

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 6/2 (1995):6-51.
Article copyright © 1995 by Martin F. Hanna.

SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY: Focusing the Complementary Lights of Jesus, Scripture and Nature

By Martin F. Hanna
Ph.D. Candidate
Andrews University

A Complex Problem

The Problem of Definitions. The problem of the relationship between science and theology is complicated by the fact that there are no universally accepted definitions for these terms. Bengt Gustafsson comments that the various sciences seem to constitute a turmoil of different and often contradictory assumptions, methods and results. While specific sciences have attained a limited coherence, the system of the sciences has not yet produced a completely ordered theoretical world view.¹ Similarly, Robert King observes that there is an apparent disarray in theology. Even individual communities of faith are being overwhelmed by theological pluralism. Today there are no commanding theologians, no systems of theology that elicit wide support, and no general agreement even as to what theology is.²

On the one hand, the terms science and theology have been used to distinguish the study of nature from the study of God.³ According to the naturalistic view of science, nature is a closed system in which God does not act. Some scientists go so far as to assume that nature is the ultimate reality and that there is no God beyond nature. From this perspective, theology is unscientific because its methods and objectives are unlike those of other sciences. These sciences are presently dominated by methodological naturalism.⁴ However, even naturalistic science seems to have

theological implications. To view nature as ultimate is to put it in the place of God, making it divine. As Roy Clouser points out, there may be a hidden role for religious belief (or unbelief) even in naturalistic theories of science.⁵

On the other hand, the term science may be used to denote any disciplined methodological search for knowledge where the method of study suits its objective. From this perspective, theology may be regarded as a theistic science; and nature may be viewed as a system which is open to divine revelation. Therefore, knowledge about God and nature are not independent of each other. As Herman Bavinck expressed it, "natural science is not the only science, and cannot be."⁶ Actually, the element of *scientia* in the theological tradition has kept it viable for a long time. Only with German Pietism did a theology which was understood as devoid of science acquire any notable authority.⁷

The Problem of Multiple Models. The various conceptions of science and theology result in a large number of conflicting theoretical frameworks or models for their relations. William Austin categorizes these models in terms of direct relations—where science and theology compete with, confirm and/or contradict each other; and indirect relations—where they provide insights, metaphysics and/or methodology for each other. Also, some models may be categorized as complex—where there are direct as well as indirect science-theology relations.⁸

The search for a viable model takes on great importance because science-theology relations may be regarded as harmful and/or helpful. For example, in rejecting one model, Carl Raschke writes that "perhaps the most formidable obstacle for theological thinking is the epistemological challenge posed by modern science." However, in support of another model, he suggests that it is "the neglect of theological thinking [which] has led not only to the demise of what was once the premier "science," [theology] but to the slow deterioration of the various habits on intellectual probing [in other sciences]."⁹

The *National Academy of Sciences* manifests a similar ambivalence about science-theology relations. The *Academy* denies that there is "an irreconcilable conflict between religion and science." Yet it claims that scientific and theological thinking are

“separate and mutually exclusive realms of human thought whose presentation in the same context leads to misunderstanding of both.” Some models for science-theology relations are regarded as a “challenge to the integrity and effectiveness of our national education system and the hard-won evidence-based foundations of Science, . . . [to] academic and intellectual freedom and to the fundamental principles of scientific thought.”¹⁰

The Problem of Scripture. Can Scripture provide a basis for the evaluation of the various models for science-theology relations? Yes it can. Dale Moody reports that, in the dialogue among theologians, it is increasingly evident that the only sufficient ground of Christian unity is the common Christian regard for Scripture.¹¹ Dorothee Sölle—a radical theologian—suggests that all Christians view Scripture not only as a source but also as the binding, limiting, norm making (*norma normans*) standard that sets the rules for the use of other normed standards for theology (*normae normatae*).¹² Similarly, Richard Davidson—a Seventh-day Adventist theologian—suggests that all Christians should come to Scripture acknowledging our biases and preunderstandings and claiming the divine promise to bring us into harmony with normative biblical presuppositions.¹³

Nevertheless, radical theology is very different from and incompatible with Adventist theology. This indicates that the role of Scripture in contemporary Christian theology is in itself problematic. Even among those who agree that Scripture sets the rules for theology there may be much disagreement as to what those rules are. A focal point of this debate is the *sola Scriptura* principle. Lack of agreement on this issue contributes to the largest division in Christianity. Catholics and Protestants regard experience, reason and tradition (ERT) as a proper context for the interpretation of Scripture.¹⁴ However, Protestants use the slogan *sola Scriptura* to identify Scripture as *the* standard for *their* evaluation of ERT. Catholics also claim to be faithful to Scripture but they evaluate ERT differently.¹⁵

The issue of the *sola Scriptura* principle also contributes to a division among Christians concerning how to relate the study of Jesus, Scripture and nature. (Notice that human nature, which includes ERT, is the context for the incarnation of Jesus and the

inspiration of Scripture). This provokes a number of difficult questions. Are Jesus, Scripture and nature revelations of God and therefore sources and standards for theology? What are the relations between God and revelation, between the divine and the human in revelation, and among God’s revelations? Do Jesus, Scripture and nature shed light on each other?

A Seventh-day Adventist Solution

An Inclusive Model. A biblical and inclusive model for Christian theology proposes a viable solution to the complex problem of science-theology relations. In this model, theology (*theologia*) is the study of God as He is revealed to humanity in His word (*logos theou*). The word of God in the entire Judeo-Christian Scripture (*tota Scriptura*) is a unique (*sola Scriptura*) and primary (*prima Scriptura*) standard for theology. According to Scripture, there is a sense in which Scripture is the source, standard and context for theology. Scripture interprets Scripture. However, also according to Scripture, Jesus and nature are in a sense unique and primary as source and context for theology. Jesus—the supreme revelation of God, is the source of the special revelation in Scripture and the general revelation in nature. Nature, including human nature, is the context for the incarnation of Jesus and for the inspiration and the interpretation of Scripture.¹⁶

An Adventist Model. This biblical model implies that there is a legitimate place for a theological interpretation of the methods and results of other sciences. As the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* suggests, “the revelation contained in the word of God is necessary for meaning and perspective in science” and the “revelation in the world of science gives added meaning to religion.”¹⁷ This does not mean that theology establishes the methods and results of other sciences or that they establish the methods and results of theology. In this model, the authority of one divine-human revelation does not compromise the authority of another. According to the book *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*, when rightly understood, the divine-human revelations in Jesus, Scripture and nature are in perfect harmony. Any apparent conflict is the result of our imperfect comprehension.¹⁸

Sin obscures God’s self-revelation through creation [nature] by limit-

ing our ability to interpret God's testimony. [However,] in love God gave a special revelation of Himself [in Scripture].

The Bible both contains propositions that declare the truth about God, and reveals Him as a person. Both areas of revelation are necessary: we need to know God through Jesus Christ . . . as well as "the truth that is in Jesus" . . . by means of the Scriptures¹⁹

Limitations. The model for theology which is presented here is necessarily relative to the writer's present understanding of God's word and is therefore open to revision. The reader is encouraged to keep an open mind to the evaluation of theoretical models on the basis of a continuing consideration of the entire word of God. It is not possible here to give an exhaustive treatment of all the issues involved in the solution of the science-theology problem. Also, only a few quotations from the many scientists and theologians who recognize the significance of these issues are included. However, the endnotes provide some indication of the extent of the contemporary discussion within and outside of Adventist theology.²⁰ In what follows, a brief history of the complex science-theology problem is presented as a background to a more complete description of the inclusive model for Adventist theology introduced above.

The Problem: Historical Background

The Premodern Period. The two thousand year history of the science-theology problem may be divided into three periods: premodern, modern and postmodern. For sixteen centuries before the Protestant Reformation, premodern theology was influenced by two theologians above all others. First, Augustine (d. 430 A.D.) promoted the idea of Plato (d. 347 B.C.) that wisdom is superior to knowledge. As a result, theology was regarded as superior to science. Later, Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274 A.D.) promoted the idea of Aristotle (d. 322 B.C.) that science is derived from first principles. Thus theology came to be regarded as the highest derived science.²¹

Nevertheless, premodern theology contained the seeds of the idea of God-world separation that would produce a harvest of science-theology conflict in the modern period. The Eastern strand of premodern theology modeled the relations of God and nature as organic through the mediation of a Cosmic Christ.²² In contrast,

Western theology modeled the transcendent world of God (*neotos*) as separated from the immanent human world (*aisthetos*) by a chasm (*chorismos*). This gap was bridged by a combination of rational natural theology grounded in nature and revealed theology received by faith.²³ However, God's word in Christ and in the language of Scripture²⁴ was viewed as primarily a source of timeless doctrine about the transcendent divine order and only secondarily a support for ideas about the immanent natural order.²⁵

The Modern Period. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, there was a decline of traditional natural theology and a rise of methodological naturalism in modern science. Consequently, nature was modeled as a machine which was separated from God. Two philosopher-theologians are especially representative of this development. René Descartes (d. 1650) divided reality into matter and mind or spirit; and Immanuel Kant (d. 1804) divided knowledge into that which may be known and that which must be believed because of practical necessity.²⁶

Jerrey Hopper comments that in the premodern period, for the most part, theology set the rules for science. "Now this situation was reversed, and the findings of science were setting the problems for philosophy which in turn was beginning to define new rules for theology."²⁷ This led to increasing conflict between modern science and traditional theology. On the one hand, modern science has undermined premodern views of the factual relevance of Scripture. On the other hand, modern *critical* hermeneutics views language as essentially descriptive of an immanent natural reality rather than a transcendent supernatural reality.²⁸

Modern theologians have responded in different ways. On the one hand, Friedrich Schleiermacher (d. 1834), the father of Protestant Liberalism, sought a truce in the science-theology conflict by describing theology as a positive and practical science rather than as a pure science. He viewed Scripture as essentially a record of religious experience. On the other hand, Benjamin B. Warfield (d. 1921) was a foremost proponent of the view that Scripture records factual propositions. This view has come to be associated with fundamentalist and conservative theology.²⁹

The Postmodern Period. A growing number of scientists and theologians regard 20th century science as radically different from

premodern derived science and modern methodological naturalism. However, others emphasize the continuity of the history of science. What is clear is that scientific models have undergone significant change. Nature is now modeled as a history in which the core of reality is mysterious. Theology has also changed. *Postcritical* theologians usually use modern critical methods, but they recognize the limited theological usefulness of the historical-critical paradigm with its emphasis on the human context of the formation of Scripture. Much of postmodern thought tends toward irrationalism and nihilism. However, many contemporary theologians seek to overcome the imbalance of the premodern and modern emphasis on transcendence and immanence by recognizing Jesus, Scripture and nature as in some sense revelations of a mediated divine transcendence.³⁰

Unfortunately, because of the tensions within postmodern thought, no new theological unity has emerged. The tendencies toward division in the premodern and modern periods have developed into a radical pluralism of views about Jesus, Scripture and nature. The Scholastic, Liberal and Fundamentalist influences continue. In addition, other types of theology view Scripture in different ways as: witness to revelation (NeoOrthodox); symbolization of divine-human encounter (Existentialist); salvation message (NeoEvangelical), source of metaphors (Narrative), source of models (Feminist), foundation for freedom (Liberation), and as an unfolding of divine action (Process). These approaches to theology view the text of Scripture either as a revelation, as a witness to a historical revelation "behind" the text, or as a catalyst for contemporary revelation "in front of" the text. Presently, the cutting edge of Christian theology involves the search for a viable model which deals with the manifold revelation of God in Jesus, Scripture and nature.³¹

Two Case Studies. Further perspective on science-theology relations in the postmodern period may be provided by tracing the influence of two *postliberal* theologians. On the right of liberal theology, Karl Barth (d. 1968)—the father of neo-orthodoxy—aimed to restate orthodoxy independently of science. On the left of liberal theology, Paul Tillich (d. 1965)—the father of existentialist theology—developed the idea that Bible symbols provide answers

to the ultimate symbolic questions of science. According to John Dillenberger, these theologians "represent the theological revolution in our time." They are key reference points on the theological landscape.³²

Langdon Gilkey (1919-), on the right of Tillich, practices a *scientific-existentialist theology* and assumes a divine realm beyond science and the complementarity of God and nature. According to Gilkey, some constitutive elements of the Bible have lost their legitimacy in a scientific culture. Science is the normative mode for knowing the space-time world, and is confined to explanation by finite or empirical secular causes. In contrast, theology is unrelated to facts and unable to establish anything relevant to science. Therefore, Scripture is to be interpreted in light of the factual conclusions of a science characterized by methodological naturalism. As a result, Gilkey concludes that while the early Christians were certain that God had raised Jesus from the dead, contemporary Christians can speak of the resurrection only in symbolic language. It is impossible to say what happened in literal terms, such as "empty tomb" and "bodily ascension," because it was the work of God and not a natural event.³³

Thomas Torrance (1913-), on the left of Barth, practices a *trans-scientific theology* which balances scientific relevance with theological independence and goes beyond the other sciences in theological explanation. Unlike Gilkey, Torrance rejects the idea that we are limited to knowledge of what early Christians appeared to make of Jesus as they clothed Him with meanings and created 'historical events' to suit their needs. He also rejects the idea that we must seek by symbolic reinterpretation to let what they did become a focus of meaning for ourselves. Theology must do its work within the context of the revolutionary changes in the scientific foundations of knowledge, but it should never build upon the foundations of any other science. Theology must be faithful to its own scientific objective and to the material content of God's self-revelation. Concerning the resurrection, Torrance concludes: "Everything depends on the resurrection of the body, otherwise all we have is a ghost of a Saviour."³⁴

Summary. The complex problem of science-theology relations developed in the aftermath of a series of dominant models for

Christian theology, namely: precritical orthodoxy—where Scripture refers primarily to timeless reality; critical liberalism—where Scripture refers primarily to temporal reality; and postcritical-postliberal theology—where Scripture refers primarily to a mediated transcendence. Postcritical thought is open to irrationalism and nihilism as well as to the idea that Jesus, Scripture and nature are in some sense revelations of God and are therefore sources and standards for theology. However, there is no theological consensus concerning the nature of divine-human communication or concerning science-theology relations. The difficulties involved in the search for a viable model have contributed to a crisis in contemporary theology. This is evident in the tension between the approaches of Barth, Tillich, Gilkey and Torrance. The inclusive model for Seventh-day Adventist theology which was introduced above will be more completely described in the remainder of this paper.

The Solution: "Postmodern" Adventism

Adventist Crisis. Gerhard Hasel reminds us that Seventh-day Adventists are not immune to the postmodern crisis in Christian theology.³⁵ In fact, many Adventists are passing through what Fritz Guy refers to as a crisis of belief—a critical moment when a change of belief is possible.³⁶ As Raoul Dederen writes in a different but related context:

the issue at stake is essentially one of authority, namely, how SDAs are going to do theology while holding to Biblical authority. Can we agree on exactly what the Bible means for us and how it is to be heard and interpreted? Can we maintain our claim to Biblical authority as a distinctive hallmark if we cannot find a way to move effectively toward theological consensus?³⁷

According to Edward Lugenbeal, this crisis includes "a deep and continuing debate among SDA scientists and theologians."³⁸ Some Adventists conceive of science-theology relations in terms of changes in our view of science which are prompted by the study of Scripture. Others advocate changes in our view of theology which are prompted by the study of nature. Still others advocate a two-way interaction between the study of nature and Scripture which may change our view of science and of theology. If this discussion

proceeds with an openness to the Spirit of Jesus and to His revelation in Scripture and nature it can only result in a continuing clarification of the Adventist model for theology and for science-theology relations.³⁹

Historic Adventist Theology. John Baldwin suggests that the "principles of historic Adventist theological method need not be abandoned, but that the approach represents a viable and convincing postmodern theological method."⁴⁰ Adventist theology is postmodern in that it developed towards the end of the modern period and offers a solution to the contemporary science-theology problem. However, the place of Scripture in Adventist theology distinguishes it from other theological trends. As Fernando Canale comments, authentic Adventist theology does not "utilize humanly originated philosophy at the detriment or plain rejection of the *sola Scriptura* principle [by] following the classical, modern, and/or] postmodern trends in Christian theology."⁴¹

The Adventist understanding of the *sola Scriptura* principle deserves special attention. Gerhard Hasel classifies Adventist theology as "postmodern" and "postcritical" because of its view of Scripture. Allowing for secondary norms, he points out that the "highest and most authoritative norm" for Adventist theology is the revelation which is "most uniquely and directly incarnated in Scripture."⁴² This uniquely direct "incarnation" of special revelation in normative Scripture is contrasted with the normed standards of general revelation in human nature such as experience, reason and tradition. However, it does not compromise the uniqueness of the revelation incarnate in Jesus or the revelation given in nature.⁴³

Ellen G. White's Contribution

The writings of Ellen G. White—the most outstanding founding member of the Adventist Church—continue to be relevant to the postmodern crisis. White's ministry is regarded by Adventists as a lesser light under the authority of the greater light of Scripture and the supreme light of Jesus. Her views, which are representative of Adventist theology, are outlined below. Thereafter, some of the evidence for the compatibility of this model with Scripture is presented.⁴⁴

Divine-Human Revelations. There are divine and human dimensions to God's revelations. First, it is impossible to gain a perfect knowledge of God from nature because sin has obscured God's revelation in nature.⁴⁵ But in spite of the distortion caused by sin, nature is "an open book which reveals God"⁴⁶ who works in nature.⁴⁷ God's character, thoughts, glory, wisdom, power and law are revealed in nature.⁴⁸ Actually, "the whole natural world is designed to be an interpreter of the things of God."⁴⁹ This revelation includes human nature. God's "law is written by his own finger upon every nerve, every muscle, every fiber of our being, upon every faculty which has been intrusted to man."⁵⁰ "The brain nerves . . . are the medium through which heaven communicates with man."⁵¹ The mind purified by grace is an intellect which is in close communion with the divine mind and to which God will be manifest.⁵²

Second, Scripture is also an imperfect representation of God due to its humanity, to the process of its preservation, transmission and translation.⁵³ In addition, "the Bible, perfect in its simplicity, does not answer to the great ideas of God; for infinite ideas cannot be perfectly embodied in finite vehicles of thought."⁵⁴ However, the divine and human dimensions of Scripture are wonderfully united. "The divine mind and will is combined with the human mind and will; thus the utterances of the man are the word of God."⁵⁵ "Every chapter and every verse of the Bible is a communication from God to men."⁵⁶ Scripture has been preserved through "the unerring pen of inspiration"⁵⁷ in its present shape as a guidebook for humanity. God, who cannot lie, qualified the human communicators of His word. He guided the selection of what to speak and write. Thus, Scripture is a perfect chain with one portion explaining another. It reliably reveals the knowledge necessary for salvation, God's will, the standard of character, doctrines, historical facts, various types of knowledge, and the highest science.⁵⁸

Last, but not least, the divine-human communion which is provided in nature and Scripture points to the divine-human union "in the nature of Christ, who was the Son of God and the Son of man."⁵⁹ In Jesus, the divine and human natures were united in one person. Yet the human was not made divine and the divine was not made human.⁶⁰ "The work of God's dear Son in undertaking to link the created with the Uncreated, the finite with the Infinite, in His

own divine person, is a subject that may well employ our thoughts for a lifetime."⁶¹

The story of Bethlehem is an exhaustless theme. . . . We marvel at the Saviour's sacrifice in exchanging the throne of heaven for the manger, and the companionship of adoring angels for the beasts of the stall. . . . Yet this was but the beginning of His wonderful condescension. It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man's nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin. Like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. . . . He came with such a heredity to share our sorrows and temptations, and to give us the example of a sinless life.⁶²

Harmonious Revelations. "Rightly understood, both the revelations of science and the experiences of life are in harmony with the testimony of Scripture."⁶³

The book of nature and the written word do not disagree; each sheds light on the other. *Rightly understood* they make us acquainted with God and his character by teaching us something of the wise and beneficent laws through which he works. We are thus led to adore his name and to have an *intelligent trust* in his word.⁶⁴

When the Bible makes statements of facts in nature, science may be compared with the written Word, and *a correct understanding of both will always prove them to be in harmony*. One does not contradict the other.⁶⁵

By different methods and in different languages, they [nature and Scripture] witness to the same great truths. Science is ever discovering new wonders; *but* she brings from her research nothing that, rightly understood, conflicts with divine revelation.⁶⁶

However, harmony alone is not a sufficient evidence of correct interpretations. Not just any harmony will do because it is possible to harmonize incorrect interpretations of nature and Scripture.

Inferences erroneously drawn from facts observed in nature have led to *supposed conflict* between science and revelation; and in the effort to restore harmony, interpretations of Scripture have been adopted that undermine and destroy the force of the word of God.⁶⁷

In order to account for His works [in nature], must we do violence to His word [in Scripture]?⁶⁸

The Hierarchy of Revelation. Correct interpretations depend on the recognition of the hierarchy of Jesus, Scripture and nature. First, the supreme revelation of God in Jesus is unique and primary as Source and Subject of every divine revelation. "No other light ever has shone or ever will shine so clearly upon fallen man as that which emanated from the teaching and example of Jesus."⁶⁹ Jesus is the key to the correct interpretation of Scripture.

Christ makes no apology when He declares, "I am the light of the world." He was, in life and teaching, the gospel, *the foundation of all pure doctrine*. Just as the sun compares with the lesser lights in the heavens, so did Christ, the Source of light, compare with the teachers of His day. He was before them all, and shining with the brightness of the sun, He diffused His penetrating, gladdening rays throughout the world.⁷⁰

In Christ is gathered all the glory of the Father. In Him is all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. He is the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of His person. The glory of the attributes of God are expressed in His character. *The gospel is glorious because it is made up of His righteousness. It is Christ enfolded, and Christ is the gospel embodied.* . . . Every text [of Scripture] is a diamond, touched and irradiated by the divine rays.

We are not to praise the gospel, but [to] praise Christ. We are not to worship the gospel, but the Lord of the gospel.⁷¹

The study of nature is also illuminated by Jesus. "Only under the direction of the Omniscient One shall we, in the study of His works, be enabled to think His thoughts after Him."⁷² Scientific research which does not acknowledge God is a positive injury.⁷³ "Knowledge and science must be vitalized by the Spirit of God in order to serve the noblest purposes. The Christian alone can make the right use of knowledge."⁷⁴ "With the first advent of Christ there was ushered in an era of greater light and glory; but it would indeed be sinful ingratitude to despise and ridicule the lesser light because a fuller and more glorious light had dawned."⁷⁵

Second, the special revelation of God in Scripture is unique and primary in that it is the standard for the theological interpretation of Jesus and nature. The Bible "contains the science of sciences,

the science of salvation." It "is the mine of the unsearchable riches of Christ."⁷⁶ "Above all other people on earth, the man whose mind is enlightened by the word of God will feel that he must give himself to greater diligence in the perusal of the Bible, and a diligent study of the sciences."⁷⁷

The theme of the Bible is Jesus. Therefore, "the foundation of all true science is contained in the Bible."⁷⁸ It is "necessary that the study of the Bible should have a prominent place among the various branches of scientific education."⁷⁹ "The deepest students of science are constrained to recognize in nature the working of an infinite power. But to man's unaided reason, nature's teaching cannot but be contradictory and disappointing. Only in the light of revelation [Scripture] can it be read aright."⁸⁰ "The greatest minds, if not guided by the word of God in their research, become bewildered in their attempts to trace the relations of science and revelation."⁸¹ Scripture is not to be tested by our ideas of nature or of Christ. Instead, our ideas are to be tested by Scripture.⁸²

Third, the general revelation of God in nature is unique and primary as the widest context for the theological interpretation of Jesus and Scripture. Scripture is not to be regarded as a textbook for all facts about nature or God. The study of nature itself is indispensable and leads to a knowledge of God.⁸³ Adventist schools are "established for the purpose of teaching the sciences, and at the same time leading the students to the Saviour, whence all true knowledge flows."⁸⁴

In the study of the sciences also, we are to obtain a knowledge of the Creator. All true science is but an interpretation of the handwriting of God in the material world. Science brings from her research only fresh evidences of the wisdom and power of God.⁸⁵

The study of nature also illuminates the study of Scripture. "As we observe the things of the natural world, we shall be enabled under the guiding of the Holy Spirit, more fully to understand the lessons of God's word."⁸⁶ "Scientific research will open vast fields of thought and information." Contemplation of "the things of nature" provides "a new perception of truth."⁸⁷

False Science and Theology. Neglect of the light of God in Jesus, Scripture or nature results in science and theology which are not Christ-centered.⁸⁸ On the one hand, false science manifests a

“show of plausibility” and places Satanic “ideas of science and nature” above the word of God as a test.⁸⁹ It is a disguised infidelity, does not recognize the limits of science, and misinterprets the facts of nature which actually support faith in Scripture. It explains the world by natural law alone and wrongly attributes infinite power to nature. This is because false science does not distinguish philosophy, theory and speculation from fact.⁹⁰ On the other hand, false theology ignores the “connected chain of truth” in the Bible and manifests “a disjointed medley of ideas” supported by a passage of Scripture here and there and “woven together in a tissue of falsehood.”⁹¹ The ignorance and folly of these “disconnected theories [are] arrayed in new and fantastic dress,—theories that it will be all the more difficult to meet because there is no reason in them.”⁹²

Reason and Faith. Reason is a “great masterly talent” which “will be taken to heaven.”⁹³ God desires that we be “intellectual Christians.”⁹⁴ He wants us to use our brains. God does not desire men to be less acute, less inquiring, less intelligent. However, it is a sin of the mind to extol and deify reason to the neglect of Scripture. To exalt reason unduly is to abase it. To place the human in rivalry with the divine, is to make it contemptible. Reason can never explain creation. Reason is limited and in need of faith because God is supreme.⁹⁵

God does not promise to remove every doubt, but He gives sufficient evidence as a reason for faith. The Bible strengthens the intellect⁹⁶ and is the norming source and standard for the reasons for our faith in Jesus.

We should know for ourselves what constitutes Christianity, what is truth, what is the faith that we have received, what are the Bible rules—the rules given us from the highest authority. There are many who believe without a reason on which to base their faith, without sufficient evidence as to the truth of the matter. . . . They do not reason from cause to effect. Their faith has no genuine foundation, and in the time of trial they will find that they have built upon the sand.⁹⁷

Summary. Correct interpretations of Jesus, Scripture and nature are never in conflict. For White, “God is one. His truth, all truth, forms a unity. . . . God is the source of all knowledge and all truth is a revelation of Him.”⁹⁸ However, not every theological

harmony is adequate because incorrect interpretations may be harmonized. Correct and harmonious interpretations must deal with the divine and human dimensions of God’s revelations. Because the special revelation of Scripture is divine, it is more accurate, authentic, attractive, true, inspired, ancient, comprehensive, wonderful, instructive, and interesting than any other book.⁹⁹ Because Scripture is also human, we should study the context, human authorship, literary form, and translation and textual variations of Scripture.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, there are divine and human dimensions in the revelation through Jesus. Also the divine revelation in nature includes human nature.

Correct and harmonious interpretations must also respect the hierarchy of Jesus, Scripture and nature. Divine revelation cannot be correctly evaluated by human ideas of science and theology. First, direct divine aid from Jesus is needed in order to understand science-theology relations. He is the Word in which our faith is anchored.¹⁰¹ Second, Jesus has given Scripture as the standard for theological interpretations of Jesus and nature. Our faith is anchored in the Jesus of Scripture. Third, Scripture recognizes nature as the widest context for theology. It is a false science which excludes any explanation other than by natural law. Also, it is a false theology which excludes insight from the light of nature. True science and theology involve a reasonable faith and a faithful reason which are based on the sufficient evidence which Jesus gives in Scripture and nature.

Evidence From Scripture

Seventh-day Adventists are often criticized for regarding Ellen White as a resource for theology. Some question how a theology illuminated by White may at the same time be faithful to the *sola Scriptura* principle. However, an *a priori* rejection of White’s ministry is a rejection of the Bible teaching on spiritual gifts.¹⁰² Further, White’s model for theology may be evaluated in terms of its faithfulness to Scripture.

Complementary Lights. Scripture depicts the revelation of God’s word in terms of the metaphor of light (Ps 119:105). First, the revelation of God—who is light (1 John 1:5), is His Word Jesus—who is the light of the world (John 1:1-14). Second, the light

of God's word shines in Scripture (2 Pet 1:19-21; Rom 3:1-2). Third, this light also shines in nature (Ps 19:1-6; Isa 6:3; Rom 1:20)—including human nature (John 1:9; Rom 2:14-16).¹⁰³ Jesus is supreme as the unique (*monogenous* John 1:14) and primary (*prototokon* Heb 1:6) Son of God. However, he brings many sons to glory (Heb 2:10). Similarly Scripture is a unique and primary revelation. However, it points to Jesus as the foundation of our faith (John 5:39) and includes nature in its scope (Col 1:15-20).

There is a sense in which nature is the widest context for theology. Nature travails for the revelation of the sons of God (Rom 8:18-26). However, sin has darkened human minds so that they do not perceive the light of general revelation in nature and special revelation in Scripture (Rom 1-3; 2 Pet 3:16). Therefore, Scripture is "a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star [Jesus] rises in your hearts" (1 Pet 1:19-21). Indeed the path of the just is like a shining light that shines more and more [clearly] until the perfect day (Prov 4:18). This light of the glory of God in Jesus is manifest in the unity of the Church (John 16:14; 17:21-22; Eph 4:4-6, 8, 13). This light of the gospel according to Scripture (Rom 16:26) in the hearts of believers by the Holy Spirit (2 Cor 4:3-6) is a foretaste of the full revelation of God's glory in nature (Rom 8:18ff).¹⁰⁴

Science in the Bible. The English word "science" appears only a few times in the King James Version of Scripture. Daniel and his associates are described as understanding "science" and "all wisdom." The same Hebrew words are used to identify God's gift of the knowledge of wisdom ((Dan 1:4, 17) which is related to salvation (Dan 12:3, 4, 10). This wisdom includes a knowledge of God's revelation in nature. The heroes of the book of Daniel were wise teachers (*maskilim*) who were skilled in the science of the Babylonians. Further, this book depicts the structure of the universe and of history.

The wider context of the OT also contains much that is relevant to science-theology relations. For example, there is a balancing of the divine transcendence which should not be imaged in worship (Exod 20:4-5) with the immanence of divine interaction in all aspects of the lives of His people (Isa 63:9). Divine redemption is presented as a matter of empirical fact in the context of a

cosmology of creation and fall (Gen 1-3) which may be compared and contrasted with other cosmologies. Wisdom is depicted as prior to and as active in the creation of the world (Prov 8). Clearly the OT encourages the theological interpretation of nature.¹⁰⁵

The English word science is used in the NT (KJV) where a warning is given concerning pseudo-science (*gnosis*). The same Greek word is used to refer to Christians as filled with "all knowledge" (1 Tim 6:20; 15:14). The immediate context of this epistle suggests that Christians are qualified to avoid a false theology of God (1 Tim 6:21). A closely related epistle teaches that Scripture makes us wise unto salvation and every good work (2 Tim 3:15-17).¹⁰⁶ In addition, the wider theological context of the NT and especially the Pauline epistles suggest that Christian's are also qualified to avoid a false theology of nature.

The issues of premodern science were raised in the Greek natural philosophy which influenced the culture to which Paul ministered. Apparently Paul was trained in both the Gentile and the Jewish schools (Acts 17:16-32; Tit 1:12; Acts 17; 22:3). As a result, there is a "thought world" connection between the terms science and theology and the Pauline terms: wisdom, philosophy, knowledge, and mind. Paul uses these terms in different ways in his complex and subtle rhetoric. Because of this, he is often interpreted contrary to his intended meaning (2 Pet 3:15-16) as one who rejected science. However, a careful contextual reading of Paul's writings provides insight on science-theology relations.¹⁰⁷

Sources of Revelation. In spite of the distortion caused by sin, Paul regards nature as a divine revelation. God's wrath is provoked by the suppression of the truth (Rom 1:18) which God gives of Himself in the world (1:19-21) and in human nature (2:14-15). This evil suppression of truth results from a futile reasoning and pretended wisdom which is actually foolishness and cannot comprehend God because it misunderstands His glory in the world (1:22-23). The solution to this foolishness is the righteousness of God, which is by faith alone (1:16-18).

Does this emphasis on "faith alone" mean "faith without reason?" Hardly! Faith is the antidote to the foolishness of sinners and is reasonable in the light of Christ.¹⁰⁸ For Paul, Christian knowledge is different from natural knowledge in its origin and

content. But revelation does use natural channels. Faith, like intuition, is the conviction of things not seen (Heb 11:1). The gospel is pragmatic: since you desire proof, Christ is powerful in you (2 Cor 13:2). There is also a place for the rational mind: let each one be fully assured in his own mind (Rom 14:5).¹⁰⁹

The Mind of Christ. Paul's discussion of the mind is very relevant to the issue of science-theology relations. Six Greek words from the Pauline epistles have been translated into English as mind. Five of these refer to factors common to all human beings: soul (*psuche*), opinion (*gnome*), thoughts (*noema*), dispositions (*phronema*) and intellect (*dianoia*).¹¹⁰ The sixth word (*nous*) is often used to indicate the seat of understanding and conviction: I will pray, sing and speak with my mind and understanding rather than in an unknown tongue (I Cor 14:14-19); Let each one be fully assured in his own mind (Rom 14:5).

This word (*nous*) is also used to indicate the content of understanding and conviction: Don't be quickly shaken from your mind (2 Thes 2:2). According to Paul, the content of the mind may be shaped by lusts, desires, appetites, and ambitions or by divine revelation. As a result, wisdom and spiritual perception, or the lack of these, focuses into a world view called a "mind." Human beings possess a world view that is vain, reprobate and fleshly: they walk in the vanity of their minds because of the hardness of their hearts (Eph 4:17); God gave them over to a reprobate mind (Rom 1:28); the fleshly mind is vainly puffed up (Col 2:18). However, world views may be changed and renewed: be not fashioned by the world, but be transformed by the radical metamorphosis (*anakainoo*) of your mind (Rom 12:2); be made young (*ananeo*) in your mind (Eph 4:23). Those who experience this miracle may say: we have the mind (*nous*) of Christ (I Cor 2:16).¹¹¹

The Natural and the Spiritual. How is the mind or world view of Christ relevant to the issue of science-theology relations? Paul uses the term "soulical" (*pseuhikos*) to identify the person with a natural mind. The term "spiritual" (*pneumatikos*) identifies one who judges everything but is not subject to the judgment of persons without the mind of Christ (I Cor 2:10-16). It is often assumed that the spiritual mind judges theology and the natural mind judges science. However, Paul does not separate the natural from the

spiritual in terms of dichotomy between special revelation in Scripture and general revelation in nature. Rather, the terms "natural" and "spiritual" are used to distinguish pseudo-science from true science.

Philosophy: Love of Wisdom. Paul regards so-called "natural knowledge" as being in opposition to the gospel of Christ. Hence his only use of the word philosophy consists of a warning: "beware lest anyone spoil you with philosophy" (Col 2:8). Paul is concerned about opposition to the claims of Jesus by some who advocate practices and teachings contrary to the truth of the gospel. In response to false philosophies of beguiling speech (2:4), empty deceit, false tradition, elemental spirits of the universe (2:8), false abasement, angel worship, visions (2:18), and self-made religion (2:23), Paul presents the antidote of the wisdom, knowledge and science of Christ.

Paul is not against true philosophy (*philosophia*) which is a search motivated by love (*philia*). Neither is he against the wisdom (*sophia*) which is the goal of that search. However, he rejects false philosophies (such as Greco-Roman philosophy, Hellenistic Judaism and Proto-gnosticism) which contradict the gospel. Paul's attitude to knowledge is made evident in many Bible translations and paraphrases. He rejects "hollow and delusive speculations, based on traditions of man-made teachings" (*New English Bible*); "intellectualism or high sounding nonsense" (*Phillips*); "false and shallow ideas based on man-made tradition" (*Translators New Testament*); and "secondhand, empty, rational philosophy" (*Jerusalem Bible*).

Similarly, Paul's rejection of worldly wisdom in his preaching to the Corinthians (1 Cor 2) does not imply the rejection of true science. The letter to the Corinthians is one of the best examples of the complexity of Pauline rhetoric. This church was divided into factions on the basis of a so-called superior wisdom which was actually foolishness. Paul rejects this pseudo-wisdom. In this letter, the meaning of knowledge or wisdom changes from one chapter to another. Mixing his categories, Paul refers to the Corinthians as filled with knowledge of Jesus (chapter 1), then as potentially subject to worldly wisdom (chapter 3), and finally, as full of conceit, bragging, fleshliness and immaturity which are part of worldly

wisdom and are morally and epistemologically undesirable (chapter 4). Paul is not denying the epistemological status of the knowledge of Jesus or its relevance to science. Rather he is contrasting it with pseudo-knowledge.¹¹²

In-Part Knowledge. Some are tempted to depreciate science because of 1 Cor 13: when the perfect (*to teleion*) comes, the "in-part" (*to ek merous*) will be abolished (v. 10). According to Paul, the in-part will be "abolished" in the same way that the childish is outgrown (v. 11), the indirect is replaced by the direct, and the puzzle or riddle (*ainigmati*) is solved (v. 12). Paul does not mean that partial knowledge should be despised. In-part knowledge is real knowledge (v. 12). It seems that while we wait for the more perfect day, we should combine our in-part knowledge of nature and our in-part knowledge of Scripture so that the light of Jesus may be more clearly seen.¹¹³

Cosmic Christ. The NT Gospels link Jesus and nature in the message of the Word of wisdom who created and enlightens everyone and became flesh revealing His glory (John 1:1-14). They also present the signs of nature which will be associated with the return of Jesus (Matt 24). Similarly, Paul depicts Jesus as the image of God who created, sustains and reconciles all things (Col 1:15-20). This is the gospel of God concerning Jesus Christ which leads to a knowledge of God's plan (*oikonomia tou theou*) for the world. The Creator chose Israel and proclaimed through prophets the coming of His Son who suffered, was resurrected and anointed with power, and who reigns until his enemies are all overcome and all Israel (Jew and Gentile) has been saved. Then Jesus will return to consummate the freedom of the children of God in the midst of a world freed from vanity (Col 1:25; Eph 1:10; 3:2, 9; Gal 4:4; 1 Cor 15:20-28; Rom 1:1-6; 9:5; 11:25-31; 15:8-9).¹¹⁴

Summary. While the English term science is rarely used in Scripture, the Bible world view is relevant to the issue of science-theology relations. God's supreme revelation is Jesus who is the light of the world. Scripture is the special revelation of light which leads to Jesus. Nature is a general revelation which provides the context for Jesus and Scripture. While sin has obscured the light of God's revelation in nature, Jesus unveils that light. He is the light

of Scripture and the light of nature who lights every person in the world (John 1:9).

While Scripture focuses on Jesus it includes nature in its scope. Emerson Shideler remarks that "the biblical account is as insistently empirical as any scientific record."¹¹⁵ Rolf P. Knierim concurs that the scientific aspect is as much a part of the Bible as the religious aspect is inevitable in science. The Bible speaks neither about God in isolation from the world nor about the world in isolation from God.¹¹⁶

There is massive evidence that the biblical writers were not only concerned with the knowledge of God but also with the knowledge of the world. Their knowledge of God's presence in the world became transparent through their knowledge of the world. That is the point where "science" became inevitable.¹¹⁷

Stuhlmacher documents how Paul's presentation of the gospel is based on the OT eschatological creation-tradition with its concept of a cosmic lawsuit. The benefit of the gift of justification through the righteousness of God is not only individual but cosmological. It is the realization of God's justice toward the world—a gift of presence and power toward the entire creation. In righteousness, God creates well-being and salvation in history and in nature.¹¹⁸ Paul's distinction between the natural and the spiritual refers to the false and the true rather to science and theology. He is against pseudo-philosophy and worldly wisdom which contradict the gospel. He is not against the study of nature. The study of Jesus, Scripture and nature is in-part, but in-part knowledge is real knowledge.

Divine revelation is the source of knowledge which is mediated through Jesus, Scripture and nature. In fact, the mind of Christ is a unique world view which is relevant to the study of nature. According to Abraham Kuyper, while naturalistic and theistic science are produced by two different minds, the history of their development has been intertwined from premodern times.¹¹⁹ Bruce Norman concludes,

Paul used some of the common cosmological terminology of the day to reach both Jew and Gentile. But he used the language with a different meaning. For him, Christ became the beginning and end of

cosmology. . . . Herein lies Paul's contribution to ancient and modern cosmology.¹²⁰

Conclusion

An Inclusive Model. In the inclusive Adventist model which is manifest in the writings of Ellen White, theology is the study of God as He is revealed in His word. Jesus, Scripture and nature are words of God and therefore are sources and standards for theology. Authentic theology recognizes the divine and human dimensions of, and the hierarchy among God's revelations. The divine human incarnation of Jesus is the supreme revelation. The divine-human inspiration of Scripture is a special revelation. Nature, including human nature, is a general revelation.

A Biblical Model. This model for theology is faithful to Scripture. *Sola Scriptura* means that Scripture has a unique authority as source and standard for theology. However, according to Scripture, its authority comes from Jesus who also works in nature. A theology of Jesus other than the Jesus of Scripture leads to the worship of antiChrist. But to put Scripture in the place of Jesus (bibliolatry) is as much a false worship as the worship of nature. We do not undermine God's revelation when we interpret Jesus, Scripture and nature in the light of each other. To do otherwise is to reject the plain teaching of Scripture.

Revelation and Theology. Revelation is not to be subjected to human standards. Rather, theology must be subject to revelation. It is important to distinguish between God's word and any human interpretation which can never be absolutely perfect. Only after the return of Christ will the full harmony between Jesus, Scripture and nature be revealed. Then the glory of God will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Until then, even Adventist experience, reason and tradition must remain open to revision based on continuing study of the entire word of God.¹²¹

Science and Theology. Any effort to separate the issues of science and theology seems to involve intellectual suicide and obscurantism. Since one word of God does not contradict another, we should seek for coherence among our interpretations of Jesus, Scripture and nature. A lack of this coherence is a signal that we

have an imperfect comprehension of God's revelation. The words of Clyde Webster are applicable to science and theology.

[In the] conquest for knowledge and truth, [we should] not force all answers to come from a single source. Where multiple sources exist, examine the differences and then strive to find the harmony between them. Truth has many faces, comes from many places, and will withstand the tests of time.¹²²

Reason and Faith. While real answers to questions about truth do come from nature, this is not the basis of faith. It is futile to build a rational natural theology as a foundation for faith in Jesus.¹²³ The interpretation of nature should be an integral part of a theology grounded in the revelation of Jesus in Scripture. Carl Raschke correctly comments that "we do not need a new natural theology, but we are obliged to bring the study of 'nature' once more back into the arena of theological investigation."¹²⁴ Theology built on reason will fall because reason apart from God has limited usefulness. However, reason is a useful resource which we should not separate from faith. Rather we should exercise a reasonable faith and a faithful reason. Reason can be a work of faith which is faithful to God's Word. Faith is not a leap into the dark. It is a leap into the light of God!¹²⁵

Evangelistic Appeal. The gospel of Jesus—which is communicated in Scripture, and which we are called to preach—is a cosmic gospel. In the words of Ellen White: "A knowledge of science of all kinds is power, and it is in the purpose of God that advanced science shall be taught in our schools as a preparation for the work that is to precede the closing scenes of earth's history."¹²⁶

There are many . . . [who] are not fully informed in regard to the truth for this time; and yet . . . in every sphere of action they work on principles that God accepts. . . . Not all men forget God in their investigation of true science.

. . . . God . . . works for these He prepares the way for them to take the place of those who have been given a knowledge of Bible truth, but who have disappointed the Lord our Savior. These men will be true to pure, holy principles in their investigation of the laws which rule our world. . . . That they may obtain advanced light, God places them in connection with men [and women] of superior knowledge regarding His Word.¹²⁷

These words are not only relevant when witnessing to those who are specialists. As Philip Hefner points out, the content of science increasingly becomes a part of the understanding of all people. In fact, contemporary science is well on the way to producing a global village.¹²⁸ This is the context of the Seventh-day Adventist global mission. Adventists must no longer allow themselves to be mistaken for "provincial globalists" who are handicapped by a local world view.¹²⁹

A Double Challenge. George Reid has issued a double challenge to Seventh-day Adventists. First, we must continue to do theology in light of the fact that God is the central fact of the universe and that theology is in a sense a monitor for all knowledge. Second, we must continue to develop approaches which are responsive to contemporary values including those of science. He warns that if we fail, our unique world view which is so relevant to the contemporary scientific culture will be written off by others as irrelevant.¹³⁰

The task of witnessing to the harmony of science and theology is great. However, Jesus is the Creator of nature and the Author of Scripture. He is the Source and Standard for authentic Adventist theology. Let us accept *His* challenge to continue to develop Adventist theology on the sure foundation of Jesus and in harmony with the norming standard of Scripture and the normed standard of nature. All His biddings are enablings. In the light of Jesus, the light of Scripture and nature may be properly focused so that the whole earth may be lightened with the glory of God.

Endnotes

¹ Bengt Gustafsson, "The Current Scientific World View," in *The New Faith-Science Debate: Probing Cosmology, Technology and Theology*, ed. John M. Mangum (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1989), p. 1; Paul Tillich, *The System of the Sciences According to Objects and Methods* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1981).

Some of these views are a part of the accepted history of science. Others are even now competing in the marketplace of ideas. Even within a single science such as Physics, our present understanding of the laws of nature are not harmonized. In response to this fact, some scientists are searching for a grand unified theory (GUT) of physics that will unify the presently contradictory laws of the four fundamental forces—electromagnetism, the weak and the strong nuclear force, and gravity. See Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes* (New York: Bantam, 1988); John Polkinghorne, *The Faith of A*

Physicist (Princeton University Press, 1994); David Lindley, *The End of Physics: The Myth of a Unified Theory* (Basic Books, 1993).

² Robert H. King, "Introduction: The Task of Theology," in *Christian Theology: An Introduction to Its Traditions and Tasks*, eds., Peter C. Hodgson, Robert H. King (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 1; Maurice Wiles, *What is Theology?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); John P. Newport and William Cannon, *Why Christians Fight Over the Bible* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1974); Richard J. Coleman, *Issues of Theological Warfare: Evangelicals and Liberals* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980).

³ Because of the semantic complexity involved, some theologians like Eta Linnemann prefer not to use the term science to denote "competent intellectual work in theology." See Eta Linnemann, *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1990), p. 140.

Like the word science, the word nature is ambiguous. On the one hand, it may be used to refer to inanimate, animal, human and/or superhuman natures (i.e., angelic and divine nature). On the other hand it may be used to distinguish that which is determined by law and that which is free to determine itself and is therefore supernatural or above nature. See Horace Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural* (New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1877); Alvin Plantinga, *Does God Have a Nature?* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1980); William Alston, *Divine Nature and Human Language* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989); R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of Nature* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1945); Gordon Kaufmann, "Nature, History and God: Toward an Integrated Conceptualization," *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 27 (December, 1992): 379-401; William Temple, *Nature, Man and God* (New York: Macmillan, 1956); E. O. Wilson, *On Human Nature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).

⁴ According to the generally accepted definitions, "a natural science is a theoretical explanatory discipline which objectively addresses natural phenomena within the general constraints that (1) its theories must be rationally connectable to generally specifiable empirical phenomena and that (2) it normally does not leave the natural realm for the concepts employed in its explanations." See Del Ratasch, *Philosophy of Science* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1986), p. 13; Norman Campbell, *What is Science?* (New York: Dover Publications, 1953); E. Nagel, *The Structure of Science* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961); R. Giere, *Understanding Scientific Reasoning* (New York: Holt, Reinhart & Watson, 1979); N. Rescher, *Scientific Explanation* (New York: Free Press, 1970); M. Wartofski, *Conceptual Foundations of Scientific Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1968); G. Gale, *Theory of Science* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979); Karin Knorr-Cetina, *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1981); Imre Lakatos, *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978); Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London: Hutchinson, 1972); Tito Arecchi, "Why Science is an Open System Implying a Meta-Science," in *The Science and Theology of Information*, eds., Wassermann, Kirby and Rordorff (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1992).

On methodological naturalism see Phillip E. Johnson, *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995); Stephen Jay Gould, "Impeaching a Self-Appointed Judge," review of Johnson's *Darwin on Trial* in *Scientific American* (July 1992): 118-20; Nancy Murphey, "Phillip Johnson on Trial: A Critique of His