

PHILIP DUCE

Comment on ‘This Cursed Earth’

I wish to comment on two specific aspects of Professor Berry’s article ‘This Cursed Earth: Is “the Fall” Credible?’, *S & CB* 11(1) (1999), pp. 29–49 [henceforth TCE].

First, the statement that ‘Neither the rabbinic nor the Jewish apocalyptic tradition has any doctrine of the Fall’ (TCE p. 31) is too sweeping and requires attenuation. Compare, for example, Gordon Wenham on Genesis 2–3:

In later Jewish and, particularly, Christian theology the story becomes very important. According to Ecclus 25:24, ‘Woman is the origin of sin, and it is through her that we all die’; Rom 5:12, . . .; and 4 Ezra 7:118, ‘O Adam, what have you done? Your sin was not your fall alone; it was ours also, the fall of your descendants.’ The sin of the first man was more than a paradigm of every sinner’s experience; it was indeed the first sin, which has had dire consequences for the whole human race. . . .

Other commentators, especially Jews, prefer to see Gen 3 as simply paradigmatic: Adam’s transgression did not have the dire consequences alleged by St. Paul. Rather, as the Apocalypse of Baruch (early 2nd century A.D.) 54:19 puts it: ‘Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.’¹

James Dunn’s comments on Romans 5:12 provide further references (found on the very page later cited by Berry, TCE p. 35 note 17):

Paul here shows himself familiar with and indeed to be a participant in what was evidently a very vigorous strand of contemporary Jewish thinking about Adam and the origin of evil and death in the world. Note particularly Sir [Ecclesiasticus] 14:17, 25:24 . . .; Wisd Sol 2:23–24 (‘God created man for incorruption . . . but through the devil’s envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his party experience it’); *Adam and Eve* 44 and *Apoc. Mos.* 14, 32; 4 *Ezra* 3.7, 21–22; 4:30; 7:116–118; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 17.2–3; 23.4; 48.42–43; 54.15, 19; 56.5–6; for rabbinic references, see [Strack and Billerbeck], 3:227–29. Gen 6:1–4 was also drawn into this speculation . . . Where Paul does come closer to the broader Jewish thought is in the tension between sin as part of human nature and the responsibility for sinning; and in the clear implication that death was a consequence of sin and so not part of God’s purpose for his creation (cf. Wisd Sol 1:13; 2:23–24; see also Black [JBL 103 1984], ‘Death’, 414–15, 421). As in the broader sweep of Jewish thought also, there is no suggestion of a distinction between ‘spiritual’ and

1 G. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1) (Dallas: Word, 1987), pp. 90–91.

'physical' death: human weakness (5:6), the corruptibility of the flesh (see on 1:3 and 7:5), and death are all of a piece in that they characterize the whole sweep of creaturely alienation from the Creator.²

While it should indeed be acknowledged that 'the bible does not know the distinction, so common among us, between a physical, a spiritual, and an eternal death', this distinction is helpful in formulating the biblical teaching.³ Dunn's last statement quoted above leads to the second point where I wish to take issue with Berry: his claim⁴ that the death which came by Adam to humanity was spiritual, rather than physical and spiritual (TCE pp. 29, 34–35).

First, some general comments. With regard to Berry's assertion that conservative commentators, in resisting dismissal of the 'traditional view', 'extend beyond the plain statements in the bible through incorporating a particular view of creation and divine activity' (TCE p. 30), the same charge could easily be made against Berry himself. Furthermore, the intimation seems to be that, unlike Berry, such commentators are unable to discern the 'plain meaning' of Scripture. Berry's concern, expressed similarly elsewhere, to 'check to the best of our understanding what the Bible *actually* says, as distinct from how it has been *conventionally interpreted*'⁵ reflects a rather tendentious, and arguably false, dichotomy. 'Understanding what the bible actually says' cannot avoid hermeneutical and exegetical issues; 'conventional interpretation' has not necessarily overridden or ignored such issues. Indeed, the intention of the most responsible 'conventional' or 'traditional' interpretation has been precisely to understand what the Bible actually says and means. Affirmation of the perspicuity of Scripture in no way precludes the need for interpretation. The value of the church's exegetical tradition – used in submission to Scripture itself – should not be underestimated, and the right of individual interpretation should be balanced by the corporate wisdom, counsel and judgment of the church.⁶

Turning, then, to the specific point at issue, here Berry is essentially right in what he affirms but wrong in what he denies. In order to support this response, I will collate the conclusions of a number of contemporary biblical scholars and theologians ['conservative commentators', some of whom Berry himself cites elsewhere in TCE, but with whom he barely interacts on this particular point]. These are not presented as authoritarian knock-down proofs, but as a consistent array of pointers to a reading of Scripture which is at odds with Berry's.

2 J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A) (Dallas: Word, 1988), pp. 272–273.

3 L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1958 [1981 reprint]), pp. 258–261. Cf. L.L. Morris, 'Death', in the *New Bible Dictionary* (3rd edn.) (Leicester: IVP, 1996), pp. 265–267.

4 By now familiar, of course, from e.g. R.J. Berry, *Adam and the Ape* (London: Falcon, 1975), p. 51; *God and Evolution* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988), pp. 70–72, 90; M.A. Jeeves and R.J. Berry, *Science, Life and Christian Belief* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), pp. 107, 110–113, 235.

5 Jeeves and Berry, *Science, Life and Christian Belief*, p. 12 (their italics).

6 Cf. M. Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?* (Leicester: Apollos, 1987), pp. 77–97. The perspicuity or clarity of Scripture should be distinguished from some kind of context-free 'plainness' or 'obviousness' of meaning, and implies that understanding is possible, not that it is always easy (cf. 2 Peter 3:16).

In his *Genesis 1–15* (1987) commentary, Gordon Wenham agrees that expulsion from the garden was indeed a drastic kind of death – a 'death before death'. However, physical death was 'the ultimate sign and seal of the spiritual death the couple experienced on the day they ate'. The consequences of their actions are both spiritual (alienation from God – which follows disobedience immediately) and physical (pain, toil, death – which take longer to become evident).⁷

Henri Blocher concurs:

The narrative shows us that the threat 'You shall die' is fulfilled in a multiplicity of ways, by a whole succession of disastrous changes . . .

[D]eath is a punishment inflicted for disobedience . . . Paul confirms this with all the clarity you could desire. By Adam's offence, death made its entry into the world of mankind (Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:21; the primary point is the death of the body, since its antithesis is the resurrection of the body).⁸

Turning to commentaries on Romans, the same conclusion is found. In the *New Bible Commentary (21st century Edition)* (1994), Douglas Moo states that

Many scholars think that the 'death' Paul refers to here [Rom 5:12] is physical death only (Sanday-Hedlam, Godet, Murray); a few, that it denotes 'spiritual' death only. But it probably includes both, separation from fellowship with God and physical mortality as the judgment of God on sin.⁹

Thus, Leon Morris, in *The Epistle to the Romans* (1988) (cited in TCE p. 46 note 61), states:

The warning to Adam ran, 'in the day that you eat of it you shall die' (Gen 2:17, RSV), but in the sense of physical death Adam did not die 'in the day' that he ate, nor for many years afterward. It is therefore suggested that a spiritual penalty is meant (cf. 6:23; Eph 2:1). To this it is objected that no one would understand from the language used that the writers of Genesis and Romans were referring to anything other than death in its ordinary physical sense (cf. Gifford, 'That death must here be understood in its primary sense as the death of the body, is clear from the connection with v. 14, where no other meaning is admissible'). Perhaps the best way to understand both passages is to see a reference to both kinds of death. Physical death is in mind, but not physical death in itself; it is physical death as the sign and symbol of spiritual death.¹⁰

Although James Dunn asserts, in his *Romans 1–8*, that Adam need not be a historical individual for Paul's theological point to be valid, it is noteworthy that on verse 5:12 he comments:

7 Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, pp. 67–68, 73–75, 90–91.

8 H. Blocher, *In The Beginning* (Leicester: IVP, 1984), pp. 172, 184 (my emphasis) [cf. pp. 171–195].

9 D.J. Moo, 'Romans', in D.A. Carson, R.T. France, J.A. Motyer and G.J. Wenham (eds.), *New Bible Commentary (21st century Edition)*, (Leicester: IVP, 1994), p. 1134.

10 L.L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Leicester: IVP, 1988), pp. 229–230.

'Death' . . . would have been universally understood as the power which defeats and ends that life which was the chief effect of creation and indeed its whole point.¹¹

For Nigel Cameron, the 'spiritual death only' idea is 'somewhat woolly', and he counters it with references to such authorities as E.L. Mascall, C. K. Barrett, N.P. Williams, C.E.B. Cranfield, Sanday and Hedlam: 'we see then, as John Hick has said, there is "a wide measure of agreement among Pauline commentators" that in Paul's thought "death (which is perhaps to be understood in a spiritual as well as a physical sense) is a consequence of sin."¹² In the up-to-date compendium of Pauline scholarship, IVP's *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (1993), J.J. Scott, Jr. concurs:

Paul asserts that humans were created as 'living beings' in the fullest sense of the word, but all 'died' in the sin of Adam. This 'death' is both spiritual and physical, with temporal and non-temporal aspects. Spiritual death began immediately with the entrance of sin into the race and is not bound to time. With it comes separation from God. Death dominates the physical life in the present (Rom 5:14), renders humans helpless (Eph 2:1), and eventuates in the physical and spiritual destruction of the individual.¹³

Berry commends the article on 'Death' in the *New Dictionary of Theology* (1988) by Murray Harris (TCE p. 34 note 15), but omits to mention Harris's statement:

By divine decree, physical and spiritual death is the consequence and penalty of sin . . . and is the common lot of mankind because all have sinned . . . Man and woman were not created unable to die but were created able to not die, although after the fall death became a universal biological necessity.¹⁴

Similar conclusions are found in such works as Bruce Milne's *Know the Truth* (1982),¹⁵ Wayne Grudem's *Systematic Theology* (1994),¹⁶ and Paul Helm's *The Providence of God* (1993)¹⁷ (commended by Berry at TCE p. 40 note 40). Helm actually quotes Donald MacKay (whose position Berry clearly resists):

In discussion of the Genesis creation narrative it is often insufficiently realized that the last creative act is recorded not in chapters 1 and 2 but in chapter 3. 'And (God) said . . . "Cursed is the ground because of you . . . thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to you . . ."' (verses 17-18 RSV). In short, we are told that the created order as we know now it is a *revised*

11 Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, p. 288.

12 N.M. de S. Cameron, *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1983), pp. 50-51, 54-56.

13 J.J. Scott, Jr., 'Life and Death', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin and D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Leicester: IVP, 1993), p. 555.

14 M.J. Harris, 'Death', in S.B. Ferguson, D.F. Wright and J.I. Packer (eds.), *New Dictionary of Theology* (Leicester: IVP, 1988), p. 188.

15 B. Milne, *Know the Truth* (Leicester: IVP, 1982), pp. 109, 267.

16 W. Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Leicester: IVP, 1994), p. 516.

17 P. Helm, *The Providence of God* (Leicester: IVP, 1993), pp. 98-99.

version. Ours is *not the same drama* as that whose conception is narrated in chapters 1 and 2 and which God pronounced 'very good'. Some changes may for all we know have been slight; but in one far-reaching respect our natural order is radically different: for ours is a creation 'under a curse', 'groaning in travail'. Not just its human history, but the very principles of natural law reflected in the growth of weeds, the toils of life and the inevitability of decay and death, are different from what they might have been, but for the fall.¹⁸

Finally, consider Philip Edgcumbe Hughes' exposition in *The True Image* (1989):

Death for man is not something merely natural, an inexorable phenomenon of the cycle of nature which is marked by the sequence of birth, life and death. The death of an animal and even of a plant may cause regret and distress for one reason or another, but it is not, as with the death of a human being, the termination and disappearance of a life of transcendent potential and unique worth. . . .

. . . Every man is dead in his trespasses and sins before he experiences physical death (Eph. 2.1); and the latter bears testimony not only to the former but also to man's urgent need to be restored to life through spiritual regeneration. Man's death, spiritual and physical, moreover, is self-induced because the sin of which he is guilty is at root his own willful turning away from God who is the Living God and the source of all life.¹⁹

This brief survey is, of course, hardly exhaustive, but is sufficient to indicate that the considerable weight of contemporary evangelical biblical and theological scholarship is firmly against the 'spiritual death only' view, with respect to what the latter denies.²⁰ Berkhof's statement still stands:

The position of the Church has always been that death in the full sense of the word, including physical death, is not only the consequence but the penalty of sin. The wages of sin is death.²¹

18 D.M. MacKay, *The Open Mind and Other Essays* (M. Tinker, ed.) (Leicester: IVP, 1988), p. 189 (original italics).

19 P.E. Hughes, *The True Image* (Leicester: IVP, 1989), pp. 119, 122 [cf. pp. 115–124].

20 Consensus alone, of course, does not guarantee correctness of interpretation. Should Berry's departure from the evangelical consensus be taken as, for example, a mishandling of Scripture, or a recovery of its 'plain meaning', or a capitulation to modernity, or a contextualization for late-twentieth century minds? I encourage readers to make their own assessments. For a useful background discussion of approaches to orthodoxy and heresy within evangelical theology, using the categorical distinction between 'bounded set' and 'centred set' thinking, see R.K. Johnston, 'Orthodoxy and Heresy: A Problem for Modern Evangelicalism', *Evangelical Quarterly* 69:1 (1997), 7–38.

21 Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, p. 260. Berkhof notes that fifth century Pelagianism taught the natural, rather than penal, mortality of Adam, and that this teaching was anathematized at the North African Council of Carthage in 418 AD. Furthermore, such a view was reiterated by Kantian, Hegelian and Ritschlian theologians, and 'found support in present day natural science, which regards physical death as a natural phenomenon of the human organism. Man's physical constitution is such that he necessarily dies. But this view . . . is contrary to the fact that man does not feel that death is something natural, but fears it as an unnatural separation of that which belongs together' (pp. 260–261).

This is echoed by Cornelius Plantinga, Jr.: 'The association of sin with physical and spiritual death runs like a spine through Scripture and Christian tradition.'²²

Furthermore, 'it is a fundamental presupposition of our evangelical understanding of the atonement, such that if the sin-death causality be undermined, the efficacy and indeed the rationale of blood atonement is destroyed.'²³ So, if physical death was not one aspect of the penalty for sin, or of the disorder and defeat brought by sin,²⁴ then why did Jesus have to die *physically* in order to redeem us?

I do not wish here to pursue in detail implications of this exegetical position for interaction with the sciences (specifically the fossil record and its interpretation, cf. TCE pp. 31–32). However, some comments by Berkhof are pertinent:

Suppose that science had proved conclusively that death reigned in the animal and vegetable world before the entrance of sin, then it would not yet necessarily follow that it also prevailed in the world of rational and moral beings. And even if it were established beyond a shadow of a doubt that all physical organisms, the human included, now carry within them the seeds of dissolution, this would not yet prove that man was not an exception before the fall.²⁵

More generally, the fundamental rule of hermeneutics is that Scripture is its own interpreter.²⁶ This is not to deny that scientific understanding of God's creation may, in principle, assist in the interpretation of God's Word. To quote James Montgomery Boice:

Scripture interprets scientific knowledge by relating it to the revealed purpose and work of God, thus establishing an ultimate context for the study and reform of scientific ideas. It is not for scientific theories to dictate what Scripture may or may not say, although extra-biblical information will sometimes helpfully expose a misinterpretation of Scripture . . . [and] may help toward attaining a more precise exegesis.²⁷

22 C. Plantinga, Jr., *Not the Way It's Supposed to Be: A Breviary of Sin* (Leicester: Apollos, 1995), pp. 47–48.

23 Cameron, *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*, p. 52. To take just one example, see R. Letham, *The Work of Christ* (Leicester: IVP, 1993), p. 125.

24 Cf. C.E. Gunton, *The Actuality of Atonement* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1988), pp. 150–154.

25 Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, p. 669. Compare, for example, John Stott in *The Cross of Christ* (2nd edn.) (Leicester: IVP, 1989): 'The Bible everywhere views human death not as a *natural* but as a *penal* event. It is an alien intrusion into God's good world, and not part of his original intention for humankind. To be sure, the fossil record indicates that predation and death existed in the animal kingdom before the creation of man . . . Throughout Scripture, then, death (both physical and spiritual) is seen as a divine judgment on human disobedience' (p. 65). The tension in Stott's position, noted by Berry (TCE p. 35 note 16) perhaps reflects his unwillingness to modify his exegetical conviction for the sake of smooth harmony with the scientific consensus.

26 Cf. Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?*, pp. 92–94.

27 J.M. Boice, *Standing on the Rock* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1997), p. 176.

However, while I share Berry's concern for 'taking into account both books of God' (TCE p. 31),²⁸ there is an important proviso:

A scientific discovery . . . may lead me to change my interpretation of Scripture at some point, though it cannot in itself *dictate* such a change. But if, after reflection, I determine that my original interpretation of Scripture was correct and that still conflicts with the apparent results of science, then I must follow Scripture.²⁹

So, for adherence to a 'traditional' exegetical position on the point at issue here, I adopt the attitude expressed by Blocher in the concluding words from his discussion of Genesis and science:

If certain factors in today's scientific picture appear contrary to the Word of God, faith is not shaken. It has such confidence in that Word that it can be quite open about its hesitations and wait patiently for the clouds to clear.³⁰

Professor Berry may insist that on his view of the death of Adam, the clouds have indeed cleared. To my mind, the exegetical position he favours has achieved this with sky blue gloss and subtle highlighting.

That said, I gladly acknowledge 'that many if not all scholars would be prepared to admit that they are *ultimately* studying Paul (or Calvin or whomever) *in order to understand themselves and their God*', with 'a very active engagement between the world of the interpreter and that of the text, with all the attendant dangers of misunderstanding and distortion' which 'should generate the appropriate caution, both in respect of method and in the degree of certainty we attach to our "conclusions"'.³¹

Philip Duce is author of *Reading the Mind of God: Interpretation in Science and Theology* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998).

R.J. BERRY

Response to Philip Duce

I am grateful to Philip Duce for his comments on my exploration of the Fall. The more sensible discussion that can be generated, the nearer are we likely to get (under God) to a full understanding of the biblical texts.

28 Although, surely, the 'two books' of God are Scripture and *creation*, not Scripture and the 'scientific record' (cf. TCE)?

29 J. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1987), p. 316 (original italics). Cf. G. Vos, *Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948 [Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1975]), pp. 36–40.

30 Blocher, *In The Beginning*, p. 231.

31 P. Cotterell and M. Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1989), p. 70 (original italics).

Duce believes that my statement that 'Neither the rabbinic nor the Jewish apocalyptic tradition has any doctrine of the Fall' is 'too sweeping'. I am happy to accept his correction if I am wrong. My prime authority was J.E. Colwell writing in the *New Dictionary of Theology*. However it is important to insist that Judaism (and for that matter much of the New Testament) emphasizes personal responsibility for our failings, rather than inherited sin.

Duce's other objections, to my assertion claiming 'the death which came by Adam to humanity was spiritual, rather than physical and spiritual' is much more important. I am not convinced by his rebuttals of my argument, but this is an extremely important issue which I trust will not stop with this interchange.

1. In my article I was careful to qualify Adam's death as specifically (p. 29), essentially (p. 34), primarily (p. 35) spiritual. I do not believe that it is proper or sensible to wholly dissociate spiritual death from physical death. My intention (and I hold to this) was to point out that physical death was a sequel or perhaps result of the severance of Adam/Eve from God. My understanding of Leon Morris (in the paragraph quoted by Duce) is that this is also his position, since 'physical death [is] the sign and symbol of spiritual death'. It is thus my answer to Duce's (rhetorical?) question, 'why did Jesus have to die *physically* in order to redeem us?' The same idea on a more trivial level occurs in Mat. 9:6: Our Lord having declared a man's sins forgiven, *then* says 'to convince you [i.e. the spectators]. . . . take your bed and go home'.
2. I remain uneasy about the language I use (p. 34) about *physical* death, *spiritual* death, and so on because of the danger of implying or (worse) introducing an unintended and unscriptural mind-body dualism in my own thought, never mind other people's. Notwithstanding there is a distinction between our animal bodies and that which is God's image in us. I would welcome help in developing a helpful vocabulary.
3. I am unrepentant about seeking new interpretations of the Bible if old ones are found wanting. Any interpretation must, of course, be internally consistent as well as concordant with other data (scientific, historical, or whatever). Perhaps the phrase 'to check what the Bible actually says' which Duce quotes from the book by Malcolm Jeeves and myself is too crude, but I would remind him that the example we used to illustrate it was Pope Urban VIII's over-literal interpretation of certain texts when faced with new information from Galileo. The Pope was wrong in his interpretation, although his successor only admitted this formally three centuries later. I am horrified with Duce's quotation (and presumed approval) of Frame's attitude that 'if, after reflection, I determine that my original interpretation of Scripture was correct and still conflicts with the apparent results of science, then I must follow Scripture'. Whilst I fully and happily accept the authority of scripture and note that Frame refers to the *apparent* results of science, Frame's methodology opens him to all sorts of inconsistencies.
4. I was interested to find Donald MacKay quoted against me. In fact I would entirely agree with the paragraph reprinted by Duce, which is taken from an essay on 'The sovereignty of God in the natural world', in which MacKay

discusses how God relates to his creation. In an earlier passage of the same essay, MacKay explains his understanding of natural laws which 'are neither necessary nor even available to [God] as an instrument of creation;. . . what we call natural laws emerge only *post hoc* as features within the created order'. In other words, MacKay defines 'natural law' in a way very different to the deterministic presumption behind its normal use. In that context I have no problems with the quote.

5. I was intrigued by Duce's introduction of Nigel Cameron's belief that 'spiritual death only' is 'somewhat woolly'. Cameron's book is by far the best anti-evolution tract known to me. However, his biblical objection to God working through an evolutionary mechanism hinges on the nature of Adam, particularly in the passages referred to by Duce. The authorities cited by Cameron and repeated by Duce do not in fact explicitly distinguish between physical and spiritual death, with the exception of John Hick. I believe Cameron is badly awry in his approach to evolution *because of his faithfulness to this particular interpretation*. I wrote in a review of Cameron's book, 'I hope this book will be read widely, but critically and prayerfully with Bible in hand.' That summarizes entirely my debate with Duce.
6. Hans Walter Wolff (*Anthropology of the Old Testament*. SCM, 1974) defines a dead person as one who is cut off from the praise of God in contrast to a living individual 'who can praise Yahweh's works and word'. Hence 'in the Old Testament, life means to have relationship [and] above all to have a relationship with God. Death means a lack of relationship' (p. 160). This is kin to my statement on p. 40.

I suspect it would be counter-productive to work through all the quotations used by Duce. He has not convinced me, and I doubt whether I will convince him. What is important is that I have stirred up debate about the interpretation and application of scripture; I believe that is apologetically and pastorally important. Peter Bowler¹ has recently reviewed the efforts of (Bishop) E W Barnes to integrate science and Christian faith, with particular reference to evolution and the Fall, comparing Barnes' attempts with the more mystical approach of Charles Raven. History (never mind reason) shows both were unsuccessful. What we can learn from them is the need for radical rigour in our approach to God's books. May that be our attitude.

In discussing Adam's cosmic responsibility for sin, Henri Blocher in his book on *Original Sin* (Apollos, 1997) quotes Bernard Ramm, then remarks, 'I confess to some amazement; the quotation testifies to the ability of fine scholars to read into the text what they think should be there' . . .

R.J. Berry is Professor of Genetics at University College, London.

1 Bowler, P.J. (1998), Evolution and the eucharist: Bishop E.W. Barnes on science and religion in the 1920s and 1930s. *British Journal for the History of Science*, 31: 453-467.

science/faith publications

The following are among the many books and other items dealing with science/faith issues which are available from Christians in Science.

The clockwork image

a Christian perspective on science

by the late Donald M MacKay; first published in 1974;
reissued by IVP in 1997; still relevant: £2 + p&p

The search for God

can science help?

by John Houghton; published in 1996 by Lion;
still available from CiS: £7 + p&p

Real science, real faith

sixteen leading British scientists discuss
their science and their personal faith

published by Monarch in 1991; reprinted in 1995; now
available only from CiS: £5 + p&p

For an order form which lists all the titles available contact

**Bennet McInnes, 5 Knockard Place,
Pitlochry, PH16 5JF, UK**

telephone + 44(0) 1796 472615

email bennet.mcinnnes@lineone.net