

Preface

IN 2008, CLAREMONT GRADUATE University (CGU), School of Religion, wisely hired the well-known scholar and thinker Ingolf Dalferth to come and teach in the Philosophy of Religion and Theology program. The position was a partial position, however, as Dalferth retained his chair at the Institute of Hermeneutics and Philosophy of Religion, University of Zürich (UZH), lecturing and researching half a year from each location. This split position, under the direction of Dalferth, opened up what turned out to be a wonderful door. Ph.D. students from UZH came to study in Claremont and Ph.D. students from CGU came to study in Zürich with many professional partnerships and friendships opening along the way. Hartmut and I were two of these students—I studying in Zürich and he in Claremont—and this work is an example of some of the thought that has developed from the relationship between the two schools.

Indeed, we thought of this book while attending a conference together in Oxford in 2010, held by the European Conference for Philosophy of Religion. Among the many conversations we held emerged the question for us concerning just what in the world a term meant that we had heard used quite often in our respective fields: “post-metaphysics.” This volume is a response to that question and gives any number of attempted answers. Whether the volume is successful depends on whether the reader believes (perhaps metaphysically?) that a definitive possibility must be offered and argued for, or whether (post-metaphysically) the play of multiple possibilities (with, say, “family resemblances”) remains adequate.

The contributors are mostly comprised of young scholars, about half of whom come from the US and the other half of whom come from a Northern European setting. We wanted, as such, to gain something like a “fresh perspective” on this topic of post-metaphysics—to see if any younger scholars

could help in its interpretation. However, we also asked two very well-known thinkers to join in our endeavor, and they kindly answered in the affirmative: Kevin Hart and George Pattison. The benefit of having these two agree to the project has been not only a continued development of what seems to be their corpus of “fresh perspectives” but their wisdom of knowing the landscape—the thinkers, the concepts, the issues—better than the rest of us.

So, we offer this volume humbly and without the pretension of believing that we’ve solved any issue definitively but with the confidence that we’ve contributed something worthy of some reflection.

Eric E. Hall

January 2014

SAMPLE