

mass of generality and confusion that has previously existed. In this way, Randal Rauser's *Theology in Search of Foundations* will serve as an important work of analytic theology.

JAMES R. GORDON  
 Trinity Evangelical Divinity School  
 e-mail: jrgordon13@gmail.com

*Religious Studies* 47 (2011) doi:10.1017/S0034412510000612  
 © Cambridge University Press 2011

Charles Taliaferro & Chad Meister (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Philosophical Theology*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Pp. xiv + 265. £50.00, \$88.99 (Hbk). £17.99, \$27.99 (Pbk). ISBN 9780521514330 (Hbk), 9780521730372 (Pbk).

This is an edited collection of essays on central themes in Christian philosophical theology, written by contemporary philosophers and theologians. The essays are preceded by some very brief introductory remarks, ones which do not summarize the contributions the volume contains. The essays are then divided into two groups, the first under the title, 'God'; the second, 'God in relation to creation'. In the first part are found essays by Ronald Feenstra on 'Trinity'; Brian Leftow on 'Necessity'; Brian Davies on 'Simplicity'; William J. Wainwright on 'Omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence'; John E. Hare on 'Goodness'; and William Hasker on 'Eternity and providence'. In the second part are found essays by Katherin A. Rogers on 'Incarnation'; Stephen T. Davis on 'Resurrection'; Gordon Graham on 'Atonement'; Paul K. Moser on 'Sin and salvation'; Chad Meister on 'The problem of evil'; William J. Abraham on 'Church'; Charles Taliaferro on 'Religious rites'; Thomas D. Sullivan and Sandra Menssen on 'Revelation and miracles'; Harriet Harris on 'Prayer'; and Jerry L. Walls on 'Heaven and Hell'. There then follows a very short – but perhaps to some helpful – bibliography, and a comprehensive and useful index.

All the essays are clearly written and there's a sense in which, when taken together, they are likely to offer something to everyone: from the general reader or the beginning undergraduate to the graduate student or professional wishing to brush up on the latest thinking in an area of the discipline that he or she has left unobserved for some time, at least one of these essays is bound to prove useful. Some of the essays are the sorts of overviews of their subject that one might well wish an undergraduate to read early on in their thinking on it. Others are harder going, relying on some prior exposure to the issues for their full appreciation.

By way of some examples – Feenstra could not reasonably be expected, in the twelve sides to which he has confined himself, to make great inroads into the

doctrine of the Trinity; his essay is more a preliminary canvassing of the issues and options. Leftow has only a few sides more and manages to delve deeper only by asking rather more of his readers than Feenstra when it comes to grasping quickly various theses in modal logic and remembering them and their acronyms as his essay proceeds. Davies, in his essay, decides solely to discuss Aquinas, as he interprets him, on the topic of simplicity, leaving more modern interpretations of the doctrine to one side. Wainwright's is an 'ahistorical' discussion of the nature of, and the relationship between, the properties of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence, whereas Hare's essay proceeds 'chronologically', giving a history of the concept on which it focuses. And so on as the book continues.

This makes for an extremely uneven reading experience if one goes from cover to cover in one sitting. But that is perhaps not how the volume would ordinarily be read; I presume that, more often, individual chapters will be picked out by topic and read in isolation from the others. And the unevenness can in itself prove an aid to digestion for the person who wishes to consume the whole in a single sitting: an essay that one might describe as having aimed more at breadth than depth refreshes the palate for one that is more narrowly focused. If the topic and methodology of one essay proves familiar, that of the next will not.

All in all then, a smorgasbord and, as with all such feasts, there are inevitably some dishes that are more to a particular individual's taste than others. So it was in the case of this feast and this particular individual. But what I might pick out as somewhat bland, others might find tasty; and what I skipped over as familiar, others might find novel and linger on with enjoyment and benefit. I think then that I do best by stopping at the level of this general commendation.

T. J. MAWSON

*St Peter's College, Oxford*  
*e-mail: tjmawson@rocketmail.com*