

they were made over a period of time, such as six days (pp. 175–76). But Thomas Aquinas put discussions about God’s creative method in perspective. He writes in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, “[T]here is something belonging to the *substance* of faith, namely that the world began at creation ... By what mode and order it was made, however, belongs to the faith only *accidentally*” (pp. 1254–55, my italics). In other words, the message of faith in Genesis is *that* God created, but *how* he created is incidental.

Concordism and the literal interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2 find their zenith in the Protestant reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin, both of whom were young-earth creationists (pp. 195, 197). Jennifer Powell McNutt underlines that “overreliance of allegorical readings” in earlier generations and belief in the “primacy of literal interpretation” led to the “hermeneutical lens of historicity” being applied throughout early Protestantism (p. 190). Luther fully depicts this method in his 1536 *Lectures on Genesis*. “[W]e assert that Moses spoke in a literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read” (p. 195). Luther and Calvin also accepted the cosmic fall. The latter contended that “corruptions” and “deformity of the world” were more the result of the “sin of man than the hand of God” (p. 197). Yet both reformers had an “appreciation for the doctrine of accommodation,” which “allows the [biblical] text to speak truth to the common person without disproving the natural philosophy [i.e., science] of the period” (p. 204).

In his chapter entitled “Post-Darwinian Interpretations of Genesis 1–2,” Aaron T. Smith discusses the wide range of exegetical approaches and reactions to the theory of biological evolution. He notes that Christians in Darwin’s generation, such as the Baptist theologian Augustus Strong and the Anglican priest Charles Kingsley, were comfortable with absorbing evolution into their theology. Yet others, like Presbyterian theologian Charles Hodge, viewed Darwin’s reductionist theory as “atheistic” (p. 262). The twentieth century saw a similar range of views. Seventh-day Adventist George McCready Price inspired fundamentalists Henry Morris and John Whitcomb to write *The Genesis Flood* in 1961, which ushered in the modern young-earth creationist movement. Baptist theologian Bernard Ramm attempted a concordist harmonization between scripture and geology with his “trinitarian progressive creation” (p. 252). Movements away from concordism also arose from both liberals, such as Rudolph Bultmann, and conservative Christians, such as Karl Barth.

David T. Tsumura in his chapter reveals that archeological discoveries in the ancient Near East (ANE) have significant implications for the interpretation of

Genesis 1 and 2. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, this evidence sets the historical and intellectual milieu during which the inspired biblical authors wrote their creation accounts. For example, the terms “image” and “likeness of god” were applied to ANE kings (p. 230). But in a radical polemical move, Genesis 1:26 NASB states, “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule.’” In other words, *all* humans are like earthly kings representing the Creator. This “royal designation” assigned to men and women to rule the world was in sharp contrast to the ANE belief that they are merely slaves of the gods. Notably, Tsumura takes to task the theologically fashionable idea that Genesis 1 reflects a cosmic temple. He argues that “one cannot say that the cosmos, let alone the Garden of Eden, was made for Yahweh to dwell in” (p. 229). Tsumura appeals to 1 Kings 8:27 NIV, “But will God really dwell on earth? The heavens, even the highest heavens, cannot contain you. How much less this temple I [Solomon] have built!” He then adds that Isaiah 66:1 views the heaven as God’s throne and the earth as his footstool.

To conclude, this book is a “biopsy” of the wide range of interpretive approaches to Genesis 1 and 2 throughout the ages. The days of Genesis 1 have been understood as literal 24-hour days, symbolic and allegorical days, and geological periods hundreds of millions of years long. Cosmological interpretations have included concordist attempts to align scripture with geocentricity, heliocentricity, geology, and evolution. The Garden of Eden has been viewed as a literal historical place, or viewed figuratively and allegorically. And the *de novo* creation of a historical Adam has proven to be quite resistant to reinterpretations over time. I suspect that further exploration of ANE creation accounts and an appreciation of their ancient understanding of living organisms (biology) will free the church from this last concordist stronghold.

This is a very good book. It is very well documented, quite readable for a general audience, and offers a wide range of valuable insights by leading scholars into the various hermeneutical approaches to Genesis 1 and 2 throughout history. This is an important contribution, and I very much recommend that it be added to your library.

Reviewed by Denis O. Lamoureux, Professor of Science and Religion at St. Joseph’s College in the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2J5.

ON THE ROAD WITH SAINT AUGUSTINE: A Real-World Spirituality for Restless Hearts by James K. A. Smith. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2019. 256 pages. Hardcover; \$24.99. ISBN: 9781587433894.

Science and philosophy originate from the human quest for knowledge. “Science” derives from the Latin

Book Reviews

noun *scientia* based on the verbal root *scire* “know.” *Scientia* in turn borrows from the Greek concept *epistemonikos* “making knowledge,” based on the verbal root *epistomai* “know/ understand,” which founds the philosophical discipline of epistemology. Existential pondering of knowledge has always been seminal for Christians, who believe Jesus Christ to be the incarnation of the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:24) and the life of God—“the *logos*’ who was with God, was God, was the creator of all that exists, and is the life which is the light of humanity” (John 1:1-5).

On the Road with Saint Augustine is philosopher James K. A. Smith’s intellectual autobiography. Smith’s confessional desire “to know” true meaning, identity, peace, and authentic life is the book’s “on-ramp” into a journey stimulated by conversations with Heidegger, Camus, Sartre, Derrida, Marcel, and Nietzsche, along with brief exchanges with the popular voices of Ingmar Bergman, Ferdinand Hodler, Bruce Springsteen, Joel Osteen, Walker Percy, and Thomas Wolfe, among a host of other interesting interlocutors. Smith’s constant companion, however, is St. Augustine, whose reflections emerge truest to the author’s own life and experience.

Augustine’s arrival at wisdom began with the brazen journey currently traveled by many postmoderns—the quest for self-discovery, glory, and satisfying pleasure. We hit the road, Smith suggests, because parents are thought clueless and everything we want is out there, on the road. “‘Here are the keys’ is a quasi-sacramental pronouncement that unleashes you to finally be yourself” (p. 60).

On this account, the Prodigal Son is our archetype. We are all prodigals suffering the delusion of self-sufficiency away from the true home of our heart’s desire and need. Like the Prodigal, human journeys always prove restless until the traveler comes to know the Father’s embrace.

Existentialists help us to understand the rationale of the road. For the nonphilosopher, this revelation is Smith’s most surprising insight. The one who introduced Smith to Augustine was none other than Martin Heidegger, whose categories of thought, if not semantics, were formed by courses Heidegger once taught on Paul’s letters and Augustine’s *Confessions*. The connections are readily apparent. As Paul admonished Christians to “not be conformed to this world” (Rom. 12:1), so Heidegger warned against falling prey to the “mass society of ‘the they’ (*das Man*)—an idea conceived in Heidegger from Augustine’s disdain for ‘absorption’ in the world” (p. 30). As Augustine came to know liberation through confession, so Heidegger “took up Dasein, which means ‘being there’” (p. 28). Smith explains:

And so Dasein functioned like a philosophical saint of sorts, an exemplar to imitate. Could we measure up to “authentic” Dasein, seizing possibilities and resisting temptation? Could we learn to be resolute, to resolve to answer the call of being, to seize our inmost possibilities—to become the “I” that I’m destined to be? As Bakewell rightly notes, while later existentialists would frame this as a call to “be yourself,” for Heidegger it was a “call to take up a self that you didn’t know you had.” (p. 28, quoting Sarah Bakewell, *At the Existentialist Café*, 79)

Invisible to the untrained eye, Smith argues that these thoughts undergird our postmodern world:

Existentialism seeped into the postwar water and was disseminated not only in philosophy books but in film and art, perhaps especially in the movies. (p. 28)

The DNA of our quest for authenticity points to the legacy of Heidegger and existentialism. (p. 29)

Hence, in philosophy as in life, the existential quest for authentic truth is the place where the rubber hits the road. The heart’s desire is for a road to a true home. It is a quest.

The book’s skeletal outline follows intuitively: “Heart on the Run,” “Augustine our Contemporary,” “A Refugee Spirituality,” “Freedom,” “Ambition,” “Sex,” “Mothers,” “Friendship,” “Enlightenment,” “Story,” “Justice,” “Fathers,” “Death,” “Homecoming.” As Smith unveils his story, it becomes apparent that the philosopher’s life has indeed tracked with Augustine’s—through stretches that he no doubt would have preferred not to tell, but toward a destination that he, like Augustine, has found worthy.

Smith finds the quest for self-realization a mirage. “The highway is my way” (p. 60), an itinerary the postmodern quest diverts from authentic authenticity to a false way of life characterized by anxiety-laden punishing emptiness. Similar to Augustine’s preconversion state, Smith recalls how “freedom to be myself starts to feel like losing myself, dissolving, my own identity slipping between my fingers ... its own form of enslavement” (pp. 62, 63).

With the apostle Paul and St. Augustine, Smith arrives home, not by finding the right road but by *being found* by the grace of God: “It turns out that being free isn’t about leaving; it’s about being found” (p. 76). As Augustine put it, “The human will does not attain grace through its freedom, but rather attains its freedom through grace” (p. 71). The existential emptiness debilitating the postmodern world is thus a signpost signaling the need for another way—namely, the regenerative grace of God.

Grace isn’t just forgiveness, a covering, an acquittal; it is an infusion, a transplant, a resurrection, a revolution of the will and wants. It’s the hand of a

Higher Power that made you and loves you reaching into your soul with the gift of a new will. Grace is freedom ... [Grace is] the gift that gives you your self again. (p. 70)

Smith's treatment of existentialism and popular culture refreshingly refrains from demonizing the giants of secularism, while gently exposing their deficiencies as proponents of comprehensive truth. His subtitle, *A Real-World Spirituality for Restless Hearts*, finds expression in a scholarly honesty appreciative of the truth found in the precursors of postmodernism but sober to their blind spots. Following Augustine's navigation, Smith's *On the Road with Augustine* is a timely message for restless hearts whose self-charted courses have sputtered into despair.

What does such a book have to do with science? A great deal, if the ultimate goal of science is to understand the reality in which we live. And what, we may ask, is the end of science, if not to enrich life and human understanding of the world in which we live? Hence, science has as much at stake in epistemology as the humanities. For to do science without the big philosophical questions in mind is to be irresponsibly inhuman. Why perform science to prolong and improve life, if we don't know what it means to live? With Augustine, we may expect life on the home front to be neither a philosophy nor a science but a reunion with the Father of both.

Reviewed by Edward P. Meadors, Professor of Biblical Studies, Taylor University, Upland, IN 46989.



SCIENCE AND RELIGION

CAN A SCIENTIST BELIEVE IN MIRACLES? An MIT Professor Answers Questions on God and Science by Ian Hutchinson. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2018. 288 pages. Paperback; \$22.00. ISBN: 9780830845477.

Imagine, in your student years, getting an opportunity to sit down with a new-found mentor for an extended period of time, to ask all of the questions that you have about faith and science. You may be coming from a wide range of backgrounds: new to your faith and unsure of how your interest in science can be reconciled with it, inexperienced and facing the reality of making it in the world on your own, or perhaps over eager to set the secular or academic world straight. Now imagine that this mentor engages you as a person and conversationally brings you along on a personal yet intellectual journey through all the answers to your questions. That is what Ian Hutchinson's *Can a Scientist Believe in Miracles?* is like.

The core of the book is derived from questions that Hutchinson has received through many years of par-

ticipating as a faith and science panelist for the Veritas Forum (veritas.org). From their website, the Veritas Forum seeks to "place the historic Christian faith in dialogue with other beliefs and invite participants from all backgrounds to pursue Truth together." As such, one can imagine the breadth and depth of questions Hutchinson has received (more than 220 according to the preface) to put him in a position to write a book like this. Fitting for the source material, the target audience is the university student looking for an introduction to these issues, and hoping for some answers.

In chapter one, Hutchinson gives a very personal account of his own spiritual journey and sets the tone for the book. This infuses the text with parts of Hutchinson that you might not otherwise see in his writings, and deepens the text, unlike sometimes dry or opaque academic readings. Each subsequent chapter focuses on an overarching topic such as "Are there realities that science cannot explain?" and "What is faith?" Under these headings, actual questions posed by participants in the forums are arranged, with Hutchinson's responses provided after each. The questions are used verbatim; this format was a good choice because they are very relatable. The scope of the questions is broad. Most of them are directly addressing faith and science issues and will probably be easily anticipated by a reader—for example, challenging the "scientific evidence" for Christianity or covering well-established "conflicts" between science and the Bible, such as cosmology and evolution. However, some questions are much more general and might be approached differently from a student more scientifically inclined, questions such as "Isn't Christianity's claim to uniqueness intolerant?" and "What explanation do you have for evil?" Others are surprisingly personal, such as "In my youthful experience of prayer, nothing ever happened. So ...?"

The format allows Hutchinson to provide direct answers to each question while also building context for the subsequent questions. His answers flow easily between personal and intellectual, providing earnest opinions along with concise but well-supported philosophical and scientific arguments for his position. While the book has a scholarly feel with many references to external philosophical and scientific works and scriptures, there are many clear definitions of terms and plainly worded explanations of these texts and arguments. Occasionally, in answering the questions, these explanations come at the expense of depth, but I think that they are appropriate. The notes section at the end has enough sources for the curious reader to follow up on a given topic. Many of the answers and refutations come back to themes familiar to Hutchinson's previous book, *Monopolizing Knowledge*: the definition of what science is and what validates knowledge. However, as