

Part 3, *Evil and Evolution*, addresses questions of why God is not culpable for animal suffering in pre-human history and why God employed violent means of creating; it highlights a variety of avenues available to affirm God's goodness in light of prehuman suffering. Only-way theodicies dominate: they include Rosenberg's view that death and decay are necessary marks of a finite world, Vince Vitale's "non-identity theodicy" (based on the idea that the existence of individuals alive today is contingent on past suffering), and Christopher Southgate's argument that the values of this world come at the expense of its disvalues. Michael Lloyd provides the only substantive free will defense, which attributes a cosmic Fall to free angelic beings, and Richard Swinburne offers an Irenaean soul-making theodicy which argues that the finite amount of suffering God allows us to endure is outweighed by the goodness of the soul-making opportunities it provides.

Part 3 benefits from the way contributors highlight lingering concerns in each other's models. Lloyd's chapter "Theodicy, Fall, and Adam" is exemplary: from only-way theodicies Lloyd calls for better defense of the unique creativity of violence, and from Augustinian nonbeing approaches he calls for a better defense of the inability of God to counteract creation's tendency toward nonbeing now if God will do so post-eschaton. However, since the format of the book does not facilitate intra-book responses, such challenges remain unaddressed. Moreover, editorial content and many contributors assume that prehuman suffering is "evil," and, although some contributors disagree, this assumption is unfortunately never explicitly contested. Nevertheless, part 3 concludes the book in a helpful way: it outlines potential solutions to concerns about evil and the goodness of creation that are discussed throughout the book.

In conclusion, part 1 provides defenses of four models of imaging—sometimes at the expense of discussion concerning human uniqueness, origins, and telos. Part 2 successfully provides a multifaceted discussion on the origins, transmission, and universality of sin. And part 3 offers theodicies that illuminate various directions forward; it also raises many unanswered questions. Ultimately, bringing a representative selection of views to the table—more so than novel ideas—is the function of this book. Editorial contributions unify *Finding Ourselves after Darwin* as an accessible, well-assembled exploration of truth. Editors, and sometimes contributors, offer epistemological guidance and identify fruitful avenues for future exploration, making the discussion one that uniquely moves the reader forward in their search for truth. Interaction between contributors, when present, adds richness to the discussion but is not consistent throughout the book. *Finding Ourselves after Darwin* is further unified by a commitment to the doctrinal core that is accompanied by various degrees of flexibility concerning the retention of theological theories that have grown up around certain doctrines.

Finding Ourselves after Darwin will help undergraduate students, pastors, and other informed Christians pursue a coherent and scientifically informed faith.

Reviewed by Charlotte Combrink, Religious Studies at Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

READING GENESIS WELL: Navigating History, Poetry, Science, and Truth in Genesis 1-11 by C. John Collins. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2018. 336 pages. Paperback; \$36.99. ISBN: 9780310598572.

C. John Collins makes judicious use of C.S. Lewis throughout his book and offers a reading of the early chapters of Genesis that seeks to avoid both an ahistorical fundamentalist interpretation and a dismissive scientism that views Genesis as bad science by ignorant people. Collins identifies himself as a "religious traditionalist," and he seeks to read Genesis in ways that take seriously the original context of the author and first readers of the text. In doing so, he makes more evident the real meaning of Genesis as a rival creation story to other creation stories circulating at that time in the ancient near East. Collins has a twofold goal.

The first is to provide guidance to those who want to consider how these Bible passages relate to the findings of the sciences. The second is to establish patterns of good theological reading, patterns applicable to other texts. (p. 32)

Collins emphasizes quite rightly that to interpret a text correctly it is important to consider the context. It is context that determines whether the words, "I'm going to kill you" are a lethal threat to life or the joking retort of a friend. Genesis is not trying to do contemporary science, so to read Genesis as opposed to or in support of contemporary science is to rip Genesis from its ancient context in terms of both its literary form and its world view. The story of Genesis is not trying and failing to answer contemporary scientific questions; rather, the story of Genesis is emphasizing that, "all human beings have a common origin, a common predicament, and a common need to know God and have God's image restored in them" (p. 113).

We can understand what Genesis truly means by putting Genesis back into its ancient context. As Collins notes, "I take the purpose of Genesis to begin with opposing the origin stories of other ancient peoples by telling of one true God who made heaven and earth ..." (p. 137). Once Genesis is put back into its context, we can better appreciate the genre of the work. The language of Genesis is not scientific but poetic. Collins notes that we can communicate truths using different kinds of language. In ordinary language, we say, "You are beautiful." In scientific language, we might say, "You exhibit visible signs of youth, health, fertility, and symmetry." In poetic language, we could say, "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day? Thou art more lovely and more temperate: Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May, And summer's lease hath all too

Book Reviews

short a date." Imagine someone who got out a weather almanac, looked up the speed of winds last May, and replied, "Last May, the winds were unseasonably calm. No rough winds at all. Shakespeare was horrible at correctly noting the weather! What a dunce!" Of course, in writing Sonnet 18, Shakespeare was not trying and failing to compose an accurate weather report. The Bard's purposes, genre, and context are entirely different than meteorology. So, too, Genesis is not trying and failing to provide a scientific account of the origin of sun, moon, and stars—or man. To fault Genesis as a bad science is like faulting Shakespeare as a bad weather man. Collins correctly notes, "To call Genesis 'science,' whether ancient or modern is an enormous literary confusion" (p. 279).

So, if Genesis is not failing to be good science, since it is not even attempting to do science, what is Genesis about? The Genesis account is a correction to the rival stories of the ancient world. Genesis holds, in contrast to the pagan myths, that the sun, moon, and stars are not gods. The heavenly bodies exist to serve humans, to mark time. The idea that nature is not a god is an idea of signal importance, for if the created order is not divine, then the door is open for science to dissect and examine the secrets of nature. Genesis steers a middle course between a radical environmentalism (worshiping nature as divine) and a radical anti-environmentalism (domineering of nature as worthless material).

The role of humankind is also made more plain by contrasting Genesis with rival stories. Collins notes,

In the Mesopotamian stories the gods made humankind to do the work they do not wish to do, but they regret their action and decide to eliminate humanity because people have multiplied and become so noisy that the gods cannot rest (which was their original goal in making man). (p. 190)

How unlike the God of Abraham who urges human beings to be fruitful and multiply. The Greek poet Hesiod wrote, "Zeus who thunders on high made women to be an evil to mortal men, with a nurture to do evil." By contrast, Genesis proclaims both man and woman to be made in the image and likeness of God. Both man and woman fall to the serpent's temptation. Both man and woman are cared for by God after the Fall.

Reading Genesis Well is a good book, and it could be made even better. At times, there is a great deal of windup before the pitch. At other times, there is needless repetition. For example, Collins writes, "The creation narrative portrays the sun, moon, and stars as makers for the (liturgical) seasons. They are servants to help humankind worship the Maker, not masters themselves worthy of human worship" (p. 293). This is a great point, but the point is made at least three times in the text.

The organization of the text could be improved in places. For example, when Collins quotes Rudolf

Bultmann's famous assertion, "It is impossible to use the electric light and the wireless [radio] and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of spirits and miracles," he does not respond to this assertion until pages later.

In places, not just form but substance can be improved. Collins quotes with approval James Packer saying, "The church no more created the canon [of scripture] than Newton created the law of gravity; recognition is not creation." But this is not quite right. The New Testament was written by early leaders of the church, such as Paul, Mark, Luke, Matthew, and John. It was the Council of Rome (p. 382) that fixed the biblical canon which was in some state of flux until then. The New Testament arose from the leaders of the early church and was cast into its current form by the leaders of the patristic church. That is much more than a mere recognition. Collins touches on the monogenism-polygenism question but does not address the dispute at sufficient length.

None of these quibbles should deter readers from profiting from Collins's research. *Reading Genesis Well* can indeed help us better understand one of the most ancient, most important, and most influential texts of all time.

Reviewed by Christopher Kaczor, Professor of Philosophy, Loyola Marymount University, 1 LMU Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045.

OLD-EARTH OR EVOLUTIONARY CREATION? Discussing Origins with Reasons to Believe and BioLogos by Kenneth Keathley, J. B. Stump, and Joe Aguirre, eds. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2017. 256 pages. Paperback; \$28.00. ISBN: 9780830852925.

In *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation? Discussing Origins with Reasons to Believe and BioLogos*, the main question comes down to, "When science and faith appear to conflict, how is the apparent conflict navigated?" In other words, which gives in and changes first, scriptural interpretation or acceptance of scientific findings? We (the reviewers) hold different opinions about several of the debates and specific arguments outlined in this book. Dr. Vukov is a philosopher and practicing Roman Catholic while Dr. Burns is an agnostic atheist and a molecular biologist. Our take on issues at the intersection of science and religion is bound to be divergent.

The book is structured as a dialogue between the two aforementioned groups, Reasons to Believe (RTB) and BioLogos, and is moderated by members of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC). The chapters each focus on a particular aspect of the science surrounding evolution and how the debating groups respond to or critique the science and/or integrate it into their faiths.

Who are BioLogos and RTB? Both groups have similar mission statements. BioLogos "invites the church and the world to see the harmony between science and