

is more Pauline than Augustinian. The Pauline nature of Ricoeur's theology and theodicy is evident from the last part of his book. He speaks of the pastoral aspect of suffering and the consequences of evil: 'The failure of the theory of retribution at a speculative level must be integrated into the work of mourning as a deliverance from the accusation which in some way exposes suffering as undeserved. [Ricoeur goes on to refer to rabbi Harold S Kushner's *When Bad Things Happen to Good People*, (New York: Schocken, 1981)] ... A second stage of the spiritualization of lament is to allow oneself outbursts of complaint directed at God' (69).

Ricoeur's thrust is toward the lived experience of being amidst evil and surviving evil; thus his theodicy is very much Pauline.

Neither Ward, nor Gisel mention the influence that Jürgen Moltmann had on Ricoeur. When Moltmann experienced Nazi genocide; he wrote how God suffered with the victims of Hitler's annihilating rage. Ricoeur's 'accusation against "God" is the impatience of hope' (70), which as Ricoeur points out has its origins in the *Psalms* of the Bible (ibid.). True theologian that he was, Ricoeur's ending shows his understanding of human nature, of God, of Buddhism and of evil: since 'once violence has been suppressed, the enigma of true suffering, of irreducible suffering, will be laid bare' (72).

Subhasis Chattopadhyay

Psychoanalyst

Assistant Professor of English
Ramananda College, Bishnupur



The Quintessence of

True Being

Nome

Society of Abidance in Truth (SAT),
1834 Ocean Street, Santa Cruz, CA
95060, USA. www.satramana.org. 2011.
59 pp. \$4.95 PB. ISBN 9780981940946.

In this slim volume, Nome explains the question: 'If the universe is unreal, why is it experienced as if real?' (27). It is the natural corollary to the central tenet of Advaita Vedanta that Brahman alone is real. Nome situates the 'timeless Knowledge' (3) of Advaita Vedanta within the continuum of the Upanishads, Acharya Shankara, the *Ribhu Gita*, and so on. Nome explains the question: 'It may be

wondered, if all are one Self, or Brahman, why are their experiences different and why, when one jiva is liberated from illusion and realizes Brahman, this is not the experience of all of them?' (47).

The Realization of Brahman, the true Self, is liberation from the individual, and need not be considered as a new or different state for or of the individual. The nature of such Liberation, or Realization, being eternal, is ever-existent. ... As it is ever-existent, the ideas of loss or attainment of it are inapplicable. (48)

There is nothing other than Brahman. Advaita Vedanta forces us to review epistemology and we will apply it to translation studies and hermeneutics.

Translation requires at least three loci: the translator, the original text, and the target language creation. There is an implied multiplicity involved in the *act* of translation. But if we are to apply Advaita Vedanta to the *act* of translation then we have to rethink this field. Who translates whom or what and into what culture/jiva-aggregate? The differences between languages, linguistic communities, or cultural milieus are illusory to the extent that there are no differences between the translator, the text to be translated, and the text to be created.

The *telos* of philosophical hermeneutics is to find multiplicity within monads, texts, or structures. This is the opposite of what Advaita Vedanta stands for. Advaita Vedanta sees unity within the apparent multiplicity of jivas, objects qua texts. This is because: Any supposed aspect of the jiva [the scholar of hermeneutics, the object or text which is being scrutinised] that bears even the least distinction from Brahman is unreal, for there cannot be another existence apart from the One Existence, regardless of whether such is imagined to be inside, outside, or alongside the One without a second' (37). Thus, Advaita Vedanta demands a rethinking of the entire domain of philosophical hermeneutics. As Nome repeatedly points out, there is no second other than Brahman. Therefore, within Advaita Vedanta, there is no temporal dimension. Nome's books including this one can be used by scholars unacquainted with Advaita Vedanta not only for understanding this philosophy but to review their own stances about other academic disciplines.

Subhasis Chattopadhyay