

the Human Mind?" (pp. 179–90); A. Markos et al., "Aut Moses, aut Darwin?" (pp. 125–42); and G. Bugajak and J. Tomczyk, "Human Origins: Continuous Evolution versus Punctual Creation" (pp. 143–64)—because of the somewhat common epistemological roots that were severed only during the early twentieth century with the enforced ideology of dialectical materialism superimposed by the political powers. A much tougher challenge is to meaningfully engage in dialogue with the Asian traditions represented in this anthology: S. Menon, "The Puzzle of Consciousness and Experimental Primacy" (pp. 3–20); M. Paranjape, "Science and Spirituality in Modern India" (pp. 39–54); P. Swanson, "*Kokoro* [Mind-Heart-Spirit]: Affirming Science and Religion in the Japanese Context" (pp. 55–68); J. Sheng, "Daoism and the Uncertainty Principle" (pp. 69–92); R. Takeda, "Whitehead Reconsidered from a Buddhist Perspective" (pp. 93–106); and H. Young Kim, "Sanctity of Life: A Reflection on Human Embryonic Stem Cell Debates from an East Asian Perspective" (pp. 107–24)—save any superficial, undiscerning quick associations. Because the issue is indeed mainly a problem for the Western mind and Western intellectual history, not to the East, a respective critical hermeneutical reflection has to precede any such conversation, a reflection that is missing here.

Despite the editor's perception of this book as "an accessible stand-alone text" (p. vii), it is anything but this. It gives account of an ongoing inquiry and of some of the individuals presently actively involved in it. It also highlights an already existing discourse on multiple topics deserving serious attention that to discuss in detail or even highlight here is simply impossible. The Templeton Foundation is to be praised for having initiated a project like this and the editor for having these papers published in a timely manner so as to get others beyond the network involved in the task. May the high expectations accompanying this publication of "scintillating overtures" (p. ix) not be disappointed but find the echo they deserve, because the various issues raised are important indeed and need serious attention.

CHRISTOFFER H. GRUNDMANN

John R. Eckrich University Chair in Religion and the Healing Arts
Valparaiso University
Valparaiso, Indiana

Science and Religion: New Historical Perspectives. Edited by Thomas Dixon, Geoffrey Cantor, and Stephen Pumfrey. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010. xii + 317 pages. \$95.00.

This book is dedicated to John Brooke, author of *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (1991). Brooke is one of the key representatives of the recent wave in the history of science that addresses extensively also the relations with religions. He may be considered the intellectual author of what has been dubbed by others "the complexity thesis," as he wrote: "it is almost always assumed that there are lessons to be learned from history. The object of this book is not to deny that assumption but to show that the lessons are far from simple. . . . The real lesson turns out to be the complexity" (Brooke 1991, 4f.). Neither polemics (conflict thesis) nor apologetics is the task of the historian, but more scholarly and impartial analysis.

The book opens with an excellent essay by Thomas Dixon that introduces various key issues, and on which I draw for this review. If everything is complex and contextualized, it seems one can have nothing but case studies. However, some of the contributors argue that some generalizations are possible, even when one avoids the all too general master narratives of conflict and secularization (so Peter Harrison, Geoffrey Cantor, and Ronald L. Numbers in this volume). And, if everything is complex, major categories such as *scientist*, *science*, and *religion* have to be historicized as well. The book reprints an essay by Harrison, Brooke's successor at the chair in Oxford, on the construction of the boundaries between religion and science. It would have been nice to complement this with an essay by Brooke on the construction of the concept of nature via various oppositions (Brooke 2009, an article not yet listed in the rich bibliography of works by Brooke and of works on religion and science in various traditions and periods).

Two authors, Salman Hameed and B. Harun Küçük, consider the way in which, in the nineteenth-century polemics against Christianity by William Draper and Andrew D. White, Islam was portrayed as a religion that, in contrast to Christianity, had been hospitable to the development of science. And is religion to be understood as belief in truth claims or rather as practice (so in this volume Jan Golinsky and Jonathan Topham)? Some contributors relate engagements of religion and science with long-term developments in European social and cultural history, including urbanization (Margaret J. Osler) and state-sponsored education in its different American and European forms (Frank M. Turner, Bronislaw Szerszynski, Adam Shapiro). Colonial history too plays a role (Sujit Sivasundaran, Hameed). Again and again, these contributions reinforce the truth of a passage quoted on page 12 by Dixon from Brooke (1991, 5): "Conflicts allegedly between science and religion may turn out to be between rival scientific interests or between rival theological factions. Issues of political power, social prestige and intellectual authority have repeatedly been at stake."

What lessons should be drawn from the studies presented here? Noah Efron signals the radical pluralism involved, and thus the way this might be an impediment to discuss any issue of substance within a tradition or across traditions. What can be done systematically once the historians have done their job? This is a question for philosophers, theologians, and others who participate in the intellectual reflection and debates. All interested in "religion and science," both observers and participants, would be enriched by taking in these exemplary examples of historical scholarship.

WILLEM B. DREES
 Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Ethics
 Vice-dean, Faculty of Humanities
 Leiden University
 PO Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands
 w.b.drees@hum.leidenuniv.nl

REFERENCES

- Brooke, John Hedley. 1991. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- . 2009. "Should the Word *Nature* Be Eliminated?" In *Envisioning Nature, Science, and Religion*, ed. James B. Proctor, 312–36. West Conshohocken, Pa.: Templeton Foundation Press.