Christian scholar has found a more satisfactory resolution to the origin of sin. Yet, the physical evidence clearly indicates that the human body evolved from an earlier form. But he argues that "the Book of Nature (science) need not bow down every time they disagree" and that "Christianity does not need an inerrant Bible."

Reviewed by Alfred R. Martin, Professor of Biological Sciences, Benedictine University, Lisle, IL 60532.

Science and Religion

REASON AND WONDER: Why Science and Faith Need Each Other by Eric Priest, ed. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2017. 224 pages. Paperback; $14.95. ISBN: 9781599475264.

The book *Reason and Wonder* consists of thirteen chapters, each of which arose for the most part out of the James Gregory public lectures on science and religion at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, funded by the John Templeton Foundation. The chapters are on diverse subjects relating science and religion. The topics in the book address the question: Do science and religion need each other? Of course, being a Templeton-funded project, the answer in every case is, in some sense, yes.

The first chapter, by Eric Priest, the editor of the volume, is an introduction to the general problem of relating science and religion. It stresses that science and religion are not at war, invoking Ian Barbour's taxonomy of the relation between the two. After that, there are chapters on the New Atheism (by Keith Ward), natural law and reductionism (Eleonore Stump), the origin and end of the universe (David Wilkinson), the universe of wonder (Jennifer Wiseman), evolution, faith and science (Kenneth R. Miller), evolution and evil (Michael J. Murray and Jeff Schloss), "Is there more to life than genes?" (Pauline Rudd), psychology and science (David G. Myers), being a person and neuroscience (John Wyatt), science, spirituality and health (John Swinton), miracles in science (Mark Harris), and "Can a scientist trust the New Testament?" (N. T. Wright). For readers of *PSCF*, many of the authors and much of the ground covered will be familiar, even if written from a slightly different slant.

Given the breadth of the book, this review will focus on a few of the essays, and respond critically to two others.

In his chapter, Keith Ward questions how plausible it is for the New Atheists to believe that the universe started from a quantum fluctuation in a preexisting quantum vacuum. If true, it would seem to suggest that the quantum vacuum must be eternal. This would mean that the universe depends upon a timeless reality beyond itself. But how could this possibly fit within scientific explanation? It would seem that this is no more scientific than asserting that a timeless God created the universe. Furthermore, to quote Ward, "Belief in God is rational, because it is based on our knowledge that consciousness and intentional agency are fundamental features of reality" (p. 45). In other words, not all relevant evidence is testable in the scientific sense. Ward points out three basic problems with the arguments of Richard Dawkins. First, it is sheer dogma to deny that consciousness could arise in any other way than through a long evolutionary process. Second, Dawkins argues that the universe of simple elements is more probable than the complex mind that God represents. But, again, this is a dogmatic assertion with no scientific foundation. Third, the idea that there needs to be an explanation for God is no greater a problem than the need to explain a universe that exists in and of itself. In summary, Ward suggests that

> the final irony is that it is belief in a rational God that makes science possible, whereas in an atheistic universe it is a complete surprise that there is any rational structure to the universe, or that human reason can make any sense of it. (p. 53)

Eleonore Stump provides a critique of the "secularist scientific picture" (SSP), which, she says, is a reductionism of everything to the laws of physics. Her claim is that "research in various areas is making inroads against some parts of this view" (p. 54). While noting that it is highly counterintuitive that such things as love, fidelity, creativity, and the progress of science could come out of such a reductionist view, she contrasts that view with the scholastic view of natural law. In the latter view, "natural law is a participation on the part of a human person in the eternal law in the mind of God" (p. 56). She goes on to say that the challenge for SSP is "the construction of the personal out of the impersonal" (p. 58). Some examples illustrate further problems, for instance, protein folding (the function of which depends on structure), and the dependence of an infant on a caregiver to allow for proper development. The essay concludes, "The rejection of reductionism leaves room for the place ordinary intuition accords persons in the world" (p. 63).

Perhaps my favorite essay was the one by Murray and Schloss entitled "Evolution and Evil." This chapter offered an argument on the problem of evil, borrowing a page from the book of skeptical theism. The first step is to recognize that one does not need evolutionary theory in order to observe that

there is apparent evil in nature—as this would have been evident before Darwin. The claim the authors wish to challenge is that since evil in nature exists for no good reason, therefore God does not exist. Rather than apply a direct argument, the authors suggest that all we really need is a good explanation of evil that is true "for all we know" (p. 101). A good explanation "makes it clear that the evil that is permitted is a necessary condition for the occurrence of an outweighing good" (p. 101). After dismissing some popular explanations they regard as weak, the authors offer two explanations that comport well with the scientific story. One relates to our lack of understanding of animal consciousness; the other reasons that the possibility of law-like regularity, producing beings such as us, would necessarily require the kind of history that we see from remnants past.

Space does not permit me to summarize the book further, but I do want to raise a couple of questions about a few of the other essays in the volume. To start with, Myers's article raises a number of issues related to religiosity and psychology, with several of the points not well supported by the data. For example, with little evidential support, Myers states that sexual orientation is "natural," that is, largely biologically influenced. The problem is what is meant here by "natural." Conditions such as substance abuse can have genetic components as well. Would we then say that they are "natural" too, and therefore acceptable, or would we recognize that the world is broken because of the Fall and interpret them in light of that? This is reminiscent of Abraham Kuyper and his "two sciences." If creation is fallen, then we must take that into account in our explanations. It follows that there is no such thing as a category called "natural" that allows us to conclude that what appears in nature can be judged simply as part of the "good." Myers tells us he comes out of the "Reformed and ever reforming" tradition, but perhaps his "ever reforming" in this case has gone too far.

Swinton's essay also suffers from some surprising misunderstandings. When I read that he thought his methods for studying spirituality and health ("randomized control variables, statistical analyses and modes of research that follow the principles of falsifiability, generalization and replicability") were the measure of why he thought the research should be considered "hard science," I was taken aback. As anyone who does research in the hard sciences knows, it is not that the methods make the conclusions reliable. It is rather the constricted subject matter of the investigation that is so constraining as to qualify as "hard science." This does not lend confidence to the conclusions Swinton draws from his investigation.

In light of the criticisms noted above, the reader should realize that the quality of the book's essays is variable; some are more substantial, others less so. Who would find the book of interest? Anyone who is following the writings of particular authors in this collection might like to pursue their essays. Beyond that, those who do not have a substantial background in the issues involved may find the essays as a whole an interesting introductory read. However, as many of the edited Templeton volumes seem to be, I would suggest that there is little here that one cannot find in more depth elsewhere.

Reviewed by Donald Petcher, Department of Physics, Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, GA 30750.

MY SEARCH FOR RAMANUJAN: How I Learned to Count by Ken Ono and Amir D. Aczel. Switzerland: Springer, 2016. 238 pages. Hardcover; $29.99. ISBN: 9783319255668.

"But what does a mathematician actually *do*?" It is still as likely as not that the lay person who asks this question will be pointed, first of all, to G. H. Hardy's *A Mathematician's Apology*, first published in 1940. In the third paragraph of that elegant but elegiac work,