communicate his redemptive plan. Thus, the interpreter should yield to Israel's concepts, conventions, and philosophies on the way to understanding the message before they move to appropriation for theological discourse. Nevertheless, several elements in *The Bible and Ancient Science* could be fine tuned. These include Lamoureux's framing of the discussion of translating Genesis 1:1 (pp. 75–81) as a text-critical issue, when it is more of a translation problem. Lamoureux also presents a generic, almost flat, portrait of the classic criticisms of biblical studies (e.g., textual criticism, literary criticism, historical criticism) that does not support a nuanced understanding of their results for the creation texts.

A little more significant is Lamoureux's understanding of Paul's typological argument in Romans 5. He struggles with the possibility that Paul's argument appears historical in nature. He states,

> As a consequence, Paul undoubtedly believed Adam was a historical person and that the events of Genesis 2–3 really happened. However, it must be emphasized that Paul's belief in the reality of Adam and the events in the Garden of Eden does not necessarily mean they are historical. (p. 175)

Thus, he is forced to wrestle with the implications of his argument as it confronts the semantics of the text. He may well have been influenced by Enns in how he tries to navigate this, but a difficult tension remains (Peter Enns, *The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn't Say about Human Origins* [2012]). For Lamoureux, and Enns for that matter, it is difficult to advocate a framework-like typology which usually interprets historical figures in the context of history as, in this instance, functioning with a significant level of historical ignorance.

A deeper commitment to comparative investigations would also have enhanced Lamoureux's argument. He is certainly aware of non-Israelite texts and how they help us understand the concepts, conventions, and message of the biblical text, for he references them in his discussions of worldview and ancient conceptions of the universe. However, reading Genesis 1–2 in the shadow of texts such as the "Enuma Elish" and the "Memphite Theology" crystalizes the form and function of the genre as well as the Old Testament's theological emphases.

Nevertheless, overall Lamoureux gets far more right than wrong and this work is valuable. It makes potentially complicated concepts accessible and applies them to the very important debate about what "inerrant" means when describing the nature of scripture.

Reviewed by David B. Schreiner, Associate Dean and Associate Professor of Old Testament, Wesley Biblical Seminary, Ridgeland, MS 39157.

History of Science

THE WATERS ABOVE THE FIRMAMENT: An Exemplary Case of Faith-Reason Conflict by Dino Boccaletti. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2020. 136 pages. Hardcover; $99.99. ISBN: 9783030441678. Paperback; $69.99. ISBN: 9783030441685.

The Waters Above the Firmament is a fascinating tour through the exegetical history of an offbeat subject: the waters above the firmament. In both popular and scholarly conversations about science and religion, a few subjects tend to dominate the landscape, with the topic of origins dominating the conversation since Darwin's day. Interestingly, however, the "waters above the firmament" references have been largely overlooked, even though they bear on the cosmology and view of creation held by biblical authors. In this volume, physicist Dino Boccaletti takes readers through an in-depth tour of how these passages have been understood by Christian exegetes from the early centuries of the Christian era through the seventeenth century.

The driving question tackled by the exegetes is how to understand the following verses from the first chapter of the book of Genesis:

> And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day. (Gen. 1:6–8, KJV)

In the history of exegesis of this passage (and others that build on it, such as Psalm 148:4, "Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens"), many different theories about its meaning have been put forward. In our own day, those familiar with the young-earth creation (YEC) movement may have heard a bit of exegesis of this passage from a peculiarly YEC point of view. In their hands, it is sometimes understood to teach that the earth was surrounded by a canopy of water that made the whole world a paradise and reduced the harmful effects of the sun, enabling people to live the centuries-long lives described in Genesis. The canopy was

then collapsed to become the source of the waters that flooded the earth in the days of Noah.

Boccaletti does not address that claim. Instead, he presents a historical overview that marches chronologically through the works of classical, medieval, and early modern commentators, trying to interpret a claim that seems to be plainly contradictory to common sense: that there is a shell of water surrounding the earth, or maybe the whole cosmos. While there was no definitive scientific refutation of this view in either the classical or medieval world, its *prima facie* implausibility nevertheless led to a persistent apparent conflict between faith and reason that needed to be contended with if the Bible's authority was to remain intact. There is also the thorny question of uncovering the cosmology that gave rise to such a description, along with its background in extra-biblical writings.

Boccaletti describes the first few centuries of Christianity, during which there were primarily three approaches to understanding the passage in question. First, it could be allegorized so that the waters were representative of something else, such as exalted spiritual beings who worship God. The second approach was to accept something like an ancient Near Eastern belief that the earth is shaped like a flat disc, and add the literal claim that there is an aqueous shell above it. The third, and most difficult, was to try to reconcile Greek cosmology with the claim about the waters. Incorporating the Greek picture, which posited a spherical earth at the center of the cosmos, led to the most creative, and sometimes convoluted, interpretive schemes. For example, Boccaletti brings us into Augustine's discussion about a theory that the waters above the firmament are held in place by God in order to cool and slow down the movement of the outer planets, which would otherwise overheat owing to their great velocities. Thus the waters above the firmament might serve to temper the heat of the empyrean. While many exegetes in the first millennium would also endorse this view or a variation on it, some thinkers, such as John Scotus Eriugena, would deny that such waters existed at all. No consensus was reached during the Middle Ages about which of these approaches was superior.

Boccaletti describes the increasing pressure to abandon the geocentric model owing to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century astronomers such as Copernicus and Galileo, and how those theories in astronomy were received by interpreters of the Bible. For reasons unrelated to science, Protestant thinkers such as Luther and Calvin began to consult sources outside the Latin interpretive tradition, most significantly the Hebrew text in which Genesis was originally written. Both men considered it vital to embrace the highest possible view of biblical authority, and inclined toward believing the waters were just that: waters, held in place in the heavenlies by a mysterious work of God. Allegories were rejected, as was the burgeoning heliocentrism of the day. Catholic interpreters of the period such as Benedictus Pererius and David Pareus also turned back to the Hebrew text, freeing themselves from the strictures of the Latin Vulgate of Jerome and its limitations about what *firmamentum* might mean. Thus they could posit that Moses's teaching in Hebrew, aimed at the everyman of his day, was consistent with the reasonable, commonsense claim that the waters above the firmament are just clouds, making the firmament the sky rather than the outer heavens.

Boccaletti does an excellent job of collecting the sources that address the passage in question. The book contains innumerable lengthy quotations that give context to the exegetes' perspectives, and he also provides helpful background to each thinker. There are over thirty interpreters presented in depth, scores more referred to, and abundant primary source materials. Boccaletti adds helpful commentary and interpretation of his own, including a nice comparison of the cosmology of Moses and the Greeks, guiding the reader through the development of interpretive movements and then situating them in their historical setting. In fact, if there is a complaint it might be that there is much more background than is needed to understand the various interpretations in question—but those who love history will revel in his thoroughness.

Despite Boccaletti's comprehensiveness and attention to detail, there were a few things a reader might expect to find that were not a part of this work. Billing itself as "An Exemplary Case of Faith-Reason Conflict," one might have anticipated more depth of analysis of the underlying methodological, epistemic, and exegetical issues. There were descriptions of some of those things, but they were not very well developed. Readers looking to get some new insights into those aspects of faith-reason conflicts—looking for a beefier treatment of theology and philosophy—will likely be disappointed. Along those lines, it is not at all clear what Boccaletti thinks we should take away from his careful study about faith-reason conflicts. What should we conclude? What are the lessons? He does not make it clear. The book is rich

with history and primary sources, but very light on insight about the nature of science-religion tensions and how to resolve them; those looking for a new angle on these perennial problems may need to look elsewhere. But for those who desire to immerse themselves in all the intriguing commentary about the waters above the firmament throughout the first seventeen centuries of Christian history, this book will be a real treat.

Reviewed by Bradley L. Sickler, University of Northwestern, St. Paul, MN 55113.

THE WAR THAT NEVER WAS: Evolution and Christian Theology by Kenneth W. Kemp. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2020. 234 pages. Paperback; $28.00. ISBN: 9781532694981.

In *The War That Never Was*, Kenneth W. Kemp roundly rejects commonplace belief among contemporary writers that a state of "warfare" exists between modern science and religion. On the scientific side, Kemp focuses narrowly on prevailing theory in the modern "paleoetiological sciences" of origins in geology and biology—especially Darwinian evolutionary science. On the religious side, his argument is confined mainly to Christian theology as it engages this kind of science. Contrary to very strong contemporary currents of opinion on both sides, Kemp contends that there never really has been a "war" between these sciences and Christian theology, and that there is no such conflict between them now.

In the introductory chapter, Kemp explains that his thesis does not stand on acceptance of Stephen Jay Gould's well-known evasive proposal that science and religion are "non-overlapping *magisteria*," so that they simply *cannot* be in conflict. For (so Kemp) it is untrue that religion trades only in *values* (so Gould). The Christian religion, at least, stands on purported *facts*, too, such as the alleged occurrence of miracles. In Kemp's view, Christian theology can and does overlap at some points with the concerns and inquiries of scientists. This means that deep conflict, or "war," between this religion and secure science is possible in theory. He specifies precisely that the potential conflict is not between ontological naturalism and supernaturalism, as often believed, but is rather a potential "epistemic conflict" on matters of both methodology and substance. He seeks to show, however, that apparently deep conflicts that have erupted and become definitive evidence for the thesis of "warfare" are, despite the prominence of certain bellicose figures on both sides, a byproduct of an urgent need to revise old ideas in the face of disruptive new ones. Kemp portrays the history of such public clashes as, more deeply, an ongoing effort of thinkers to adapt traditional religious articulations to new religious-relevant discoveries in science, and thereby to preserve "peace" between the two great sources of truth.

Aside from the opening chapter, Kemp's defense of this thesis is historical rather than merely theoretical in the abstract. The main body of the book is a succinct yet impressively detailed and well-documented tour of historical episodes that supposedly exemplify the alleged "warfare." Whether Kemp achieves his aim or not (readers' opinions are bound to be mixed), it is safe to say that the discussion brings a fresh and forcefully defended perspective to these old and (so we may think) worn instances of apparent "war" between science and theology. I believe that this book is worth reading just for the historical accounts themselves, apart from the controversial conclusions that Kemp draws from them.

The selected episodes are unsurprising: developments in nascent pre-Darwinian geology that ignited flare-ups between this new science and traditional readings of Genesis 1–11; the fiery debate between Thomas Huxley and Samuel Wilberforce over Darwinian theses at Oxford in 1860; the famous Scopes Trial of 1925 and the anti-evolution campaign that followed afterwards; and finally, the intense curriculum debates over inclusion of creation science (young-earth science) and intelligent design theory that were recently adjudicated by American courts. All these incidents appear to prove that the thesis of inherent "warfare" is obviously true. Kemp seeks rigorously to show that it is false.

As for conflicts between geology and traditional readings of Genesis over the age of the earth, the length of the "days" of creation in Genesis 1, the story of Noah's Flood, and the story of Adam and Eve and the Fall, Kemp shows in carefully documented fashion that a great many Christian thinkers—probably a majority in America and the United Kingdom—had minimal difficulty in finding ways to adjust their readings of Genesis to accommodate the creation story plausibly enough to the emerging science. He discusses the eventual agreement of geologists that a worldwide flood did not happen, but not alternative readings. Further, I do not think he deals adequately with the problem that geology creates for doctrines connected with belief in a world-ruinous Fall. This problem persists now in geology and is magnified by challenges that Darwinian science poses to traditional lapsarian theodicy.