

# Faith and Philosophy: Journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers

---

Volume 24 | Issue 2

Article 11

---

4-1-2007

## Harriet A. Harris and Christopher J. Insole, eds., FAITH AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS; THE IMPACT OF ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Frank B. Dilley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://place.asburyseminary.edu/faithandphilosophy>

---

### Recommended Citation

Dilley, Frank B. (2007) "Harriet A. Harris and Christopher J. Insole, eds., FAITH AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS; THE IMPACT OF ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION," *Faith and Philosophy: Journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers*: Vol. 24 : Iss. 2 , Article 11.

DOI: 10.5840/faithphil200724233

Available at: <https://place.asburyseminary.edu/faithandphilosophy/vol24/iss2/11>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ePLACE: preserving, learning, and creative exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faith and Philosophy: Journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers by an authorized editor of ePLACE: preserving, learning, and creative exchange.

*Faith and Philosophical Analysis; The Impact of Analytical Philosophy on the Philosophy of Religion*, edited by Harriet A. Harris and Christopher J. Insole. Ashgate, 2005. 201 pp. \$99.95 (cloth), \$29.95 (paper).

FRANK B. DILLEY, University of Delaware (Emeritus)

This collection of original articles examines the impact of analytical philosophy on philosophy of religion, and is one of the volumes in the Heythrop Series in Contemporary Philosophy, Religion and Theology. The editors and almost all of the contributors are from Great Britain. The volume contains eleven contributions, including one each from the editors who also provide a twenty-page introduction to the varying opinions presented. I found the collection illuminating and focused on the topic that the editors address, and note that none of the contributors are non-Western.

The writers who have contributed to this volume range from those who defend analytical philosophy as the only legitimate way to do philosophy to those who believe that analytical philosophy is either dead or ought to be. Some of the contributors will be known to readers of this journal (Cyril Barrett, Basil Mitchell, Richard Swinburne, Charles Taliaferro) but others will possibly not be. There is no "Reformed" epistemologist in the volume, but Harriet A. Harris devotes her piece "Does Analytical Philosophy Clip Our Wings?" to examining it as a test case and Ann Loades provides a discussion of it in considering various forms of relating philosophy of religion to theology. The critics in this volume are feminists, phenomenologists, pragmatists, or what is new to me, exponents of 'Radical Orthodoxy'. All are sympathetic to philosophy of religion, but are concerned with whether the narrow focus of analytical philosophy, its lack of concern with non-Christian religions and its resistance to non- or wider-cognitive approaches, is an asset or a weakness.

The editors expand on their subtitle by raising the question of whether philosophy of religion should be paying attention to our "most heartfelt and ultimate concerns, including death, failure and the directing of our will and emotions," and contrast this approach with what they see as the preoccupation of analytical philosophy of religion with "the nature of justified belief, probability and proof, and how the words in our sentences function" (p. 1). This tension between what many people want from philosophy of religion and what analytical (and other) Western philosophers of religion typically do has often been expressed to me by my own students. I have replied to them that there are other ways to do philosophy, and other cultures besides Western, and that they should study such things, but I have mourned with them over our typical failure to appreciate other approaches and other expressions of religion in Western analytical (and other) philosophy of religion. Such questions can also be raised about typical Western theology as well.

Basil Mitchell and Richard Swinburne defend the approach of analytical philosophy in two chapters, "Staking a Claim for Metaphysics" and "the Value and Christian Roots of Analytical Philosophy of Religion." Elizabeth Burns, on the other hand, suggests that the verificationist approach, which both Mitchell and Swinburne rejected, pointed toward helpful ways of transforming metaphysics, retaining but transforming religious language.

In her view "God" is "the transcendent guarantee of disinterested goodness" which is manifested, but not exclusively, in Jesus of Nazareth. Cyril Barrett's contribution similarly defends "The Wittgensteinian Revolution" as a way of changing the focus of Christian philosophy of religion.

In "The God's Eye Point of View; A Divine Ethic" Charles Taliaferro defends analytical philosophy and its attempts to arrive at objective and impartial truth, while Pamela Sue Anderson, whose *A Feminist Philosophy of Religion* is credited by the editors as being the first full feminist philosophy of religion, defends an "embeddedness" approach, advocating seeking the truth through a pluralistic dialogue between persons with different positions, rather than attempting to provide a single agreed-upon 'God's Eye' view.

Harriet A. Harris, as the title of her contribution indicates, suggests that analytical philosophy clips our wings, using reformed epistemology as her example. We should expect philosophers of religion to deal with things that matter and to provide wisdom for living and personal growth rather than just aiming at which beliefs it is rational to hold. She advocates room for spiritual disciplines and contemplation in philosophy of religion, and says that ethics should have priority over ontology and epistemology. She wants "reformed epistemologists" to be more ambitious, to consider "what promotes wisdom, and how a religious habitus develops" and go beyond their concern for justifying holding beliefs that they cannot provide evidence to justify. What is proper modesty for them is lack of ambition for her.

G. K. Kimora advocates "deeper" approaches, seeking to reconstruct philosophy of religion along romantic and neo-pragmatic lines. He thinks that Richard Rorty, Hilary Putnam, Stanley Cavell and Charles Taylor, all of whom have abandoned analytical philosophy, point us toward neo-pragmatics, a new "autobiographical-literary" voice.

Ann Loades is interested in the relationship of philosophy and theology and surveys quite a number of well-known contemporary writers in England and the United States, from *Language, Truth and Logic* to the present, writers who might be called philosophical theologians who practice the techniques of analytical philosophy but address topics of God, individual theological beliefs, other religious traditions and many of the topics which go beyond what analytical philosophers did in the 50s and 60s. She also introduces what is, for me, a new movement, that called 'Radical Orthodoxy'.

I am unable to comment on the contributions of Giles Fraser, who is, I gather, a defender of 'Radical Orthodoxy', and Christopher Insole's "Political Liberalism, Analytical Philosophy of Religion and the Forgetting of History". The absence of comment is my fault, not theirs.

This volume is welcome but requires a sophisticated knowledge of the past 70 years of Anglo-American analytical philosophy of religion. Those readers who are not aware that there are a substantial number of contemporary philosophers interested in religion but who either formerly were or never were devotees of analytical philosophy should read it and learn.