

should attract the attention of not just scholars of a Barth–Aquinas dialogue, but also contemporary debates between Thomism(s) and *ressourcement* theology. Having used Barth's theology of creation and covenant to intervene into these debates, Skaff could have brought in Barth's criticisms about the *analogia entis*, but strangely, he does not do so. Chapter 4, which covers Aquinas's account of the Old Law and biblical history, also extends the conversation towards Pauline studies. From Apocalyptic Paul to the New Perspective, contemporary scholarship on Paul and the biblical law has centred around the question of continuity and discontinuity in biblical history. Skaff's analysis of Aquinas in this chapter shows that contemporary Pauline scholarship and classical theology can be mutually illuminating, and Aquinas may help hold the discontinuity and continuity that Paul narrates together in ways contemporary biblical scholarship has not. Finally, chapter 5 engages questions of justification and merit in the context of the New Law. Skaff argues that the divide between Barth and Aquinas on this issue does not pertain to divine and human action (a typical assumption in these debates), but about how divine justice is accomplished: Christ's justification *extra nos* (Barth) versus the justification and sanctification of the individual through the Holy Spirit (Aquinas). This latter point, as it pertains to pneumatology, is worth exploring further within and between Catholic and Reformed traditions more generally and could yield interesting potential for ecumenical dialogue.

Considering this shared ground between Barth and Aquinas, two questions remain for this reviewer. First, can this moral grammar of divine justice and mercy contribute to our understanding of actual divergences between these thinkers? For example, does the reality of, or lack thereof, of natural knowledge of God (or *analogia entis*) say something about their shared understanding of God's mercy and justice (or vice versa)? Or should the differences be explained and understood in light of other commitments, not shared between these thinkers? Second, if there is agreement between Aquinas on law and Barth on election and command, one wonders how the mediation of law and divine command figures into this. Is Aquinas's belief that angels are the mediating agents of the Old Law between God and humanity compatible with Barth's own beliefs about angelology and divine command? These critical questions are meant only to expand and evaluate the scope of this important book, which is a welcome clarification of actual differences and convergences between Barth and Aquinas and an excellent contribution to constructive and ecumenical theology.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000510

William Greenway, *Reasonable Faith for a Post-Secular Age: Open Christian Spirituality and Ethics*

(Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2022), pp. xii + 215. \$28.00.

Martha Moore-Keish

Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA, USA (moore-keishm@ctsnet.edu)

In this powerful collection of essays, William Greenway sharpens the moral clarion call that he has been sounding for the past decade. With unflinching eye, he describes the

economic and environmental crises threatening our global community, and he summons all humans to deploy faith and reason together to address these challenges. Greenway seeks to render visible a simple truth: many people across the globe agree on what is reasonable and good, and this shared understanding is grounded in common understanding of a 'spiritual dimension of reality' (p. 2). 'I believe we' (here he means not only leaders in the world's faith traditions, but also secular 'atheist' critics of religion) 'actually share substantial spiritual and ethical common ground, and I am interested in finding a positive way forward' (p. 9).

Greenway is not arguing for human effort alone as the path to repair the world. His approach is grounded in moral realism: the conviction that there is a force beyond us, not of our own making, that seizes us with agape. As a Christian theologian, Greenway is ready to call this 'God', but he is not invested in defending that term for all people. Rather, he is invested in the conviction that there is something Real that grounds us and binds us together, if we consent to it.

In his lucid introduction to the volume, Greenway traces the evolution of the contemporary philosophical landscape, beginning with the Enlightenment and ending with the inadequacy of modern western 'secular' thinking. He notes that this inadequacy is visible in thinkers like Gayatri Spivak, who is reaching for something beyond 'secular reason', but without recourse to religious/spiritual reality. While many in the West now recognise the problems of a simple Enlightenment appeal to natural reason, many thinkers (even, Greenway laments, the analytic philosopher Richard Rorty) remain convinced that we can distinguish between 'religious' and 'secular' reasoning, maintaining an outdated Enlightenment suspicion of 'religion'. It is this suspicion that Greenway seeks to address.

In addition to his concern about lingering 'secular thinking', Greenway critiques the sectarian fragmentation that arises from postmodern relativism. Despite the extensive resources of the world's faith traditions, Greenway describes ours as an age of dangerous sectarianism that is unable to address the integrated and oppressive global systems that drive towards profit for the few. In 'A Time for Prophets? Non-Sectarian Affirmation of Particularities and Universal Morality', Greenway illumines the practical dangers of such sectarianism. After describing the skyrocketing cost of EpiPens because of global market forces, he laments, 'postmodern stress on the discrete identities of diverse communities has been resulting in a sectarian fragmentation that leaves all these discrete communities enfeebled in the face of global economic forces' (p. 198).

Greenway avers that recognition of common religious and spiritual ground could actually help us address such sectarian intolerance. In a particularly lyrical passage, he describes the agape that grounds human experience:

while our reactions vary according to context, in both horrific and joyful contexts we are seized by the same reality, by the same passionate concern for others. This is a passion, a love, a concern that is not from us, not a product of any decision on our part (though we might harden our hearts), not a product of our desires. It is most fully and accurately described as a passion not from us that seizes us for others. This is what Christians call agape... (p. 17)

There is much to celebrate in this volume. Greenway offers sophisticated engagement with complicated philosophical arguments; this is no glib claim that we are all really up to the same thing. His thesis emerges from decades of conversation with western analytic philosophy, driven by an ethical passion shaped by his own Christian evangelical roots. For instance, he argues, against Jeffrey Stout, that social justice movements

‘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