

evolving, we may be able to better understand who we are as churches in our contexts and who we can become together. (p. 236)

Martyn Percy
Cuddesdon, Oxford, UK

Alan P.F. Sell, *Four Philosophical Anglicans: W.G. De Burgh, W.R. Matthews, O.C. Quick, H.A. Hodges* (Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), pp. x+327. ISBN 978 1 4094 0059 2.

doi:10.1017/S1740355311000246

This impressive book examines the works of four Anglican philosophers, once eminent but now largely forgotten. Alan Sell dedicates a section of the book to each, setting out the major themes of their research, before offering some broad but illuminating comparisons.

In each case, Sell begins by telling us a little of their lives. William George de Burgh (1866–1943) was the first Professor of Philosophy at the newly founded University of Reading. Walter Robert Matthews (1881–1973) studied and taught at King's College London, leaving to become Dean of Exeter and later St Paul's. Oliver Chase Quick (1885–1944) ended his career as Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Herbert Arthur Hodges (1905–76), who completes the set, replaced de Burgh at Reading at the extremely young age of 29, and retained the chair until his retirement. For all that these figures differ in philosophical outlook, methodology and churchmanship, the insights of the four are strikingly relevant to contemporary discussions.

The author of *The Legacy of the Ancient World*, de Burgh was deeply influenced by the classics and used ideas from ancient Greek philosophy to address modern philosophical problems. He was concerned that a focus on the scientific method left little room for the 'moral-cum-spiritual dimension' (p. 22). His main target was the logical positivists, who had missed the Aristotelian point that 'the human being's end is not simply to live, but to live well' (p. 26). This is particularly pertinent today, given that many logical positivist assumptions prevail in the work of the 'New Atheists'. De Burgh held Descartes largely responsible for our excessively narrow concept of reason, and is strongly dismissive of Spinoza, but he also criticizes Thomas Aquinas's distinction between the theologian (who begins with revelation) and the philosopher (who begins with the creaturely). In his own work, unlike many analytic philosophers today, he refused to separate the two, incorporating theology and apologetics into his philosophical work.

Matthews was also interested in the relationship between philosophy and science, and expressed the rather premature hope that their mutual antagonism was coming to an end. Like de Burgh, he was not opposed to science, but believed that its method of 'analysis, simplification and abstraction' gives us an incomplete picture (p. 88). Sell notes three other important themes in Matthews' work. First, there is a strong focus on the experiential basis of religion, which draws on both Schleiermacher and Otto. Second, Matthews drew on psychology and was a member of the Society for Psychical Research. Third, he was concerned with apologetics, and linked waning interest in Scripture to the decline of the 'metaphysical impulse: the

Gospel does not speak to modern thinkers because it 'answers a question which they have forgotten to ask' (p. 91).

Quick shared de Burgh and Matthews' antipathy towards a narrow rationalism, whereby 'the intellect is the only true arbiter of cognition' (p. 159). But he also warned against anti-intellectualism, which he regarded as a particular Anglo-Saxon vice, and which sidelines theological inquiry. Sell characterizes Quick's method as the attempt 'to balance traditionalism against the claims and benefits of modern thought' (p. 148). In doing so, he sought a middle path between Liberal Protestantism, which sought to reform doctrine in line with historical facts, and Catholic Modernism, which valued doctrine independently from those facts. Much of the rest of the chapter considers Quick's treatment of specific doctrines, giving this chapter a rather different focus from the others.

Hodges completed his doctoral research on Wilhelm Dilthey, the hermeneuticist and editor of Schleiermacher's works. He published two studies of Dilthey, and used him to critique empiricism, emphasizing the social dimension of human life. He also criticized psychology for being too enamoured with the empirical approach of natural science, suggesting that it was worth sacrificing objectivity for depth of insight. Yet intriguingly, and unlike the other three philosophers considered in this book, he reserved the term 'knowledge' for statements that are empirically verifiable. Religious statements do not usually count as knowledge, but nor are they meaningless. They belong to a different order, and 'theology begins only when science has shot its bolt' (p. 249).

Many readers will find this book rewarding as an introduction to the thought of four unfamiliar yet fascinating scholars. Yet Sell provides much more than an exposition of their work. As well as the final comparative chapter, he offers numerous comments and critical remarks throughout the text. Very occasionally his attempts to 'correct' the thinkers need further justification. For example, while readers might agree that Hodges' definition of the Fall (p. 266) is 'tame' insofar as it construes it as humankind's failure to respond to God and not as a decisive rejection of God, this is surely a matter for theological debate. Many of Sell's interjections reflect his Reformed theology, and this is especially evident when he considers Hodges' view of justification and infant baptism.

In the final paragraph, Sell gently asks what the four would have made of recent philosophical trends. He does not pursue this further, but his book will undoubtedly encourage others to reflect upon this question. I very much hope that, thanks to Sell's work, the insights of these four scholars might help to shape Anglican contributions to philosophical debate in the future.

Geoff Dumbreck
Oxford

C. FitzSimons Allison, *Trust in an Age of Arrogance* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2011), pp. 180. ISBN 978 0 7188 9236 4.

doi:10.1017/S1740355311000258

One of the less commendable practices among some Christians has been the tendency to scour Scripture for disagreeable characters by which to identify opponents. Perhaps the most notable example of this was the frequent identification during the Reformation of the Pope with the Antichrist of Revelation. But almost all