate one's relation to the conscious self. Blamey witnesses him repeatedly deploying Freud's *Durcharbeiten*, notably in *Freud and Philosophy*, and he uses Freud's 1914 essay ('*Erinnern, Wiederholen und Durcharbeiten*: Remembering, Repeating and Working Through') to discuss the uses and abuses of memory. Is amnesty possible? Commanded forgetting is a form of amnesty. Forgetting may indeed be necessary, as social utility, a form of amnesty – but can that ever consist of really forgetting? The work of memory is 'completed with the work of mourning and guided by the spirit of forgiveness', except that 'the past once experienced is indestructible' so can we really forget? [63]

Robert Fisk gives us an example of memory that suggests we may be able to lay thoughts temporarily to rest and look forward and bear witness when required: himself a resident of Lebanon for thirty-two years, a few years ago he was driving with friends up into the Shouf mountains for a picnic. He found himself enjoying the smell of the pines for the first time. He realized that, although the war ended twenty-three years earlier, he was only now, as never before, believing in a new Lebanon. Yet this is not forgetting; when Fisk needs to, he can give the details of the horrors of the war, the history of it and the many horrors since, and think about the horrors yet to come, as well as the future that the smell of the pines makes possible.

How do we forgive?

Ricœur returns to three of his first mentors; Jaspers, Nabert and Marcel, looking at the limits that constrain our thought about forgiveness. One is our inability to go back in time and either re-live or undo that which cannot be undone. Another is the asymmetry that exists between being able to forgive and being able to promise, looking forward with a happy memory. The abyss between the act and the agent must be bridged by avowal, yet then broken – this is a significantly different emphasis to his work in the 1960s and 1970s from what he called the agentless semantics of action, from Donald Davidson's work. Here, the action can never be returned to the agent, never be undone, as it has happened and the agent has seen the effect of their action which will now become part of history and be separated from them. If we are to hold ourselves responsible for our own actions, we need to understand and accept the possibility of guilt, even if we are innocent of bad motives. Ricœur agrees with Derrida, for whom forgiveness must face up to the unforgivable, or else it is not forgiveness, and it must be given without the condition of a prior request.[64] Forgiveness, like guilt, should be rare and stand the 'test of impossibility, and Jaspers gives perhaps a fuller sense of what guilt really means'.

Ricœur wants Jaspers' *Die Schuldfrage,* The Question of Guilt, to be reread.[65] He discusses prescription in criminal law courts, where it can happen that proceedings are halted and no further action is taken; this is both 'a phenomenon of passivity, of inertia, of negligence' and also 'an arbitrary social gesture'. Yet there are crimes for which none can be held responsible and for which there can be no appropriate punishment, because the crime is, in a sense, unforgivable and therefore no punishment could be fitting or, alternatively, terrible enough. Nevertheless, something is owed to the guilty, some sort of consideration rather than contempt. Political guilt involves citizens who are somehow responsible because they belong to the political body in whose name crimes were committed. He looks back to World War Two and feels that the collective group has no moral conscience, and that it is too easy for people to fall back onto old hatreds, which raises difficult issues regarding individual memory and collective memory. It becomes necessary for people to 'learn to recount otherwise', to develop new narratives.

Ricœur returns to his old work on Maus and the economy of the gift. Forgiveness is not merely reciprocity, where the gift anticipates another gift in return; forgiveness is asymmetrical and must not expect anything in return.[66] He cites Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) as exemplifying suspicion and misunderstanding over gifts. They are generous and they are distrusted, because it seems impossible that they should be giving with no request for anything in return – and of course he recommends that we should not be disingenuous; there is indeed an expectation, of friendship, peace, even of submission, the residue of colonialism or the enemy becoming a friend.[67] Forgiveness should be unconditional; the request for forgiveness should be conditional.[68] Nor is it possible to organize forgiveness. He cites the South African Truth and Reconciliation tribunals as examples of a procedure that enjoyed some success yet also provided evidence that people do not forgive. 'I ask you for forgiveness' and 'I forgive you'; two speech acts that do what they say.[69] If I accept that I cannot control all the actions I commit, then forgiveness may be able to respond to the destruction of my desire for sovereign mastery over my actions.[70]

Yet Ricœur is still challenging the symmetry often postulated between forgiving and promising; forgiveness is related to love and therefore cannot be institutionalized. Ricœur sees always, however, a political component to human actions, for which he finds the quintessence in Rembrandt's 1653 painting of Aristotle contemplating a bust of Homer. Look closer and you see a third figure;

Alexander (emperor and also Aristotle's pupil) is depicted on the medallion that hangs from Aristotle's chain. The philosopher, the poet and the politician are all vital.[71] Abel and Mongin write well on these areas. In terms of having a vision for a future, Ricœur supports Arendt who stands against Heidegger, arguing that we are not born to die, but to begin.[72] We have to unbind the agent from the act – not as English speech act theorists tried to do so that the person and their acts are consequentially separable, but in order that the person can start again. This sounds like *Oneself as Another*, but now Ricœur is emphasizing the need to recognize the other within oneself, in a pairing of forgiveness and repentance leading to self-regeneration; who can say they are not guilty? For Aristotle, being is act, is power. For Kant, the only good thought is a good will. Ricœur sounds as if he is moving away from Kant to argue that others are a means to an end because we need each other to stay alive and live well together, yet he seems to pull back from leaving Kant in order to remind us that "you are better than your actions".[73]

Suddenly Ricœur switches to happy memory, which started the epilogue. Here we discover a bond with *The Course of Recognition*. Recognition must be confirmed; every act of memory is summed up in recognition of the self as well as of the other.

If the quickest way to the self is through the other, as argued in *Oneself as Another*, then through translation of mood and meaning we can learn how to accept negation and go beyond it to affirmation.[74] This distancing and drawing near creates a gap in which the tension can become clear between my language and the other language, in which more than one interpretation can coexist while I attempt to resolve the tension, and possibly concede untranslatability.[75] The dialogic nature of this tensile, fragile state is much more productive for Ricœur than what he sees as the Kantian monologic debate about ethics, particularly in the role of principled public intellectual.

Conclusions

In his later works Ricœur shows clearly how we can move beyond the hermeneutics of suspicion, which is one part of the middle of three stages. In Ricœur's three-stage world, we start with pre-critical naivety; experience of history, analysis of documents. With experience and sophistication through living life and being part of cultural developments, we move into the second stage, which is critical exegesis; developing our own commentary on how we see events, selecting a range of evidence bases and seeking to persuade others of our views. If we become stuck here, in our vitally important version of the hermeneutics of suspicion, yet vulnerable to clever, ironic despair, we risk sliding back to a pre-critical stage of structured, comforting yet inadequate dialectical understanding. If we can cope with the uncertainty that arises from leaving structured thought behind, and move on to the third stage we enter second naivety, second-order reflection, sensitivity to the metaphorical meaning of life, the capacity to face up to incompleteness in which there will be surprises; we must continue with Kant's approach to reason that is based on antinomies and not foreclose on the possibility of surprises. Here we should be active, as writers, as historians, sociologists, teachers, NGO workers, reconciliation workers – and writing fairly is as active a task as physically active interventions. We should recall that Ricœur was active in his censure of the Algerian War, and was briefly detained by police who decided that he could be harbouring arms and/or Algerian fighters.[76] He was also critical of the Israeli occupation of Palestine.

In *Memory, History, Forgetting* Ricœur seeks to persuade us that the work of recollection is not absolute; remembering rises out of the gift of a forgetfulness that must be able to recall memories if necessary in order to bear witness, but can also release the person into pleasing memories so they can live their daily life. He pleads for caution in accepting history that others have created, and urges a respectful yet also a suspicious approach to testimony, so that we are not swept off our feet by the emotive power of dramatic historical narratives. He is proposing that we use a form of triangulation of evidence; testimony, documents and written histories – with less emphasis than I would like on the personal understanding that each of us brings to a story, even before the evidence unfolds.

These are examples of identity and alterity for Ricœur, as is Husserl's doubt about whether he could make himself understood: Ricœur is grateful for Husserl's struggle to describe the ways in which we try and fail to fully understand another person by an 'analogising grasp'. We must never forget the asymmetry that is at the core of our relationships with others, because the asymmetry, paradoxically, can enhance our understanding of difference and similarity between people, by drawing our attention to how different we are from each other. Being different encourages forgetfulness and a spur for the suspicion that arises partly from negation; we are too different from each other to be able to develop understanding and mutual recognition. Yet again I see suspicion being used, as Blamey and Pellauer have also identified it, as a necessary, even a positive force; I see it as a force that can undermine positive thinking if seen as a limit idea that blocks further debate, but functions as a condition of possibility if used to reveal the 'dialectic of the dissymmetry between me and others and the mutuality of our relations'.[77] We can be grateful for love and fairness in friendships when we accept and respect the distance necessitated by the inevitable dissymmetry in relationships. In the final chapter we will see how Ricœur attempts, while knowing he will only be partially successful, to reduce this dissymmetry by balancing love and justice against each other, and also maybe so that they can lean into each other.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

Marx, Freud and Nietzsche gave us new interpretative powers, yet they are powers based on doubt about the concept of self, so how can we, ourselves, understand who we are? Their ideas were useful to many philosophers in France in the 1960s–1970s, for exploding current academic thinking and also for doubting the existence of the person as autonomous subject and author of their own fate, in an era that Dosse describes as pervaded by 'an ideology of suspicion'.[1] Heidegger's work was also influential, for asserting that we merely exist, not really allowing ourselves to experience the real aliveness of Being (with Heidegger's upper case B to audit its status as a noun). Ricœur attempted (for over seventy years) to recover the self by deciphering the signs of civilization and critiquing the vacuum that he found at the heart of Heidegger's Being. He offered his philosophical interpretation in a multidisciplinary approach through language, metaphor, narrative, translation, literary theory, philosophy of science, theology and history. He proposed active choices that involve moral risks; he rejected what he saw as Hegel's controlling attempt to develop a grand plan for how the world inevitably improves upon itself. Yet he made use of Hegel's negativity and an existential sadness permeates his work, which predates the masters of suspicion. What may look like an academic philosophy in a restricted sense has in fact a complex and poignant existential density visible in early works such as *Freedom and Nature* and *Fallible Man*. Ricœur returns to their preoccupations explicitly in his final decade. The supposedly empty space between the opposites we create is in fact teeming with our desires, fears, illusions and fantasies *and* our enormous potential to do good.

This is a post-Hegelian Kantian wager about the self and the other, which goes beyond Hegel's totalizing drive yet remains Kantian in challenging the conscious mind and its role in our perception of the world. How can we, after Kant, agree that we influence our perceptions with our own personal understanding, and yet hope to avoid what Norris terms 'pernicious value-relativism'?[2] Like Husserl, Ricœur accepted that the task, by its nature, could never be completed. He acted within and on the boundaries of many disciplines and also refused to be confined to one school of thought within any discipline, insisting that human thought must be able to choose to think beyond the limits of any one method or discipline. He created various systems for helping us to develop an argument in which the tension between opposing viewpoints is sustained for as long as possible, to avoid foreclosing on an argument, missing an important point, or – most significantly – deceiving ourselves into thinking that truth is ever really reached. By these means he has created a taut space between Kantian antinomies and suspicion co-ordinates this void between them.

Twentieth-century life spanned many events in which human motivation was suspect: Ricœur felt deceived by the Treaty of Versailles, that made his father's death as a soldier hero seem futile after all, and by the confused politics that emerged as a reaction to the perceived injustice of the treaty. Later, in the 1940s he was ashamed that he initially failed to understand the threat posed by Hitler. In the 1960s he campaigned for the liberation of Algeria from French colonial domination and became concerned about the way in which secularism was interpreted in modern France with regard to tolerance and symbolism in lay communities, such as the dress code of Muslim and Christian schoolgirls.[3] Freeman (2008) describes this time we live in, when people use information that confirms their suspicions and reject the rest, in what psychologists call the belief confirmation bias.[4] Ricœur used suspicion to face up to itself and also to moderate its own potentially corrosive effects. The masters of suspicion provided methods to be explored, and Ricœur used the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' for some years, thereafter abandoning it, while continuing to 'do hermeneutics' and to use the term 'suspicion'. The value of his use of suspicion was to provide an opportunity to resist extremist reaction to the complications of the postmodern world. Suspicion provides a necessary yet not sufficient opportunity to challenge our thinking and investigate inconsistencies, acting as a critical friend to reason and hope.

I argue in the second half of this book that Ricœur found himself unable to resolve the immense problems of doubts about the self that Marx, Freud and Nietzsche created, because he rejected their conclusions as too deterministic, and hoped to give us some confidence in our limited powers to think and act well, using suspicion instead of scepticism to raise the stakes. Before he engaged with these three masters of suspicion, Ricœur immersed himself in existentialism and phenomenology, and then developed a linguistic turn that led him to hermeneutics and towards a more assertive endeavour to make meaning as well as to discover it. We need to revisit briefly these major strands of thought that he deployed.

Phenomenology and the other person

Phenomenology shows us that each of us is an intentional subject who is caught in a contradictory relationship with the object; we seek to understand the objects in our world, including the other person, but find that we ourselves are the source of the interpreting.[5] Phenomenology was challenged by structuralism, which was both sceptical and destructive of any desire to describe perceptions. Structuralism emerged from the debris of phenomenology and created a reinvigorated public debate about philosophy and the social sciences, while both attacking and seeking to assimilate other disciplines. The person became a casualty; the author was killed off, people did not speak for themselves and linguistic structures, not people, bore meaning.

Descartes' philosophy provided a model of scepticism that goes back to the classical world, yet it contained no theory about the existence of the other person. The body provided enough of a challenge to the mind: Gassendi facetiously addressed Descartes as 'O Mind,' while Descartes retaliated with 'O Flesh' in their debates about Descartes' Meditations.[6] In his book on Husserl, Ricœur invited us to consider that the other person embodies one of the great questions that philosophy needs to address; he demonstrated how some of the great thinkers influenced Husserl, and how they fared in this issue regarding 'the Other.' Kant failed to satisfy Husserl, although Kant believed that he was resolving the problem set by Hume.[7] It seemed to Husserl that Hume did better than Kant, challenging the subjectivism of sensuous empiricism.[8] Ricœur set Hume aside. Ricœur differentiated between Kant's great question, as the search for validity for a possible transcendental consciousness, and Husserl's great question as the search for the origin of the world.[9] He saw a crucial difference between phenomenology and psychoanalysis; phenomenology indicates that the unconscious is *another* text, but not that it is *other*. Freud's psychoanalysis deciphers another text from that of the conscious mind, and it is a text that alters our understanding of ourselves.[10] The other is not only *out there*, we have the other, the foreign, the different *within us*, and psychoanalysis liberates hermeneutics to help us understand that. Talking about it may be the only way forward, bringing people together to talk and see that the similarities that bind us are much greater than the differences, even when this involves bringing secularists and devout people together.[11]

Hermeneutics and Ricœur's linguistic turn

In the linguistic turn Ricœur moved into hermeneutics: he situated the search for meaning inside language itself, finding structuralist linguistics very useful, and accepting that his interpretations will always be provisional. He believed that his work is part of what Jean Greisch, particularly with regard to Ricœur's later work, calls 'the hermeneutical age of reason.'[12] Still, as in the middle period, hermeneutics welcomes structuralism as part of its 'collaboration with other modes of understanding' and returns to phenomenology with its self-analysing idiolect.[13] This is a different solution from that of the analytical philosophers like Frege and Russell, for whom Ricœur had great respect, but from whose attachment to the primacy of logical precision and conceptual clarity in language he distanced himself. At the core of this approach was Ricœur's desire that he developed in *The Rule of Metaphor* (1975), that text could displace the ego's self-absorption to that of a subjective Kantian self engaged with text, influenced by and changed by text, and that action can be 'read' as a sort of text. Subjectivity becomes a problem, however, when it is pushed to a narcissistic extreme. Ricœur saw the successful defeat of this in the big ideas that history has struggled with; Galileo refuted our central position in the universe; Darwin showed us that we are neither distinct from nor superior to the animals. Kant, with his second Copernican revolution, had already shown us that we can have conceptual understanding, yet the limits he posited would lead to the possibility that we cannot know for sure that we understand ourselves. We are the thinking objects of our own subjective thoughts, and therefore not able to be the object analysed accurately by ourselves. Then Marx, Freud and Nietzsche asserted that we no longer even know what we think, so how can we be rational beings?

Suspicion and belief

Ricœur used the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' to respond on several occasions to the challenge posed by Marx, Freud and Nietzsche in the 1970s. He identified and understood, rather than claiming to resolve it. He described hermeneutics as disruptive, disturbing the surface of the water when we want to interrupt our relationship with tradition and interpret it critically. Yet he deplored the potential of suspicion to rampage destructively. By decoupling hermeneutics from suspicion he was able to continue to use hermeneutics with structuralist thought. He also continued to use suspicion, up to the end of his writing. Although Ricœur used the phrase 'hermeneutics of suspicion' very little, and stopped using it a decade after he first did so, it has developed a life of its own, and is often used out of context, with a sequence of incomplete references.[14]

Suspicion is often used as a limit experience; Thiselton describes how, in the postmodern world, 'A hermeneutic of radical suspicion replaces a hermeneutic of potential or initial trust.'[15] Yet Ricœur avoided discussing postmodernism, and refused to let suspicion be harnessed for what he saw as a dead end journey into negativity. Instead he used the concept of suspicion as a condition of possibility that was integral to what he called 'capable being', 'that mode of certainty that deserves the name of attestation, which is at once irrefutable in terms of cognitive proof and subjected to suspicion by virtue of its character of belief'.[16] Attestation is not a form of virtue ethics, as Muldoon points out, more a personal struggle to effect pluralist fairness.[17] Suspicion will be with us whether we like it or not, and it has the potential to help us think more clearly about the beliefs and the motives that we suspect.

I propose that suspicion can function more fruitfully as a condition of possibility than as a limiting condition: this interpretation is made possible by my close reading of Ricœur's own work, that of other Ricœur scholars and careful archival research. The quality that suspicion requires, as we discussed in Chapter 4, is its capacity to be balanced, even if rather unsteady in its gait:

> I call suspicion the act of dispute exactly proportional to the expressions of false consciousness. The problem of false consciousness is the object, the correlative of the act of suspicion. Out of it is born the quality of doubt, a type of doubt, which is totally new and different from Cartesian doubt.[18]

Spinoza is quietly omnipresent from 1930s onwards, offering Ricœur a mode of doubt that is closer to Freud than to Descartes and more appealing; once we acknowledge that we are enslaved we can renounce the illusion of free will and seek to liberate ourselves from desire, in direct proportion to that desire. This will liberate two capacities; the ability to speak and the ability to love.[19] This resembles more closely the 'exercise of suspicion' that Ricœur developed. 'Exercise' is intentional, controlled and proportional.

On the other hand what does excessive use of suspicion look like? An example from Ricœur is Marx's approach to religion; whereas Ricœur agreed with Marx that the church as an institution is capable of corruption and abuse of power, he did not extend that suspicion to a wholesale condemnation of religion. Yet he welcomed the dialectical struggle between secular and religious thinking; from the 1940s onwards, Ricœur had always seen his work as a dialogue between those with religious faith and those for whom God may well be dead. Brought up as a Protestant, who from childhood was an avid reader of the Bible, Ricœur found it perfectly understandable that many do not share his faith. Ricœur wished to keep faith and secularism separate, not only because he did not wish to preach his own faith too insistently but also in order to show us that theology and secular philosophy *are* different; 'my two allegiances always escape me, even if at times they *acknowledge* one another' and we can find a resting place somewhere between them, depending on the issues at stake.[20] Similarly, faith and suspicion can function as polarities; each validates the other, shows up the other's weaknesses and attempts to derive moral strength from such oscillation. Ricœur sought to help us out of an impasse; we refuse to be guided by metanarratives or meta-ethics, yet we also do not believe in ourselves enough to know how to act well.[21]

Attestation – here I am – l'exercice du soupçon

Attestation – I have to balance here by exercising suspicion, 'because the world is an ironic question, "And you, what will you do?"'[22] Muldoon shows us that our response is closely related to self-doubt and suspicion.[23] We pay a very high price for 'freedom through disbelief, through demystification' as Clark expresses it.[24] If, as Ricœur asserted, the symbol gives rise to meaning, then this goes beyond our rejection of faith frameworks: we risk losing the power of thought when, through suspicion, we deny the symbol its meaning. We have to make decisions about which symbols, which meanings, are worth believing in; alternatively we may sweep all meaning away in a flood of disbelief about anything and everything *or* insist upon our omnipotence.

Cavell's work on scepticism is useful: he describes the extreme form in Othello, 'as a depiction of the murderous lengths to which narcissism must go in order to maintain its picture of itself as skepticism, in order to maintain its stand of ignorance, its fear or avoidance of knowing, under the claim to certainty'.[25] This disproportionately negative state is often mistaken for suspicion, but Ricœur sought to recover suspicion as a vitally important and impressive project that challenged Kant, went even further back to Descartes and, by its nature perforce proves disappointing in the end although we cannot do without it. He developed his own tightrope walk, employing suspicion as a condition of possibility that helps us to balance and hope. In his 1963 paper he writes about the inadequacy of interpretation when it takes the shape of 'intellectual weighing scales' (*une sorte de balance intellectuelle*) because this precludes the excess of meaning that language gives.[26] In *Thinking Biblically* Ricœur further developed his discussion about symbols and meanings; discourse is vital. Moreover, Marx, Freud and Nietzsche needed a dose of their own hermeneutics of suspicion. Through his work on Freud in particular, Ricœur concluded that, as well as drawing our attention to vital problems, these masters of suspicion were themselves concealing ideologies and powerful beliefs beneath their suspicion of religion and their views of human nature. After studying them in the 1950s and 1960s the rest of his life's work was devoted to finding *different* ways of solving the problem that they had identified and for which they had provided useful analytical tools through economics, psychoanalysis and genealogy.

Ricœur also remained true to work done *before* he explored the term hermeneutics of suspicion and then, as a result, uncoupled suspicion from hermeneutics; in 1963, in the *Cahiers Internationaux de Symbolisme* he writes about the 'exercise of suspicion', the necessity of creating a central space, a hub, a magnet of destruction in the 'work' (*travail*) of comprehension, which will facilitate a hermeneutic of reconstruction and recollection. This is more useful than intellectual weighing scales, as this puts us at the heart of the interpretation and also allows us to use techniques for achieving distance. Such a process involves a reduction of dependence on nouns in order to reduce our subject-object fixation. This will also liberate verbs, so that we can act better, and it is integral to attestation, first mentioned in 1957 yet not fully worked on until later.[27] He attributed the initial destructive act to the three teachers of suspicion and even in 1963 it was clear to him, if not to us, that *they* cannot remake meaning for us, we have to do it ourselves. In fact, Freud stayed with him to help him make meaning out of the inheritance of loss and mourning until the end of his writing life, but the other two, especially Marx, fell away.

Muldoon comments that the presence of attestation – being active and accountable – is rarely apparent in *Oneself as Another*, yet when it is, it is crucial because 'language expresses being', even when language appears to insist on the precise opposite by 'denial of the literal referentiality of language'.[28] This is reminiscent of Cavell listing common ordinary words in the preface of *The Claim of Reason*, words 'caught in fields of attraction and suspicion', because of the human 'doubling back ceaselessly upon itself'.[29] In *Memory, History, Forgetting* Ricœur describes attestation as marked in language by fault, and by evil and also by desperate hope.[30] Aristotle's polarity for the human is that of being true and being false, and attestation and suspicion are bonded thus together, with no possibility of getting rid of suspicion. Yet suspicion is not on the same level, nor is it the same sort of phenomenon as attestation, which is both epistemological and ontological. Suspicion cannot be epistemological and ontological as it is parasitic upon them, yet being suspicious is necessary for attestation to take place: 'Suspicion is also the path toward and the crossing within attestation.'[31] Suspicion haunts attestation, adhering to it and inherent in it, having insinuated itself into our very being. Suspicion casts doubt over our attempts to understand personal identity, and then of narrative identity and finally of whether we know how to act ethically when we have conflict of duties. Can this strengthen selfhood? For Muldoon, it appears that we have no choice; 'To exclude the menacing shadow of suspicion would ultimately insist on a metaphysical absolutism that Ricœur foresaw as impossible, given the undecidability in regard to the voice of conscience.'[32] To facilitate this process Ricœur worked on narrative, thereby making possible the bringing together of time and imagination, and thus he could claim to go beyond Kant and Heidegger.

There are three characteristics of us as humans that make it possible that we can survive our own fallibility and fragility: first we recognize others as being like ourselves, and engage in conversation; secondly we can see another's point of view, and thirdly we can use the first two characteristics to work out how to act in ways that are equitable. These are also reflected in the Little Ethics.[33] They are dependent upon belief in others and upon self-belief, and must also be tempered by suspicion.

Postmodern philosophy and the hermeneutics of suspicion

One of the characteristics of postmodern thought, since Lyotard entreated us not to accept the metanarratives of history, science, religion and politics, is a dismantling of received ideas of truth, knowledge and reason. In *Memory, History, Forgetting* we see the need to remember that we must remember; in a rare comment about the term 'postmodernism', Ricœur looked at Friedlander's analysis of the Nazi regime, the 'final solution' of extermination that goes beyond the limits of representation, as it is so barbaric. In this context Ricœur denounced 'the self-referentiality of linguistic constructions, which make impossible the identification of any stable reality whatsoever. What plausible response, then, can this so-called postmodernism give to the accusation of having disarmed thought in the face of the seductions of negationism?'[34] Do we refuse to think because we are seduced by negativity, the scepticism evoked by Cavell? There are plenty of practical examples: Islamophobia in the Western world offers an example of suspicion running wild, not underpinned by a sufficiently self-critical understanding of oneself as another and partly fuelled by state ideologies. Berel Lang demonstrates the need to fight for historical representation, especially with regard to such atrocious events as the Holocaust.[35]

Ricœur respected Nietzsche, yet resisted the postmodern desperation that Nietzsche set in motion with '*How the "true world" finally became a fable: the History of an Error*', 'At bottom the old sun, but seen through mists and skepticism, pale, Nordic, Kōnigsbergian. Grey morning. The first yawn of reason. The cockcrow of positivism.'[36] Ricœur rejected Nietzsche's view of Kant through the mists and scepticism and the 'seduction of negationism'. Nor did he engage much with Foucault, not at all with Baudrillard and he offered us a view of the sign that makes it still possible to see ourselves as capable of creating new meanings through language, as in metaphor, poetry, allegory and narrative.[37] Yet his term the 'hermeneutics of suspicion' has been adopted to suggest a negative postmodern state of mind, as we see in Shah-Kazemi's work on 'hermeneutics of suspicion or of Sufism?' No wonder Ricœur, who always chose his words carefully, dropped the term from his repertoire.[38]

Instability, asymmetry and negation

Having left the hermeneutics of suspicion behind, there is still a tension in Ricœur's method (as analysed in Chapter 7) that creates a sort of unstable balance, where opposing ideas or phenomena are balanced against each other. He finds this in language, thought and action, all of which can be ambiguous; hence the only way to develop some sort of clarity is through communication with others. This communication must lead to a working version of intersubjectivity, i.e. we learn more about ourselves and the way we think by explaining ourselves to others, responding to the ways in which others react to us and doing the same for them. Human destiny is the struggle to come to terms with being finite, blocked and limited, and can be partially understood by examining what it is that makes me, in my bodily presence, a person in the world. By accepting what I am – the finite, limited and limiting nature of being me – I can explore the *idea* of what I am not; infinite in my thinking and my language, not bound by the flesh and the blood. Yet constant reminders are necessary, in a Kantian way, about my limits, which necessitate both the application and the *appropriate* use of suspicion. Thought and language for Ricœur are interdependent and help us in this balancing act, and translation becomes a form of provisional interpretation.

In 'Violence and Language' he analyses the violence inherent in many linguistic acts that voice the power of the state; the law is 'like a great irascible individual who at times speaks the language of fear, of anger, of offended dignity, of impudent boasting, that is to say, of violence'.[39] We develop our understanding of the world at least partly through negation (this is not that, and I know what it is because it is not that). Negation can, however, lead to negativity or nihilism in the sense that we may choose to prefer these things that are more 'this than that' i.e. closer to us than other things. Translation epitomizes the tension created in interpreting meaning between original language and the translation where one will dominate the other – an asymmetry that is inevitable and difficult to bear, and can be interpreted as alien. Ricœur invited us to challenge negativity by being aware of it as a possible outcome of uncertainty and ignorance and untranslatability. Thus translation can function as a paradigm for philosophy and also for mechanisms such as tolerance, and what Ricœur terms 'recovery'.

Religion and philosophy

Failure is inevitable and a strong regulative idea for Ricœur. Is it a failure of the dialectical method if religion and philosophy can only acknowledge each other, not work together? Well, the bifurcation in his writing seemed to come in the 1970s, after *The Socius and the Neighbour* and after *Political and Social Essays* that contained discussions about Christianity. In chapter 7 of *Critique and Conviction*, Ricœur argues for the mediation of language and scripture, one that accepts the irremediable differences between the philosophical texts and the Christian texts. The canonical texts, those upon which the faithful are dependent, need to be read differently by a philosopher, who is critical.

Does the exercise of suspicion only work, then, with secular literature? Ricœur had a profound belief that there is an anterior meaning, something that cannot be considered as chronologically originary, but foundational to belief, in the word that is the faith. He differentiated between *Denken* (to think) and *Erkennen* (to know), arguing like Kant that to know is a 'non-philosophical manner of thinking and being'.[40] At the very least, Ricœur hoped of his dialectical methodologies that they will displace from the centre the violent desire for totalizing knowledge that arises when hope and power are both at their peak.[41] In his book *Evil* he found this to be characteristic of much philosophical and religious thought; the search for reason that cannot be contradicted and 'our proneness to systematic totalization'.[42] He also challenged Hegel's attempt to disarm fault by embracing it. In the end it may turn out that Ricœur's methodological dialectics led him away from the potential of what Clark calls 'the absent centre' which could offer us the unspeakability of truth that we occasionally experience as a flash of insight, a moment of certainty about meaning and existence.[43] Alternatively the centre may not be absent at all, Ricœur himself had something – his religious beliefs – at the core of all his dialectical to-ing and fro-ing. Clark wonders whether this vitiates the value of Ricœur's work for those of us who are more explicitly secular.[44] Will we be able to use this approach even without religious values? Perhaps we will find that Ricœur has still made it possible for us to weave between doubts, between conflicting interpretations, in order to develop or strengthen our own 'little ethics' at the heart of it all. What we have learnt is to avoid foreclosure, avoid decision-making that is too hasty and not furnished with enough information, and be aware of the 'absent centre' and what it can hold:

> This advance of testimony over reflection is, so to speak, the gift that the religious offers to the philosophical, lending freely to it without requiring something in exchange. This would be the debt the philosophical owes to the religious, which lends to it the category of testimony.[45]

O Mind, o flesh

Despite his abandonment of Freud's determinism and what Ricœur saw as overemphasis on our physical needs, Freud's methods and ideas stayed with Ricœur throughout his working life. Even as early as the 1930s, Ricœur wished to create a clear connection between Freud's beliefs and their possible effect on our attempts to be a 'responsible agent' through suspicion of our own motives.[46] Spinoza also played an important role, as a sceptic who was devout. He cited Spinoza's evocation of the role played by the association of ideas in remembering, similar to Aristotle's associationist learning, and links this to Freud's theories about memory, both in *Freud and Philosophy* and *Memory, History, Forgetting*, asserting that psychoanalysis is a modification of the Spinozist critique of free will.[47] Psychoanalysis reveals the suspension of the conscious mind's control, so that 'the subject is made a slave equal to his true bondage', to use Spinoza's phrase.

Dalbiez introduced Ricœur to Pyrhonnism (often used to describe scepticism in general), through Aenesidemus, recorded by Sextus Empiricus and linked by Dalbiez with Hume and Kant in their assertions that analytically one cannot deduce one thing from another. Pyrhonnism, exemplified by Spinoza, influenced the formation of modern Western philosophy, with more significant use of scepticism than that of Descartes who, like Bacon, believed that he knew how to refute sceptical attacks upon faith. Spinoza differentiated between scepticism and rational doubt, and in literary terms, Norris agrees with Kermode and Todorov in seeing Spinoza as responsible for liberating textual hermeneutics 'from its erstwhile bondage to the dictates of orthodox belief'.[48] Spinoza's apparently unwavering belief in God on the one hand, and his challenges to Biblical texts on the other, are very different from Ricœur's uneasy view of suspicion as a necessary yet not sufficient challenge to personal motivation. Spinoza functions as Ricœur's more confident other self: Spinoza's alter ego and his conatus provides for the physicality of our existence, whereas the Cartesian mind-body split makes the body subordinate to the mind and an object of the mind's curiosity and suspicion.

In this situation, however, we cannot progress without suspicion, because it helps us to challenge the question as well as the answer. The question is 'who am I?' This necessitates understanding ourselves as reflected in other people, through relationships. "I cannot empirically verify what I believe I should do; I have to overcome my own suspicions about myself and attest to them in the face of your suspicion." On the last two pages of his late major work, *The Course of Recognition*, Ricœur reminds us that suspicion is a vital ingredient in the attempt to develop friendships; we can exchange gifts but not places (a failure of phenomenology, with its inability to help us understand the other person, even in the Fifth Cartesian Meditation) and we must use suspicion in order to ensure that we never forget the dissymmetry between ourselves and others.

"Deferring decisions, seeking more information, overwhelmed by doubt and indecision – this is when I have most chance of proceeding to a balanced decision" and I return to the phenomenological idiolect. Muldoon identifies the passage in which Ricœur shows how necessary suspicion is for making right judgements; 'attestation . . . constitutes the instance of judgement which overcomes suspicion in all the circumstances where the self designates itself.'[49] We have the sense here of a sceptical self-undermining, which we saw in Chapter 7. Ricœur learnt with Dalbiez, in his late teens, to debate sceptical ideas, as part of the power of negativity: having a point of view is itself a negation because it excludes other viewpoints. This can develop into an argument about the physicality that he found lacking in Kant, Husserl and Heidegger: cloning produces identical or near identical copies, but sexual relations produce something completely new, a unique sating of both desires. Dialectical tension can only arise between different, not identical forces, and yet they must, as in sex and the metaphor, also be compatible. In 1960, when summarizing *Fallible Man*, he writes of the two poles of thinking and sensing and their synthesis, and describes the resulting blind spot that Kant perceives at the centre of a luminous vision, 'a function of the soul, blind but indispensable'.[50] It is this special place that Ricœur sought to locate in his dialectics, the studied weightlessness of the tightrope walker, creating a place between polarities that gives us the space to explore and reconcile the conflicts of interpretations, and suspicion is vital here. Will I fall? Will I fail? This place is difficult to create and maintain as constructive between religion and secularism. Even Ricœur found it well nigh impossible, despite understanding the idea of Christ, the Idea of the highest good, as illustrating the resolution of the dialectic. His personally lived religious faith goes beyond Kant, yet Ricœur remained within a Kantian framework.

Ricœur has also grappled with Kantian time, space and causality: in our post-Enlightenment secular world we will not be able to exercise suspicion in a balanced way if we have neither religious belief nor faith in ourselves. Ricœur offers us his worked-out methods of historical recollection, recognition, language, dialectics and second naivety. Suspicion is embedded in each method as a condition of possibility for attempting to end false consciousness, so that we can hope that what we say will be equal to what we do.[51] If we continue to talk to each other there will be *time* for possibilities for deep reflection on our conduct and *space* for negotiating different decisions in difficult relationships. Ricœur's development of Hegel's dialectical model added the new dimension of *causality*; initially, first naivety interacts with critical analysis. As long as we do not remain stuck at that second stage of critical analysis, methodological dialectics, with the hermeneutics of suspicion, we can move to second naivety. This third stage allows us to develop a deep respect for the reflections of others, suspicious yet determined to hope, a unique blend of experiences and suffering, even if it is also a world-weary wisdom of incomplete and provisional solutions.

Suspicion enables us to deal with difference; difference in others and discrepancies within ourselves, between our social obligations and our desires. Ultimately, in fact, suspicion is less potent than the still frequent use of the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' would suggest. Suspicion is more important to Ricœur on its own, not as part of 'hermeneutics', a critique of critique which Ricœur found powerful enough on its own. Suspicion is vitally important for its iconoclastic power as a free radical that challenges accepted reality, and is a useful tool if it is used in a manner proportionate to the need: in a small misunderstanding between friends, the whole friendship should not be jeopardized. Suspicion complements Kant's views about perception; we must suspect what we see; it may not be what is there. Yet suspicion also adds the intersubjectivity that we do not find in Kant: untidy, irrational human love. Suspicion is a necessary yet not sufficient prerequisite for the hermeneutics of recovery, and has to be encouraged by seeking love *and* justice.

Agape, the erotic and allegories of love

Ricœur resolved the Cartesian mind/body, subject/object separation by the allegory of love; as we love physically in order to give and find pleasure, so should we also love morally to be with the Other. Ricœur wrote as a Protestant outsider in a Roman Catholic state, as the Other, interpreting the Song of Songs with its appeal to outsiders, promising love and return from exile. He wrote with LaCocque on the nuptial metaphor in the Song of Songs and discussed the possibility that it can be read as an erotic poem, possibly written by a woman with the intention of creating transference by analogy between sexual union and spiritual love.[52] Then, having rooted spiritual love in the correspondence of sexual union, he sought another allegory, this time between spiritual love, and humans' love for one another, whether it is sexual or not. He believed this two-step allegorical development is achieved in the Song of Songs without narrative, but by description. The symbolic values attached to our understanding of evil from *The Symbolism of Evil* are still valid, yet here with the Song of Songs we are presented with symbolic representations of *love* as the ultimate bond between beings who are committed to each other's needs and satisfactions in such a way that each will be satisfied by the otherness of the other person. By justifying the substitution of one meaning (physical, erotic) for another (metaphysical, emotional) Ricœur insisted that the original, physical meaning is still there.

By such images the hyperbole and exaggerated tone of religious language make accessible the ideas about faith and trust that we find difficult to express in our self-conscious, ironic postmodern vocabulary. Ricœur believed the modern reader may read the text as a statement of carnal love with no allegorical meaning, despite the Reformation insight that worldly work and marriage are a means of cooperation with divine grace.[53] Clearly, however, Ricœur believed the Biblical text and meaning hold special significance, such as, in this context, returning from exile, coming home, being accepted and enfolded and above all, being a believer. This seems laughably utopian because humanity has failed so far to heal its woes with love, and Ricœur quoted Pascal about the disproportionality between love and justice in his essay of the same name.[54] For Ricœur, love is a suspension of the ethical, because it disorients our sense of equal distribution in order to focus on the loved one(s). He insisted upon the allegorical relationship between love and agape (Christian love, defined as non-erotic).[55] Justice must therefore provide the counterbalance that reorients us towards social living.

Love and justice

We need to temper justice with love so that justice is not purely and coldly utilitarian, and also use love (love towards other humans in an abstract sense) to reduce the competitive desires that often characterize our dealings with each other when seeking justice.[56] Love and justice are antinomies that, in truly Kantian manner, are inherent to reason itself when on their own (there must be love, there must be justice). Yet they seem to become dogmatic assertions or hopelessly unattainable polarities when set against each other and they should arouse our suspicions.[57]

How do we resolve this? Ricœur's version of the Golden Rule contains more love than Kant permitted it: Ricœur preferred 'love your neighbour as yourself' to 'do as you would be done by'. Integral to his philosophy is awareness of the other person, who is by definition different from me, because they are not me. For Ricœur it proved possible to achieve a great deal if we can see ourselves reflected in the other and see the other as part of oneself, as Husserl attempt in the Fifth Cartesian Meditation. This makes it possible, indeed necessary, to love the other as oneself, and thus the differences between another person and me become less significant than the similarities, because I cannot reject part of myself.

It goes against a rule-based, rational idea of justice to 'love your enemies, and do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return' as in Luke 6.32-4[58]

> Without the corrective of the commandment to love, the golden rule would be constantly drawn in the direction of a utilitarian maxim whose formula is *Do ut des*: I give *so that* you will give.[59]

Similarly, the rule of justice, without any corrective, tends to subordinate co-operation to competition, 'or rather to expect from the equilibrium of rival interests the simulacrum of co-operation'.[60] Can we achieve this sort of unstable equilibrium, using the tension between potentially incompatible ideas in order to challenge violence and hatred in favour of some sort of fairness, tolerance and balance for all? Ricœur believed that we must incorporate into our penal codes and codes of justice a supplement of compassion and generosity that will allow us to facilitate rights for minority groups and for faith groups. The Categorical Imperative must be respected, but ultimately replaced by the Golden Rule, which in its turn must be displaced by the commandment to love your enemy, if we are to deal with the violence latent in our attitudes towards others. The distance created by the state mechanisms around the citizen is insoluble in its capacity for alienation. If we want fair institutions, we can see for ourselves that laws and the institutions that embody them should come under the influence of the economy of the gift, the unconditional love that tempers justice. Vacillation between love and justice should result in asceticism in the exercise of power, the refusal to abuse power, an instability that allows the other the right to be wrong.

Ricœur developed a hermeneutics of suspicion that started with the revelations about ourselves that Marx, Freud and Nietzsche told us – his masters of suspicion. As a result he saw a new hermeneutics, more honest and yet also more demanding, yet he also concluded that suspicion could tip over into something corrosive like Cavellian scepticism; evidence for this is in postmodern relativists like Baudrillard, in whose ideas Ricœur was not interested. He separated 'hermeneutics' from 'suspicion' and focused on the potential polarization even within the term suspicion: being suspicious in proportion to the problem is the key to understanding. It is in the definition of suspicion that we see the greatest and most counterproductive misunderstanding. Kant's choice of words to describe suspicion (see Chapter 1) reflects our own views about suspicion; it is doubt about other people's motives, and since Marx, Freud and Nietzsche we have had the mechanism for applying that to ourselves as well as to others. Suspicion is thus personal, challenging Kant, looking beneath people's surface behaviour and words to find concealed and therefore, according to the masters of suspicion, bad things.

The hermeneutics of suspicion has been used often to refer to a world in which we can no longer be proud of our own motives, trust others and believe in God or Good. Here is the paradox: Ricœur rejected the use to which the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is often put. His suspicion was a radical move away from this drift towards scepticism, where we may run aground, in an extreme reaction against the delusion that we are omniscient and therefore can become stuck in current thinking. He believed we can only understand the world by balancing antinomies such as justice and love, altruism and selfishness, the other and the self. We know too much to get back to the infant unity with the things themselves; yet we can never know enough and must accept the cleavage, the fault line, provisionality. This balancing act requires the use of suspicion in order to both *maintain* the gap, the space, the blank between contrasting phenomena, and also *work* the gap into a condition whereby the fragile coexistence of contradictory yet interconnected opposites can be achieved.

Any reading of Ricœur that does him justice must also acknowledge the ethical intent behind his reinterpretation: suspicion is a personal offence and it is about motives, and Ricœur's approach enables us to apply it to people and their acts as well as to ourselves, because all of us are caught between contradictions. He was consistently prepared to intervene as a principled public intellectual and to challenge prevalent beliefs. His deployment of suspicion also invites us to *personalize* concepts. No longer can we pretend that laws, books, works of art and opinions based on racial stereotyping or cultural habits are impersonal representations of natural justice and beauty and nothing to do with us – Ricœur urged us to challenge them as products of *our* own, personal human action and therefore open to suspicion. I understand Ricœur to be a radical rebel, who can take his place alongside the best activists, showing us that we can face up to Pascal's challenge to the discrepancies, tensions and spaces between meaning and belief.

'The eternal silence of these infinite spaces fills me with dread.'[61]

Notes

Introduction

[1] Patočka, J. (1996) *Heretical Essays*, translated by Erazim Kohak and with a preface by Paul Ricœur. La Salle, Ill: Open Court.

[2] Vansina, F. D. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Bibliography 1935–2008*. Leuve, Paris, Dudley, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters.

[3] Source: Catherine Goldenstein.

[4] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*. Ed. D. Ihde, transl. various. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, p. 448.

Chapter 1 Cartesian doubt

[1] Kant, I. (1799/1994) On a Supposed Right to Lie Because of Philanthropic Concerns in *Immanuel Kant. Ethical Philosophy* (2nd edn), transl. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett, pp. 162–6, p. 166.

[2] Ricœur, P. (1998) *Critique and Conviction. Discussions with François Azouvy and Marc de Launay*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity Press (*CAC*), p. 6. See also Ricœur, P. Mon premier maître en philosophie in M Léna (ed.) (1991) *Honneur aux maîtres*. Paris: Critérion, pp. 221–5.

[3] He bequeathed this material to the archive of the Ricœur Foundation in Paris Fonds Ricœur, www.fondsRicœur. Archives 001–2, dated 1931–1932, notes taken by Ricœur in classes about scepticism; Archives cours manuscrits A52, dated 1932, notes taken by Ricœur in classes given by E. Leroux on Spinoza. NB notes on conatus.

[4] Freeman, D. and Freeman, J. (2008) *Paranoia: The Twenty-First Century Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[5] Kant, I. (1783/2001) *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, transl. P. Carus/J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett, p. 6.

[6] Norris, C. (1994) "What is Enlightenment?" according to Foucault in Postmodern Studies 10, pp. 53–138 in *Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the Wake of the 80s* Part II. *Foucault and Critical Theory*. Ed. R. Miguel-Alfonso and S. Caporale-Bizzini. Amsterdam: Rodopi, p. 125.

[7] *CAC*, p. 18.

[8] *CAC*, p. 16.

[9] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, *COI*, pp. 99, 127. In 2007 Northwestern issued a new edition, with a foreword by Bernard Dauenhauer.

[10] Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961) (highly regarded by Ricœur) explored in 1951 the issues of phenomenology and linguistics (as discussed in Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964) *Signs*, transl. R. McCleary. Evanston: Northwestern University Press).

[11] Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 3. I thank Christopher Norris for suggesting the similarities between thought about scepticism of Cavell and Ricœur, and I will also show significant and interesting differences.

[12] Rockmore, T. (2006) *In Kant's Wake. Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[13] Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers*, 22. Chicago: Open Court, p. 443; Hall, W. D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur and the Poetic Imperative*. New York: SUNY Press.

[14] Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press, p. 213.

[15] Ricœur, P. (1950/1967) *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*, transl. E. G. Ballard and L. E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp. 165, 172. Ibid., 164–6; Husserl, E. (1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Philosophy: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Evanston Ill: Northwestern University Press, p. 90.

[16] *HAP*, see endnote 15 above.

[17] Derrida, J. (2003) La Parole. Donner, nommer, appeler in M. Revault d'Allonnes and F. Azouvi (eds) (2004) *Ricœur 1*, Paris: Seuil, pp. 26–39, pp. 31–2; Ricœur, P. (1950/1996) *A Key to Edmund Husserl's Ideas 1*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, transl. B. Harris and J. B. Spurlock, ed. P. Vandevelde. Note how long it took before this work, that inspired Derrida so much in Ricœur's translation, was translated into English.

[18] Ricœur (1960/1967) *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, p. 351.

[19] Cavell, see endnote 11, p. 9.

[20] Fonds Ricœur. Archive 48, 49, considerable collection dated 1951, entitled *Spinoza on Time and Eternity* (Temps et l'éternité chez Spinoza). Ricœur works here on Spinoza through Delbos, Brunschvicg, Rivaud and Wolfson. Material added to, dated 1965 at which point he wonders in his concluding summary for students whether we are reading Spinoza too much like Hegel, when pondering whether there is a virtue to negative time and eternity.

[21] Clarke, D. (2006) *Descartes. A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 210, 212. Ibid., p. 165.

[22] Clarke, D. (2003) *Descartes' Theory of Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Personal comment: I trained and worked as a child psychologist, and from personal observation of ten years of case work, the existence of psychosomatic illnesses suggests to me that we are still attracted to dualist solutions, although the existence of psychosomatic illnesses should provide evidence that is irrefutably in support of one aspect of Descartes: if a person is emotionally disturbed or under mental pressure this can manifest itself in physical symptoms, suggesting

that mind and body are inextricably linked. Yet if the person denies this connection, they are evincing an insistence upon dualism, which may preclude investigation of the full range of aetiologies, and thence obstruct remediation.

[23] *HAP*, p. 8.

[24] Ibid., p. 9.

[25] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, pp. 6–8.

[26] Ricœur, P. (1966/1970) *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation,* transl. Denis Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, p. 375ff.

[27] Discussion of 'the other' is an important feature in twentieth-century philosophy; in French the pronoun *autrui*, meaning 'others', became a noun *l'Autrui*, perhaps to convey a sense of existential otherness. Derrida sees the capital letter as an increasing of distance between oneself and others, emphasizing alterity in general. This capital letter has entered the English usage (see pp. 130–2 in (1967/2001). Violence and Metaphysics in *Writing and Difference*, transl. A. Bass. London: Routledge). We can dismiss this discussion as an affectation, yet it is unwieldy to write about the other person without being exclusive: he/she/they/one. It is interesting to see how Ricœur avoids the term '*autrui*' in his book *Oneself as Another.* (*Soi-même comme un Autre.*)

[28] *HAP*, p. 85.

[29] Husserl, E. (1954/1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

[30] Saussure, F. de (1916) *Course in General Linguistics*. This is put in question by the recently discovered work by Saussure (2002/2006) *Writings in General Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. I don't know whether Ricœur read the more recent one.

[31] Religion and its relationship with Ricœur's philosophy will be a subsidiary theme in this book; the rationalism of Spinoza, Leibniz and others draws its strength from the still dominant understanding of Descartes, as a believer. Husserl goes in a different direction and takes the idea of the cogito from Descartes, developing a phenomenology that is without God.

[32] *HAP*, pp. 116–18.

[33] Levinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, transl. Alfonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. Derrida, J. (2004) La Parole. Donner, nommer, appeler in *Ricœur 1.*, eds M. Revault D'Allonnes and F Azouvi Paris: Seuil.

[34] Derrida, J. (1967/2001) Violence and Metaphysics in *Writing and Difference*, transl. A. Bass. London: Routledge.

[35] Norris, C. (2000) Deconstruction: Modern or Postmodern? in *Modernity, Modernism, Postmodernism*, ed. M. Barbeito. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela Publicatións, pp. 68–86.

[36] *HAP*, p. 26.

[37] *HAP*, p. 25.

[38] See first essay in Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press. *FTTA.*

[39] *HAP*, pp. 118–23, 204–7.

[40] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, pp. 10–12.

[41] Moran, D. (2000) *Introduction to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, p. 178.

[42] Kearney, R. (2004) *On Paul Ricœur. The Owl of Minerva*. Aldershot: Ashgate, p. 102.

[43] *HAP*, pp. 123–31.

[44] *FAN*, p. 189.

[45] Ibid., p. 386.

[46] Ibid., p. 192.

[47] *FAP*, p. 377.

[48] *FAN*, p. 449.

[49] Husserl, E. (1954/1970) *Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

[50] Ricœur followed with interest Foucault's change from despair with Kantian man towards seeing the individual as ethical. See Norris for a clear analysis of this – Norris in endnote 6 above.

[51] Nietzsche, F. (2000) *Philosophical Writings*, ed. R. Grimm and C. y Vedia. New York and London: Continuum, p. 201.

[52] Norris, C. (2000) Deconstruction: Modern or Postmodern? *In Modernity, Modernism, Postmodernism*, ed. M. Barbeito. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, p. 57.

[53] Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Part 1. An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon.

[54] For a good retrospective summary of Derrida, see Chris Norris' Introduction in Derrida, J. (1972/2004) *Positions*, transl. A. Bass. New York and London: Continuum.

[55] Ricœur, P. (1950/1966) *Freedom and Nature*, transl. E. Kohak. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press (*FAN*), *Fallible Man* (1960/1965 and1986) revised transl. C. A. Kelbley (*FM*). New York: Fordham University Press and (1960/1967), *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press. Ricœur, P. (1950/1996) *A Key to Edmund Husserl's Ideas 1*, ed. Pol Vandevelde, transl. Bond Harris and Jacqueline Bouchard Spurlock. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press. This commentary was originally published in French as part of Ricœur's translation of *Ideas* 1 and was only published in English in 1996. Ricœur, P. (1950/1967) *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*, transl. E. G. Ballard and L. E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern University Press (*HAP*).

[56] *HAP*, p. 212.

[57] Fonds Ricœur Archives: 96.

Chapter 2 Ricœur's hermeneutics I: the archaeology of suspicion

[1] Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur. His Life and Work*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, p. 17.

[2] Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers, 22*. Chicago: Open Court, p. 25.

[3] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 46–7 and Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une Vie* Édition revue et augmentée. Paris: La Découverte, Poche, p. 315.

[4] Esprit no. 322, Nov. 1963: 635 and Dosse 2008: 316–18, see endnote 2, and Chapter 6 in this book.

[5] Archives 003, Fonds Ricœur, Paris. 'On exagère maintenant en 1930 l'idée de constitution.'

[6] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 7. Dalbiez, R. (1936) *La Méthode psychanalytique et la doctrine freudienne*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer and Hahn 1975: 19, 21.

[7] Reagan, see endnote 1 above, p. 19.

[8] See chapters 14 and 46 of Dosse (2008), see endnote 3 above.

[9] Ricœur, P. (*FAN, FM, SOE*) and C. Reagan and D. Stewart (eds) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur: An Anthology of His Work* (Boston: Beacon Press 1978).

[10] Ricœur, P. (1955, 1964/1965) *History and Truth*, transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

[11] *Freedom and Nature*, pp. 381, 395. See also Van Leeuven, T. M. (1981) *The Surplus of Meaning*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 15–21.

[12] Ricœur, P. and Dufrenne, M. (1947) *Karl Jaspers et la philosophie de l'existence*. Paris: Seuil; and Ricœur, P. (1948) *Gabriel Marcel et Karl Jaspers. Philosophie du mystère et philosophie du paradoxe*. Paris: Temps Présent.

[13] Clarke, D. (2006) *Descartes. A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[14] Husserl, E. and Cairns, D. (1982) *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, transl. D. Cairns. Dordrecht: The Netherlands. *HAP*, pp. 83–4.

[15] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une Vie*. Paris: La Découverte, pp. 314–15.

[16] Mongin, O. (1994) *Paul Ricœur*. Paris: Le Seuil.

[17] Ricœur, P., *Time and Narrative 1–3 (Vol. 1 1983/1984, Vol. 2, 1985/1985, Vol. 3 1985/1988)* Chicago: University of Chicago Press (*TAN*) and *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2000/2004). Chicago: University of Chicago Press (*MHF*).

[18] Hegel, G. W. (1807/1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit*, transl. A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Husserl, E. (1900/1970) *Logical Investigations*, transl. J. N. Findlay 2 vols. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[19] *HAT*, p. 316.

[20] Ibid., p. 309.

[21] Ibid., p. 315.

[22] Marcel, G. (2007) *Man against Mass Society*, transl. G. S. Fraser. Chicago: St. Augustine Press. First published in English in 1962 by the Regnery Press. Marcel gave the Gifford Lectures in 1950, entitled *The Mystery of Being*.

[23] *HAT*, p. 317.

[24] Part of this lecture series has been translated into English as Negativity and Primary Affirmation, in *History and Truth*, pp. 305–28, first published in French in 1956.

[25] Fonds Ricœur 7. Detailed notes on Sartre's plays on Sorbonne notepaper (1957–1964).

[26] Fonds Ricœur 27. Union Theological Seminary in USA, eight seminars of two hours each, delivered in English on *Anthropology and Religion in the Philosophy of Existence*. Undated: period late 1950s to early 1960s. Unpublished.

[27] *FAN*, p. 135.

[28] *FAN*, p. 135; *HAT*, p. 315.

[29] *HAT*, p. 324.

[30] Ibid., pp. 327–8.

[31] Ibid., pp. 325, 326.

[32] Ibid., p. 309.

[33] Ricœur enjoys Schaldenbrand's definition of the mediating imagination, which she develops in his work on metaphor as a reflection of the kinship through conflict that characterizes the human condition. For an excellent discussion of this, see Ricœur's preface p. x and Schaldenbrand, p. 80 both in Reagan, C. (1979) *Studies in the Philosophy of Paul Ricœur.* Athens: Ohio University Press.

[34] *FM*, p. xxxv.

[35] *FM*, p. 41; Kant, I. (1781/1998) B181: 273. *Critique of Pure Reason,* transl. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[36] *FM*, p. 76.

[37] *FM*, p. 137.

[38] LaCocque, A. and Ricœur, P. (1998/1998) *Thinking Biblically,* transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

[39] *FM*, p. 138.

[40] Ibid., p. 138.

[41] Ibid., pp. 50, 54, 55; Kant, I. *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy,* transl. and ed. M. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[42] Ibid., pp. 145–6. See also Ricœur's discussion of Pascal in MHF pp. 227–238 and 261–274

[43] Rasmussen, D. (1971) *Mythic-Symbolic Language and Philosophical Anthropology. A Constructive Interpretation of the Thought of Paul Ricœur.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, p. 104.

[44] Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur: His Life and Work.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, p. 124, from a conversation recorded by Reagan and Ricœur in 1991.

[45] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action.* London: Athlone Press. *FTTA.*

[46] *SOE*, p. 387.

[47] *SOE*, pp. 101–4 and contrast with *Thinking Biblically* 8:14. See endnote 38 above.

[48] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur: Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, p. 38 deals very briefly with this.

[49] *SOE*, p. 140.

[50] *SOE*, p. 142.

[51] *SOE*, p. 155.

[52] *SOE*, p. 156.

[53] Bunting, M. (25.2.08). Secularists have nothing to fear from women wearing headscarves, *The Guardian.* http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/feb/25/turkey.islam

[54] Interesting discussion by S. H. Clark (1990) *Paul Ricœur.* London: Routledge, pp. 95–6.

[55] We see this in the etymology of the word symbol (sun=with; ballein=throw). *SOE*, p. 170.

[56] Dosse 2008, p. 311.

[57] *COI*, pp. 54–61.

[58] *SOE*, p. 237.

[59] *SOE*, p. 144.

[60] Ricœur, P. (1971) The Model of the Text; Meaningful Action Considered as Text in Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press. *FTTA*, p. 167.

[61] Gadamer, H.-G. (1960/1991) *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised edition, transl. J. Weinsheimer and D. Marshall. New York: Crossroad; Simms, K. 2003. *Paul Ricœur*. London: Routledge, p. 39.

[62] *HAT*, p. 327.

[63] Rasmussen, D., p. 88, see endnote 43 above.

Chapter 3 Ricœur's masters of suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche and Freud

[1] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 1, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 354; Day, B. (1999) *The Velvet Philosophers*. London: The Claridge Press.

[2] Hahn (1995) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. The Library of Living Philosophers*, 22. Chicago: Open Court, p. 167.

[3] Ricœur, P. (1965/1970) *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, transl. D. Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 33–4, 463–4 (*FAP*).

[4] Ricœur, P. (1950/1966) *Freedom and Nature*, transl. E. Kohak. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press (*FAN*) (1960/1965 and 1986) *Fallible Man*, revised transl. C. A. Kelbley (*FM*). New York: Fordham University Press and (1960/1967) *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press (*SOE*).

[5] Gerhart, M. (1979) *The Question of Belief in Literary Criticism: An Introduction to the Hermeneutical Theory of Paul Ricœur*. Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag, p. 153. I believe the third text may be certain archive material on *La Négation*.

[6] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 29 (*CAC*).

[7] Simms, K. (2007) *Ricœur and Lacan*. London: Continuum.

[8] *FAN*, p. 376.

[9] Ibid., pp. 375–7.

[10] Ibid., p. 10.

[11] Ibid., pp. 373–409.

[12] Ibid., p. 401.

[13] Ibid., 1950: 403.

[14] *FAP*, pp. 495–6.

[15] *CAC*, p. 29.

[16] Ricœur also delivers these lectures in France in French, but does not translate literally from French to English. Some of his essays on Freud have only recently been published in French: Ricœur, P. (2007) *Autour de la Psychoanalyse*, ed. C. Goldenstein and J-L. Schlegel. Paris: Seuil.

[17] *FAN*, pp. 381–95.

[18] *CAC*, pp. 68–73.

[19] *CAC*, p. 29.

[20] *CAC*, p. 76.

[21] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde, p. 127.

[22] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une Vie.* Edition revue et augmentée. Paris: La Découverte Poche, ch. 29.

[23] Dosse (2008) *Paul Ricœur*, p. 291.

[24] Lacan asserted that the unconscious is structured like language, and used structuralist terms and ideas. Simms explains how Ricœur engages with Lacan's disciples Laplanche and Leclaire in their development of Saussure's model that shows signifier (that which represents something, often a task done by a word) and signified (that which is represented) as if they were upper and lower fractions. They extend this with the bar acting as both a repressor and a way of showing how a signifier can drop down below the bar and become the signified. Simms, 49–54, see endnote 7 above; Ricœur, *FAP*, pp. 401–3.

[25] Dosse 2008, *Paul Ricœur*, pp. 300–10, and Stephen Clarke comments that as late as 1998, when he invited Ricœur to London, Ricœur was unwilling to discuss it. Personal communication November 2008; Simms, see endnote 7 above.

[26] Dosse 2008, *Paul Ricœur*, endnote 10, p. 291, contains '*Le conscient et l'inconscient*' pp. 409–22, later published in English in *COI* (pp. 99–120).

[27] *FAP*, pp. 32–6, and similarly in *The Conflict of Interpretations*, the essay, Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Culture, pp. 148–50.

[28] *FAP*, p. 426.

[29] *COI*, p. 18.

[30] Ibid., p. 18.

[31] Ibid., p. 149.

[32] 7 November 2007. Chicago Ricœur conference; personal communication from David Pellauer.

[33] Ricœur, P. (2000/2004) *Memory, History, Forgetting*, transl. K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press, p. 103.

[34] Freud, S. (1954) *The Origins of Psychoanalysis.* New York: Basic Books, contrasted by Ricœur with the earlier (1950) *Project for Scientific Psychology.* London: Imago.

[35] Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1947) *The German Ideology.* Ed. R. Pascal. New York: International Publishers; Marx, K. (1963) *Karl Marx. Early Writings*, transl. T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill; Ricœur, P. and multiple author team (1978) *Main Trends in Philosophy.* Paris: UNESCO, pp. 348ff.

[36] Nietzsche, F. (2000) *Basic Writings*, transl. W. Kauffmann, intro. P. Gay. New York: The Modern Library.

[37] Archives 003. Early 1930s. Notes taken by Ricœur from courses by Dalbiez on *Freud et la Volonté.* 'Tout l'oeuvre du maître de Vienne est, sinon une négation, du moins une préterition systématique du rôle de la volonté.' My translation; 'All the works of the master of Vienna are, if not a negation, at least a systematic passing over, an avoiding of the role of the will.'

[38] *FAN*, pp. 408–9.

[39] *FAN*, p. 409.

[40] Simms, pp. 75–85, see endnote 7 above.

[41] *FAP*, p. 375.

[42] Ibid., pp. 268, 292.

[43] Ibid., p. 377.

[44] Ibid., pp. 274, 379.

[45] Spinoza, B. (1994) III, Of The Affects in *The Ethics.* Ed. and transl. E. Curley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 157.

[46] *FAP*, p. 274.

[47] Freud, S. (1905/1966) *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*, transl. J. Strachey. London: Routledge, p. 62. Derrida, J. (1984) *Margins of Philosophy*, transl. A Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[48] *FAP*, p. 403.

[49] *SOE*, p. 35.

[50] *FAP*, p. 277.

[51] Ibid., p. 279.

[52] Ibid., p. 324.

[53] Ibid., p. 329.

[54] Ibid., p. 330.

[55] Ibid., p. 321.

[56] Ibid., p. 338.

[57] *COI*, p. 172.

[58] Ibid., p. 174.

[59] *CAC*, chapter 4: Politics and Totalitarianism.

[60] *COI*, pp. 442–8.

[61] Ibid., p. 443.

[62] Ibid., p. 453.

[63] Ibid., p. 456.

[64] Ibid., p. 457.

[65] Ibid., p. 458.

[66] Day, B. (1999) *The Velvet Philosophers.* London: The Claridge Press, p. 97.

[67] Ibid., p. 89; Patočka, J. (1996) *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History*, transl. E. Kohak. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court, has a Preface by Paul Ricœur, pp. vii–xvi; Ricœur, P. (1999) Lectures 1. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, pp. 69–92; Charta 77 was a manifesto for civil rights and liberties.

[68] Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work.* Beacon Press: Boston, 216–17.

[69] Ricœur, P. *History and Truth* (1955, 1964/1965) transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press (essay in *HAT*, The Image of God and the Epic of Man, p. 115).

[70] Two essays in *HAT* are noteworthy: Note on the History of Philosophy and the Sociology of Knowledge, pp. 57–62 and The Political Paradox, pp. 247–70.

[71] *HAT*, p. 248.

[72] Ibid., p. 248.

[73] Ibid., p. 252.

[74] Ibid., pp. 255–6.

[75] Ibid., p. 260.

[76] Ibid., p. 263.

[77] Ricœur, P. (1986 Engl./Fr 1997) *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia.* New York: Columbia University Press. Lectures delivered in autumn 1975 in Chicago which, somewhat against his will, he allowed to be published. Note that p. 330 lists Ricœur's writings on ideology and utopia.

[78] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, ed. and transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (*HHS*) pp. 231, 233; Clark, S. (1990) *Paul Ricœur*. London: Routledge, pp. 116–17. *HHS*, 234–5.

[79] Clark 1990: 117.

[80] Dauenhauer, B. (1998) *Paul Ricœur: The Promise and Risk of Politics. 20th Century Political Thinkers*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, p. 7.

[81] Dosse 1997, vol. 2: 48, see endnote 1 above.

[82] Althusser, L. (1968) Lénine et la philosophie in *Bulletin de la Societé Française de Philosophie 62*: 125–61, discussion between Althusser and Ricœur, pp. 161–81.

[83] Popkin, R. (2003) *The History of Scepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 205.

[84] *LIU*, p. 234–5.

[85] Dosse 1997: vol. 2, p. 288.

[86] Day, see endnote 64 above. Appendix II. As one of the Velvet Philosophers, Ricœur helped to create a network of intellectual contacts for an 'underground university' in Czechoslovakia, visiting in 1980, 1986 and 1989.

[87] Reagan and Stewart 1978, pp. 213–14, see endnote 54 above. *FAP*, p. 386.

[88] *COI*, p. 153; Andy Warhol Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, and travelling exhibition *Other Voices. Other Rooms* 2007–2009.

[89] *FAP*, p. 458.

[90] Ibid., pp. 542–3.

[91] Ibid., p. 535.

[92] Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995), p. 167. See endnote 2 above.

[93] Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 17.

Chapter 4 On the use and abuse of the term 'hermeneutics of suspicion'

[1] Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 143, and Cavell, S. (1979) *The Claim of Reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[2] Gadamer, H. (1984) The Hermeneutics of Suspicion in *Man and World* 17, pp. 313–23; Leiter, B. (2005) The Hermeneutics of Suspicion: Recovering Marx, Nietzsche and Freud in *The Future for Philosophy* (2004) ed. B. Leiter. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 74–105; Shah-Kazemi, R. (2006) *The Other in The Light of The One. The Universality of the Qu'ran and Interfaith Dialogue*. The Islamic Texts Society; Vaught, C. (2005) Access to God in Augustine's Confessions. New York: SUNY Press, p. 252, endnote 44; White, E. (1991) Between Suspicion and Hope: Paul Ricœur's Vital Hermeneutics. Literature and Theology, 5, pp. 311–21; Williams, R. The Suspicion of Suspicion: Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer in *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology*, ed. R. H. Bell. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

[3] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) Freedom in the Light of Hope, in *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde, pp. 402–24 (*COI*); *Fallible Man* is important too.

[4] *COI*, p. 415, and discussed in Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur and Kant: Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, pp. 41, 43.

[5] See Chapter 8. Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur: His Life and Work.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press (interview 1982: p. 105). Ricœur, P. (1963), Le Conflit des herméneutiques: Épistémologie des interprétations in *Cahiers Internationaux de Symbolisme. No. 1. Genève: Societé de Symbolisme.* I thank Catherine Goldenstein for locating this paper.

[6] Hart, K. (2000) *The Trespass of the Sign: Deconstruction, Theology and Philosophy.* New York: Fordham University Press, p. 48. Totalizing hermeneutics included for Derrida the following: Ricœur's hermeneutics of suspicion and of faith, and Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, and reception studies and allegorical and philological hermeneutics.

[7] O'Connell, S. (2001) Foucault and the Hermeneutic of Suspicion. *Outspeak.* New York: SUNY Press, pp. xiii, 5.

[8] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, ed. and transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (*HHS*), p. 46.

[9] See his paper at Bonneval, 1960, Consciousness and The Unconscious, which appears in *COI*, see endnote 3 above; pp. 152–84.

[10] Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work.* Boston: Beacon Press, p. 214.

[11] Ritivoi, A. D. (2006) *Paul Ricœur: Tradition and Innovation in Rhetorical Theory.* Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 42.

[12] Ricœur, P. (1986 Engl./Fr 1997) Lectures *on Ideology and Utopia.* New York: Columbia University Press.

[13] *LIU*, p. 93.

[14] Reagan 1996, p. 100, see endnote 5 above; Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

[15] *COI*, p. 101.

[16] Simms, K. (2007) *Ricœur and Lacan.* London: Continuum, p. 23 and chapter 3.

[17] *HHS*, p. 55, see endnote 8 above.

[18] *COI*, p. 99.

[19] Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur & Kant. Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, p. 36.

[20] Ritivoi, see endnote 11 above.

[21] *FAP*, pp. 32–6; Robinson, G. D. (1995) Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion: A Brief Overview and Critique in *Premise* vol. 11(8).

[22] R. Kearney and M. Rainwater (eds) *The Continental Philosophy Reader* (1996) London: Routledge, p. 136.

[23] Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers, 22.* Chicago: Open Court.

[24] Kearney, R. (2004) *On Paul Ricœur. The Owl of Minerva.* Aldershot: Ashgate, p. 156.

[25] *COI*, p. 331.

[26] Ihde, D. (1971) *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, p. xiv.

[27] Ihde, p. xvii, as in endnote 26 above.

[28] *COI*, pp. xvi–xvii.

[29] Hahn, p. 65, see endnote 23 above.

[30] Ihde as in endnote 26 above.

[31] Ricœur, P. (1965/1970) *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, transl. D. Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press (*FAP*), p. 27.

[32] Ricœur, P. (1975) Biblical Henneneutics in *Semeia* (4): 29–148, p. 131.

[33] Ricœur, P. (1974) *Political and Social Essays*, ed. D. Stewart and J. Bien. Athens: Ohio State University Press. Perhaps the 1975 *Semeia* text or another drew Rowan Williams' comment in his essay The Suspicion of Suspicion: Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer in *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology*, ed. R. H. Bell. San Francisco: Harper and Row. Williams uses a 'project of Christianized post-Freudian suspicion' to show the importance of Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer as critical thinkers, without discussing Ricœur.

[34] Ricœur, P. (1975/1977) *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, transl. R. Czerny. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press. *ROM*, p. 285; Hahn, see endnote 25 above, p. 429.

[35] Ricœur, P. (*ROM*), p. 285, see endnote 34 above.

[36] *Ideology, Utopia and Faith* (1976) The Centre for Henneneutical Studies 17(19, 21).

[37] *HHS*, p. 76.

[38] Reagan, see endnote 14 above, p. 105, interview recorded 19 June 1982.

[39] Hahn 1995, see endnote 23 above. Intellectual Autobiography in Hahn, p. 22; Reply to John Smith in Hahn, p. 165.

[40] Ricœur, P. (1991) *A Ricœur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*. Ed. M. Valdes. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 223, 235.

[41] *FAP*, p. 27.

[42] *FAP*, pp. 542–3.

[43] Thiselton, A. (1992) *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 350.

[44] Leiter, B. (2005) The Henneneutics of Suspicion: Recovering Marx, Nietzsche and Freud in *The Future for Philosophy* (2004), ed. B. Leiter. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 74–105.

[45] Ibid., 169; Clark, S. (1990: 90). *Paul Ricœur*. London: Routledge.

[46] Hahn, p. 22, see endnote 23 above.

[47] O'Connell, S. (2001) Foucault and the Henneneutics of Suspicion in *Outspeak*. New York: SUNY Press, pp. xiii, 5; Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur, Les Sens D'une Vie*. Paris: La Découverte, p. 483.

[48] *SOE*, p. 41.

[49] Ibid., p. 87.

[50] Insted (2007) *The Search for Common Ground: Muslims, Non-Muslims and the UK Media* Greater London Authority www.insted/co/uk/islam.html http//:www.London.gov.uk/mayor/equalities/docs.co

[51] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) Ideology and Utopia in *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: Athlone Press, p. 100.

[52] Ibid., p. 86.

[53] 1963, *Le Conflit des herméneutiques*, see endnote 5 above; 'décrire plutôt que'expliquer, cela veut dire laisser venir le sens au lieu de le ramener à des

causes ou à des functions'; my transl: 'describe more than explain, that means letting the meaning come out rather than drawing it back to causes and functions', p. 167.

[54] *FAP*, p. 275.

[55] Gadamer, H. (1984) The Hermeneutics of Suspicion in *Man and World* 17, pp. 313–23.

[56] *COI*, p. 117.

[57] Ibid., p. 119.

[58] Ibid., p. 331.

[59] Ricœur, P. (1986 Engl./Fr 1997) *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Columbia University Press, p. 161.

[60] See endnote 9 above 1963, p. 165; Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press, p. 214.

[61] Reagan and Stewart, ibid., pp. 214–15, see endnote 10.

[62] Ibid., p. 215.

[63] Reagan 1996, see endnote 5, pp. 27, 75, 97–8, 105.

[64] *LIU*, see endnote 59, pp. 160 and 162.

[65] *FAP*, pp. 390–1.

[66] Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 57.

[67] *COI*, p. 157.

[68] Ricœur in Reagan and Stewart 1978, p. 214.

[69] *FAP*, p. 34.

[70] *LIU*, p. 255.

[71] Kaplan, D. M. (2003) *Ricœur's Critical Theory*. Albany: New York State University Press, p. 21.

[72] Dauenhauer, B. (1998) *Paul Ricœur: The Promise and Risk of Politics. 20th Century Political Thinkers*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, p. 23.

[73] *COI*, p. 415; Kant, I. (1998) The Paralogisms of Pure Reason and On the Paralogisms of Pure Reason in *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. and ed. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 411–58.

[74] Ricœur, P. (1960/1967) *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press. *SE* p. 356.

[75] *SOE*, p. 16.

[76] Ibid., p. 348.

[77] *COI*, pp. 412, 415.

[78] Kant, I. (1781/1998) *Critique of Pure Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, A369: p. 426.

[79] Guyer, P. (1987) *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 279–95.

[80] Kant, I. (1799/1994) On a Supposed Right to Lie Because of Philanthropic Concerns in *Immanuel Kant. Ethical Philosophy* (2nd edn), transl. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett, pp. 162–6.

[81] Ricœur, P. (1975) My Relation to the History of Philosophy in *Iliff Review* 35, p. 8; Hahn (1995:139).

[82] *COI*, pp. 417–19.

[83] Hahn, pp. 552, 558, 567–70.

[84] *HHS*, see endnote 8 above.

[85] Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 9–10.

[86] Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur & Kant. Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, p. 118.

[87] Cavell, see endnote 85 above, pp. 143–4.

[88] Ibid., p. 11.

[89] Ibid., p. 138.

[90] Ibid., p. 85.

Chapter 5 Ricœur's hermeneutics II: the theory of interpretation

[1] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, p. 442.

[2] *The Rule of Metaphor* and Volume Three of *Time and Narrative* appear both here and in Chapter 6, on linguistic analysis, because of their importance for hermeneutics, for linguistic theories and for ethics, which Ricœur was at pains to distinguish one from the other and also to combine.

[3] Ricœur, P. (1985/1987) *Time and Narrative* Book 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 270.

[4] Ricœur, P. (1983) A Reply: Towards a 'Post-critical Rhetoric'? in Pretext, *Ricœur and Rhetoric* 4/3–4, pp. 201–13.

[5] Ricœur, P. (1967) *Husserl. An Analysis of His Phenomenology.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, p. 11.

[6] *COI*, p. 13.

[7] Foucault, M. (1966/2003) *The Order of Things.* London: Routledge, p. xv.

[8] See translator's note 28 (p. 83) in Derrida (1972/2002) *Positions*, transl. A. Bass. London: Continuum, for a flavour of the allegiances and identity changes that were common and disruptive to relationships; See also J. Hillis Miller's review of *Time and Narrative in The Times Literary Supplement* (*TLS*, 9–15 October 1987, pp. 1104–5) for a Derridean follower's attack on Ricœur and the assertion that he has 'detached his work from the real action these days on narrative theory' i.e. deconstruction, p. 1105.

[9] He started lecturing in the USA in 1954. *CAC*, p. 41.

[10] Life: A Story in Search of a Narrator (1987), in M. Valdes (ed.) (1991) *A Ricœur Reader: Reflection and Imagination.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 425–37 and *Oneself as Another* as discussed in Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995), *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers, 22.* Chicago: Open Court, p. 33.

[11] This appears as the Appendix to Ricœur, P. (1975/1977) *The Rule of Metaphor: Multidisciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language.* Trans. R. Czerny et al. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

[12] Ricœur, P. (1976) *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning.* Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, p. 3.

[13] Ricœur, P. *COI*, pp. 381–401 (see endnote 1 above); Wallace, M. (1995) *The Second Naiveté. Barth, Ricœur and the New Yale Theology*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, pp. 53–5.

[14] *IT*, see endnote 12 above.

[15] Ricœur, P. *Time and Narrative* 3 vols (1983–1988), transl. K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press; and the essay collection *From Text to Action* (1991) especially the essay Ideology and Utopia, pp. 308–24. This is a collection of essays written during the 1970s and early 1980s.

[16] He develops *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* as a pair (see for example *ROM* 98, *TAN* Bk. 1: ix–xi).

[17] Fonds Ricœur Archives: 39 bis. Guilt lecture series 1958 Columbia University New York, Unpublished.

[18] Ricœur, P. (1974) Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics in Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 134–48. This essay is a summary of *The Rule of Metaphor*, and was first published in New Literary History 6, just before *The Rule of Metaphor* appeared in French in 1975.

[19] Pretext, 1983. See endnote 4 above.

[20] *COI*, p. 87.

[21] *COI*, p. 71.

[22] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity Press. *CAC*, p. 77.

[23] In his 1967 essay Genesis and Structure, Derrida praises Husserl for his refusal 'to close the question' in any debate, because of 'the problem of the foundation of objectivity' on the mutually interrogative projects of phenomenology and structuralism, pp. 193, 199; Derrida, J. (1967/2001) *Writing and Difference*, transl. A. Bass. London: Routledge.

[24] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Ed. and Transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *HHS*, pp. 57–8.

[25] *COI*, p. 20.

[26] *HHS*, pp. 220–1.

[27] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press, *The Model of the Text* 1971: 144–67. *FTTA*; see also *IT* 1976, pp. 82–4.

[28] *IT*, p. 85.

[29] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les sens d'une vie*, chapter 30.

[30] *ROM*, p. 280.

[31] In *Memory, History, Forgetting* Ricœur engages with, for him, brutal frankness in a dissection of historical narratives and their many flaws, see *MHF*, ch. 9.

[32] *ROM*, p. 296.

[33] Stephen H. Clark, personal communication, November 2008.

[34] Kearney, R. (2004) *On Paul Ricœur. The Owl of Minerva*. Aldershot: Ashgate, p. 12.

[35] Ricœur, P. (1990/1992) *Oneself as Another*, transl. K. Blamey. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. 300–3.

[36] *ROM*, p. 292.

[37] Ibid., p. 294.

[38] Fonds Ricœur CL 04 1970s lecture series on *Analytical Philosophy of Imagination*; Sorbonne and Chicago.

[39] Ricœur, P. (1981) Sartre and Ryle on the Imagination, in *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre*, ed. P. A. Schillp. La Salle, Ill: Open Court, pp. 167–78.

[40] Wood, D. (1991) *On Paul Ricœur. Narrative and Interpretation.* London and New York: Routledge, p. 45.

[41] *TAN* 1, p. 6.

[42] Ibid., pp. 83–6.

[43] *ROM*, pp. 37–8.

[44] Ibid., p. 43.

[45] *TAN* 1, pp. 53, 57.

[46] Ibid., p. 65.

[47] Ibid., p. 81.

[48] *TAN* 3, pp. 7, 96, 254.

[49] *TAN* 1, pp. 62–3.

[50] Ibid., p. 85.

[51] *HHS*, pp. 52–3.

[52] Ibid., p. 59.

[53] Ibid., p. 89.

[54] Ricœur, P. Life in Quest of a Narrative in D. Wood (ed.) (1991) *On Paul Ricœur: Narrative and Interpretation.* London and New York: Routledge, p. 32.

[55] Ibid.: Vanhoozer, K. Antecedents to Time and Narrative in Wood above, p. 36, Ricœur above, p. 51. This is the irreconcilable difference between life and fiction; we cannot control our lives in the way we can make up a story.

[56] *TAN* 1, chapter 6, pp. 175–225.

[57] Ibid., p. 177.

[58] *ROM*, p. 280.

[59] *TAN* 1, p. 181.

[60] Ibid., p. 191.

[61] Ibid., p. 197.

[62] Ibid., p. 200.

[63] Valdes 1991, p. 435, see endnote 10 above.

[64] *TAN* 3, p. 274.

[65] Ricœur, P. (1990/1992) *Oneself as Another*, transl. K. Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *OAA*, pp. 297–356 passim.

[66] One of these is the *Pretext* paper to which I have referred already. Another is a paper he gave on 15 April 1987 in the Department of Philosophy of Haverford College USA (Fonds Ricœur Conf. 059). This paper is entitled Mimesis, Reference and Refiguration in Time and Narrative: unpublished. Thanks to Catherine Goldenstein for clarification, 10.12.08.

[67] Fonds Ricœur Conf 059. P.4: 15 April 1987, see previous endnote.

[68] *TAN* Bk 3, p. 102.

[69] Ibid., p. 204.

[70] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press. *FTTA*, p. 39.

[71] *FTTA*, p. 41.

[72] *ROM*, pp. 284–5.

[73] Ibid., p. 285.

[74] *HHS*, p. 244.

[75] *ROM*, p. 298.

[76] LaCocque, A. and Ricœur, P. (1998) *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, *TB* xvi; Ricœur, P. (2000) *The Just*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

[77] *TAN*, p. 270.

[78] *TAN* 3, p. 219; Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity. *CAC*, p. 79.

[79] See *FTTA* and Hegel and Husserl on intersubjectivity, chapter 11, 227–45.

[80] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Dosse comments that the historian Todorov followed the reading of signs and semiotics in the 1980s that Ricœur had used in the 1960s, and for which Ricœur had been mocked as an opponent of structuralism.

Chapter 6 Linguistic analysis

[1] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp. 108, 127.

[2] Norris, C. (1994) What is Enlightenment? Kant According to Foucault (pp. 53–138) in *Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the Wake of the 1980s*, ed. R. Miguel-Alfonso and S. Caporale-Bizzini. Amsterdam: Rodopi, p. 101.

[3] Thiselton, A. (1992) *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 349.

[4] Ricœur, P. (1971) The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text, pp. 144–67 in Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press, p. 163.

[5] Ricœur, P. Explaining and Understanding: On Some Remarkable Connections Among the Theory of the Text, Theory of Action, and Action of History, pp. 149–66 in C. Reagan and D. Stewart, eds. *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press and in Ricœur, P. (1973) *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

[6] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 87.

[7] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 125.

[8] *COI*, p. 64.

[9] Ricœur, P. (2004/2006) *On Translation*, transl. E. Brennan. London: Routledge, pp. 30–1.

[10] Ibid., p. 32.

[11] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, ed. and transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11, 134.

[12] Ibid., pp. 138–40.

[13] *OT*, p. 31 see endnote 9.

[14] Ricœur, P. (1974) eds. D. Stewart and J. Bien, *Political and Social Essays*. Athens: Ohio University Press, p. 91; Fanon, F. (1963/1965) *The Wretched of The Earth*. Preface by Jean-Paul Sartre, transl. C. Farrington. London: MacGibbon and Key.

[15] Kant, E. (1998) *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. and ed. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, A41, p. 273.

[16] Ricœur, P. *Fallible Man* (1960/1965 and 1986) revised transl. C. A. Kelbley. New York: Fordham University Press.

[17] Ibid., p. 45.

[18] Existentialism is another strand, discussed regarding Sartre and Marcel, with its focus on the agency of the human. This is incompatible with structuralism, in which meaning is in linguistic units, analysable in the physical structure of the text and nowhere else.

[19] Burke, S. (1998) *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in the Work of Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

[20] Ricœur, P. (1983) A Reply: Towards a 'Post-critical Rhetoric'? in L. W. Phelps (ed.) *Ricœur and Rhetoric*. Pre/text 4/3–4, pp. 201–13.

[21] Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur: His Life and Work*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, p. 107.

[22] Ricœur, P. (1996) *The Hermeneutics of Action*, ed. R. Kearney. London: Sage, p. 28.

[23] *FM*, p. 30.

[24] *HHS*, p. 77.

[25] Ricœur, P. (1975) Biblical Hermeneutics in *Semeia* 1975(4) pp. 29–148, p. 132.

[26] Ibid., p. 131.

[27] Norris, C. (1987) The Rhetoric of Remembrance: Derrida on De Man in *Deconstruction against Itself: Textual Practice*, pp. 154–68; De Man's essay The Rhetoric of Temporality (pp. 102–41) is in (1983) *Blindness and Insight*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

[28] Hillis Miller, J. (2001) Parable and Performative in the Gospel and in Modern Literature in *The Postmodern Bible Reader*, ed. D. Jobling, T. Pippin and B. Schleifer. Hillis Miller asserts four paradoxes to exemplify Biblical parables: the word of God can only be spoken indirectly; you need to know the Word in order to understand the parables, the disciples need to have them explained by Jesus and they are analogical, i.e. against logic. The chapter seems to me to be undecided about whether to be thoroughly postmodern and challenge meaning, or to accede that Biblical parables are somehow special. Miller is undecided because, by his own admission, he is not sure whether secular and Biblical parables should be separate or not, pp. 133–5.

[29] Ibid., p. 118.

[30] C. Reagan and D. Stewart, eds. (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press, chapter 16.

[31] *BH*, p. 95.

[32] Ibid., p. 85.

[33] Kermode, F. (1966) *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[34] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press, p. 14.

[35] Ibid., p. 17.

[36] Guardini, R. (1954) *Le Mort de Socrate*, transl. P. Ricœur. Paris: Seuil. This translation from the German is little known and shows another early text translation by Ricœur; thank you to Catherine Goldenstein for drawing it to my attention. 9.12.08. Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 41; Ricœur, P. (2004/2006) *On Translation*. Intro. R. Kearney, transl. E. Brennan. London: Routledge; Ricœur, P. (2001/2007) *Reflections on the Just*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 106–20; Ricœur, P. (1998/1998) *Thinking Biblically*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 331–61. It is interesting to compare the translations by Brennan and Pellauer, of the essay 'The Paradigm of Translation'; for example where Brennan cites the French phrase and translates 'nous déployons les plis' as 'we are opening out the folds', p. 25, Pellauer translates it as 'we unfold it' p. 117. Here we have the practice of translation; it is impossible to find perfection, and you also need to read it in context. This image of folding is a Kantian one that Ricœur uses often, as an image for explanation.

[37] Ricœur, P. *History and Truth* (1955, 1964/1965), transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press. *HAT*, p. 282.

[38] *OT*, p. 15.

[39] Ibid., p. 9; Benjamin, W. (2000) The Task of the Translator in *Selected Works of Walter Benjamin Vol 1*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. This was originally the 1923 preface to Benjamin's own translation of Baudelaire's Tableaux Parisiens.

[40] In Fonds Ricœur archives, 96, there is a very thick file labelled in Ricœur's hand 'La Négation.' Earliest notes are dated 1953–1954, 1954–1955 (including Hegel, Kierkegaard vs Hegel, Heidegger and Sartre) then material from 1969–1970 (Négation et subjectivité) that he has labelled 'seminar course notes' in English, with key terms such as 'ontology and the aporias of negation' and two worked examples: Parmenides and Aristotle. Throughout, key terms such as 'Néant' (Nothingness), alterity and contradiction are prominent. Such a folder exemplifies the way he collected material over decades, adding to and reworking teaching and book material.

[41] Kearney, R. (2007) Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Translation in *Research in Phenomenology* 37, pp. 147–59, p. 158.

[42] Ricœur, P. (1995) *Figuring the Sacred. Religion, Narrative and Imagination*, transl. D. Pellauer. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, p. 47.

[43] Kearney, R. (2008) Vers une herméneutique de la Traduction in *Paul Ricœur. De l'homme faillible a l'homme capable*, coordonné par Gaëlle Fiasse. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, p. 166.

[44] Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[45] Stiver, D. (2001) *Theology after Ricœur*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, p. 170.

[46] LaCocque, A. and Ricœur, P. (1998) *Thinking Biblically*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[47] Simms, K. (2003) *Paul Ricœur*. London: Routledge, pp. 134–6.

[48] My translation; the One who is, the eternal Being and the I AM HERE.

[49] *TB*, p. 361.

[50] *HHS*, p. 169.

[51] *OT*, pp. 5, 10, 23.

[52] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 65–6.

[53] Essay in *FAN* History of Decision: From Hesitation to Choice.

[54] Derrida, J. (1990) Force of Law. The Mystical Foundationism of Authority, transl. M. Quaintance. *Cardozo Law Review* 11, pp. 919–1045.

[55] *FM*, pp. 87, 101.

[56] *HHS*, p. 161.

[57] *OT*, p. 8. *OT*, pp. 15, 16, 27, 29.

[58] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, p. 131.

[59] Ricœur, P. *Reflection and Imagination: A Ricœur Reader* (1991), ed. M. Valdes. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 494–5.

[60] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity. *CAC*, p. 83.

[61] As we see in endnote 15, p. 191 in *CAC* and p. 179 (1995), Ricœur uses examples from literature to show what he means by refiguration; Proust's Combray optician hopes that his magnifying glass will help his patients to see the world more clearly, and Ricœur hopes that devices like metaphor and narrative can help the reader to understand the text more clearly, and, through the refiguration of the world by metaphor, to see the world more clearly (*CAC*, p. 179).

[62] Valdes, p. 431 see endnote 59 above.

[63] Ibid., pp. 448, 455; *Poetry and Possibility*: interview of Ricœur by Manhattan Review.

[64] Vandevelde intro. to PR Key to Husserl's *Ideas* 1, p. 21.

[65] Valdes, p. 430.

[66] 1967 essay Violence and Language, pp. 88–101 in *PASE* see endnote 13 above (1974).

[67] Ibid., 99.

[68] Ricœur, P. (1996) The Erosion of Tolerance and the Resistance of the Intolerable (pp. 189–201) in *Tolerance between Intolerance and the Intolerable*, ed. P. Ricœur. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

[69] Reagan and Stewart (1978) pp. 33, 230, see endnote 31 above.

[70] *PASE*, p. 101.

[71] Ibid., 469.

[72] Robinson G. D. (1995) Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion: A Brief Overview and Critique in *Premise* vol. 11 (8) p. 16.

[73] *FTTA* 100, see endnote 28.

[74] In the second of four interviews with Reagan 26 October 1988, published in 1996. Reagan 1996:111.

[75] Ibid., p. 112.

Chapter 7 Methodological dialectics

[1] Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur and Kant: Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, p. xv and chapter 2.

[2] Pellauer, D. (2002) At the Limit of Practical Wisdom. Moral Blindness in R. Cohen and J. Marsh (eds) *Ricœur as Another. The Ethics of Subjectivity.* Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 187 and Pellauer refers us to Biblical Hermeneutics, *Semeia* 1975, pp. 139–42.

[3] Ricœur, P. (1991) *A Ricœur Reader: Reflection and Imagination,* ed. M. Valdes. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, p. 82.

[4] Ricœur, P. (1950/1966) *Freedom and Nature,* transl. E. Kohak. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, p. 4.

[5] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation,* ed. and transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 77.

[6] Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations,* transl. D. Ihde, p. 345.

[7] Anderson, P. Kant and Ricœur 1993, see endnote 1 above.

[8] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction,* transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity, p. 76.

[9] Ibid., p. 6.

[10] *HAP,* p. 133.

[11] Blundell, B. (2003) Creative Fidelity: Gabriel Marcel's Influence on Paul Ricœur, pp. 89–102 in A. Wiercinski (ed.) *Between Suspicion and Sympathy,* ed. Toronto: The Hermeneutic Press.

[12] Ihde, D. (1971) *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur.* Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, p. 15.

[13] Ibid., pp. 14–20, and Chapter 3.

[14] Ricœur, P. *History and Truth* (1955, 1964/1965), transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, p. 3.

[15] Ibid., p. 4.

[16] Ibid., p. 5; Scott-Baumann, A. (2003a) Reconstructive Hermeneutical Philosophy: Return Ticket to the Human Condition in *Journal of Philosophy and Social Criticism* vol. 29(6), pp. 705–29.

[17] Ibid., p. 11.

[18] Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order.* New York: Simon and Schuster; see also as counter argument, Sen, A. (2006) *Identity and Violence. The Illusion of Destiny.* London: Allen Lane.

[19] Siddiqui, A. (2007) The Siddiqui Report in *Islam in Universities in England.* www.w.socialcohesion.co.uk/blog/2007/06/the_siddiqui_report_the govern.html

[20] Concurrently he is developing his interest in symbolism – *The Symbolism of Evil* – also developed in studying Book of Genesis; Ricœur, P. The Language of Faith in C. Reagan and D. Stewart (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, An Anthology of His Work.* Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 223–38.

[21] Ricœur, P. (1971) The Model of the Text; Meaningful Action Considered as Text in Ricœur, P. in (1986/1991) *From Text to Action,* transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press. (In 1970 there was a defining moment for post-structuralism. Barthes published S/Z, on the idea of intertextuality, the idea being developed by his student, Julia Kristeva, who became a famous philosopher on her own right.)

[22] Anderson, p. 38, see endnote 1 above.

[23] Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur: His Life and Work.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, p. 104.

[24] Archives 001–2, Fonds Ricœur, lectures attended in 1931–1932 when Ricœur was 18–19 years old.

[25] *HHS*, p. 92, see endnote 5 above.

[26] *HHS*, Part 1; Scott-Baumann, A. (2003a) Reconstructive Hermeneutical Philosophy: Return Ticket to the Human Condition in *Journal of Philosophy and Social Criticism* vol. 29 (6), pp. 705–29.

[27] Taylor, C. (1971) Interpretation and the Sciences of Man in *Review of Metaphysics* vol. 25(1), pp. 3–10, p. 3.

[28] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une vie.* Paris: La Découverte, pp. 646–8.

[29] *FAP*, p. 365.

[30] *FAP*, pp. 79, 108–10, 391–3, note Ricœur's comment that Freud discusses secondary processes and repression more in the 'Project' than in the later 'Interpretation of Dreams.'

[31] Reagan 1996, p. 105, see endnote 23 above.

[32] Ricœur, P. (1975) Biblical Hermeneutics in *Semeia* 1975(4) pp. 29–148.

[33] Reagan 1996, p. 60.

[34] *COI*, pp. 30, 39, see endnote 6 above.

[35] Ricœur, P. *Reflection and Imagination: A Ricœur Reader* (1991), ed. M. Valdes. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, p. 241.

[36] Reagan 1996, p. 104.

[37] Ibid., 109.

[38] *COI*, p. 19.

[39] Reagan 1996, p. 109.

[40] Ibid., p. 103.

[41] Ibid., p. 117.

[42] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press, p. 37.

[43] Ricœur, P. (1990/1992) *Oneself as Another*, transl. K. Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 300–2.

[44] Strawson, P. F. (1959/2006) *Individuals. An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics.* London: Routledge.

[45] Norris, C. (1997) *Resources of Realism. Prospects for Post-Analytic Philosophy.* Basingstoke: Macmillan. Norris provides a fascinating set of arguments, including some discussion of Ricœur on Davidson, pp. 62–4, although I question Norris' listing of Ricœur alongside Heidegger's brand of hermeneutics, which latter I find suspect and quasi-mystical in the end.

[46] *OAA*, pp. 300–3.

[47] Ibid., pp. 2, 6.

[48] Reagan 1996, p. 121; Wallace, M. (1995) *The Second Naiveté. Barth, Ricœur and the New Yale Theology.* Macon: Mercer University Press. Wallace believes that Ricœur's hermeneutic approach provides 'a *via media* between mainline narrative theology and secular literary readings of the Bible', p. 50.

[49] Ricœur, P. (2008) *Amour et justice.* Paris: Seuil. See p. 10 for Ricœur's request that Amour et Justice and the two Gifford chapters omitted from *OAA* should be published together. Catherine Goldenstein also reports that it was a condition of the Gifford lectures to incorporate an explicitly theological theme, rather than it being, on this occasion, his choice. Discussion of draft manuscript with author 8.12.08.

[50] *CAC*, pp. 127–38, p. 135; Scott-Baumann, A. (2003b) Teacher Education for Muslim Women: Intercultural Relationships, Method and Philosophy in *Ethnicities* 3(2).

[51] Derrida, J. (2003) La Parole. Donner, nommer, appeler in M. Revault d'Allonnes and F. Azouvi (eds) (2004) *Ricœur 1*. Paris: Seuil, pp. 26–39, p. 27.

[52] Ricœur, P. (2007) *Vivant jusqu'à la mort*. Préface O. Abel, postface C. Goldenstein. Paris: Seuil, pp. 129–31.

[53] Ricœur, P. (2004/2005) *The Course of Recognition*, transl. D. Pellauer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 93.

[54] *MHF*, pp. 495–505.

[55] Personal communication 27.8.08; 'j'en ai parlé à Jean Greisch, qui pense aussi que Mémoire, Histoire, Oubli est la clôture de l'oeuvre de Paul Ricœur'; author's communication with Catherine Goldenstein.

[56] *COR* was based on lectures given in Naples and Vienna in the late 1990s; communication with Catherine Goldenstein 27.8.08; see review of *COR*: Gregor, B. (2006) The Course of Recognition in *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 18, nos1–2, pp. 210–11; Connolly, J. (2007) Charting a Course for Recognition: A Review Essay in *History of the Human Sciences* vol. 20. No. 1, pp. 133–44. This contains an interesting analysis of Ricœur's arguments about Honneth's work.

[57] Author's e-mail contact with Catherine Goldenstein 27.8.08 'Ses conférences (données en anglais) s'intitulaient "process of recognition." C'était sur l'aspect dynamique qu'il insistait. Au moment de choisir le titre français, il a choisi 'parcours' parce que c'était à la fois l'exploration; je me souviens du soir où nous en avons parlé chez moi: mon mari et Paul parlaient des parcours d'exploration qu'ils faisaient quand ils étaient scouts. On partait en 'reconnaissance'.'

[58] *COR*, p. 17.

[59] Discussion between C. Goldenstein and the author, 9.12.08.

[60] Ricœur, P. (1963) Le Conflit des herméneutiques: Epistemologie des interprétations in *Cahiers Internationaux de Symbolisme. No. 1. Genève: Societé de Symbolisme*, pp. 152–84, p. 166.

[61] I thank Manuel Barbeito for his commentary on Milton. November 2008.

[62] Pellauer, D. (2002) At the Limit of Practical Wisdom. Moral Blindness in R. Cohen and J. Marsh (eds) *Ricœur as Another. The Ethics of Subjectivity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 187–99.

[63] Scott-Baumann, A. and Norris, C. (2004) Derrida and Indian Thought; Prospects for an East-West Dialogue. *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts* vol. 5(2) http://www.aber.ac.uk/tfts/journal/archive/norris.html

[64] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 451.

[65] *COR*, p. 263.

[66] *CAC*, p. 88.

Chapter 8 Philosophical anthropology

[1] Ricœur, Universal Civilisation and National Cultures in *History and Truth* (1955, 1964/1965), transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press. *HAT*, p. 276.

[2] Lévi-Strauss, C. (1952) *Race et Histoire.* Paris: UNESCO.

[3] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 128.

[4] *HAT*, p. 277, see endnote 1 above.

[5] C. Reagan and D. Stewart (eds) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur: An Anthology of His Work.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1978, p. 31.

[6] He writes in the journals *Esprit* and *Christianisme Social*; see Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une Vie.* Paris: La Découverte, pp. 267–85.

[7] *SOE*, p. 351.

[8] Reagan and Stewart 1978, p. 27.

[9] Relevant texts here are The Socius and the Neighbour in *HAT*; Love and Justice, in Paul Ricœur. *The Hermeneutics of Action,* ed. R. Kearney. London: Sage, pp. 23–39; Ricœur, P. (1995/2000) *The Just,* transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Ricœur, P. (1986/1997) *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia.* New York: Columbia University Press; Ricœur, P. (1996) The Erosion of Tolerance and the Resistance of the Intolerable (pp. 189–201) in P. Ricœur (ed.) *Tolerance between Intolerance and the Intolerable.* Oxford: Berghahn Books and (2001/2007) *Reflections on the Just,* transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

[10] Ricœur, P. (1974) in D. Stewart and J. Bien (eds), *Political and Social Essays.* Athens: Ohio University Press, and in Ricœur, P. (1986/2007) *Evil, a Challenge to Philosophy and Theology,* transl. J. Bowden. London: Continuum; Ricœur (1995) *Figuring the Sacred,* transl. D. Pellauer, ed. M. Wallace. Minneapolis: Fortress Press and Ricœur, P. (1998/1998) *Thinking Biblically,* transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

[11] Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction,* transl. K. Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 152.

[12] Ricœur, P. (1971) The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text, pp. 144–67 in Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action,* transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press; Dauenhauer, B. (1998) *Paul Ricœur: The Promise and Risk of Politics. 20th Century Political Thinkers.* Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

[13] Hahn, L.W. (ed.) (1995), *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers.* Chicago: Open Court, p. 347.

[14] Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *FTTA*, p. 155.

[15] I am grateful to Steven Clark for pointing out to me that Austin's speech act theory began as a legal concept. November 2008.

[16] *HAT*, pp. 319–28.

[17] Abel, O. et Porée, J. (2007) *Le Vocabulaire de Paul Ricœur.* Paris: Ellipses, pp. 73–5.

[18] The Socius and the Neighbour in *HAT.*

[19] Ibid., p. 99.

[20] Urbanisation and Secularisation in *PASE,* 1974, p. 189. He also comments on Meister Eckhart for whom, as a mystic, not all is personalized in the being-God.

[21] Ibid., p. 183.

[22] Ibid., p. 189.

[23] *CAC*, p. 11.

[24] *PASE*, p. 448.

[25] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens d'une Vie.* Paris: La Découverte, chapter 48, pp. 521–31.

[26] Ricœur, P. (1990/1992) *Oneself as Another.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, chapters 7–9.

[27] Jervolino, D. (1975) Gadamer and Ricœur on the Hermeneutics of Praxis in R. Kearney (ed.). *Paul Ricœur. The Hermeneutics of Action.* London: Sage Publications, pp. 63–79, p. 75.

[28] Hahn, p. 53. See endnote 13 above.

[29] *COI*, p. 463.

[30] *OAA*, 1992: 163; Dosse 2008, p. 553, see endnote 25 above.

[31] Ibid., pp. 312–15.

[32] Ibid., p. 163.

[33] Scott-Baumann, A., Bloomfield, A. and Roughton, L. (1998) *Becoming a Secondary Schoolteacher.* London: Hodder and Stoughton; Scott-Baumann, A. (2006) Ethics, Ricœur and Philosophy: Ethical Teacher Workshops in *International Journal of Research and Method in Education* 29(1), pp. 55–70; Scott-Baumann, A. (2003c) Citizenship and Postmodernity in *Intercultural Education* 14/4.

[34] Ibid., p. 269.

[35] Hume, D. (1748/1998) Section V. Sceptical Solution of these Doubts in A. Flew, (ed.) *David Hume. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding.* Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, p. 89.

[36] *OAA*, p. 269.

[37] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, pp. 107–8.

[38] *OAA*, pp. 302, 341.

[39] Greisch, J. (1995) Testimony and Attestation in *Philosophy and Social Criticism* vol. 21, 5/6, pp. 81–98.

[40] *OAA*, pp. 22–3.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid., pp. 22–4, 347–52.

[43] Ibid., p. 350.

[44] Spinoza, B. *The Ethics* (1994) ed. and transl. E. Curley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Part III, Precept 6, p. 159.

[45] Fonds Ricœur Archives 48, 49.

[46] 'J'ai beaucoup d'energie, peu de force et pas de pouvoir'. Dosse 2008, p. 9.

[47] Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur and Kant: Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

[48] *OAA*, p. 355. There is a good summary of *OAA* (1990/1992) in Reagan 1996, chapter 3 and Ricœur summarizes it himself in discussion in *CAC*, pp. 89–94. Dauenhauer (1998) gives us a strong analysis of the political implications of *OAA* and other texts. Dauenhauer, commenting on the Nazis, does not find a solution in Ricœur to the way in which an unacceptable regime could be identified before it is too late, p. 133. The legal system will not solve the problem either.

[49] Rawls, J. (1999) *A Theory of Justice.* Revised edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[50] *OAA*, p. 234.

[51] Dauenhauer, p. 179, see endnote 12 above.
[52] *CAC*, p. 66.
[53] Ricœur, P. (1986/2007) *Evil, a Challenge to Philosophy and Theology*, transl. J. Bowden. London: Continuum, p. 33.
[54] Ibid., pp. 35, 38.
[55] Ibid., p. 68.
[56] Ibid., p. 58.
[57] Ibid., pp. 59–64.
[58] Ibid., p. 56.
[59] Ricœur (1960/1967) *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, p. 85.
[60] Dosse 2008, p. 610; Théry, I. (1994) *Le Démariage*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
[61] Dosse 2008, p. 605.
[62] Ibid., ch. 54.
[63] *OAA*, p. 341.
[64] Ibid., p. 343.
[65] Ibid., p. 342.

Chapter 9 Ricœur's hermeneutics III: recovery

[1] Ricœur, P. (1960/1965 and 1986) *Fallible Man*, revised transl. C. A. Kelbley (*FM*). New York: Fordham University Press.
[2] Lévi-Strauss lived to be 100 in 2008, at the time of writing.
[3] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 285; His legacy is strong, and anthologies and collections are coming out regularly, in collaboration with the Fonds Ricœur e.g. Ricœur, P. (2007) *Anthologie*. Ed. M. Fœssel and F. Lamouche. Paris: Seuil; *La Pensée Ricœur* (2006) ESPRIT, which contains many interesting tributes, including Frédéric Worms on *Vivant Jusqu'à La Mort*, pp. 300–11.
[4] *On Translation* will also be discussed in the final chapter, as it sums up much of his lifelong work on language and philosophy as translation.
[5] Pellauer, D. (2007) *Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed*. London and New York: Continuum, p. 139.
[6] *MHF*, p. 61; I thank Stephen Clark for suggesting a connection.
[7] Reagan and Stewart 1974/1978, p. 224.
[8] *MHF*, Part 3, chapter 2, pp. 52–385.
[9] Ibid., p. 10.
[10] Ricœur calls the Holocaust the Shoah, using the Hebrew term. *MHF*, p. 85.
[11] Ibid., pp. 179, 186.
[12] Ibid., p. 190.
[13] Blamey, K. (2003) Paul Ricœur's *Durcharbeiten* in A. Wiercinski (ed.). *Between Suspicion and Sympathy*. Toronto: The Hermeneutic Press, p. 576.
[14] Ibid., p. 577.
[15] *MHF*, p. 165.

[16] Ibid., pp. 169–71; Nora, P. (1996, 7, 8) Three volumes. *Realms of Memory* 1, 2, 3, transl. A Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press.

[17] *MHF*, p. 179.

[18] Chapter 21 in Fisk (2006) *The Great War for Civilisation. The Conquest of the Middle East.* London: HarperCollins, and conversation with Fisk on 19.10.08; For these witness events Fisk is often accused of anti-Semitism, which he strenuously denies. The Independent 7.01.09, p. 5.

[19] *MHF*, p. 180.

[20] Ibid., p. 139.

[21] Derrida, J. (1998) *Of Grammatology*, transl. Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak. Corrected edn. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

[22] Ricœur (2004/2005) *The Course of Recognition*, transl. D. Pellauer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, *COR*, p. 42.

[23] *COR*, p. 43; *MHF*, p. 230.

[24] (A68/B93). Kant (1971/1998) *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. A. Wood and P. Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 204–5.

[25] *MHF*, p. 246.

[26] Ibid., p. 223.

[27] Ibid., p. 306.

[28] Ibid., p. 209.

[29] Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

[30] *MHF*, pp. 261–74. Ricœur uses 'representation' in three different ways; first it is the way we remember things past in the form of images that we recognize, even though they cannot be proven to bear any direct relation to the past, because it is gone. Secondly representation is the historian's depiction in writing of what has happened, and this becomes a challenge to memory because the historian uses expertise, method and, supposedly, dispassionate distance. Thirdly, yet in fact as a fulcrum between the first and second meanings, is representation as 'an object, a referent, of the historian's discourse' (190). This resembles *mimesis* 2, in which we find understanding of the events themselves, which show relationships between means and ends, agents and effects. *Mimesis* 2, emplotment, is the vital mediator between *mimesis* 1 (our prehistorical understanding of causality) and 3 (which is the reception of a story by the reader). See chapter 5. Ricœur presents *mimesis* as a tripartite imitation of action: *mimesis* 1 is our understanding of how actions hang together, signalled by our use of temporal order words like before, while, during, after, then, etc. (*Time and Narrative* 1: 53, 57, 65).

[31] *MHF*, pp. 243, 249, 261, 368.

[32] Dimbleby was reporting the bombing from a Lancaster bomber, whose propellers are audible on the recording and Fisk also describes the potential of such recordings to have an unforgettable auditory effect and give the listener the impression of witnessing what that eyewitness is experiencing.

[33] *MHF*, p. 235.

[34] Ibid., p. 234.

[35] Mink, L. (1987) *Historical Understanding.* Ed B. Fay et al. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

[36] De Man, P. (1979) *Allegories of Reading.* New Haven: Yale University Press; for a more detailed discussion see also Chris Norris (2002) *Deconstruction.* London: Routledge, pp. 102–7.

[37] Blamey, K. (2003) Paul Ricœur's *Durcharbeiten,* pp. 575–84 describing *FAP,* 391–2 in *Between Suspicion and Sympathy.* Ed. A Wiercinski. Toronto: The Hermeneutic Press.

[38] *MHF,* pp. 237–8.

[39] Author's conversation with Robert Fisk 19.10.08.

[40] *MHF,* p. 247 and *TAN* Book 2, pp. 29–60.

[41] Ibid., p. 249.

[42] Ibid., pp. 263–70.

[43] Ibid., p. 274.

[44] Ibid., p. 276.

[45] Ibid., pp. 280, 319.

[46] Part Three of *MHF*, The Historical Condition.

[47] *TAN,* pp. 208–16.

[48] *MHF,* p. 304.

[49] Ibid., p. 317; Fonds Ricœur archives 002. In 1930 Dalbiez was lecturing to Ricœur on magic, and in an essay for which he received 18/20 and 'excellent', Ricœur writes of magic: 'C'est un grand rêve sans doute, mais où les emotions, sous l'aiguillon du désir jouent avec les notions les plus profondément enracinées dans le psychisme humain.' My transl.: *It [magic] is a big dream, doubtless, but one in which the emotions, spurred on by desire, play with notions that are most profoundly rooted in the human psyche.* I argue that this is very different from the argument of Winch and others, that witchcraft is no less rational than, for example, belief in antibiotics, and that other cultures are simply different. Nor however, does Ricœur reject magic but understands it as an integral part of the human condition.

[50] *MHF,* p. 318 and *CAC,* p. 12.

[51] Author's conversation with Robert Fisk 19.10.08.

[52] *MHF*, pp. 349 and 369.

[53] Ibid., p. 377.

[54] Ibid., pp. 9, 363.

[55] Ibid., p. 357.

[56] Ibid., pp. 45, 344, 357.

[57] Ibid., pp. 358–9.

[58] Ibid., p. 382.

[59] Part 3, chapter 3, pp. 412–52.

[60] Changeux, J-P. and Ricœur, P. (2000) *What Makes Us Think?* Transl. M. B. DeBevoise. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[61] *MHF,* p. 428.

[62] Blamey, K. (2003) Paul Ricœur's *Durcharbeiten* in A. Wiercinski (ed.) *Between Suspicion and Sympathy. Paul Ricœur's Unstable Equilibrium.* Toronto: Hermeneutic Press, pp. 575–84.

[63] *MHF,* pp. 430–56.

[64] Ibid., pp. 468–78.

[65] Jaspers K. (1947) *The Question of German Guilt,* transl. E. B. Ashton. New York: Dial Press.

[66] *MHF*, pp. 460–70.

[67] Ibid., p. 482 and *FS* 328.

[68] Ibid., pp. 482, 485.

[69] Ibid., p. 485.

[70] Ibid., p. 487.

[71] Ricœur, P. *L'unique et le singulier* (1993) Liège: Alice Éditions.

[72] Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 246; see also Abel, O. (2003) *Paul Ricœur. La Promesse et la Règle*. Series Ed. A. Garapon. *Le Bien Commun*. Paris: Editions Michalon; Mongin, O. (1994) *Paul Ricœur*. Paris: Le Seuil. Chapter on Conviction and Democracy; Kaplan, D. (ed.) (2008) *Reading Ricœur*. New York: SUNY Press.

[73] *MHF*, pp. 490–2.

[74] Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *HHS*, p. 161.

[75] In *On Translation* Ricœur ranges widely: he uses Goethe and Novalis to show how we oscillate between the idea of perfect translation and creative approximations, p. 8. He discusses how Bacon argued for eliminating the 'idols' of language and Leibniz attempts to implement this by proposing a universal lexicon of simple ideas, p. 16; some of it is to do with the ineffable asymmetry of humanity such as we find in narrative and in rhetoric and poetry, pp. 15, 27, 29.

[76] Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens D'une Vie* (1913–2005) Paris: La Découverte, pp. 267–78.

[77] *COR*, pp. 261–3.

Chapter 10 Conclusion

[1] Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism* vol. 1, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 354.

[2] Norris, C. (1994) *Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the Wake of the 80s* Part II. *Foucault and Critical Theory*. "What is Enlightenment?" according to Foucault in *Postmodern Studies* 10, pp. 53–138. Rodopi, p. 55.

[3] *CAC*, p. 135. Ricœur discussing Education and Secularism: By not allowing the veil in schools 'we will deprive of an education precisely those girls for whom school would have been a means of social advancement and even of liberation with regard to the family.'

[4] Freeman, D. and Freeman, J. (2008) *Paranoia: The Twenty-first Century Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 117.

[5] The late work of Husserl is the source of the development of modern hermeneutics, as his idea of the *Lebenswelt* (lifeworld) indicates a very deep relationship that humans have with their world, before meaning, before interpretation.

[6] Clarke, D. (2006) *Descartes. A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[7] Ricœur, (1967) *Husserl. An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press (compiled from papers published between 1949 and 1957).

[8] *HAP*, p. 166.

[9] *HAP*, p. 25.

[10] Ricœur, (1966/1970) *Freud and Philosophy. FAP*, p. 392.

[11] Scott-Baumann, A. (2007) Collaborative Partnerships as Sustainable Pedagogy: Working with British Muslims in C. Roberts and J. Roberts (eds) *Greener by Degrees: Exploring Sustainability through Higher Education Curricula. Section C4.* Bristol: Severnprint. Book available from Geography Discipline Network (GDN) University of Gloucestershire, Francis Close Hall, Cheltenham, Glos, UK GL504AZ ISBN 978-1-86174-180-6 http://resources.glos.ac.uk/ceal/resources/greenerbydegrees/index.cfm

[12] *OAA*, p. 25; Greisch, J. (1985) L'Age herméneutique de la raison. Paris: Édition de Cerf.

[13] *COI*, pp. 30, 39.

[14] Here is an example: in *Reflexive Modernisation*, Beck, Giddens and Lash mention Ricœur and the hermeneutics of suspicion and describe the need for a hermeneutics of retrieval, which is hopeful and more positive than the work of the masters of suspicion (145–6). This indeed is the chief aim of Ricœur's work but they do not attribute retrieval to him. Moreover they make no reference to it from within his work. They refer us to Thompson's *Critical Hermeneutics* – when we go to Thompson we find no reference to Ricœur's work on recovery, but pp. 46–7 and 55 describe the hermeneutics of suspicion, without a reference and without any mention of the hermeneutics of recovery.

[15] Thiselton, A. (1992) *New Horizons in Hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1992, p. 143.

[16] *MHF*, p. 392.

[17] Muldoon, M. (1998) Ricœur's Ethics. Another Version of Virtue Ethics? Attestation is not a Virtue in *Philosophy Now.* Fall 1998, pp. 301–9.

[18] Ricœur in Reagan and Stewart 1978, pp. 214–15.

[19] *COI*, 191–2.

[20] *CAC*, p. 150. I suggest my own translation of 'elles se font signe mutuellement', which seems to me to be more than a nod in this context. PR (2001) *La Critique et la Conviction.* Paris: Hachette, p. 228.

[21] *MHF*, p. 300.

[22] *FAN*, p. 139.

[23] Muldoon, M. (1998) *Ricœur's Ethics.* See endnote 2 above, p. 306.

[24] Clark, S. H. (1990) *Paul Ricœur.* London: Routledge, p. 57.

[25] Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 143–4.

[26] 'une sorte de balance intellectuelle' Ricœur, P. (1963), Le Conflit des herméneutiques: Épistémologie des interprétations in *Cahiers Internationaux de Symbolisme. No. 1. Genève: Societé de Symbolisme*, pp. 152–84, p. 162.

[27] *Esprit*, Le paradoxe Politique vol. 25, nos 250, 730. I recommend Dauenhauer's analysis of this. See Jean Greisch also: Testimony and Attestation in *Philosophy and Social Criticism* vol. 21 (5/6) pp. 81–98.

[28] Muldoon, M. S. (1998) Ricœur's Ethics. Another Version of Virtue Ethics? Attestation is not a Virtue in *Philosophy Today*, 301–9.

[29] Cavell (1999, first published 1979) *The Claims of Reason.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. xii.

[30] *MHF*, p. 132; *OAA*, p. 301.

[31] *OAA*, p. 302.

[32] Muldoon, see endnote 23 above.

[33] *OAA*.

[34] *MHF*, p. 256; there are of course more balanced views of postmodernisms, e.g. Linda Hutcheon's 2002 *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.

[35] Lang, B. (1997) Is it Possible to Misrepresent the Holocaust? in *The Postmodern History Reader*, ed. K. Jenkins. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 426–33; I witness the unbalanced quest for representation in both the Muslim and the more secular community, as co-chair of the independent review on Muslim Faith Leader Training commissioned in October 2008 by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

[36] Nietzsche, F. (1997) *Philosophical Writings*, ed. R. Grimm and C. y Vedia. New York: Continuum.

[37] Baudrillard, J. (2004/2005) *The Intelligence of Evil or The Lucidity Pact Transl.* C. Turner. Oxford and New York: Berg, p. 56. Baudrillard sees this as one part of our self-deceiving attitude towards reality, shown starkly in his book about the Gulf War and his work on the simulacrum. We create a parallel world, a fantasy that makes the real world seem more real; an example is Disney World, which is so fantastical in contrast to its surroundings that it conceals the truth: we have 'abolished the real world'.

[38] Shah-Kazemi, R. (2006) *The Other in The Light of The One. The Universality of the Qu'ran and Interfaith Dialogue.* The Islamic Texts Society.

[39] *PASE*, Violence and Language, p. 94.

[40] *CAC*, p. 149.

[41] Ibid., p. 155.

[42] Ricœur, P. (1986/2007) *Evil: A Challenge to Philosophy and Theology*, transl. J. Bowden. London: Continuum, p. 34.

[43] Clark, S. H. (1990) *Paul Ricœur.* London: Routledge, p. 8.

[44] Ibid., p. 9. Ricœur is read and reported by theologians: McIntosh, M. (1998–1999) *Mystical Theology.* Oxford: Blackwell, p. 122; Fiddes, P. F. (1988) *The Creative Suffering of God.* Oxford: Clarendon Press; O'Collins, G., S. J. (2007) *Jesus Our Redeemer. A Christian Approach to Salvation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 201, note p. 143; Fodor, J. (1995) *Christian Hermeneutics: Paul Ricœur and the Refiguring of Theology.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[45] *CAC*, p. 160.

[46] *FAN*, pp. 408–9.

[47] *FAP*, p. 391; *MHF*, p. 5.

[48] Norris, C. *Spinoza and the Origins of Modern Critical Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell, p. 255.

[49] Muldoon, see endnote 17 above, translation from Ricœur, (1995) De la métaphysique à la morale in *Réflexion Faite.* Paris: Éditions Esprit, p. 306, and for a detailed comparison with Macintyre's virtue ethics.

[50] 1978: 26; The Antinomy of Human Reality and the Problem of Philosophical Anthropology in Reagan and Stewart (eds) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur*, Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*, A78.

[51] Reagan and Stewart, p. 217.

[52] LaCocque, A. and Ricœur, P. (1998/1998) *Thinking Biblically*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

[53] Ibid., p. 293.

[54] Ricœur, P. Love and Justice, transl. D. Pellauer in (1996) *The Hermeneutics of Action*, ed. R. Kearney. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage, p. 24. This essay has been published in several places, and one of Ricœur's last wishes was to have it re-issued, to mark its high importance: *Amour et Justice*, Paris: Seuil, 2008. Gifford, P. et al. (2003) *2000 Years and Beyond*. London: Routledge; Gifford quotes Kristeva in her belief that the Eucharistic Agape in the Song of Songs 'is the exact antidote to the depressive and destructive tendencies of the Western, masculinist Narcissus and his complex of abandonment'. See also Kristeva, J. Reading the Bible in D. Jobling, T. Pippin and R. Schleifer (2001) *The Postmodern Bible Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 92–101.

[55] *COR*, pp. 222–3, 281.

[56] Ibid., p. 37.

[57] Ibid., p. 35.

[58] Ibid., p. 34.

[59] Ricœur, P. (1995) (essays first published in French 1971–1992) *Figuring the Sacred*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, p. 328.

[60] Ibid., 328.

[61] Pascal, B. (1966) *Pensées*, transl. A.J. Krailsheimer. Baltimore: Penguin Books, p. 95.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

1 Archives Fonds Ricœur: archives 001–2, dated 1931–1932, notes taken by Ricœur in classes about scepticism.

2 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archive 52, dated 1932, notes taken by Ricœur in classes given by E. Leroux on Spinoza. NB notes on conatus.

3 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archives 48, 49, dated 1951, lecture notes given by Ricœur on *Spinoza on Time and Eternity* (Temps et l'éternité chez Spinoza). Ricœur works here on Spinoza through Delbos, Brunschvicg, Rivaud and Wolfson. Material added to, dated 1965.

4 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archive 96. Courses given by Ricœur on *La Négation*, dated 1958–1959, then 1969–1970 both French and English.

5 Archives Fonds Ricœur: archive 003. Notes taken by Ricœur on *Dalbiez, Freud,* and *Psychoanalysis.* Mostly dated early 1930s.

6 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archive 27. Eight seminars of two hours each, delivered by Ricœur in English on *Anthropology and Religion in the Philosophy of Existence.* Union Theological Seminary, USA. Undated: late 1950s to early 1960s. Unpublished.

7 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archive 7. Courses given by Ricœur on *Théâtre et philosophie.* Detailed notes on Sartre's plays, Camus, Brecht etc. on Sorbonne notepaper (1957–1964).

8 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours manuscrits 1. archive 39 bis. Lecture series on *Guilt.* 1958 Columbia University New York.

9 Archives Fonds Ricœur: Cours liste 4. archive CL 04: 1970s, Courses given by Ricœur on *Analytical Philosophy of Imagination*; Chicago. English manuscripts.

10 Archives Fonds Ricœur: liste 'conférences' 1. archive Conf 059; contains three Louvain papers from 1955 and a paper he gave on 15 April 1987 in the Department of Philosophy of Haverford College USA, entitled Mimesis, Reference and Refiguration in Time and Narrative: unpublished.

Books and articles

Abel, O. (2003) *Paul Ricœur. La Promesse et la Règle.* Series, ed. A. Garapon. *Le Bien Commun.* Paris: Editions Michalon.

Abel, O. and Porée, J. (2007) *Le Vocabulaire de Paul Ricœur.* Paris: Ellipses.

Althusser, L. (1968) Lénine et la philosophie in *Bulletin de la Societé Française de Philosophie 62*: 125–61, discussion between Althusser and Ricœur, pp. 161–81.

Anderson, P. (1993) *Ricœur and Kant: Philosophy of the Will.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baudrillard, J. (2004/2005) *The Intelligence of Evil or The Lucidity Pact*, transl. C. Turner. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S. (1994) *Reflexive Modernisation.* Cambridge: Polity.

Benjamin, W. (2000) The Task of the Translator in *Selected Works of Walter Benjamin Vol. 1.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bunting, M. (25.2.08) Secularists have nothing to fear from women wearing headscarves, *The Guardian.*

Cavell, S. (1979) *The Claim of Reason.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cavell, S. (2003) *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Changeux, J-P. and Ricœur, P. (2000) *What Makes Us Think?* Transl. M. B. De Bevoise. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Clark, S. H. (1990) *Paul Ricœur.* London: Routledge.

Clarke, D. (2003) *Descartes' Theory of Mind.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, D. (2006) *Descartes. A Biography.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, R. and Marsh, J. (eds) (2002) *Ricœur as Another. The Ethics of Subjectivity.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Connolly, J. (2007) Charting a Course for Recognition: A Review Essay in *History of the Human Sciences.* Vol. 20. No. 1, pp. 133–44.

Dalbiez, R. (1936) *La Méthode psychanalytique et la doctrine freudienne.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer and Hahn.

Dauenhauer, B. (1998) *Paul Ricœur: The Promise and Risk of Politics. 20th Century Political Thinkers.* Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

De Man, P. (1979) *Allegories of Reading.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Derrida, J. (1967/1998) *Of Grammatology*, transl. Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak. Corrected edn. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1967/2001) *Writing and Difference*, transl. A. Bass. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1972/1984) *Margins of Philosophy*, transl. A. Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1972/2004) *Positions*, transl. A. Bass. Intro. C. Norris. New York and London: Continuum.

Derrida, J. (1990) Force of Law. The Mystical Foundationism of Authority, transl. M Quaintance. *Cardozo Law Review* 11, pp. 919–1045.

Derrida, J. (2004) La Parole. Donner, nommer, appeler in M. Revault d'Allonnes and F. Azouvi, (eds) *Ricœur 1.* Paris: Seuil.

Dosse, F. (1997) *The History of Structuralism*, vol. 1 and 2, transl. D. Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dosse, F. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Les Sens D'une Vie* (ed. and updated). Paris: La Découverte, Poche.

Fiasse, G. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. De l'homme faillible a l'homme capable,* coordonné par. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Fisk, R. (2006) *The Great War for Civilisation. The Conquest of the Middle East.* London: HarperCollins.

Foessel, M. and Mongin, O. (eds) (2006) *La Pensée Ricœur,* ESPRIT.

Foucault, M. (1966/2003) *The Order of Things.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Part 1. An Introduction.* New York: Pantheon.

Freeman, J. (2008) *Paranoia: The Twenty-First Century Fear.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freud, S. (1905/1966) *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious,* transl. J. Strachey. London: Routledge.

Freud, S. (1950) *Project for Scientific Psychology.* London: Imago.

Freud, S. (1954) *The Origins of Psychoanalysis.* New York: Basic Books.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1960/1991) *Truth and Method.* 2nd revised edition, transl. J. Weinsheimer and D. Marshall. New York: Crossroad Hahn, L. W. (ed.) (1995) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur, The Library of Living Philosophers,* 22. Chicago: Open Court.

Gadamer, H-G. (1984) The Hermeneutics of Suspicion in *Man and World* 17, pp. 313–23.

Gerhart, M. (1979) *The Question of Belief in Literary Criticism: An Introduction to the Hermeneutical Theory of Paul Ricœur.* Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag.

Gifford, P. et al. (2003) *2000 Years and Beyond.* London: Routledge.

Gregor, B. (2006) The Course of Recognition in *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies.* 18, nos1–2, pp. 210–11.

Greisch, J. (1985) *L'Âge herméneutique de la raison.* Paris: Édition de Cerf.

Greisch, J. (1995) Testimony and Attestation in *Philosophy and Social Criticism,* vol. 21, 5/6, pp. 81–98.

Guardini, R. (1954) *Le Mort de Socrate,* transl. P. Ricœur. Paris: Seuil.

Guyer, P. (1987) *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, K. (2000) *The Trespass of the Sign: Deconstruction, Theology and Philosophy.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Hegel, G. W. (1807/1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit,* transl. A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heidegger, M. (1926/1962) *Being and Time,* transl. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hume, D. (1748/1998) Section V. Sceptical Solution of these Doubts in A. Flew (ed.) *David Hume. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding.* Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company.

Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Husserl, E. (1900/1970) *Logical Investigations.* Transl J. N. Findlay, 2 vols. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Husserl, E. (1954/1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology.* Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Husserl, E. and Cairns, D. (1982) *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, transl. D. Cairns. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.

Ihde, D. (1971) *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur*. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Insted (2007) *The Search for Common Ground: Muslims, Non-Muslims and the UK Media* Greater London Authority www.insted/co/uk/islam.html http//:www.London.gov.uk/mayor/equalities/docs.co

Jaspers K. (1947) *The Question of German Guilt*, transl. E. B. Ashton. New York: Dial Press.

Jervolino, D. (2007) *Ricœur. Herméneutique et Traduction*. Paris: Ellipses.

Kant, I. (1781/1998) B181: 273 *Critique of Pure Reason* in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, transl. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (1783/2001) *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, transl. P. Carus and J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Kant, I. *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788/1996) in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, transl. and ed. M. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (1799/1994) On a Supposed Right to Lie Because of Philanthropic Concerns in *Immanuel Kant. Ethical Philosophy* (2nd edn) transl. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Kearney, R. (2004) *On Paul Ricœur. The Owl of Minerva*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kearney, R. (2007) Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Translation in *Research in Phenomenology* 37, pp. 147–59.

Kearney, R. (2008) Vers une herméneutique de la Traduction in *Paul Ricœur. De l'homme faillible a l'homme capable*, coordonné par Gaëlle Fiasse. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Kemp, P. and Rasmussen, D. (eds) (1988) *The Narrative Path. The Later Works of Paul Ricœur*. Cambridge, Mass.: London: MIT Press.

Kristeva, J. (2001) Reading the Bible in D. Jobling, T. Pippin and R. Schleifer. *The Postmodern Bible Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 92–101.

LaCocque, A. and Ricœur, P. (1998/1998) *Thinking Biblically*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lang, B. (1997) Is it Possible to Misrepresent the Holocaust? in *The Postmodern History Reader*, ed. K. Jenkins. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 426–33.

Leiter, B. (2004) The Hermeneutics of Suspicion: Recovering Marx, Nietzsche and Freud in *The Future for Philosophy*, ed. B. Leiter. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 74–175.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1952) *Race et Histoire*. Paris: UNESCO.

Levinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, transl. Alfonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Marcel, G. (2007) *Man against Mass Society*, transl. G. S. Fraser. Chicago: St. Augustine Press.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1947) *The German Ideology*, ed. R. Pascal. New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1963) *Karl Marx. Early Writings*, transl. T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964) *Signs*, transl. R. McCleary. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Mink, L. (1987) *Historical Understanding*, ed. B. Fay et al. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Mongin, O. (1994) *Paul Ricœur*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Muldoon, M. (1998) Ricœur's Ethics. Another Version of Virtue Ethics? Attestation is not a Virtue in *Philosophy Now*. Fall 1998, pp. 301–9.

Muldoon, M. (2002) *On Ricœur*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Nietzsche, F. (1997) *Philosophical Writings*, ed. R. Grimm and C. y Vedia. New York: Continuum.

Nietzsche, F. (2000) *Basic Writings*, transl. W. Kauffmann, intro. P. Gay. New York: The Modern Library.

Nora, P. (1996, 1997, 1998) *Realms of Memory* vols 1, 2, 3, transl. A Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press.

Norris, C. (1987) The Rhetoric of Remembrance: Derrida on De Man in *Deconstruction against Itself: Textual Practice*, pp. 154–68.

Norris, C. (1991) *Spinoza and the Origins of Modern Critical Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Norris, C. (1994) 'What is Enlightenment?' according to Foucault in *Postmodern Studies* 10, pp. 53–138 in *Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the Wake of the 80s* Part II. *Foucault and Critical Theory*, ed. R. Miguel-Alfonso and S. Caporale-Bizzini, Amsterdam.

Norris, C. (1997) *Resources of Realism. Prospects for Post-Analytic Philosophy*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Norris, C. (2000) Deconstruction: Modern or Postmodern? in *Modernity, Modernism, Postmodernism*, ed. M. Barbeito. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela Publicatións.

Norris, C. (2002) *Deconstruction*. London: Routledge.

O'Connell, S. (2001) Foucault and the Hermeneutic of Suspicion. *Outspeak*. New York: SUNY Press.

Patočka, J. (1996) *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History*, transl. E. Kohak. Preface by Paul Ricœur, pp. vii–xvi. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court.

Pellauer, D. (2007) *Paul Ricœur. A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum.

Rasmussen, D. (1971) *Mythic-Symbolic Language and Philosophical Anthropology. A Constructive Interpretation of the Thought of Paul Ricœur*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Rawls, J. (1999) *A Theory of Justice*. Revised edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reagan, C. and Stewart, D. (eds) (1978) *The Philosophy of Paul Ricœur. An Anthology of His Work*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Reagan, C. (1979) *Studies in the Philosophy of Paul Ricœur*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Reagan, C. (1996) *Paul Ricœur. His Life and Work*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ricœur, P. and Dufrenne, M. (1947) *Karl Jaspers et la philosophie de l'existence*. Paris: Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (1948) *Gabriel Marcel et Karl Jaspers. Philosophie du mystère et philosophie du paradoxe*. Paris: Temps Présent.

Ricœur, P. (1950/1966) *Freedom and Nature*, transl. E. Kohak. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1950/1967) *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*, transl E. G. Ballard and L. E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern Press.

Ricœur, P. (1950/1996) *A Key to Edmund Husserl's Ideas 1*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, transl. B. Harris and J. B. Spurlock, ed. P. Vandevelde.

Ricœur, P. (1955, 1964/1965) *History and Truth*, transl. C. A. Kelbley. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1960/1965 and 1986) *Fallible Man*, revised transl. C. A. Kelbley (*FM*). New York: Fordham University Press.

Ricœur (1960/1967) *The Symbolism of Evil*, transl. E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ricœur, P. (1963) Le Conflit des herméneutiques: Épistémologie des interprétations in *Cahiers Internationaux de Symbolisme. No. 1. Genève: Societé de Symbolisme.*

Ricœur, P. (1963) *Esprit* no. 322, Nov. 1963: 635.

Ricœur, P. (1966/1970) *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, transl. D. Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1969/1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations*, transl. D. Ihde. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1974) *Political and Social Essays*, ed. D. Stewart and J. Bien. Athens: Ohio State University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1975) Biblical Hermeneutics in *Semeia* (4), pp. 29–148.

Ricœur, P. (1975) in My Relation to the History of Philosophy *Iliff Review* 35.

Ricœur, P. (1975/1977) *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, transl. R. Czerny. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Ricœur, P. (1976) *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1976) *Ideology, Utopia and Faith* in *The Centre for Hermeneutical Studies 17.*

Ricœur, P. and multiple author team (1978) *Main Trends in Philosophy*. Paris: UNESCO.

Ricœur, P. (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, ed. and transl. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ricœur. P. (1983) A Reply: Towards a 'Post-critical Rhetoric'? in Pretext, L. W. Phelps (ed.), *Ricœur and Rhetoric* 4/3–4, pp. 201–13.

Ricœur, P. (Vol. 1 1983/1984, Vol. 2 1985, 1985/Vol. 3 1985/1988) *Time and Narrative*, vols. 1–3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ricœur, P. (1986/1991) *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II*, transl. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson. London: The Athlone Press.

Ricœur, P. (1986 Engl. / Fr 1997) *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ricœur, P. (1986/2007) *Evil, a Challenge to Philosophy and Theology*, transl. J. Bowden. London: Continuum.

Ricœur, P. (1990/1992) *Oneself as Another*, transl. K. Blamey. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ricœur, P. Mon premier maître en philosophie in M Léna (ed.) (1991) *Honneur aux maîtres*. Paris: Critérion.

Ricœur, P. (1991) *A Ricœur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*, ed. M. Valdes. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Ricœur, P. (1993) *L'unique et le singulier* Liège: Alice Éditions.

Ricœur, P. (1995) *Figuring the Sacred. Religion, Narrative and Imagination*, transl. D. Pellauer. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Ricœur, P. (1995) *Réflexion Faite. Autobiographie Intellectuelle.* Paris: Le Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (1995/1998) *Critique and Conviction. Discussions with François Azouvy and Marc de Launay*, transl. K. Blamey. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ricœur, P. (1995/2000) *The Just*, transl. D. Pellauer. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Ricœur, P. (1996) *The Hermeneutics of Action*, ed. R. Kearney. London: Sage.

Ricœur, P., ed. (1996) *Tolerance between Intolerance and the Intolerable.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Ricœur, P. (1999) *Lectures 1*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (2000/2004) *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ricœur, P. (2001/2007) *Reflections on the Just.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ricœur, P. (2004/2005) *The Course of Recognition*, transl. D. Pellauer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ricœur, P. (2004/2006) *On Translation*, transl. E. Brennan. London: Routledge.

Ricœur, P. (2007) *Anthologie*, ed. M. Foessel and F. Lamouche. Paris: Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (2007) *Autour de la Psychoanalyse*, ed. C. Goldenstein and J-L. Schlegel. Paris: Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (2007) *Vivant jusqu'à la mort.* Préface O. Abel, postface C. Goldenstein. Paris: Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (2008) *Amour et Justice.* Paris: Seuil.

Ricœur, P. (2009) *Living up To Death*, transl. D. Pellauer. Preface O. Abel. Postface C. Goldenstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ritivoi, A. D. (2006) *Paul Ricœur: Tradition and Innovation in Rhetorical Theory.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Robinson, G. D. (1995) Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion: A Brief Overview and Critique in *Premise*, vol. 11(8).

Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saussure, F. de (1916) *Course in General Linguistics.*

Saussure, F. de (2002/2006) *Writings in General Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schillp, P. A. (ed.) (1981) *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre.* La Salle, Ill: Open Court.

Scott-Baumann, A. (2003a) Reconstructive Hermeneutical Philosophy: Return Ticket to the Human Condition in *Journal of Philosophy and Social Criticism.* Vol. 29(6), pp. 705–29.

Scott-Baumann, A. (2003b) Teacher Education for Muslim Women: Intercultural Relationships, Method and Philosophy in *Ethnicities* 3(2).

Scott-Baumann, A. (2003c) Citizenship and Postmodernity in *Intercultural Education* 14/4.

Scott-Baumann, A. and Norris, C. (2004) Derrida and Indian Thought; Prospects for an East-West Dialogue. *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts*, vol. 5(2) http://www.aber.ac.uk/tfts/journal/archive/norris.html

Scott-Baumann, A. (2006) Ethics, Ricœur and Philosophy: Ethical Teacher Workshops in *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 29(1), pp. 55–70.

Scott-Baumann, A. (2007) Collaborative Partnerships as Sustainable Pedagogy: Working with British Muslims in C. Roberts and J. Roberts (eds) *Greener by Degrees: Exploring Sustainability through Higher Education Curricula. Section C4.* Bristol: Severnprint._Book available from Geography Discipline Network (GDN) University of Gloucestershire, Francis Close Hall, Cheltenham, Glos, UK GL504AZ ISBN 978-1-86174-180-6
http://resources.glos.ac.uk/ceal/resources/greenerbydegrees/index.cfm

Sen, A. (2006) *Identity and Violence. The Illusion of Destiny.* London: Allen Lane.

Shah-Kazemi, R. (2006) *The Other in The Light of The One. The Universality of the Qu'ran and Interfaith Dialogue.* The Islamic Texts Society.

Siddiqui, A. (2007) The Siddiqui Report on *Islam in Universities in England.* www.socialcohesion.co.uk/blog/2007/06/the_siddiqui_report_the govern.html

Simms, K. (2003) *Paul Ricœur.* London: Routledge.

Simms, K. (2007) *Ricœur and Lacan.* London: Continuum.

Spinoza, B. (1677/1994) *The Ethics*, ed. and transl. E. Curley. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stiver, D. (2001) *Theology after Ricœur.* Westminster: John Knox Press.

Strawson, P. F. (1959/2006) *Individuals. An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics.* London: Routledge.

Taylor, C. (1971) Interpretation and the Sciences of Man in *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 25(1), pp. 3–10.

Théry, I. (1994) *Le Démariage*, Paris: Odile Jacob.

Thiselton, A. (1992) *New Horizons in Hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Thompson, J. B. (1981) *Critical Hermeneutics. A Study in the Thought of Paul Ricœur and Jürgen Habermas.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Leeuven, T. M. (1981) *The Surplus of Meaning.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Vansina, F. D. (2008) *Paul Ricœur. Bibliography 1935–2008.* Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters.

Vaught, C. (2005) *Access to God in Augustine's Confessions.* New York: SUNY Press.

Wallace, M. (1995) *The Second Naiveté. Barth, Ricœur and the New Yale Theology.* Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

White, E. (1991) *Between Suspicion and Hope: Paul Ricœur's Vital Hermeneutics.* Literature and Theology. Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 311–21.

Wiercinski, A. (ed.) (2003) *Between Suspicion and Sympathy*, Toronto: The Hermeneutic Press.

Williams, R. The Suspicion of Suspicion: Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer in *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology*, ed. R. H. Bell. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Wood, D. (1991) *On Paul Ricœur. Narrative and Interpretation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Index

Abel, O. viii, 2, 168
  socius 139
action and attestation 128–9, 145–6, 150–2
  Davidson 32, 108, 128, 144
  and dialectic 71, 165
  From Text To Action 4, 5, 105–6, 113–14, 127, 137
  group 139, 144
  and Kant 85, 132, 146, 168
  and language 68, 84, 108, 120–1, 129, 177
  and Marcel 17, 118–19
  'Model of The Text, The' 61, 121
  Oneself as Another 141–3
  semantics of 32, 79, 144
  and suspicion 46, 60, 66, 73, 184
  and text 46, 81, 97–8, 121–3, 137–8, 173
  see also mimesis; narrative
Adorno, T. 76
Aenesidemus 7, 122, 179
affirmation 28–30, 32, 38, 42, 110, 138, 168
  primary 29
  reaffirmation 94
agape 181–2, 216n
Algeria 1, 42, 69, 136, 169
Althusser 55, 98
analytic philosophy 112, 127
  realist 128
  responsibility 144
Anaximander 29, 37
Anderson, P. 62, 85, 117, 146
Anscombe, E. 143
anti-Semitism 158
Arendt, H.
  and Heidegger 168
  on Jaspers 155
Aristotle 21, 54, 94, 114, 176
  associationist learning 179
  and *habitus* 158
  and Heidegger 141–5
  memory 151, 155
  and metaphor 84
  mimesis 87, 90
  praxis, phronesis 142–3
  by Rembrandt 167–8
  and *Time and Narrative* 125
  see also mimesis
atheism 5, 52, 140
attestation 91
  and conscience 144–5
  Heidegger 145
  Memory, History, Forgetting 176
  Spinoza 146
  and suspicion 128–9, 145–7, 174–6
  see also Muldoon
Augustine 114
Austin, J. L. 32, 36, 80, 108
  and ordinary language philosophy 80, 88, 99, 108, 127
  and speech-act theory 99, 144, 208n
  and Thiselton 71
  see also Ryle

Barbeito, M. 207n
Barth, K. 103, 118
  broken dialectic 149–50
Barthes, R. 112
Baudelaire, C. 154
Baudrillard, J. 11, 95, 177, 183

Benveniste, E. 99, 164
Bergson, H. 118, 128, 130
  remembering 131, 154–5
Bible 35, 39, 42, 80, 103, 104, 108
  exegesis 98, 109
  and metaphor 95
  and rational 129
  Song of Songs 146, 181–2
  see also Barth; religion; Song of Solomon
Blamey, K.
  mandate of suspicion 76, 156
  memory and *Durcharbeiten* 161, 166
  psychoanalysis 161
  suspicion 169
Boltanski, L.
  politics 147–8
Braudel, F. 89
Bultmann, R. 103

Catholic, Roman 23, 129, 154, 181
Cavell, S.
  on scepticism 9–12, 58, 59, 67, 75–6, 175–6
  suspicion 153 *see also* suspicion
Changeux, P.
  neuroscience 165
Chicago 2, 55, 79, 155
Christianity 1, 3, 46, 65, 137, 140, 178
  and Jaspers 23
  and Marcel 23
  outsider 154
  Protestant 129, 154
  and secularism 129
  see also Catholic
Clark, S. 55, 59, 85
  absent centre 179
  on Austin 208n
  on Baudelaire 210n
  freedom through disbelief 175
  on Ricœur's metaphor 85
  on Saussure 66
Clarke, D.
  Descartes 12, 18
cogito 8
  anti-cogito 128, 132
  Descartes 17, 39, 145
  Freud 124
  Hume 142
  Nietzsche 142, 145
communism, European 22, 40, 55, 136
conditions of possibility *see* Kant
consciousness 45, 60, 69
  false 44–5, 69–70, 75–6, 174, 181
  and the philosopher 62
  see also unconscious
continental philosophy 5, 9, 10, 99, 106, 112, 123, 127–8
  and attestation 127–9
  and Barth 118
  Explaining and Understanding 110, 117
  and structuralism 123

Dalbiez, R. 7, 22–3, 38, 42, 43, 46, 60, 153, 180
  Pyrhonnism 179
Davidson, D. 108, 126, 128
  person 143
Dauenhauer, B.
  on Ricœur's dialectics 71
  'Model of The Text, The' 137
De Certeau, M. 160
deconstruction 101
  and De Man 161
  and Foucault 67
  and Heidegger 65, 88, 93
  and Ricœur 68, 101, 132
  and suspicion 132
  see also Derrida
De Man, P.
  synecdoche 102
Derrida, J. 19, 22, 47, 60, 93, 154
  deconstruction 5, 36, 47, 79
  forgiveness 167
  Of Grammatology 158
  on Husserl 15, 19
  on kettle logic 48
  on Levinas 31
  on metaphor 86
  pharmakon 158
  on Ricœur 11, 130
  on structuralism 36

Descartes, R.
  Cartesian doubt 1, 3, 45, 106, 124
  cartesianism 18
  cogito 19, 23, 29, 32, 46, 107, 145
  before Descartes 141
  double negative 29
  dualism 6, 12–13, 45–6, 181
  idealism 128
  Marx, Nietzsche, Freud 12
  Kant 17–18, 72
  scepticism 10–12, 172
  love 181
determinism
  and Freud 41, 46, 50, 56, 66, 74, 179
  and Marx 9
dialectics 25, 97, 99, 115–34, 140
  and asymmetry 59, 169
  atheism and faith 140
  and Barth 149–50
  Fallible Man 118
  and Hegel 12, 16, 56, 64, 115, 181
  and hermeneutics 82
  and hermeneutics of suspicion 9, 63
  and Kant 31, 71, 144
  and Marcel 25
  and masters of suspicion 10
  method 11, 76, 132–3
  moral space 133
  and space/gap between meanings 109–11, 133
  and structuralism 36
  and suspicion 71, 74–5
  see also methodological dialectics
Dilthey 5, 68, 80, 83, 89
  Explaining and Understanding 122
discourse 65, 83, 99
  and Frege 92
  and hermeneutics of suspicion 64–5
  and metaphor 84, 92, 95, 127, 161
  text 106–9, 137, 175
doubt 91
  and back questioning 61
  and Blamey's mandate of suspicion 156
  Cartesian 1, 3, 7–21, 45, 124, 174
  and Dalbiez 153
  and hermeneutics of suspicion 27, 64, 67, 114
  and Kant 25
  and Marx, Nietzsche, Freud 6, 45, 59–60, 69, 81
  and Sartre 28–9
  and self-doubt 61, 63, 67, 72, 145, 170, 175
  and suspicion 68, 69, 93, 97, 110, 148, 157, 176, 184
Dosse, F. 26
  ideology of suspicion 40, 170
  Lacan 43
  Olivier Ricœur 140
  Ricœur and law 151
  on Ricœur's dialogics 43, 133
  on Spinoza's *conatus* 146
  structuralism 43, 83, 95
dualisms 32, 33, 67, 115, 121
  Cartesian 3, 6, 13–18, 46, 117
  mind-body 13, 25, 117, 119, 187n
  subject-object *see* subject-object dualism
Dufrenne, M. 8, 25

ego 5, 80, 126–7, 173
  Descartes 15, 45
  ego and superego 50, 52, 70
  Husserl 19, 25, 39
Eliade, M. 42
epoché 45, 93
Esprit 23, 24, 53, 127, 151
ethics 1, 4, 15–16, 97, 99
  and Aristotle 52, 143
  and attestation 173
  and Kant 52, 110, 178
  and language 97, 137
  and *Little Ethics* 141, 144, 147, 176, 179
  and narrative 19, 53, 142–3
Europe 1, 92
  integration 107
evil 3, 23, 24, 26, 38–9, 42, 49, 119
  Kant 117
  and narrative 93–4
  and sin 37, 67, 97, 149
  St Paul 35, 150

evil (*Cont'd*)
  symbols 34–6, 37 *see also Evil, The Symbolism of Evil under* Ricœur
existentialism 3, 17, 23–5, 32
  and phenomenology 19, 22, 117, 118, 171
  see also Marcel; Sartre
Explaining and Understanding 74, 80, 82, 83, 98, 110
  Habermas and Gadamer 122–3
  rejection of 130

faith
  and atheism 5, 52, 140, 174
  and culture 3, 129
  and Freud 57, 81
  secularism 68, 133
  Spinoza 20, 179
  suspicion 174–5, 180–1
fallibility 3, 34, 111–14, 143, 176
  and dialectics 180
  as fault line 30
  and phenomenology 141
  and testimony 158
  see also Fallible Man under Ricœur
false consciousness *see* consciousness
Fanon, F. 99
Feuerbach, L. 72
Fisk, R. 6
  Armenian genocide 157
  Deighton 161
  forgetting 166
  Hamburg bombing 160
  reader 164
  Sabra and Chatila 157–8
Fonds Ricœur, le ix, 2, 131
forgetting 130, 153–4, 162, 165–6
  suspicion 165, 180
forgiveness 107, 130, 156, 162, 166–8
  Truth and Reconciliation tribunals 167
Foucault, M. 19, 66–7, 76, 78–9, 98–9, 177
Freeman, D.
  belief confirmation bias 170
Frege, G. 81, 99, 172
  logic 100
Freud, S. 60, 63, 80, 9
  cogito 46, 61, 124
  death drive 50
  on desire 13
  determinism 22, 50, 179
  discipline 124
  dreams 84
  Eros and Thanatos 48, 50
  and faith 57
  forgetting 166
  libido 51, 164
  mourning 149
  narcissism 44, 48
  naturalism 25
  and negation 124
  Oedipus 34, 48
  on repression 166
  Ricœur's early work on Freud 41–4
  Unheimlichkeit 159–60
  see also masters of suspicion; Ricœur

Gadamer, H.-J. 5, 37, 66, 71, 76, 112, 126
  and Habermas 122–3
  on hermeneutics of suspicion 68–9
Geertz, C.
  symbolic anthropology 159
gift 72, 131, 169, 179–80
  Maus 167
God 10, 108, 184
  and Derrida 158
  and Descartes 15, 17
  and evil 149–50
  in Genesis 108–11
  and Kant 72–3
  and negation 28
  and patriarchy 52, 62
  Protestant 174
  and Spinoza 20, 180
Goldenstein, C. 2, 131, 195, 200, 203, 206n, 207n
Greisch, J. 131
guilt symbols 33–46, 52, 57, 163

Habermas, J. 19, 56, 127
  and Gadamer 122–3
Halbwachs, M. 159

Hebrew 109
  Yerushalmi 159
Hegel, G. W. F. 54, 63, 64, 72, 92, 107, 110, 170
  Conflict of Interpretations, The 61–4
  dialectical technique 12, 110, 115–16, 121–2
  doubling of the self-conscious 27
  evil 149–50
  fault 179
  Freud 66, 69
  history 163
  Kant 12, 73
  master–slave 16, 29, 35, 115
  negation 12, 20–3, 27–9, 38, 74, 107, 139
  opposites 116, 119
  recognition 131
  suspicion 92–3, 144, 163
  totalizing thought 12, 92, 116, 139, 163, 170
  see also negation
Heidegger, M. 19, 50, 78, 82–3, 89, 93, 106
  Aristotle 142
  Being 170
  Dasein 8, 82, 164
  das Man 156
  deconstruction 93
  Memory, History, Forgetting 154–5, 164–5
  metaphor 84, 86
  mourning 164
  the past 165
  phenomenology 122
  phronesis 142
  sciences 88
  Sorge 142, 165
  Vorhandenheit 164
  Zuhandenheit 164
hermeneutic phenomenology 88, 93, 105, 117, 121
  and Ihde 63–4
  Heidegger 98
hermeneutics 9, 46, 61, 71, 85, 105
  circle 82
  and Gadamer 68–9
  linguistic turn 33, 120–5, 172
  metacritique 65
  myth and symbol 23, 37, 61, 94
  ontological 162
  and phenomenology 11, 19, 20, 34, 60–1, 72, 80, 93, 105, 118, 122, 124, 161
  of recovery 66, 153–69, 181
  scepticism 106
  of the self 24, 46, 129–30
  structuralism 2, 36, 117, 123, 126, 172
hermeneutics of suspicion 4, 9, 36, 59–77, 101, 106, 110, 113–14, 145, 175, 183–4
  abandonment of 59, 65–6, 70, 76, 118, 145, 171, 181
  condition of possibility 73–5
  deconstruction 132
  as demystification 72
  Ihde on 63–4, 75
  Kant 59–60
  limit idea 71–3
  provisionality 129
  St Paul 150
  see also hermeneutics; suspicion
hijab 35
  headscarf 121
  see also Islam
Hillis Miller, J. 103
historiography 1, 80, 95, 125, 155–6
history 6, 87, 89, 90, 153–69
  Annales 159
  archives and testimonies 160
  Braudel 89, 159
  eidetic power 160–1
  epistemology 162
  and Fisk 153–69
  Hegel 12, 89, 92, 149, 163
  Heidegger 83, 89, 165
  historical mode 162–3
  Husserl 18
  judgement 158
  and Koselleck 163
  Mannheim 70
  memory 95, 154–8
  narrative 90, 155–6, 160–2
  proportionality 75

history (*Cont'd*)
  scale 159
  and structuralism 9, 22, 101, 115, 135
  translation 109–11
  see also Memory, History, Forgetting under Ricœur
Hitler 162
Holocaust 22, 157, 163, 177
hope 8, 11, 30, 45, 59, 88
  as deception 72
  and Freud 84
  and Hegel 96
  and Kant 64, 74, 91, 115
  and second naivety 71–2, 114
  and the self 128
  and suspicion 94, 145, 171, 156–7, 181
Horkheimer, M. 76
Hume, D.
  and cogito 10, 128
  Dalbiez 179
  desires 143
  on Hume 10
  Kant 171
  scepticism 10, 138
Husserl, E. 10–12, 18–19, 81, 107
  bracketing/*epoché* 13, 20, 45, 93, 112, 119, 127
  Cartesian Meditations 11, 20, 25
  cogito 25
  Descartes 10–13
  history 18
  idealism 121–2
  intentionality 13–14
  on Kant 17–18
  Logical Investigations 27
  negation 38, 96
  the other 16
  reduction 16–17, 25
  Rückfrage 4, 74, 78, 89, 90, 156
  see also negation

ideology 55, 65, 69, 127
  Just, The 71
  and Mannheim 70
  and metanarratives 92
  and suspicion 40, 65, 70, 93, 170
  and utopia *see* Ricœur
idiolect 20, 27, 37, 89, 172
  in *Freedom and Nature* 16–17
Ihde, D. 41, 63, 75, 119
imagination x, 30
  and Freud 60
  and Kant 30–1, 38, 73–4, 89, 139, 176
  and Marin 161
  as mediator 31, 38, 146
  and metaphor 102
  Sartre and Ryle 86
  and suspicion 38
Islam
  Islamophobia 158
  Siddiqui Report 120
Israel 158, 169

Jaspers 23, 25, 154
  forgiveness 166
  guilt 167
  Kierkegaard 23
Jervolino, D. 141
Just, The 147–8
  see also Ricœur, *Reflections on The Just*

Kant, E. 3–8, 12, 33, 71–3, 79, 85–6, 89, 102, 109, 168
  on antinomies 73, 110, 115–16, 120, 132–3, 146, 169–71, 182, 184
  and Categorical Imperative 26, 183
  cogito 8
  conditions of possibility 34, 47–8, 73–5, 94, 131, 162
  and Copernican revolution 44, 71, 173
  Critique of Judgement, The 38, 73–4
  Critique of Practical Reason, The 31
  Critique of Pure Reason, The 71, 73, 159
  Dalbiez 179
  deontology 144
  Descartes 8, 136
  '*Freedom In The Light of Hope*' 59, 72
  Golden Rule 139, 147, 183
  having, power and worth 32–3
  history 163
  Husserl 17–18, 172
  imagination 38, 73–4, 86–9
  limit concept 8, 71–3, 85, 146
  objectivity 25

  rationality 26, 97, 106, 136
  recognition 165
  rules 143, 148
  scepticism 7–12
  on suspicion 7, 27, 31, 59–62, 73–5, 175, 178, 181, 184
  third term 100, 115, 119
  see also will
Kaplan, D. 71
Kearney, R. 17
Kierkegaard, S.
  and Jaspers 23
  and Sartre 28, 29
Koselleck, R. 163

Lacan, J. 38, 40, 43, 47, 62, 99
LaCocque, A. 106–9, 182
language 4, 5, 47, 136, 176
  and desire 82, 181–2
  dialectical 117, 120
  ethical 53–6, 80, 85, 97, 103, 106–13
  hermeneutical 128–9
  and history 156–62
  Lacan 47
  and masters of suspicion 65
  and ordinary language philosophy 71, 80, 88, 130–1, 137
  other, the 31, 52, 106, 110, 181
  religious 80, 149, 178–82
  structuralist 15, 33, 36–7, 79–80, 82, 96–8, 101
  and translation 99, 106–11, 178
  and verbs 30, 34, 68, 109, 161, 175
  and violence 112–13, 131–2, 178
  see also action; linguistic turn
La Rochefoucauld 59, 69, 110
law 141
  see also Rawls
Leibniz, G. 12, 20, 102
Leiter, B. 59, 66, 76
Levinas, E. 14–15, 26, 36
  and Derrida 15, 31
  ethics 15–16
  other, the 15–16, 31
Lévi-Strauss, C. 37, 80, 83, 101
  Roger Caillois 135
  Race and History 135
linguistic analysis 97–114, 153
linguistics 82
  and Ricœur's teaching 36
  and Saussure 32
  structural 80–4
linguistic turn 24, 63, 77, 78, 81, 86
  hermeneutics 172
logic 12, 23
  and analytical philosophy 172
  and Hume 122
  and kettle 48–9
  and language 80, 81, 100, 108
  metaphor 116
  theodicy 149
Love 31
  allegory 182
  and justice 169, 181–3
  see also Song of Songs
Lyotard, J-F. 19, 76, 92, 163

Mannheim, K. 59, 70, 71
Marcel, G. 17, 19, 23
  dialectic 25
  existentialism 118–19
  forgiveness 166
  miracle 131
Marin, L.
  Pascal's *Pensées* 161–2
Marx 69–70, 99
  alienation 45, 54
  Ricœur 53–6
  State, the 54
  see also masters of suspicion
masters of suspicion 8–10, 40–58, 60–2, 69, 76–7, 113, 117, 170–1, 175, 183
  anti-cogito 128, 132
Maus, M.
  economy of the gift 167
memory 6, 88, 114
  bearing witness 154–6
  Bergson 165–6
  Changeux 165
  collective memory 155–6, 159–60, 167
  Derrida 158
  other, the 168
Merleau-Ponty, M. 14, 16, 19–20, 43
  see also physicality

metaphor 5, 6, 49, 72, 80–5, 93–6, 101–3, 111
  and antinomies 85–6, 102, 180
  conflict and kinship 116
  and De Man 101, 161
  and Derrida 86
  and Heidegger 84
  and parable 97, 100–5
  and semantic impertinence 5, 84, 94, 102–3, 116
  Song of Songs 182
  and suspicion 152
  see also narrative
methodological dialectics 114, 115–34, 153, 181
  as dualism 115
  methodology 116, 123, 156
  see also dialectics
mimesis 87–90, 95, 111
Mink, L. 161
Mongin, O. 26, 168
motives 100
  and causes 32, 138
  and Descartes 17
  and desire 48–9, 94
  and Marcel 17
  and Spinoza 48
  and suspicion 7–9, 12, 22, 73, 89, 145, 150, 173, 179, 184
Mounier, E.
  and *Esprit* 23–4
Muldoon, M.
  attestation 173–6
  suspicion 180
multidisciplinary work 83, 87, 154, 170
Muslims 1, 16
  in the media 67–8
  secularism 129, 170
  see also Islam
myth 35–6, 79
  in Freud 42–3

Nabert, J. 154, 164
  forgiveness 166
naivety first 24
  law 151
  philosophical anthropology 136
  second 11, 42, 64–5, 100, 114, 132, 136, 152, 153, 168–9, 181
  second naivety as Copernican revolution 71
Nanterre 139, 148, 150–1
narcissism 14, 48–50, 82
narrative 36, 53, 80, 87–93, 101, 103, 104, 111–12
  action 98, 121–3
  ethical 142–3
  heuristic 99
  historical 156, 161–2
  identity 134, 176
naturalism 18, 20, 25
  and Kant 38, 146
  Leiter 66
  and negativity 93
negation, negativity 9, 12, 16, 21, 36, 39, 73, 85, 93, 94
  as affirmation 32, 38, 138, 168
  and Dalbiez 135, 179–80
  descriptive 28
  dialectical 37, 116
  and double negative 29, 38, 130
  and Freud 124
  judgemental 26, 28, 108, 116, 178
  and metaphor 85
  and postmodernity 177–8
  and Sartre 27–31
  secularized theology 27
  Spinoza 28
  translation 107–8, 111
  wound 162
Nietzsche, F. 28, 32, 84, 89
  genealogies 52
  on guilt 52
  and Ricœur 51–3
  will to power 51
  see also masters of suspicion
Nora, P.
  memory 159
Norris 7, 16, 97, 102–3
  on Cavell 186n
  on Kermode, Todorov 180
  value-relativism 170

Oedipus
  Freud and Ricœur 49
  and guilt 57
ontology 8, 29
  belief system 29–30, 82–3, 106, 128
  definitions of 29
  and epistemology 88, 162
  and Heidegger 8, 88
  Merleau-Ponty 16
ordinary language philosophy 127
  actor 136
other, the 1, 7, 11, 106–7, 115, 187n
  Aristotle 140
  God 140
  Heidegger 140
  and Husserl 15–16, 20, 68, 96
  intersubjectivity 16–17, 177
  Oneself as Another 141–8
  and Sartre 20, 28–32
  sympathy 126
  theology 140, 181–2
  and translation 98–111, 178

parable 5
  and Bible 99
  in 'Biblical Hermeneutics' 103–4, 125
  and dialectical tension 36, 100
  and Good Samaritan 139–40
  and metaphor 101, 103, 111
  and 'Model of the Text, The' 121
  as narrative 35, 65, 103
Parfit, D. 128
Paris 2, 22, 47
Parmenides 21
Pascal, B. 69
  disproportionality and space 170, 184
  and historical scale 159
  love and justice 182
  Pensées 161, 162
Patočka, J. 53
Pellauer D
  and Hegel 110
  maître 44, 75–6, 154
  polarities 133
  and post-Hegelian Kantian 116
  and Ricœur 154
  and St Paul 35
  and suspicion 75–6, 144–5, 169
phenomenological distress 61–2
phenomenology 3, 4, 7, 11, 23, 60, 82, 105, 118–20, 155
  and dialectics 63
  and Hegel 27, 116
  and Heidegger 82, 88, 122
  hermeneutics 60–1, 72, 75–6, 105, 139, 141
  history 160
  and Husserl 13–21, 25, 27, 39, 45, 60, 78, 89, 90, 113, 119
  idealism 121
  and intentionality 22, 57, 105, 107
  and ordinary language philosophy 80, 130
  and the other 171–2, 180
  of perception 57
  and psychoanalysis 40–3, 47, 56, 117, 124–5, 172
  of religion 35
  and structuralism 33, 55, 81, 171–2
  and subject-object 121, 122, 127
  see also idiolect; Ihde; Husserl
philosophical anthropology 5, 97, 100, 119, 134, 135–52
  limitation 74, 146–7
  second naivety 2, 6, 153
Philosophy of the Will 9, 11, 24, 141
  see also will
physicality 180
  desire 14, 16, 19, 44
  erotic love and allegories of love 170–84
  lived body 30, 144
Plato 29, 54, 102, 165
  Meno 155, 165
  mimesis 87
  Phaedrus 156
  testimony 157
  Theaetetus 155, 165
Popper, K.
  falsification rule 163–4
Porée, J.
  socius 139

postmodern thought 18–19, 31, 76, 78, 173, 183
  hermeneutics of suspicion 176–7
  Nazi 177
Protestant 174
  the other 181
psychoanalysis 42, 47, 60–1, 70, 79, 82, 97, 107–8, 156
  and hermeneutics 51
  other, the 172
  phenomenology 124
  Spinoza's freewill 179
psychology
  Freedom and Nature 116
  suspicion 157
Pyrhonnism
  Spinoza 179

Rawls, J. 133
  Golden Rule 147
  Just, The 147
  veil of ignorance 147
reader, the 104–6, 111–12
  citizen-reader 161
  Fisk 164
Reagan, C. 34
  interviews 121
  and Stewart 61
reason 71
  and Cavell 176
  and Hegel 149, 163
  history 163
  and Kant 26–7, 38, 59–60, 64, 85, 115–16, 139, 144–7
  language 149
  and Nietzsche 177
  Practical 31
  Pure 71–3, 131, 136, 159
  and Spinoza 48
  see also Kant
religion 3, 4, 5, 10
  and Bergson 118, 128
  and Eliade 35, 43
  and Freud 50–1, 57
  and Marx 174
  and masters of suspicion 46, 50–1, 60–1, 75, 113, 175
  and Nietzsche 51–3
  phenomenology of 35
  and philosophy 132, 138, 140, 178–9
  and secularism 56, 163, 181
  and Spinoza 20, 56
  see also Bible; Catholic
Rembrandt, v. R.
  and Aristotle 167–8
representation, historical 159–62, 165, 177, 211n
  symbolic 3, 38–9, 94–7, 161, 182
Ricœur, P.
  'Biblical Hermeneutics' 64–5, 99, 103–4, 125
  Conflict of Interpretations, The 41, 50, 53, 59, 61–4, 72, 81, 98, 105
    language 125
  Course of Recognition, The 27, 34, 60, 108, 110–11, 114, 115, 130–3, 159, 180
  Critique and Conviction 98, 109, 129, 178
  Erosion of Tolerance and the Resistance of the Intolerable, The 144
  Evil 137, 149, 150, 178
  Fallible Man 24, 100, 102, 110, 138
  Figuring The Sacred 108, 137
  Freedom and Nature 14, 17, 26, 41–2, 56, 61, 72
  and Freud 46–51
    Freud and Philosophy 14, 24, 38, 42–4, 47, 50, 57, 62, 68, 98, 125
  From Text To Action 80, 105–6, 113
  Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences 83, 88, 101, 122
  History and Truth 24, 26–8, 53–4, 119–20
  Husserl An Analysis of his Phenomenology 11, 19–20, 172
  Interpretation Theory 79–80, 83, 98, 125
  Just, The 5, 71, 95, 146, 151
  and Kant 30–3 *see also* Kant
  Lectures on Ideology and Utopia 55, 70, 112, 137
  'Love and Justice' ix, x, 137, 216

  Memory, History, Forgetting 26, 60, 95, 99, 106, 108, 114, 130–2, 154–69
  'Model of the Text, The' 121
  and Nietzsche 51–3
  Oedipus 49, 57
  Oneself As Another 27, 88, 91, 95, 110, 114, 127–9, 135–49, 176
  On Translation 98, 106–11
  Political And Social Essays 98
  'Political Paradox, The' 53–4
  post-Hegelian Kantian 116, 139, 170
  Reflections on The Just x, 154
  relay station 21, 90
  Rule of Metaphor, The 81, 84–7, 89, 98, 101, 173
  semantic impertinence 103
  Symbolism of Evil, The 24, 25, 34–7, 46, 57, 94, 97, 136–8, 150–1
  Thinking Biblically 108–9, 175
  Time and Narrative 26, 87–93, 99, 104, 108, 114, 125–7
Ryle, G. 78, 86

Sacco and Vanzetti 163
Sartre, J-P. 20, 28, 32, 64, 86, 99
  Derrida 11
  Fanon 99
  History and Truth 136
  Husserl 14, 18
  and negation 21, 27–31
  nothingness 18, 28, 64, 138
  and Ryle 78, 86
Saussure, F. 32, 37, 40, 98
  narrative theory 160
  signifier and signified 34, 37, 49, 99, 161
scepticism 7, 114, 65
  and Descartes 10, 12, 20, 172
  and Hume 7, 10
  and Husserl 7, 10
  and Kant 7, 12
  and postmodern thought 19, 183
  and Spinoza 20
  see also Cavell
Schleiermacher, F. 68, 78, 83, 107
science 66, 132, 136
  and Changeux 175
  and Descartes 25
  and Dilthey 122–3
  and Heidegger 88
  and Marcel 23
  see also Habermas
Searle, J. 22, 36, 71, 99, 144
  see also Austin
secularism 10, 133, 140
  Clark 179
  and education 129, 171, 213n
  and Good Samaritan 140
  and religion 172, 174, 181
  religion and philosophy 174, 178–9
    see also religion
self 17–18, 23, 152
  analytic 85
  idem and *ipse* 141–4
  identity 136
  justice 141
  ordinary language philosophy 127–9
  and other 168
  self-consciousness 100
semantics
  of action 79, 108, 166
  of desire 39, 47–8, 84
  see also physicality
Sextus Empiricus 7, 122, 179
Shah-Kazemi, R. 177
Siddiqui report 120
signifier and signified *see* Saussure
Smith, J.
  in Hahn 74
Socius and Neighbour
  as Good Samaritan 27, 139–40
Song of Solomon/Song of Songs 6, 146, 181–2
  and Cartesian dualism 6, 181
  and erotic 181–2
Spinoza, B. 7, 12, 20, 48
  association of ideas 179
  and atheism 52
  conatus 146, 164, 180
  on proportionality 106, 138, 174, 179
  on scepticism 20, 179–80
spirituality 26, 39, 54, 63, 109, 111, 138
  and love 182

stain 33, 35, 49, 97, 124
  as sin 33–5, 67, 124
Stalin 157
state 183
  Hegel and Marx 54–5, 69, 139–40
  Roman Catholic 181
  'Violence and Language' 177–8
Strawson, P. F. 99
  Individuals 128
structuralism 3–5, 9, 22, 32–3, 36–7, 43, 78–9, 80, 95, 96, 97–8, 112, 156
  anthropology 135
  and Foucault 79, 99
  and Lévi Strauss 83
  linguistic analysis 72, 97–105, 111, 112, 127
  methodological dialectics 115, 122–3, 133
  phenomenology 171–2
  and post-structuralism 95, 115
  and Saussure 66
subject-object dualism 13, 14, 21, 23–5, 27, 113, 117, 121–2, 127, 175, 181
  Course of Recognition, The 132
  and Heidegger 88
suspicion 7–9, 48, 51, 58, 61, 66, 70, 92, 93, 94, 96, 114, 153, 184
  and belief 173–4
  condition of possibility 73–6, 138, 151, 169, 174–5
  conscience 144
  Course of Recognition, The 180
  difference 181
  exercise of 62, 68, 125, 174–5
  explaining and 75
  false consciousness 44, 174
  historical knowledge 157–8
  hubris 67–9, 150
  Islamophobia 177
  limit idea 75, 169, 173–4
  loss of innocence 132
  and metaphor 93–4
  narrative 161
  negative/positive poles 69–71
  other, the 62, 110
  phenomenology 160
  positive force 169
  proportionality 70–1, 75–6, 138
  relative viewpoint 163
  religion 9, 38
  scepticism 7, 10–12, 40, 58–9, 75, 96, 102, 106, 114, 175
  self-belief 138
  space between antinomies 170
  suppression 125
  see also hermeneutics of suspicion; masters of suspicion
symbols 10, 36–7, 42, 51, 72, 79, 84, 93, 103
  archaic 69
  and guilt 72
  and hermeneutics 61, 105
  and history 160–1, 175
  Marx, Freud, Nietzsche 66, 79
  and myths 23, 35, 58
  and secularism 171
  signified 36
  Symbolism of Evil, The 24, 71, 138
  and symptoms 42
  and unconscious, the 42

Taylor, C. 123
theology and secularism
  Fallible Man, Symbolism of Evil, The 137
  totalising tendencies 150
  see also Hegel
Théry, I.
  divorce 151
Thévenot, L.
  politics 147–8
Thiselton, A. 59, 66, 69, 71, 98
  postmodern thought and suspicion 173
Time and Narrative 87, 114, 134
translation 2, 97, 106–14, 178
Tveit, K.
  Sabra and Chatila 157–8

unconscious 14, 63, 79
  'Consciousness and the Unconscious' 43–4, 56, 60, 69
  Dalbiez 23–5
  Freud 32, 41–50, 56–7, 60–2, 79, 84, 124–5

  phenomenology 14, 41, 172
  Sartre 29
  structuralism 49, 79

Vanhoozer, K. 89
Vansina, F. 2
violence and language 112
  see also language

Walzer, M. 147–8
war 7
  Hamburg 160
  Nazi 177
  prisoner of 8
  Second World War 22, 153–6, 167
  Vichy France 156
  see also Algeria
will ix, 1, 3, 4, 11, 30–2
  bad 34–5, 58
  collective 54, 144
  and Dalbiez 46
  Derrida 110
  excluded 113
  existential 32, 138
  Freud 42, 51–3, 79, 192n
  Hegel 92
  involuntary 116
  Kant 53, 59, 141, 146
  negative 29, 142
  and Nietzsche 17, 51–3, 79, 141
  poetics 146
  reading 101
  Spinoza 70, 124
  suspicion 69, 114
  see also Kant; Spinoza, conatus; state
Wittgenstein, L. 71, 80, 83, 113, 127
Wood, D. 87