work means that those seeking to pick up this single portion of the set would benefit from accessing the first chapter of the first volume before beginning.

Overall, this volume is an excellent contribution to its field. As with the first, it is for the most part very readable and it does an excellent job of illuminating current scholarship on the mosaic of Scottish historical theology. I highly recommend this volume.

Philip D. Foster,
University of Edinburgh
https://doi.org/10.15664/tis.v27i1.2105


There is no shortage of books on the topic of science and religion and the apparent conflict between the two fields. This collection of essays offers a refreshing change of pace from the run-of-the-mill debate. The authors suggest that advances in evolutionary science and genetics need not pose a crisis for theologians. The tensions found between new scientific discovery and theology can instead be used to spark creativity and promote discussion about the way in which certain doctrines are understood.

The book is divided into three sections, each focusing on a different challenge that is posed for theology by the advances in contemporary evolutionary science and genetics. The first section focuses on the doctrine of the image of God, the second on original sin, and the third on the problem of evil. These are not the only doctrines which might need to be re-examined in light of new scientific evidence, but they are foundational teachings for the Christian faith and it seems a logical place to start.

Part One is organized around four typical views of the image of God: the functional view, the structural view, the relational view, and the dynamic view. The functional view posits that God’s image is reflected in the dominant role that humans play in creation. The structural view claims
that the image of God refers to human characteristics or capacities. The relational view states that the image is found not in humankind per se, but in the relationship between God and humankind. Finally, the dynamic view, also known as the Christological or eschatological model, states that the image of God will not be evident prior to the eschaton. Michael Burdett, in his introduction to this section, explains that the aim of these chapters is to explore how different models of the image of God might open up a conceptual space for a dialogue with evolutionary science to take place.

Part Two focuses on four core elements of the Christian story: creation, fall, redemption, and judgment. If the historical Adam explains the fall of humankind into sin, and thus the need for redemption, then it is of pivotal importance that this doctrine can be understood in light of the evolutionary claim that there was no first human couple. The authors suggest ways of recontextualizing the concept of original sin in such a way that it is not incompatible with the findings of science. This requires some fancy hermeneutical footwork. In the end, the authors recognize the limits and challenges of their own theories but believe that they have successfully provided resources for further reflection.

Part Three builds upon the previous section since many theologians agree that evil is a result of humankind’s fall into sin. The first chapter in this section defines the problem of evil and outlines some of the standard theodicies, such as the free will defence and the greater good defence. Chapter 15 has greater theological depth than the other chapters as Rosenberg re-evaluates traditional interpretations of the teachings of Augustine. The contributors in this section demonstrate that theodicy still holds a place in the conversation and has not been quenched by evolutionary science.

The collection of essays is not merely a random compilation of pieces that conveniently fit under one of the three headings. It is well organized and structured with a purpose. Each essay and each section progresses naturally from the one before it. At the same time, each work is capable of standing on its own. Together they serve the purpose of enlarging the conversation, rather than limiting it.

The authors and editors have not compiled an à la carte menu of contradictory theories from which one is expected to choose a singular position on a given doctrine. Rather, they have successfully created a smorgasbord where one can feel free to peruse a variety of offerings, select
or reject aspects of each theory, and possibly create new theories by combining facets of the various positions presented. Perhaps the reader will reject all of the views in their entirety, but the contributors will still view their work as a success as long as it has paved the way for new and ongoing conversations.

The editors of this work have come together for a specific purpose: to assemble scholarship that presents a variety of methods and insights and introduces a variety of models for consideration to prompt further thought and reflection, with the aim of providing a path toward further conversation. There are concepts and ideas presented in this book that are not fully developed, which leaves the door open for others brave enough to try to navigate the ever-changing landscape of scientific discovery. It is my view that they have accomplished what they set out to achieve.

The contributors recognize the limitations of their own field and also advise the reader to recognize the limits of the field of science. The landscape of scientific discovery is ever-changing. What is believed to be true today is susceptible to being proven false tomorrow. Limits to our understanding do not have to limit our faith. Different types of beliefs call for different levels of belief-commitment. For example, the doctrine of the Trinity may call for a stronger belief commitment than making sense of the doctrine’s metaphysical intricacies.

Each piece is well written and well researched by notable scholars yet accessible to the lay reader. It is easy to follow and understand. It deals with issues that are relevant for today. It is a joy to read and it is sure to spark the imagination.

Carol King,
Logos Institute for Analytic and Exegetical Theology
St Mary’s College
University of St Andrews
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