

For example, in the section regarding analog community, the author takes an extended look at the list of the first disciples in Matthew 10:2-4. He pays particular attention to the unique descriptors for two of them: Matthew, a tax collector; and Simon, a zealot. These two would have been bitter enemies, yet we read nothing of the animosity that would have existed between them. There was something, a force, contained in their leader that was much stronger than their own histories and opinions of one another. Kim later notes that there is the need for this kind of communal relationship, as

The digital age has disconnected and detached us from one another in ways completely unique to our current moment in history. True analog community is what the world is hungry for, whether they know it or not. (p.113)

The author is certainly no luddite. He applauds the use of digital technology when properly focused. He himself lives in the heart of Silicon Valley, and, in many ways, he has been at the cutting edge of digital technology and its use in the church. He is the lead pastor of teaching at WestGate Church in the same area, and until recently was teacher-in-residence at Vintage Faith Church in Santa Cruz. He cohosts *The Regeneration Podcast*. He has a very useful website (jaykimthinks.com), and he makes himself readily available via Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook. All this is to say that Jay Kim has considerable credibility concerning the subject matter of this book. In fact, on the March 22, 2020, version of Regeneration Podcast, there is a specific commentary about the book, with some pandemic perspective as well. One of the book's phrases which is featured in the podcast discussion is "the temptation to pursue relevance at any cost." The podcast is a good resource for those considering getting the book.

ASA/CSCA members might well be wondering if the book is primarily for pastors and church leaders (which group, of course, includes a number of our members). As for those involved with the scientific endeavor, there are also some worthy considerations. This reviewer has long considered scientific activity as a form of worship, and the work of the ASA as an important ministry in itself. Many of the warnings that Jay Kim provides in his book can be easily transferred to those who share the importance of a vital science and faith relationship. In fact, it is about relationship. Digital "spectacle" may be a useful and inspiring aspect of short-term events and conferences, but the purpose of both church and our individual witness is quite different. It requires an analog approach, enhanced by a subtle and reflective use of technology which builds upon the purpose of churches and congregations, but does not replace it. In conclusion, I would recommend this book to ASA members interested in how digital technology shapes the church.

Reviewed by Bob Geddes, a geologist and minister (retired) in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Hamilton, ON L9A 4Y2.

DIVINE ACTION AND THE HUMAN MIND by Sarah Lane Ritchie. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 373 pages. Hardcover; \$120.00. ISBN: 9781108476515.

Imagine a medieval castle within which rests not one but two keeps. One keep is tall and strong, seemingly impenetrable. The other, short, rather shabby, and in some disrepair. For years, the inhabitants of the shabby keep have tried to communicate with the strong tower. They have built bridges, thrown ropes, shot arrows with messages, all to no avail. One day, it is discovered that both keeps rest on the same foundation, and that foundation has passageways from one tower to the other. The possibility of communication is free and open, always has been, but the blueprints were lost, so no one knew. In the discussion of science and theology, much has been made of the power and regularity of the laws of nature and the belief that the laws stand free of theological influence. The laws are the tall keep, protecting the august authority of the scientific method. Theologians often lose heart before the keep's thick walls, retreating to their rather shabby tower. Sarah Lane Ritchie argues that we are just discovering the shared foundation between the two keeps and that theology need not quake at the foot of the tall tower. There have been, all along, the resources in theology to show how the two keeps are related.

Ritchie's work focuses on the recent past, and argues for a "theological turn" in divine action theorizing. She notes the influence of the Divine Action Project (held over the course of 15 years, ending in 2003), most of whose publications found themselves searching for a "causal joint" where the power of God to act could touch the created world without interfering with the laws of nature. Theologians have been wary to question the power and correctness of the metaphysical foundations of those laws. The result manifests itself in three key beliefs: (1) noninterventionism (God doesn't or can't intervene in the working of the laws of nature); (2) incompatibilism (God and nature cannot both cause the same events); and (3) prescriptive accounts of the laws of nature. These key beliefs summarize the "standard model." Ritchie takes on the standard model through considering the work of Philip Clayton as well as the "hard problem" (of consciousness) theorists who reject the notion that mind can be reduced to nature (or at least to the material or the physical). Ultimately, she ferrets out the areas in which those in the science and religion field appeal to a nonphysical account of the human mind, where God can work without interfering with the laws of nature. Ritchie's approach is both historical and philosophical; her exegetical work is solid, showing where various theorists stand in the midst of the standard model, and how their views sometimes make unwarranted assumptions or have unwanted implications.

Her thesis is that the "theological turn" in recent accounts of God/world interaction can overcome the

Book Reviews

standard model, giving theology something closer to equal footing with science. There is a shared foundation. Ritchie defends the possibility of interactionism, compatibilism, and a more descriptive account of natural laws. She even proposes that the mind could be entirely natural, perhaps even purely physical, and yet fully rooted in divinity. God can interact with the natural world, not through some nonnatural causal joint but, first, because it is infused with the divine via God's immanence; second, divine and natural causation of the same events are compatible because the two sorts of events are not truly separable; and third, the laws of nature should be understood as describing what happens rather than telling us what must happen. She approaches the theological turn through contemporary Thomistic "double agent" theory, an Orthodox "incarnationalism," (Ritchie calls it a "naturalistic panentheism,") and a new emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in charismatic theology. In each case, but especially the latter two, Ritchie finds evidence of a broadening of the notion of what counts as natural that allows the human mind to be entirely part of the natural world, falling under natural law, and noting that the natural law is not separable (in a variety of ways, depending on which divine action theorists are considering) from divine activity.

As such, Ritchie traces out the theological turn in recent work on divine action, placing her essay in the Current Issues in Theology series, part of whose goal is to present state-of-the-art work with original insights for upper-level undergraduates and graduate students, as well as for Christian teachers and church professionals. The book certainly fulfills those goals. Ritchie deals with a mountain of research from the last 50 years, and does so with pluck, generosity of mind, and honesty. Her presentation of complex and difficult theories is clear and understandable without talking down to the audience or skimming over details.

Few books are without some problems, however. I will note what seem to me two weaknesses in an otherwise fine book. The first is Ritchie's seeming confusion of historical developments and philosophical arguments. I wondered why the mere fact that certain theories have come from the theological turn is a reason to think those theories true. While Ritchie does present a good deal of critical assessment of both the standard model and the work coming out of the theological turn (and those assessments are both balanced and fair), it was not clear to me why a person should accept the theological turn as moving us toward truth. That a proposal comes to the table in history is not a reason to believe it. That one should reject the standard model, yes. But that the alternative is right? Not so much. To be fair, Ritchie doesn't claim the latter to be true (but something closer akin to "possible"). However, there is the subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) claim that there has been this historical shift and, therefore, the new models are superior. Perhaps, however, this sort of confusion

between historical and philosophical viewpoints is difficult to avoid in a book in this series. It is a tall order to give account of new, and fairly recent, major shifts in thought, no matter how original the new paradigms may be.

The second question (and I admit to having no good solution myself) is the account of what is "natural." Ritchie is aware of the slippery nature of the term, along with its sister "supernatural." Perhaps the terms have outlived their usefulness. If there is a shared foundation between theology and science, why the separation of natural and supernatural? I was reminded of Irenaeus's work *On the Incarnation* as well as the following quotation from G. K. Chesterton:

Because children have abounding vitality, because they are in spirit fierce and free, therefore they want things repeated and unchanged. They always say, "Do it again"; and the grown-up person does it again until he is nearly dead. For grown-up people are not strong enough to exult in monotony. But perhaps God is strong enough to exult in monotony. It is possible that God says every morning, "Do it again" to the sun; and every evening, "Do it again" to the moon. It may not be automatic necessity that makes all daisies alike; it may be that God makes every daisy separately, but has never got tired of making them. It may be that He has the eternal appetite of infancy; for we have sinned and grown old, and our Father is younger than we.

Concerning Irenaeus's take on the incarnation along with Chesterton's reflection: both point to the theological turn in the science and religion field. Perhaps natural laws don't exist at all in the ways scientists and philosophers of science have generally thought of them. It is just that we have grown older than God's love of monotony. When, to spice things up, I throw a curve at my youngest child when re-reading, for the hundredth time, his favorite book, and replace a monotonous word with an alternative, laughter breaks out. The joy is present on his six-year old face. So, perhaps, with God. Perhaps the divinity reads new words into the story now and again, just to keep a smile on our faces. Perhaps the laws are not fixed "in nature" but in God's intention, and the divine is surely free to throw us a curve. The theological turn, it seems, begins to redeem the role of theology in science and religion discussions by recognizing that science is not itself divine, any more than is theology. Both are human constructs out of our experience of the natural and the mystical, and they should have something closer to an equal footing in the human intellectual project. Perhaps, indeed, the keep of theology is not merely on the same footing as the keep of science but is just as tall and strong. It may, however, take time to convince the inhabitants of both keeps to move toward a more inclusive view.

Reviewed by Mark S. McLeod-Harrison, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, George Fox University, Newberg, OR 97132. ⇔