instance, an essay on masochism, an essay on David Lynch, an essay on the occult, and an essay on epistemology. The strength of the book is also its weakness. The book paves new ground by bringing literary and philosophical insights to a project that is, topically speaking, a project in psychology of religion (this is its strength), but what is missing from the book is serious engagement with previous and contemporary work in psychology of religion and religious studies related to the theme of the volume (this is its weakness). Perhaps Fish is right that religion will be the next big thing in the academy, and if so, one hopes that religious studies scholars will have a place at the table. In any case, religious studies scholars did not have a strong presence in the table of contents of this book. This book will be most valuable to scholars in psychology of religion seeking to incorporate literary and philosophical insights into their work. The volume is recommended.

Nathan Carlin
University of Texas Medical School

Religion and Science


In this volume, Ruse examines Christianity with a generosity uncommon in recent times. He begins with a lengthy overview of the switch from an organismic conception of the universe to modernity’s machine metaphor. Ironically, he argues, the loss of the teleological view was partly a consequence of the mechanist metaphor, itself inspired by Christianity. Although it is not clear that he has disentangled all of the various conceptions of the metaphor, Ruse has made a great contribution to our understanding of mechanism—an all too neglected concept in the science-religion literature outside of Thomist circles. For Ruse, while mechanistic science rightly dominates, it cannot answer every important question, such as why there is something rather than nothing. The essentials of Christian faith, not being in the scientific domain, are not destroyed by science. But there are costs for this concession. God can still be the creator; but cannot be too involved (e.g., guiding mutations). Natural theology is suspect. Evidence itself seems in science’s domain. So, Christians should be fideists about miracles. Using religious knowledge (say, that God created the world) to guide one’s science appears unthinkable. In the end, nothing in science eviscerates Christian faith, but then, neither does knowledge of the natural world form a seamless unity with revealed knowledge. One suspects many Christians will find this a Faustian bargain. Christian belief, while taken seriously by Ruse, is an add-on to an already coherent worldview that may just as easily be left off.

Logan Paul Gage
Baylor University

Theology


In 1979, the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture in Nagoya initiated an intermonastic exchange involving Christians and Buddhists from leading monasteries of Europe and Japan. The brief experience of the nuns and monks who shared in the monastic life of their Buddhist counterparts led to more extended encounters and, for not a few of the participants, left a lasting impact on their religious life and practice. The guidelines established the previous year by the Vatican commission for Monastic Interreligious Dialogue proved, in practice, too restrictive to accommodate the experience of the participants. The numerous doctrinal suspicions voiced by church authorities observing the events from the outside failed to capture the spirit of the adventure, and it was only through the patient resistance of monks like de Béthune that the dialogue continues to this day. This book is a thoughtful and inspiring reflection on that spirit. Tracing his encounters with the tea ceremony, Zen meditation, and life in a Buddhist monastery, the author examines the idea of “hospitality” as the heart of interreligious dialogue. His text is sprinkled with well-chosen sayings and stories from the Buddhist tradition, along with the occasional jab at the “shallowness” and baroque irrelevance of the way Christian doctrine and art is promoted in Rome. The contrast is not drawn with arrogance, but with the simplicity of a true spiritual master who knows what it is to let go of privilege and rank in order to remain a disciple to the things that matter most.

James Heisig
Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture


This collection of ten essays follows up the authors’ Constants in Context (2004) by deepening their argument that twenty-first-century Roman Catholic mission theology and practice should be understood as “prophetic dialogue.” The adjective “prophetic” heralds the bold and normative function of divine action and therefore of mission work, while the noun “dialogue” evokes the gentle humility of listening to and passing over into other cultures, so that mission is gentle while bold and dialogical while normative. Likewise, “prophetic dialogue” represents a compromise between the Asian priests of the Society of the Divine Word, who stress mission as dialogue, and their Latin American counterparts, for whom mission work, as liberation, requires prophetic commitments. This clearly written book represents the latest from two leading North American missiologists and deserves consideration.
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