compensate for the conservative slashing of social program budgets in the United States. Reaganomics certainly has not helped advance 'God's kingdom.'

This book is part of a new series published by the University of Notre Dame Press, 'The Library of Religious Philosophy,' under the general editorship of Thomas V. Morris. Philosophers interested in religious concepts can look forward to additional challenging books in this exciting series from Notre Dame. The assumption is that clear thinking is always better than muddled thinking, especially on religious matters. This is a lesson from analytic philosophy which theologians always need to remember. Graham has helped foster this lesson throughout this important book.

ANTHONY J. LISSKA

GOD AND HISTORY. ASPECTS OF BRITISH THEOLOGY 1875-1914 by Peter Hinchliff. *Clarendon Press*, **Oxford. Pp. 267. 1992. £32.50.**

Here we have a solid survey of 'British' theology, Anglican, Roman Catholic and Free Church, which covers the forty or so years before the outbreak of war in 1914, a period during which our island theologians took themselves rather seriously but wrote little that is still read today. Peter Hinchliff takes as a guide through the maze of publication the whole range of problems raised for theologians 'by new ways of understanding history and its relationship with faith'. He starts from Newman, whose theory of development he describes as having died with him, and Jowett, whose Liberal Protestant individualism he regards as a cul-de-sac. Then we have, as we are bound to do, an essay on 'The essays in *Lux Mundi*', followed by a chapter on the 'British' idealists, who are criticised on the ground that 'a purely metaphysical Christ was no real substitute for a historical one, for the Christ of christian tradition needed to be related to the Jesus of history'. From the 'traditional' point of view this is self-evident, but the source of idealism's appeal was that both the Christ-of-theology and the Jesus-of-the-New-Testament were increasingly seen as ambiguous human productions. Hinchliff echoes the usual dismissal of Hegelianism—'the dominant philosophy in Britain until as late as the 1940s'—as though the theological problem had disappeared, but if it has one suspects that it has vanished in an idealist direction. From this point of view it is strange that in his chapter on Catholic Modernism Hinchliff gives little room to Tyrrell, who in his later writing exalted a Christ of present experience and virtually dismissed the religious significance of any historical Jesus. There follow a chapter on A.M. Fairbairn, which will interest specialists, and another on R.J. Campbell, of whom enough has been written before. The book ends with an excellent discussion of B.H. Streeter and of theology in about 1914.

This is inevitably a familiar cast and 'Faith and History' is a familiar drama, which, when directed by a theologian, usually ends with Faith

triumphant. The kind of distinction which is commonly made comes out in Hinchliff's discussion of the Anglican Archbishop Benson's anti-papal book on Cyprian (1897): 'Benson was, no doubt, correct in arguing that the third century knew no developed doctrine of papal authority such as that held by Roman Catholics in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. . . but whether Cyprian was the author of the Petrine text of *De Unitate* is another question, and, in fact, none of these matters has very much bearing upon the theological issue of papal authority and jurisdiction. That was a matter to be determined on wholly other grounds than the historical points involved in establishing the correct text of Cyprian's treatise'.

What really seems to annoy 'Faith' at this point is the awareness that while Hinchliff may be right about Benson's own shortcomings as a historian cum theologian, 'History' can also offer a much more sophisticated and plausible account of how papal claims to universal temporal and ecclesiastical power developed. Of course one can, at a certain level of abstraction, devise a self-sufficient theological account of the 'papacy', though 'First Faith' cannot at that level impose it on 'Second Faith', whose theological fundamentals are different. One does not determine the issue, one only states a theological opinion, and it is not irrelevant to ask what 'History' knows about such opinions. To go further, to impose a definition, would be historical, not theological. The Papacy itself, in any case, is not a theological abstraction, but an institution whose diplomats aspire to a role in the Middle East peace process and with this in mind have recently agreed to a bilateral commission aimed at normalising relations with Israel, a state which the Vatican has not yet formally recognised. It may well be that contemporary Anglican Bishops would like to be ecumenically reconciled in an institution which sent representatives to a Middle East peace conference, but neither they nor 'Faith' is entitled to settle the correctness of such conduct in a sanitised theological conference, that is, on 'wholly other grounds than. . . historical points'.

What was rarely accepted by late Victorian and Edwardian theologians, whose attitude to the British Empire was religiously complacent, was that even in the space of their own historical experience the Christian Churches were being forced out of their 'overseas-missionary' attitude to other religions: 'Faith and History' was changing into 'Faiths and History'. Troeltsch understood this more clearly than anyone discussed here. And the first and second global wars would drive the point deeper. Peter Hinchliff's book, which is both well-written and carefully researched, faithfully reports how limited the view perhaps inevitably was from a society which felt itself solidly at home on a peak of imperial dominion.

JOHN KENT