

PAUL RICŒUR: SYMBOLS OF GOOD AND EVIL IN HISTORY, THE BIBLE AND IN OUR TIME

MARIEKE MAES
FONTYS UNIVERSITY, UTRECHT

Abstract. In his *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricœur explores the dynamics of human consciousness of evil in different cultures and times. Consciousness of evil is examined by looking at the different prevailing symbols wherein human beings confess their experience with evil. Although appeared in 1960, this study is still cited in recent publications in psychology, cultural anthropology and religion. In this article I describe the context of *The Symbolism of Evil* as the last part of Ricœur's study of the will and give a summary of its relevant content.

I. INTRODUCTION

The theme of this special issue of *The European Journal for Philosophy of Religion* is: "How Discernment between Good and Evil Shapes the Dynamics of the Human Journey". Obviously, this theme poses a fundamental question. In *The Symbolism of Evil* (in French *La symbolique du mal*) Paul Ricœur has presented a thorough analysis of the concepts that human beings have used at different times and in different cultures when expressing their consciousness of evil.¹ In this essay I attempt to address the following question: What is the significance of *Symbolism of Evil* for the theme of this issue of the *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion*? In other words: how is the discernment of good and evil and its dynamics in history described in Ricœur's study?

Ricœur emphasizes we can only speak in symbols or metaphors about the consciousness of evil; we have no direct access to this consciousness. This basic insight is still relevant. For instance, Gary Anderson in his study: *Sin. A History*

1 Paul Ricœur, *La symbolique du mal* (Aubier Montagne, 1960); Paul Ricœur, *The Symbolism of Evil* (Harper & Row, 1967).

points out how the philosophers of language Lakoff and Johnson remind us how often we use metaphors of battle when describing the terms of an argument. Anderson writes in this context: “In his seminal work *The Symbolism of Evil*, Paul Ricœur takes this point a step further. In his view, philosophers have no direct and unmediated access to the semantic content of ideas such as fault, sin, error, and their consequent rectification, (which is what we call “forgiveness”).”²

To answer my question: how is the discernment of good and evil and its dynamics in history described in Ricœur’s study? I shall give a recapitulation of the different forms of consciousness of good and evil such as are mentioned in *The Symbolism of Evil* and the development of the different forms of consciousness of good and evil. The present study is a description, or an outline, of the dynamics of consciousness of evil.

In my article I will also describe the motivation of development of the different forms of discernment between good and evil. The orientation of this development may be described as joy, as Spinoza did in his *Ethics*.³ Or the kingdom of God as is promised in the Bible. In my conclusion I hope to gather the insights from Ricœur’s study regarding different forms of consciousness of good and evil and relate them to our own human journey today.

Before going into the matter, I should like to make some remarks about the context of Ricœur’s study.

II. THE CONTEXT OF THE SYMBOLISM OF EVIL

Ricœur’s *The Symbolism of Evil* appeared in 1960, the same year as Gadamer’s *Wahrheit und Methode*. It has become a classical study of the thinking about symbols of evil, interpretation and exegesis. Although it is not mentioned in the title, it is also a study about the symbols of the liberation of evil, and therefore a study of freedom and hope. It is the last part of a trilogy whose overall title is: *Philosophy of the Will*, or *Philosophie de la Volonté*.⁴ In this ambitious project Ricœur describes the possibilities and limitations of free will. Volume 1: *The voluntary and the Involuntary*; Volume 2: *Fallible Man*; Volume 3: *The Symbolism of Evil*.

2 Gary A. Anderson, *Sin: A history* (Yale Univ. Press, 2009), 5.

3 Spinoza, *Ethica* (Bert Bakker, 2002). In Latin: *Laetitia*.

4 Paul Ricœur, *Philosophie de la volonté* (Aubier Montaigne, 1950).

The theoretical background and methods used in Ricoeur's *Philosophy of the Will* include phenomenology as well as hermeneutic philosophy. The hermeneutical revolution in philosophy and theology prepared the way towards an openness to various forms of texts and other ways of expression as valuable sources for philosophical thought. In this study we may also see the fertile influence of the philosophy of Karl Jaspers as well as the investigations of Mircea Eliade into the phenomenology of religion. However, there is no bibliography in *The Symbolism of Evil*, so we partly have to guess which studies Ricoeur was familiar with.

The Symbolism of Evil is an important element in the whole of Ricoeur's oeuvre, partly because of the methodological and theoretical boundaries he reached in this study. In the study of Freud, which he wrote after *The Symbolism of Evil*, Ricoeur tackled the problems of free will anew, and subsequent to that his hermeneutics became more radical. The study of linguistics and philosophy of language also caused Ricoeur to refine his theory of language and significance. The scope of the present essay does not allow me to go more deeply into Ricoeur's later theories of language and interpretation.

It is not easy to classify the genre of *The Symbolism of Evil*. Is it a study in philosophy or a study in comparative religion, or the history of religions, or the psychology of religion? It seems to be all of these at the same time and that makes it unique in its kind.

III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SYMBOLISM OF EVIL FOR THE DISCERNMENT BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL

What is the significance of *The Symbolism of Evil* for today's discernment between good and evil? As pointed out above, *The Symbolism of Evil* is the final part of *Philosophy of the Will*. In *Philosophy of the Will* Ricoeur describes the structures, possibilities and limits of the free will. In *Fallible Man* he describes the roles played by desire and passions in human behaviour. These studies remain within the area of phenomenological and reflective philosophy. In *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricoeur carries out an investigation of the confessions of evil in the hope of coming closer to the experience of human beings and the interpretations of evil which people have provided in different cultures and religions. Thus, in *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricoeur took a hermeneutical step. The motivation for the choice of analysis of the language of confession is contained

in the boundaries Ricoeur encountered in his philosophical analysis of free will and evil. Philosophy is dependent on expressed experiences from life. For experiences of evil and confessions of evil this means we are dependent on different sorts of texts from different cultures; Greek tragedy for instance, early legal tracts, from myth and from confessions of evil in the Bible. In these sources Ricoeur looks for answers to existential questions such as: why do human beings do evil to others and themselves, and what is the influence of the different forms of evil on people's self-interpretation, self-consciousness and self-esteem? And what is the relation between these different forms of consciousness of evil and the possibility of doing good? Does insight in the different forms of consciousness of evil offer the possibility of becoming a better person and reaching what Spinoza calls joy? In the tradition of reflective philosophy we can answer this question positively. Insight in the different forms of consciousness of evil is necessary for self-reflection and insight in ourselves. Maybe we find here also a further clarification of — and new perspectives for — questions of the human journey on their way to the Kingdom.

Ricoeur's personal motivation for his investigation was, in part at least, the notion of the fall and original sin. In a way this theological notion is an interpretation of the given fact that all human beings experience evil and permanently have to make decisions and choose between good and evil. But at the same time the interpretation of original sin and the ways of liberation from original sin, as we see the writings of Saint Augustine and Saint Anselm, has led to great problems in the fields of theology, spirituality as well as ethics. In the theology of original sin, sin is interpreted as a debt which humankind has to pay without having the means to pay. In *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricoeur also develops a critical analysis of this interpretation of the story of Genesis 2 as the story of an original sin which causes a debt to be paid by humankind and the negative effects of this interpretation on Christian Theology and especially Christology.

III.1 Symbolism

Symbols are phenomena of language. Ricoeur stresses that experiences of good and evil are conveyed in symbols expressed in words, and this is the only way in which reflection on evil is possible. It is important to note that the experience of evil can only be communicated in symbols or metaphors, that is to say: in words with double meaning. Articulated in symbolic terms, the

dynamic of reflection and of different forms of consciousness of evil becomes possible. Symbols are signs appearing to humans in cosmic hierophany, nocturnal dreams and poetic imagination, expressing a double significance. In the first, literal meaning of a symbol a second meaning appears in the perspective of holiness. There is a relation in symbols between the first and second meaning; a relation which can be described as analogous. A stain may infect my health, a “stain on my soul” may infect my spiritual health. Symbolic testimonies about early experiences of evil we find in various texts.

III.2 Holiness and the symbolism of evil

It is also a fundamental given that we cannot understand evil without having a contrasting notion. The contrasting notion for the consciousness of evil is especially the notion of holiness. In other words: the consciousness of good and evil points towards ideas of holiness. In *The Symbolism of Evil* Ricœur is inspired by studies in religion by Rudolf Otto and Mircea Eliade and their description of holiness as *Tremendum et Fascinosum*: experiences of that which causes anguish and at the same time fascinates. According to Eliade the holy is what often manifests itself as that upon which a community is built and rebuilt. Founded in a holy place, in a holy time, the community is itself holy. The holy is the possibility of being. Living in relation with this holiness causes the experience of evil as that which separates us from the holy. Because the experience of evil most often causes questions without answer: why me, why our people? We can see a dialectic in interpreting experiences of evil. New answers to questions posed by the experience of evil are tried. In this dialectic of consciousness of good and evil there is also a development of the idea of holiness.

IV. THE FORMS OF DISCERNMENT BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL FOUND IN THE SYMBOLISM OF EVIL

With symbolism of evil we enter the territory of the manifestation of the holy and therefore the territory of fear and taboo. Ricœur distinguishes three forms of consciousness of evil: shame, sin and guilt. Between these different forms of the consciousness of evil there is phenomenologically speaking an earlier and a later, a development or a dialectic, wherein elements of the earlier symbol of evil return in the later forms of consciousness of evil. So we can

discern a dialectical development between the different symbols of evil. In a way the first layer of consciousness of evil and its symbolism returns in the next layers of consciousness of evil. Famous is Ricœur's expression: Symbols give rise to thought; an expression that itself gives rise to thought.

IV.1 *The Stain*

The first experience of evil is the feeling of being impure, dirty or polluted. This first experience causes the emotion of shame. In his in-depth study *Shame* Stephan Pattison describes the various dimensions of — and the different perspectives on — shame. One of the difficulties in describing shame is that it is a 'hidden phenomenon'.⁵ Pattison, who follows Ricœur in his analysis of shame as the feeling of being impure, speaks about 'ecology of defilement'.⁶ The first symbol in which the fear of evil is expressed is the stain or blot, the contamination. A stain is a sign that one is impure and dirty. Pattison also agrees with Ricœur where the latter points out that 'the world of defilement is a world anterior to the division between the ethical and the physical'.⁷

As already remarked, according to Eliade the holy is what manifests itself as that upon which a community is built and rebuilt. The stain threatens what is manifested as holy, and since the holy is the condition or possibility of being itself, it threatens the individual life and the community. Everything that threatens the holy has to be expelled and is defined as impure. Thus the distinction between the holy and the unholy is reflected in the distinction between pure and impure.

Having a stain on your skin, being polluted, means you are contagious and impure. You make others dirty and impure too with your dirt; you infect the holy community and moreover you will have to be isolated from the community, otherwise the stain will multiply itself and destroy the holy community. Afflicted with a stain, you are a danger for the continued existence of the community, and you will therefore be expelled from it. Only a priest, a representation of holiness, can declare me pure again, re-establish me as a member of the community and liberate me from my shame, often in a ritual of purification which makes one pure again. We recognise the relation between the consciousness of evil and the holy. To be freed from the stain you

5 Stephen Pattison, *Shame: Theory, therapy, theology* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 40.

6 Ibid.

7 Ricœur, *La symbolique du mal*, 33.

have to wash yourself, for instance, in a holy river. We see many examples of this consciousness of evil symbolised in the stain in the Bible, for instance in Leviticus. (Lev. 13 passim) The prescriptions in the case of impurity are often formulated in the language of morals.

This consciousness of evil as symbolised by the stain has not disappeared in our time, despite modern science and modern medicine. Modern people are likely to see a contagious disease as something that has nothing to do with holiness, but with cleanliness and health. But today there are also many examples of the consciousness of evil symbolised by the stain, cases that meet measures of exclusion.

Being a disgrace for the holiness of my community, I have to hide myself, I have to be expelled. This notion: 'I have to hide myself' makes one conscious of the importance of the eyes of the other for the experience of shame. In shame is discovered what I fear, namely the eyes of the other. The emotion of shame is inconceivable without community. The relation to the other is also the basis for further development of consciousness of evil, but the first experience, the experience of shame, remains in one way or another in the next forms of consciousness of evil. In this also Pattison follows Ricœur when he writes:

Western Christianity has tended to see the nature of sin, fault and alienation from self and from God as matters of offence and guilt. However, Ricœur points out that this is underlain with the metaphorical stain of defilement. Defilement is a 'symbolic stain' and every evil is symbolically a stain (Ricœur 1967:36, 46). If defilement continues to be an important human experience, perhaps in the form of shame, and it also occupies an important, if implicit, place in Christian religious discourse and practise relating to sin and atonement, then paying attention to notions of pollution and defilement may be an important aspect of evaluating this religious tradition.⁸

The development from shame as the consciousness of the impurity towards the consciousness of sin is something we find in different cultures. In texts from various cultures we see comparable expressions of confession from shame as the consciousness of the impurity of the stain and of consciousness of the loneliness of sin. The phenomenological difference between consciousness of stain and consciousness of sin is an intentional one. The consciousness of sin can be distinguished by two important features. In comparison with shame it is more ethical, that is to say the sinner is conscious of the fact

8 Pattison, *Shame*, 91.

that he or she has trespassed on a moral law. And the consciousness of sin is marked by the notion *before the goddess or God*.

IV.2 *The symbolism of Sin*

According to the aforementioned Gary Anderson, 'sin' has a wide range of meaning in the Bible.⁹ The symbol of sin develops from a burden to be carried away in Leviticus (for instance Leviticus 16:21, 22) to a debt to be paid in Isaiah and the Gospels. Experiences with exile and slavery lay at the basis of this change of metaphor.

Permanent, however, for the consciousness of sin is the relation with the holy one. This intentionality opens the perspective to the infinity. The perspective of the infinite which is given with the holy one causes a development of consciousness of evil wherein new symbols of evil are discovered.¹⁰ The consciousness of sin is caused by harming or breaking this relation by trespassing on moral laws. The consciousness of sin presupposes theism, a relation with gods or God.

The broken relationship as consciousness of sin is a negation—and in this aspect a discontinuation with the symbolism of the stain. But this negation is also a way of being, a state of mind and in this aspect, it is a continuation with the symbolism of the stain. The broken relation affects my being. Ricœur pointed out, as did Anderson, that 'sin' has a wide range of meaning and that in Hebrew there are several words for sin: *chattat*, miss your goal, *awon*, going a winding road, *pasha*, obstinacy, more a form of intentionality, and *sjaga* the situation of the sinner having gone astray.¹¹

This consciousness of 'before God' is expressed in a relation with God, which in the Bible is the covenant. When I transgress the will of the god, I will do harm to this relation. The prophets warn against such a neglecting of the relation with the god, in Israel as well as in other cultures.

Obedience to the law however is neither the first nor the foremost item in this relation which constitutes the covenant. It is important to be aware of this for an understanding of the consciousness of evil. Laws are given within the relation of the covenant. Priests and prophets alike try to ensure that covenant is recognized and observed. This covenant can be disturbed, and with

9 Anderson, *Sin*, 6, 7.

10 Ricœur, *La symbolique du mal*, 57-65.

11 Ibid., 94, 95.

the destruction of the covenant the good life itself will be destroyed. In the Old Testament this is caused especially by worshipping idols who are nothing, and also by chasing after nothingness. By doing this the sinner him or herself becomes a nothing before God.

IV.3 Experiencing sin

As we have seen, Ricœur points out that the subjective side, the emotional side of the consciousness of sin is the fear of the wrath of God. In the Old Testament God gives his covenant with the law. In this finite order of the law there is an infinite requirement of God. Especially the prophets Amos, Hosea and Isaiah refer to the infinite requirement behind the covenant. These three prophets state that the relation between God and his people is disturbed because of the wrong intentionality of the people. They lack a just mind and righteous heart. We see famous examples of this development of consciousness of sin in Isaiah: 6: 5-7, or Psalm 51 or 65 for instance.

Because of their infidelity God will answer his people with a judgement. Anger is the other side of the holiness of God. The prophets preach the coming of the Day of the Lord, which will be a day of fear. The Lord will annihilate his people. In other words: the Day of the Lord will be a day of destruction and a day of disaster for the people. The Day of the Lord will be a day within our history, but the symbol of the Day of the Lord also implies an interpretation of history. The biblical examples state clearly that the consciousness of sin is not necessarily felt personally only. A whole people can bear the burden of sin committed in history, such as the Dutch may feel for their history of slave trade for instance.

In this further development of the consciousness of evil into the symbolism of sin, the symbolism of the stain and consciousness of shame return. In the consciousness of sin caused by awakening the anger of God by my faithlessness there is also shame.

Ricœur states that the transition between the symbolism of stain and sin is more phenomenological than historical.¹² For instance, the Greeks show an overlap in meaning between *katharos*, pure, *hagnos* innocent, *hagios* holy, and *hosios*, pious, devout.

12 Ibid., 51.

A famous example of this consciousness of evil consisting in shame and sin we see in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. The godly plight to revenge the murder of his father Agamemnon by his mother Clytemnestra and her lover, obliges Orestes to kill her. But by killing his mother he awakens the anger of the gods by trespassing their order of justice and so he is punished with madness. There is a border transgressed and a balance disturbed: the balance of justice. To restore the balance a price has to be paid. The price to be paid for this disturbed order is suffering. This idea of disturbed balance that has to be restored is a leading idea in jurisdiction even in our days.

The subjective side, the emotion of sin, is an internalisation of the infinite requirement behind the covenant and the law. Fear of sin means consciousness of the infinite measure that God represents and asks from his people. There is a requirement for radical change. I am not asked to obey the law better, but I need to change radically, I need a new heart. The prophets are also the ones who show the way to deal with this infinite demand. The consciousness of sin is a new intentionality, a new perspective and new element in comparison to the consciousness of the impurity of the stain. Especially new in comparison of the symbolism of the stain is the message of the preaching of the day of the Lord.

IV.4 The symbolism of guilt

The last consciousness of evil is guilt. In his description Ricœur stresses three aspects or directions of consciousness of guilt: in the field of ethics and jurisdiction with the notion of responsibility and liability; in the field of ethics and religion with the notion of a fine and scrupulous conscience; in the field of the psychology of religion with the accused and condemned consciousness and the notion of hell.

One cannot understand the consciousness of guilt without the two other moments of consciousness of evil: shame and sin. These moments come back in the consciousness of guilt. It is important to realise that one can be a sinner without being conscious of it. David needed the intervention of Nathan to develop self-knowledge and to awake his conscience, as is told in 2 Samuel. Guilt is the experience, the feeling and knowledge of being the cause of evil. I abused my liberty; I had the option to act otherwise but I did not. This con-

science of me being the cause of evil myself, because of my misuse of liberty, is new in relation to the stain and the sin, Ricœur states.¹³

The relation between sin and guilt is very complicated. In a way the consciousness of sin is the consciousness of guilt. Guilt is the interiorization of sin. In the dynamics of symbolism of evil, guilt is the culmination point. In the consciousness of guilt, we can also see the beginning of the tragic vision of human beings, familiar from the Greeks, but not absent in the Bible either. The tragedy consists in the consciousness that God sees me, but because of my trespasses, I am not worth to be loved by Him. The experience of relation is destroyed by my own fault. In consciousness of personal guilt, the symbolism of the stain and the sin return. This is illustrated in Psalm 51 as already mentioned.

To restore the relation with God I have to do his will. His will is expressed in the law. But behind the law there is the infinite requirement of God. The consciousness of the covenant wherein the law is given is a heteronomy. There is the danger of obedience to the law without love and the loneliness of the feeling of failure with regard to the law. Here one finds also the meticulous consciousness. This can lead to the notion of enslaved free will, the notion developed by Saint Paul. How can I be liberated from this meticulous conscience? This is the moment when Saint Paul mentions the grace and forgiveness of God. It is a new moment in the consciousness of evil and goodness.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS: THE SYMBOLISM OF REDEMPTION

How significant is the analysis of the dynamics of consciousness of evil as developed in the *Symbolism of Evil* for our human journey, the theme of this issue of the *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion*? The chain of consciousness of symbols of evil has its accumulation in guilt as the enslaved free will. This consciousness of evil consists in bearing the burden of failure and a barren loneliness. In the consciousness of guilt, the other forms of consciousness of evil return. In the loneliness of guilt there are aspects of the shame for the burden which is your own responsibility and your loneliness because you are yourself the cause of it, and of sin felt as a broken relation.

13 Ibid., 101.

Analysis of the different forms of consciousness of evil is a way to self-knowledge; a way of appropriating the self, in Ricœur's words. The symbolism of guilt brings me to the point where I am personally asked to make a radical decision between life and death (Deut. 30:15), between God and the nothingness of idols. The dialectic of the different forms of consciousness of evil, to which we have access by interpreting the symbols, is also a dialectic in which we fulfil the famous recommendation of Delphi: know yourself. By knowing ourselves, we become ourselves.

In the different forms of consciousness of evil, we particularly find also the counterpoints, the symbolism of redemption and freedom. The way towards the appropriation of the self involves detours, also de detours of symbolism of evil. In consciousness of evil and in confession of what went wrong, people can find the way to a choice, to be open for the gift of love, to a restored relation with God and neighbour. The ways of confession are found in Psalm 51: "A broken and contrite hart, O God, thou wilt not despise." (Psalm 51:17). The symbolism of redemption is also illustrated elsewhere in Psalm 51: clean me, wash me, purify me, redeem me, forgive me, make me free, and bring me back to you. The symbols of redemption are remission, liberation, bringing back home again, sharing a festive meal where God is the host.

Self-interpretation and self-appreciation are related to different forms of consciousness of good and evil. The different forms of consciousness of evil are different forms of (lack of) self-knowledge or (lack of) self-appreciation. The famous words of Socrates that a human life that not reflect on the self is not worth to be lived are also relevant here. The symbols of evil are a way to know ourselves and realise our lives as human beings endowed with free will. However, we cannot do this without knowing the symbols of goodness that brings perspective of joy. With the dialectic of the symbols of evil goes the dialectic of the symbols of redemption. When we can open ourselves to the meaning of grace as the liberation from guilt, then we can also be liberated from sin, liberated also from an unbearable burden and be brought back on the right path. And this will make us feel liberated from shame, washed clean and pure. According to Ricœur this is what Saint Paul meant when he wrote: "[...] how much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ." (Romans 5:17)

Necessarily my concluding remarks seem paradoxical. Are the different forms of consciousness of evil liberating and revealing a perspective to a good

life? Is the chain of symbols of evil not only tragic, terrifying and a menace to the joy of life? Ricoeur stresses that in the different forms of consciousness of evil are also found ways for liberation of evil. Pattison, for instance, points in the case of liberation from shame to the stories of Luke where it says that Jesus heals people from shame and at the same time invites them into the community. Similar to the example of the crippled, bent-over woman is the story of Zacchaeus.¹⁴ The different forms of the consciousness of evil give way to self-knowledge but they can also open up the perspective of hope. Consciousness of evil, as my sin, gives also consciousness of good, as the perspective of hope. This hope can liberate me from my enslaved free will and make me experience joy.

In Christianity the different forms of consciousness of evil have found their theological articulation in the theology of original sin. This is a highly problematic notion that entails the danger of alienating from the revealing aspects of consciousness of evil. Already Kant in the first part of his *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* and Kierkegaard in his *The Concept of Anxiety* have pointed to the philosophical and theological problems presented with the notion of original sin. Ricoeur follows them in their analysis.¹⁵

What are we losing when we are without insight in these dynamics of consciousness of evil? What happens to humanity when this consciousness of good and evil in relation to my responsibility disappears? Evil itself has not disappeared. The conclusion seems to be that without insight in the dynamics of the symbols of evil, there is a risk that we are also losing sight of the symbols of liberation and the perspective of hope.

14 Pattison, *Shame*, 307.

15 Immanuel Kant, *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. (F. Nicolovius, 1793); Søren Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety* (Norton & Co., 2015).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Gary A. 2009. *Sin: A history*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt1nq1r7>.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1793. *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. Königsberg: F. Nicolovius.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. 2015. *The Concept of Anxiety*. New York, NY: Norton & Co.
- Pattison, Stephen. 2000. *Shame: Theory, Therapy, Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ricœur, Paul. 1950. *Philosophie de la volonté*. Paris: Aubier Montaigne.
- . 1960. *La symbolique du mal*. Paris: Aubier Montagne.
- . 1967. *The Symbolism of Evil*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Spinoza. 2002. *Ethica*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.