

‘cannot succeed in being good and just without faith in the living God’ (p. 200). That is, remembering and having faith in ‘God’, means precisely feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, freeing the oppressed.

As a Christian theologian increasingly engaged in comparative theological work, I am interested to see Greenway engage more deeply with religious voices from non-western and non-Christian traditions to test and develop his claim that a common ‘reasonable faith’ can address the dangers of our post-secular age. Greenway clearly invites this – he does not want claim of commonality to mask real diversity (a danger that haunts projects like that of the late John Hick). I wonder: is there something to be learned from engaging in conversations with religious instances that are not grounded in agape? Or are all religions actually swept along in a universal agapic undertow?

Many of these essays have been previously published, but their revision into a single volume around a common theme makes them available to a wider audience. As noted in the book’s subtitle, these essays engage philosophers with whom Greenway has long been in conversation, including Donald Davidson, Emmanuel Levinas, John Rawls, Mayra Rivera, Rorty, Spivak, Stout, Charles Taylor and Bernard Williams. Some of these essays address a more specialised academic audience (e.g. chapters 1, 2, 5, 6), while others speak more easily to non-specialists (see, for instance, the elegant chapter 7, ‘Christian Ethics in a Postmodern World?’, originally written in 1994 and now available for the first time in print, as well as the compelling final sermon, ‘A Time for Prophets?’). This volume will be most rewarding for those who are familiar with the thinkers engaged, and/or who have a penchant for analytic philosophical approaches. However, all readers who are invested in the conversation about faith and reason will benefit from this serious critique of secular so-called rationality, and for Greenway’s call to join the forces of reason *and* faith in common cause for the common good.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000522

Katrin Gülden Le Maire, *Pannenberg, the Positioning of Academic Theology and Philosophy of Science: An Evaluation of His Work in the German Context*

(Berlin: Peter Lang, 2022), pp. 282. \$61.95.

Steffen Lösel

Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA (steffen.loesel@emory.edu)

The book analyses the social, historical and educational–political background, theological reasoning and academic impact of Wolfhart Pannenberg’s 1973 work, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Theologie (Theology and the Philosophy of Science)* and argues for the continuing relevance of Pannenberg’s defense of the scientificity (*Wissenschaftlichkeit*) of theology.

The introduction (chapter 1) establishes the historical context of Pannenberg’s book. The author draws attention to the endangered existence of theology faculties in Germany in the late 1960s, caused by institutional reforms, attacks by

philosophical atheists, the ascendancy of sociology as a rival field and inner conflicts about the self-understanding of theology as a discipline. Today, Gülден Le Maire again sees theology in jeopardy, both in Germany due to diminishing student numbers, competition for financial resources and continuing internal debates about whether theology should be taught at state universities; and across the Atlantic, because of the advent of a 'post-factual age' (p. 24), assaults by atheist scientists and an increasing 'compartmentalization and theological dissonance supported by political activism' (p. 25).

Chapter 2 offers an intellectual biography of Pannenberg, including his war experiences, studies of philosophy and theology, and the influence of Karl Barth and Pannenberg's teachers in Göttingen and Heidelberg. Chapter 3 traces the genesis of Pannenberg's book, beginning with his critique of Word of God theologies in *Revelation as History* – a critique which laid the foundation of his own theological alternative to both liberal Protestantism and German idealism. Chapter 4 focuses on the educational-political and denominational landscape of Germany in the early 1970s, the particularities of the German university system, and the various threats to the existence of theology therein. Chapter 5 directs the reader's attention to the implications of Pannenberg's understanding of theology as the science of God (rather than of Christianity). The author shows that Pannenberg's concept picked up and went beyond where philosopher and logician Heinrich Scholz left the matter in his debate with Karl Barth in 1931. Gülден Le Maire further explains how, in dialogue with William W. Bartley, Hans Albert, Thomas Kuhn and Karl Popper, Pannenberg developed his suggestion that theology must formulate truth claims in the form of hypotheses which require critical testing.

In chapter 6 the author discusses Pannenberg's influence on other theologians and the reasons why he did not have a theological legacy: German Protestant theology has largely moved towards a renewed *Kulturprotestantismus*; and in the United States only Wentzel van Huyssteen took up his former teacher's concern for the scientific character of theology, arguing that Pannenberg failed 'to resolve the problem of a fideistic axiomatic theology', by not attending to 'the crucial question of the personal commitment in the act of theorizing' (p. 142). Chapter 7 returns to the contemporary relevance of Pannenberg's project amidst postmodernist doubts about universal truth claims and a 'neo-liberal theology' which, in the author's view, 'shows signs of a retreat *from* commitment through a non-theological theology' (p. 198). Gülден Le Maire proposes that theologians need to develop 'normative standards and claims concerning the discipline of theology' (p. 211) in order to respond to the 'contemporary technological paradigm shift' (p. 224).

The book offers a wealth of context to Pannenberg's *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, in terms of the book's genesis, its socio-cultural background, and its reception. The author presents a comprehensive overview of the secondary literature on both sides of the Atlantic and makes a convincing case for why Pannenberg's defense of theology's existence at the university is still important today. However, the book's strength is also its weakness. Throughout the book, the author quotes so many divergent voices that the reader tends to lose track of her own position. One wonders with whom Gülден Le Maire ultimately agrees or disagrees, and why. Does Pannenberg's defense of the scientificity of theology still hold up today, despite the rejection of his 'theological universality in the light of salvific history' (p. 225) by his postmodern and neo-Troeltschian critics? In other words, is Pannenberg's defense of the scientificity of theology only historically important, or does Pannenberg still have something

substantial to contribute today? Or, in Bultmann's terms, is only the 'that' of Pannenberg's defense of theology's scientificity important, or also the 'what'? If the latter, what are his lasting contributions to the defense of theology's scientificity? Can his 'epistemology and public implications deduced from his perceived universality remain effectively unchallenged' (p. 225), as Gülden Le Maire suggests? Frankly, I was hoping for more answers from the author.

There are also a few minor points of correction. First, although *Bundespräsident* (German Federal President) Gustav Heinemann was a one-time member of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), as Gülden Le Maire states (p. 56, n. 185), he eventually joined the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and became *Bundespräsident* as a member of that party. Omission of the fact is misleading.

Similarly misleading is the discussion of Karl Barth's evaluation of the phenomenon of religion. Gülden Le Maire rightly states that Barth was highly critical of religion as a human phenomenon and of Schleiermacher's use of the concept of religion for theological purposes; but she goes on to claim that 'Barth and proponents of dialectic theology went as far as to reject the idea of Christianity as a religion at all' (p. 106). But already in *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf* (1927), §18.3 ('Gott und die Religion'), and again in §17 of *Church Dogmatics*, Barth acknowledges that Christianity is a religion and, as such, falls under the same negative verdict as all human religions. Only because God uses Christianity as a vehicle of divine self-revelation (and thus justifies and sanctifies what in and of itself is an expression of human sin) does Christianity differ from other religions. More clarity would be helpful here so as to not misrepresent the complexity of Barth's thought on this point.

Finally, Gülden Le Maire claims that Ian Barbour, '[w]hilst influenced by A. Whitehead and process theology...differed from both in denying *creatio ex nihilo*' (p. 94). The implicit suggestion that Whitehead embraced creation out of nothing is peculiar. In the second volume of his *Systematische Theologie* (pp. 29–30, n. 46), Pannenberg himself quotes several statements from Whitehead's *Process and Reality* (1929) to the contrary.

These problems notwithstanding, the book offers a helpful contextualisation of Pannenberg's defense of the scientificity of theology.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000480

Emilio Alvarez, *Pentecostal Orthodoxy: Toward an Ecumenism of the Spirit*

(Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2022), pp. xiv + 174. \$24.00.

Patrick Oden

Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, USA (patrickoden@fuller.edu)

During Spring semester of 1996, I had the opportunity to take historical theology with Robert Webber. To hear him speak of the richness of the Orthodox tradition inspired me and began what has now been a quarter century of being enthralled with Orthodox