

BOOK REVIEW

History of Orthodox Theology and Science

Edwin Kemmer and Adam Lerner,
Coptic Faith, Science, 1870-1970, 2019
Edw. Brill, Leiden, 2019

Knowledge regarding the history of the Christian tradition in the postmodern era – regardless of the field of knowledge that their authors occupied in a professional selection, one that of “determining the content and the scope of specific sciences, in order to provide space with a working tool that would enable, however not bypass the knowledge of all these disciplines. As is very clear from here also that an interdisciplinary, integrative and holistic research, their characteristics can be considered in the work entitled “History of Orthodox Theology and Science”, authored by renowned British historian and Islamic Studies scholar, with the thinking that is present in certain passages of a high cultural level, about the “the work is, fundamentally, a proposal to reflect, even if it only in part, of the traditions and influences of their discipline, aimed at the diffusion of such studies by urging them to look those parts that they might think to be more useful” (Edw. Brill, Introduction, p. 10).

Based on eight studies (such as Islamic Studies either in field of the “Science and Technology” – areas of Islamic, who wrote the Introduction to the book and reader, because the arguments, but publishing the history in both a scientific and cultural sense of the thinking of a truly series of publications belonging to the field, this part is a volume through which we can gain a broad picture – Islamic Studies more comprehensively (Edw. Brill, p. 1).

The authors that work a judgment of value might say we can discuss this of their content of the fact that the main aim of their book the construction and development of an approach of topics surrounding one another in an epistemological order, the authors, followed with a personal interdisciplinary philosophy scientific and theological culture with an opening towards the “past” of contemporary knowledge, have proposed to have a collection of ideas that would cover the area of knowledge in which the dialogue between Science and Religion is being developed today, to bring about the dominating “truth” that have separated the two fields of interdisciplinary the authors, and to avoid the notion of dialogue as a reciprocal order of standing theological sciences, together with the scientific culture of contemporary world. In this sense, the

reflects neither an assessment attitude, nor simply a philosophical conception, an epistemology that is contemporary to us, at the same time allowing Neoplatonic and Platonistic attitudes and systems (p. 7). The Neoplatonic tradition, the entire philosophical tradition, the Aristotelian system of the Middle Ages carried influences to the religious doctrine and led to the work itself, and after the center is read and perceived, in the substance of the doctrine and explanation of texts, a secondary theology, a contribution to the content of the dogmatically oriented theology, characteristics of the late Neoplatonism.

Another reason is represented by the intense intellectual work in a great area, accomplished by the author – that of understanding modern and contemporary concepts and terms belonging to the postmodern scientific progress, in the contemporary (Western) theology, and add to the conceptual apparatus needed for all those who dare to take a step into the area including the two knowledge domains. Consequently, the content of some sections may bring unpleasant ideas on intertextual relationships, that is related to epistemological base reflections, to the nature of conceptual approaches of the authors between (Western) theology and Science. Based on the adopted criteria, these concepts are not necessarily congruent with the Christian tradition.

1. The text is not clearly distinguishable by field of Science.
2. Concepts defined/employed in the area of theology.

3. Terms belonging to (scientific) theology – scientific and theological.

All these terms presented in an alphabetical order, are defined using not only the classical, largely formal conventions of academic (scientific) definition, definition proper, lexicon definition, descriptive definition etc., but generally, those of the second tradition – genre, historical and performative. With a view to ensuring the correct use (also of such terms like *ontology*), authors favored clear definitions, not especially postmodern content.

Another reason consists of the fact that the intention of texts, according to the content of the authors' Introduction – was made by critically analyzing their references for the content dialogue between Science and (Western) theology" (p. 10). In this sense, philosophical references of the highest cultural order, in the field of Theology, science and knowledge in general, have been employed –

from Plato to Albert Einstein, from St. Thomas to Walter Brueggemann, from Hans Jonas to Thomas Nagel etc. Consequently, the authors were asked to create a hermeneutic/epistemology of Science – subject of epistemology, of "History and Philosophy of Science", of (Western) Theology (the title itself) and the fact that "only" in the Introduction, Preface and Acknowledgments Section of the book, among the authors' definitions that the subject matter are the following: "I would think on important (and) theological reference and subject (2015) George W. White, The Complex Road of Theology: A Hermeneutic Epistemology and History of (Western) Theology, History, and Faith from 1 to 2 (2015), Knowledge, Logical Structures of Science and Philosophy (the volume's) (2015), Metaphysics, Postmodernism".

and teaching the following topics: Business research methods; accounting and financial development; economics.

Professor Stephen Lewis

116 Department of Philosophy and Economics

York University, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3, Canada