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---


The following five quotations are from Random House reviews, published on the rear cover of the book.

Ian G. Barbour (Physics, Religion, Carleton College) says of *Science and Religion: A Critical Survey*: "This is a remarkable book and I predict its widespread use. It is truly interdisciplinary, analyzing with integrity the methods and central themes of contemporary scientific and religious thought ... The author clearly and fairly surveys alternative viewpoints, discusses them carefully, and presents a creative position of his own. ... This first-rate book can be highly recommended to anyone seeking access to the best of recent thought."

Karl E. Peters (Editor, *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*, Philosophy, Rollins College) says of *Science and Religion*: "The best current comprehensive treatment of science and religion. ... Rolston's particular genius is his ability to offer careful and insightful philosophical critiques in his rich survey. ... An excellent text that should be studied by every seminary student and graduate student in religious studies who wishes to relate religious thinking to the contemporary sciences."

Frederick Ferré (Philosophy, University of Georgia) says of *Science and Religion*: "This book is a delight. I like best its emphatic recognition of real dynamism on both sides of the science and
religion dialogue. ... It is up to the minute on methodological developments in both areas, as well as clear and responsible in treating recent scientific developments. Everyone in the field will need to work with this text."

Robert Russell (Director, Center for the Study of Theology and the Natural Sciences, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley) says of *Science and Religion*: "I value this work greatly for attempting and, by and large, succeeding at bringing science and religion into a meaningful and creative relationship. ... Its particular attractions are its scope and its free-flowing and invigorating style. ... Important reading for anyone wanting to wrestle seriously with science and religion."

Marvin Henberg (Philosophy, University of Idaho) says of *Science and Religion*: "Here is a well-written work with excellent organization, the product of scrupulous research. ... Rolston places himself directly at the eye of the contemporary storm. In the tradition of Maimonides’ *Guide for the Perplexed*, the book is a sensitive contribution to the musings of human beings who must accept the insights of science but wish to maintain their faith."

John F. Haught (Theology, Georgetown University) says, "Rolston, a professor of philosophy at Colorado State University, has written a monumental work, one deserving of widespread usage by theologians and scientists alike. Carefully organized and beautifully written, it appears to be the fruit of years of reflection by a deeply religious mind fully conversant with the best of modern science and theology. ... The book excels in its exposition of the explanatory inadequacies of naturalistic explanations of evolution. ... The book is truly outstanding. One may safely predict that it will enrich discussions of science and religion for many years to come." Review in *Theological Studies* 49(1988):368-370.

David Foxgrover (United Church of Christ, *Christian Century* reviewer) writes, "Rolston has written a superb and subtle book that will become a standard in the field. Yet this work by a professor of philosophy at Colorado State University is more than a textbook, a critical survey. Worthy of the scholar as well as the student, it stands on its own as a creative attempt to deal with one of the 20th century’s central theological issues. ... Rolston’s superb scholarship and subtle style will engage even the reader who finally dissents. But both the convinced and the unpersuaded will conclude that the reading was worthwhile." Review in *Christian Century* 105, no. 4 (February 3-10, 1988):132-133.

Donald W. Musser (Religion, Stetson University), in a critical review for the *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, says:

"Rolston ... has produced a book on the issues, problems, and prospects of the dialogue between science and religion that rivals Ian Barbour’s *Issues in Science and Religion* (New York, 1966) as the best in the field. After a lucid introduction to the methods of inquiry in the two areas, Rolston discusses representative topics in the physical sciences, biological sciences, psychological sciences, sociological sciences, and historical sciences and delineates how these topics relate well to religious claims. He presents the relevant scientific material accurately and intelligibly and then critically assesses the theories; he is especially good at logical analysis of the scientific ideas. For example, in the chapter on religion and the social sciences he presents clearly Durkheim’s theory of religion and then perceptively shows its limitation and deficiencies. One can say the same for his discussion of relativity theory and indeterminacy in physics and neo-Darwinian theory in biology."

Joseph Pickle (Religion, Colorado College) says, in a critical review for *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*, "This book is notable for its breadth and depth. It surveys a wide range of material and conducts a provocative dialogue between the perspectives of the natural and social sciences and a theoretical view of religion. It reminds one of Ian Barbour’s magisterial *Issues in Science and Religion*. ... This book is filled with admirably argued and powerfully presented treatments of crucial issues in the discussion of religion and science. The great strength of the book is in the careful weaving of religious themes with scientific motifs. ... This book is the most substantial argument for a position on the relationship of science and religion that is eminently worth arguing. The presentation is finely nuanced and carefully developed." Review in *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 23(1988):203-205.

E. J. McCullough (Philosophy, University of Saskatchewan) says:

"In an age of penetrating scientific and philosophical analysis, the ability to synthesize and to relate disciplines becomes a rare skill. The amount of information in each discipline is overwhelming; the risks in writing sketchy summaries are enormous. Most scholars, faced with these obstacles, avoid cross disciplinary work. Rolston is admirably suited in background and in scholarly work to take on the task of synthesis of distinct disciplines. His background in philosophy of science and in theology, added to his service in the field of environmental ethics has brought him into areas of science, economics, history and theology. In environmental ethics, specialization leads to conflicts of values which the specialist is ill equipped to handle. Similarly, the specialist in science or theology is ill equipped to handle conflicts which arise between science and religion. A person with Rolston's background does have the preconditions for the task. ... Rolston has succeeded in bringing his own unique background into full play in this work. ... *Science and Religion* is a penetrating and provocative book. It can be read by both scientific and religious specialist and non-specialist with great profit. It is also accessible to a general audience. In making a case for the synthesis of scientific and theological truths, Rolston's aim is to combine the Greek insight that the unexamined life is not worth living with the Hebrew insight that the uncommitted life is not worth examining. In this quest, he merits his presence in long and distinguished philosophical company." *Canadian Philosophical Reviews* 7(1987):373-375.

John J. Compton (Philosophy, Vanderbilt University) says,

"This book marvelously combines the elements needed for any thoughtful examination of the intersections of science and religion today. It is comprehensive ... it is rich in scientific and theological detail. It is methodologically self-aware and circumspect at every point, both in respect of the sciences and religious thought and in resepect to its own developing argument. And it has a developing argument, inspired by a powerful constructive vision of the wholeness of the human endeavor to understand, of which, it is argued, the sciences and religious reflection form complementary parts. And as sheer grace for the reader, the book is engagingly and trenchantly written, perfused with insightful epigram, a text to delight as well as to illumine. ... This is a robust challenge (made) with rare erudition and skill. ... This is a lovely book. It oversteps hallowed boundaries and stimulates fresh thought." Review in *Critical Review of Books in Religion: Annual Supplement to the Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 2(1989):425-427.

Ian Barbour (Physics, Religion, Carleton College) cites *Science and Religion* in his *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997), citations on pp. 94-95, 186-187, 339, 342, 346, 350, particularly with reference to Rolston's "illuminating discussion" of methodology in both science and in religion, and his discussion of life as an interaction phenomenon between living organisms and the elementary matter out of which they are composed, with "downward causation complementing upward causation."


Ian Barbour (Physics, Theology, Carleton College) quotes and cites *Science and Religion* at various places in *Religion in an Age of Science: The Gifford Lectures*. Rolston's position on methodology in science and religion, on the relationship between biological processes and the underlying physics (interaction and downward causation), and on suffering in the animal world is incorporated into Barbour's argument. In *Religion in an Age of Science: The Gifford Lectures: 1989-1991*, vol. 1 (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990), pp. 23-24, 116-117, 171, 273, 275, 279, 283. These lectures were given at Aberdeen University, Scotland. An endorsement by Rolston is also featured on the book jacket.


Donald A. Henson (Philosophy, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, PA) says:

"Most traditional courses in the philosophy of religion pay scant attention to the conflict between scientific and religious worldviews. Many of the most popular anthologies used in such courses ... offer nothing in the way of readings which explore these issues. The present volume by Holmes Rolston, *Science and Religion: A Critical Survey*, is not only an important scholarly contribution to these issues; it will also be welcomed by philosophers who wish to locate or develop curricular materials which would allow students to explore the connection and conflict between religious and scientific views of the world.

Rolston's study is an expansive, penetrating survey of the sciences, exploring not only their methodologies and implicit philosophical assumptions, but examining as well the particular claims within these disciplines which appear incompatible with Western theistic belief. ... Rolston explores the implications for religious beliefs of such diverse theories as relativity and quantum mechanics, Darwinian evolution and natural selection, behaviorism, and Freudian psychoanalysis. Given the breadth of such a survey, some unevenness might well be expected in the author's knowledge and treatment of these specialized disciplines. But Rolston displays a solid grasp of this complex material, and he carefully documents his study with extensive and illuminating references. ... The virtue of Rolston's study derives from the broad sweep of speculative insight, given that Rolston's purpose is to display such a bewildering variety of scientific claims and theories. ... Rolston's work is an insightful, thought-provoking study which should be read by serious students of religion and theology." *Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy*, American Philosophical Association. June 1988, pp. 16-17.

Arthur Peacocke (Biochemist and Director of the Ian Ramsey Centre, Oxford University) cites *Science and Religion* in an analysis of Rolston's account of "cruciform naturalism," incorporating Rolston's position into his own argument about the character of the biological world and its compatibility with theistic belief. In *Theology for a Scientific Age* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), citations and discussion on pp. 62, 68-69, 194-195
R. Puligandla (Religious Studies, University of Toledo) says that *Science and Religion* is "commendable for its clarity and critical acumen." Review in the American Library Association's *Choice*, June 1987, p. 254.


The Graduate Theological Union at Berkeley and the Center for the Study of Natural Sciences conducted a course, fall 1988, in exploration and critical appreciation of *Science and Religion: A Critical Survey*, led by John H. Wright assisted by experts from various disciplines who were invited to comment on issues the book discusses. *Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences Newsletter*, July-August 1988.


Christopher Southgate and Andrew Robinson (Theology, University of Exeter) cite and quote variously from Rolston, regarding evil in evolutionary natural history. In Nancey Murphy, Robert John Russell, and William R. Stoeger, eds., *Physics and Cosmology: Scientific Perspectives on the Problem of Natural Evil* (Rome: Vatican Observatory and Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2007), citations and quotations on p. 73, p. 74, p. 75, pp. 84-87, p. 88, p. 90.


George S. Bebis (Holy Cross Orthodox School of Theology, Hellenic College, Brookline,
Massachusetts) says of Rolston's *Science and Religion*" "In an admirable and bold way, he deals with the critical dialogue and confrontation between science and religion. ... Professor Rolston has a brilliant mind and his book will provoke a great interest among those who study the relationship of secular science and religion." Review in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32(1987):432-433.

S. Mark Heim (Philosophy of Religion, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts) says:

"*Science and Religion* is a critical survey of the dialogue between religion and science, conceived on a very broad scale and carried through across a wide range of disciplines, from physics to psychology. The apparent superficiality of such a massive project is avoided by an impressive marshalling of specific cases, and by sustained attention to a few crucial questions. Since its publication in 1966, Ian Barbour's *Issues in Science and Religion* has served as a standard textbook in this area. Rolston's work provides a first rate alternative and supplement. ... The distinguishing feature of Rolston's book is the way in which he has organized the material around a sustained and nuanced argument. ... He views nature as a *storied reality*, playing upon the necessity to appreciate both its multi-leveled character and its openness to narrative of human meaning, if there is to be full understanding. This proves an especially fruitful perspective (and) functions unusually well, giving the reader a thick sense of the complexities involved in moving from one 'story' to another, and the variety of perspectives within science as it operates on these different levels. ... Rolston's study is careful, and yet freshly suggestive in the manner it probes the nature of scientific theory. ... The book deserves and will find wide use." Review in *Christian Scholar's Review* 17(1988):490-491.

L. Russ Bush (Theology, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas) says that *Science and Religion* is an "unusually insightful book," though "the book is rather sophisticated and will take quite a bit of time if it is read and digested. ... Rolston brings a vast synthesis of information to the subject and even where I disagree I can learn from the discussion. Along with Ian Barbour, Frederick Ferré, and Robert Russell, I too commend this as important reading for advanced students in the field." Review in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30(1988):75.

Jeff Astley (School of Education, University of Durham, England) says that *Science and Religion* "is likely to become the standard text on this subject: a valuable source of information and reflection suitable for both the 'A' level teacher and the undergraduate student of science and religion." It is "a good guide book containing an up-to-date, large-scale map. ... The arguments are clearly presented and the language is often pithy and memorable. ... What marks the author's thesis as a significant contribution to the science and religion debate are his stress on the category of 'story' (rather than 'law'), on the importance of the discernment of 'meanings' rather than just 'causes'), and on the place of ('logically singular') historically explanation alongside ('logically plural') scientific explanations. ... The book is worth reading simply for its unflinching recognition that it is on the age-old battle ground of the problem of suffering that the warfare of science and religion is at its bloodiest."

"The theist will welcome the depth of the author's spirituality as well as his learning, and relish his out-flanking attacks on scientists, and their camp-followers, who have overreached themselves in their claims for the explanatory power of the theory of natural selection, the adequacy of certain psychological models of the mind, and the possibility of value-free social science." Review in *British Journal of Religious Education* 11(1989):49-50.

Karl Peters (Editor, *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*) uses a quotation from *Science and Religion* as an epigraph to a special issue of *Zygon* on novel ways of relating science and religion. The quotation is: "Science and religion share the conviction that the world is intelligible, susceptible to being logically understood, but they delineate this under different paradigms. In the cleanest cases we can say that science operates with the presumption that there are causes to things, religion with the presumption that there are meanings to things." *Zygon* 25(1990):3.

K. Helmut Reich (European Laboratory for Particle Research [CERN], Geneva, and Department of Education, University of Fribourg, Switzerland) cites and quotes from *Science and Religion* several times in a discussion of complementarity as a category for relating science and religion, taking *Science and Religion* as one of three of the most important contemporary examples of spelling out in detail what this complementarity means. "The Relation between Science and Theology: The Case for Complementarity Revisited," *Zygon* 25(1990):369-390, citations on p. 384, p. 388, p. 390.


Research Conference

The following papers appear in an issue of the *Center for Theology and Natural Sciences Bulletin*, vol. 11, no. 2, the proceedings of a research conference devoted to Rolston's work in the interrelations between biology and theology at the Center for Theology and Natural Sciences, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA, February 8-16, 1991.


Rolston, "Genes, Genesis, and God in Natural and Human History, pp. 9-23.

Commentaries in analysis of Rolston's published work and conference papers:


Ted Peters, "Beyond the Genes: Epigenesis and God, pp. 34-35.


M. Clarke (Philosophy, Concordia University, Montreal) cites Science and Religion in "Epistemic Norms and Evolutionary Success," Synthese 85(2)(1990):231-244.


Henry A. Regier (Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Toronto) cites Rolston's distinction between hard and soft naturalism in Science and Religion as important for understanding a tension within different approaches to environmental science. In "Ecosystem Integrity in the Great Lakes Basin: An Historical Sketch of Ideas and Actions," Journal of Aquatic Ecosystem Health 1(1992):25-37.

Murray Clarke (Philosophy, Concordia University, Montreal) cites Science and Religion for its "nonorthodox progressive alternative" to evolutionary theory as a random walk. In "Epistemic Norms an Evolutionary Success," Synthese: An International Journal for Epistemology, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science 85(1990)231-244, citation on p. 240, p. 242, p. 244.

Christopher F. Mooney (Religion, Fairfield University, Connecticut) cites Science and Religion for its discussion of the relationship of causes in science to meanings in religion. In "Theology and

Michael A. Corey (Claremont Graduate School) cites and quotes from *Science and Religion* on creation as an open process that permits integrity in the creatures. In *God and the New Cosmology* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1993), pp. 249-250.


J. P. Moreland (Theology, Biola University, LaMirada, CA) cites *Science and Religion* in a select bibliography in *Christianity and the Nature of Science: A Philosophical Investigation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), p. 252, also p. 35.


Svetlana Devyatova (Philosophy, Moscow State University) cites *Science and Religion* as presenting a concept of God consistent with science. In *Religiya i Nauka: Shag k Primireniiyu? (Religion and Science: A Step toward Reconciliation)* (Moscow: Moscow University, 1993), citations on p. 31f, p. 48ff, p. 166.

Svetlana Devyatova (Philosophy, Moscow State University) cites *Science and Religion* as illustrating the influence of science on the concept of God in Western thought. In *Veru, Shtaby Znat (Faith in Order to Understanding)*, a special issue of *Chelovek i Obscehestvo (Human Beings and Society)* (Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Education), March 1992, pp. 3-63, citations on pp 33-34. 33-34.

Sallie McFague (Theology, Vanderbilt Divinity School, Vanderbilt University) cites and quotes from *Science and Religion*. Rolston argues "with extreme sublety" the claim "that no special entity, principle, or substance needs to be or should be introduced to explain the evolution of the universe from its simple beginning to its present outcome--on our planet, to human beings with brains or minds (and some would claim) spirits" (p. 47, p. 228), though a concept of "downward causation" is needed where "a prolife principle is overseeing the affairs of matter" (p. 234). Also p. 222. In *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

M. A. Corey (Claremont Graduate School) cites and quotes from *Science and Religion*, building on

Stanton L. Jones (Psychology, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL) cites Science and Religion as well documenting the use of psychological findings or theories to attempt to revise, reinterpret, redefine, supplant, or dismiss religion, and as working out in detail aspects of the relation between psychology and religion, as well as between science and religion in general. In "A Constructive Relationship for Religion Within the Science and Profession of Psychology," American Psychologist 49(1994):184-199, citations on p. 185, p. 188, p. 189, p. 199.


John H. Wright (Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley) calls Science and Religion "an extraordinarily complete basic treatment." In "Theology, Philosophy, and the Natural Sciences," Theological Studies 52(4)(1991):651-668, citation on p. 651, also p. 667.


David W. Oxtoby (Chemistry, Director of the James Frank Institute, University of Chicago) cites


James E. Coufal and Charles M. Spuches (Environmental Sciences and Forestry, SUNY, Syracuse, NY) cite *Science and Religion* in *Environmental Ethics in Practice: Developing a Personal Ethic* (Syracuse, NY: SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, 1995), Appendix D12.


Robert A. Campbell (University College of Cape Breton) and James E. Curtis (University of Waterloo) cite *Science and Religion* as one of the leading studies to examine science and religion on a philosophical basis. In "The Public's Views on the Future of Religion and Science: Cross-National Survey Results," *Review of Religious Research* 37(no. 3, March, 1996):164-171, citation on p. 164, p. 171.


Langdon Gilkey (Theology, Divinity School, University of Chicago) cites *Science and Religion*. Rolston is one of three "impressarios of religion-science events" whose "example and organizing talents have encouraged a great deal of my work in the field." In understanding the "four major categories in terms of which nature has been experienced and known, ... I am especially and vastly indebted to Micea Eliade, Lawrence Sullivan, and, for modern science, Holmes Rolston, Ill." Rolston makes a "fascinating, perceptive and (to me) very original exploration of the theme of the intertwining of energy and pain, life and suffering (and their common result: more life, new life, and new life forms)." "The great Dying yields the great Renewal." "No one has made this point more perceptively, clearly, and profoundly than Rolston."

John Polkinghorne (Physics, Theology, Cambridge University) cites *Science and Religion* for its "candid response to the problems represented by the cruciform nature of our world." In *Belief in God in an Age of Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), citation on p. 79.


J. Wentzel Van Huyssteen (Theology and Science, Princeton Theological Seminary) cites *Science


Eduardo R. Cruz (Religious Studies, Pontifical Catholic University of Sao Paolo) cites *Science and Religion*. "Any sophisticated description recognizes the ambivalence of the evolutionary process that has led to humankind ... more generally found in the tension between designlike and nonanthropomorphic (usually related to "disorder) traits in all evolutionary processes--see, for example, the excellent account given by Holmes Rolston, III." In "Paul Tillich's Realistic Stance toward the Vital Trends of Nature," *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 36(2001):327-334, citations on p. 330, p. 331, p. 334.


Arthur Peacocke (Ian Ramsey Centre, Centre for the Study of Science and Religion, Oxford University) finds that *Science and Religion* "is a stimulating book and is especially significant for its treatment of the biological, psychological, and social sciences." In *Paths from Science towards God* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2001), citation on p. 188.


John F. Haught (Theology, Georgetown University) cites *Science and Religion* on hard and soft

Lisa H. Sideris (School of Environment and Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal) cites Science and Religion. In Environmental Ethics, Ecological Theology, and Natural Selection (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), citations passim.

Angelica Duran (English, Purdue University) cites Science and Religion on the relation between words and mathematics in science and the bearing of this on the sublime in religion, "the strategies of mathematical signification that can be applied to Milton's era and to our own." In "The Sexual Mathematics of Paradise Lost," Milton Quarterly 37(no. 2, 2003):55-76, citation on pp. 70-71, p. 76.

Derek L. Pusey (Physics, Iowa State University) cites Science and Religion. In "What if ID IS True?" Presbyterian Outlook 188 (no. 8, February 27):12-13.


Mikael Stenmark (Theology, Uppsala University, Sweden) cites Science and Religion on critical evaluation of religious belief, on causes and meanings in science and religion, and on relations between science and religion. In How to Relate Science and Religion (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), citations on p. 21, p. 26, p. 29, p. 266, p. 275.


Wayne Viney (Psychology, Colorado State University) and William Douglas Woody (Psychological Sciences, University of Northern Colorado) say “Thoughtful critical comment of psychology is nowhere better illustrated than in Holmes Rolston’s scholarly book Science and Religion: A Critical Survey. Rolston carefully explores classical psychoanalysis, behaviorism, and humanistic psychology along with a brief treatment of cognitive psychology. His work challenges the earlier claim of Leuba that ‘the subjective facts of religious life belong to psychology.’ Indeed, Rolston notes correctly that in the case of most behavioral psychologies, there is no inner life. Other psychological systems, according to Rolston, are equally inadequate in their attempts to explain human religious experiences. The reductionist scientific frames in each case are insufficient for the profuse, robust, personal, and complex nature of the subject matter they hope to capture.

Roslton concludes that none of the psychological systems he explores ‘has enough historical rooting, evolutionary scope, cultural appreciation, or ontological insight. This does not fault what they can successfully abstract from life, but shows them to be incomplete explanations of what it means to live humanly in the world.’” In Wayne Viney and William Douglas Woody, Neglected Perspectives on Science and Religion: Historical and Contemporary Relations (New
Part 2. Other critical notice in science and religion


John Brooke (History of Science, University of Lancaster; Science and Religion, Oxford University) and Geoffrey Cantor (History of Science, University of Leeds) cite and quote from "Does Nature Need to be Redeemed?" a "striking passage" on the human relationship to nature. In their Gifford Lectures, *Reconstructing Nature: The Engagement of Science and Religion* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), citation on p. 167, p. 175.


Nancey Murphy (Philosophy, Fuller Theological Seminary) and George F. R. Ellis (Mathematics, Astronomy, University of Cape Town, South Africa) cite "Does Nature Need To Be Redeemed?", "quoting Rolston's inimitable prose at length" on the "cruciform" character of the natural world. In *On the Moral Nature of the Universe: Theology, Cosmology, and Ethics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), citations on p. 203, pp. 211-213, p. 245, p. 248.

David W. Oxtoby (Chemistry, Director of the James Frank Institute, University of Chicago) cites Rolston's discussion of "surprises of the first magnitude" in human and evolutionary history, and his criticism of process philosophy for insufficient attention to such genuine novelty, in "Religion in an Age of Science; Metaphysics in an Era of History" (review of Barbour, Religion in an Age of Science). In "Sudden Change in the World," Zygon 29(1994):547-555. citation on p. 549. p. 555.


J. Wentzel Van Huyssteen (Princeton Theological Seminary) cites "Science, Religion, and the Future" repeatedly. "Holmes Rolston is right, therefore, when he claims a more nuanced approach: at present, for example, there may be more dialogue and integration between physics, cosmology, and theology; but between biology and theology there is certainly ample conflict and considerable independence" (p. 3). "Again, Rolston is sharp and to the point: the dialogue between biology and religion will increasingly try to figure out whether in the genesis of these riches [biodiversity on Earth] we need interference by a supernatural agency, or the recognition of a marvelous endowment of matter with a propensity toward life... Rolston has also intriguingly predicted that in the century to come science will reveal the order on our earth to be even more remarkable still" (p. 37).

"Holmes Rolston gives a vivid rendition of how the two kinds of biology have now been creatively and theoretically interrelated: the genetic level supplies variations, does the coding of life, and constructs proteins; organisms then cope at their native-range levels, inhabiting ecosystems; and species are selected and transformed as they track changing environments across deep evolutionary time" (p. 107). "Holmes Rolston too has argued this point very clearly: in nature information travels intergenerationally through genes, while in culture information travels neurally, as people are educated into transmissible cultures" (p. 158). In Duet or Duel? Theology and Science in a Postmodern World (London: SCM Press, 1998, and Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998). Citations on p. 2, p. 3, p. 34, pp. 36-38, pp. 106-108, p. 158.


Christopher Southgate (Theology, University of Exeter, UK), Celia Deane-Drummond (Theology, University College, Chester, UK), Paul D. Murray (Theology, Newman College, Birmingham, UK), Michael Robert Negus (Biology, Newman College, Birmingham), Lawrence Osborn (Astronomy, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. UK), Michael Poole (Education, King's College, London), Jacqui Stewart (Theology and Biology, University of Leeds, UK), and Fraser Watts (Theology and the Natural Sciences, University of Cambridge, UK) cite "Science, Religion, and the Future." In God, Humanity and the Cosmos (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, and Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1999), citations on p. 393, pp. 396-397, p. 425.


Bradley C. Hanson (Religion, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa) cites "Shaken Atheism: A Look at the Fine-Tuned Universe." In Introduction to Christian Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), citation on p. 49.


Chad Stanley Mason (Mennonite pastor, Des Moines, Iowa) cites Science and Religion: "The secret of life is that it is a passion play" (p. 144). In "Passion Play," Christian Century 123(no. 8, April 18, 2006):9-10.

Joseph A. Bracken (Theology, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio) cites "Naturalizing and Systematizing Evil" for its concept of a "cruciform creation." In Christianity and Process Thought (Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2006), citation on p. 32, p. 143.

Robert J. Russell (Director, Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA) cites "Does Nature Need to be Redeemed?" for its account of natural history as a "passion play." In "An Appreciative Response to Niels Henrik Gregersen's JKR Research Conference Lecture," Theology and Science 4(no.,2, 2006):129-135, citation on p. 132, p. 134.


Von Markus Huppenbauer (Theology, University of Zurich) cites "God and Endangered Species," also with reference to the "backup pelican chick" discussed in Science and Religion, chapter 3. In "Der liebe Gott, die Moral und das zweite Pelikanküken: Schöpfungsethische Reflexionen vor perspektivitätstheoretischem Hintergrund [The Compassionate God, Morality, and the Second Pelican Chick - Creation-ethical reflections against a perspectivist-theoretical background - The


Marti Kheel (Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA) has a chapter, "The Ecophilosophy of Holmes Rolston III" in *Nature Ethics: An Ecofeminist Perspective* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008), pp. 137-162, including citations of Rolston's *Science and Religion*.


Christopher Southgate (Theology, University of Exeter) cites various of Rolston's works repeatedly (about six dozen times) as these apply to the suffering of nonhuman creatures in evolutionary natural history. In *Groaning in Travail: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008), citations passim.


David G. Horrell, Cheryl Hunt, and Christopher Southgate (Theology, University of Exeter) cite and quote from various of Rolston’s works, especially as these involve the ambiguous creation which must be understood as both “very good” and “groaning in travail.” In Greening Paul: Rereading the Apostle in a Time of Ecological Crisis (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010). Citations on p. 133, p. 143, p.185, p. 207, pp. 262-263, p.278, p. 308.

Robin Attfield (Philosophy, University of Wales, Cardiff) cites and quotes from Rolston repeatedly, especially on questions of disvalues in nature. In Wonder, Value and God (London: Routledge, 2017). Citations on pp. 18, 23, 24, 50, 54, 57, 69n, 80-81, 83, 86, 90n, 111-112, 128,
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