

seems to indicate (260). This appears to be the modern reader's presupposition showing through, not the message of the canonical text.

While one might quibble with the contributors regarding this or that minor point, as I have done above, the cumulative impact of the various essays in this *Festschrift* is powerful and inescapable: Creation suffuses the biblical canon and can no longer be marginalized as peripheral or only ancillary to salvation history. Creation is foundational to biblical faith and inextricably linked with salvation history in the final form of both OT and NT.

I found the methodological approach in most of the essays to be refreshing, consisting of a synchronic reading of the "received text" in its final canonical form, by contrast with so many atomizing studies of creation (and other themes) in the past that have never come to grips with the biblical theology of the text as it now presents itself to us. James Barr's essay, "Remembrances of 'Historical Criticism': Speiser's Genesis Commentary and Its History of Reception," was omitted in the survey above, since it seemed out of place in this work. This essay characterizes David Gunn and Danna N. Fewell's critique of Speiser's work as "a massive misunderstanding and misrepresentation." I found Barr's definition of "historical criticism," which for him means only source criticism and excludes form criticism, tradition criticism, and other critical methodologies, to be extremely narrow.

This book not only identifies a "tectonic shift" in biblical studies toward the significance of creation theology, but contributes significantly toward substantiating the validity of this shift. Furthermore, it gives evidence of the power and theological richness of the recent methodological trend in biblical studies toward holistically presenting the theology of the Bible in its final canonical form. While different perspectives and insights into creation theology appear in different books and blocks of the biblical canon, there emerges an overarching unity, rooted in the Genesis creation accounts, that forms the "divine protocol" and "prologue" not only of the Pentateuch, but of the entire Bible.

Andrews University

RICHARD M. DAVIDSON

Davis, Jimmy H., and Harry L. Poe. *Designer Universe: Intelligent Design and the Existence of God*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 2002. 252 pp. Paperback, \$12.99.

Jimmy Davis and Harry Poe have *almost* written a great book. *Designer Universe* has been positively reviewed by Charles Colson (BreakPoint with Charles Colson, June 27, 2002. Considering the Evidence: Intelligent Design in the Twenty-first Century), and *Christianity Today* bestowed an Award of Merit in Apologetics/Evangelism on it in their 2003 Book Awards (Union News & Information, News Release May 23, 2003. "Union's Poe and Davis Take *Christianity Today* Award"). Both authors hold teaching positions at Union University in Jackson, Tennessee: Davis in chemistry and Poe in the area of faith and culture. Integrating the perspectives of a scientist and a theologian in one book had the potential to result in a seminal interdisciplinary work on the question of design in nature. *Designer Universe* could have been, but is not, the great book that should have resulted from this collaboration.

Before discussing failures that remove *Designer Universe* from among the best books on faith and science, we need to note a wonderful contribution made by this book. The first three chapters make an excellent presentation of different ways in which philosophers and theologians from Christian and non-Christian religions have approached the question of design in nature. These three chapters would make profitable reading for anyone interested in the argument for God from design. This is particularly true for those who believe that the study of nature naturally leads to discovery of the Christian Creator God. This is denied not only by scientists committed to the philosophy of materialism, but by the reality within which all people of faith live.

As Davis and Poe point out in the first chapter, one of them first heard the design argument for the existence of God from a Hindu mystic named Swami Chinmayananda. Evidence of intelligent causes in nature reveals the necessity of something we call "God," but whether this is the God of the Bible is an entirely different matter.

The first three chapters make a profound point: there have been and are many different views of what God is, what design is, and what design means. Any Christian interested in using the argument from design needs to be thoroughly aware of these different perspectives if they intend to use this approach in sharing their faith. Reading these chapters would greatly benefit both scientists and theologians interested in questions of science and faith.

If only the subsequent chapters continued the excellent foundation developed in the first three, *Designer Universe* would be an excellent book, but it fails to do this. After the first three chapters, the text degenerates into something like a weakly written high-school textbook with occasional parenthetical comments that amount to "Wow, God must have had a hand in this!" Instead of using specific examples from nature to continue discussing how various views of design and God may influence interpretation of evidence, a plodding description of physical, chemical, and genetic wonders is given.

Perhaps chapters 4 through 6 would be useful background information for people who never took a high-school science class. However, anyone familiar with high-school science can safely skip the last four chapters; instead of advancing the interesting argument, these chapters simply bog it down. Using chapters 4 through 6 to improve understanding of the wonders of nature needs to be done with care as, inexplicably, there are a number of errors. In my own area of specialty, genetics, the mistakes are glaring. In chapter 6, "Designer Genes," Davis and Poe say, "Each organism has a unique number of chromosomes" (182). This is flat-out wrong; gorillas, orangutans, chimpanzees, and no doubt many other animals and plants, have 48 chromosomes. On the other hand, *Datura stramonium* (common names include Thorn-apple, Mad Apple and Jimson Weed) may have anywhere from 24 to 36 chromosomes (W. S. Kluge, and M. R. Cummings. *Concepts of Genetics*, 2d ed. [Columbus: Merrill, 1986], 265). However this grammatically imprecise sentence is read, it is incorrect.

Because other errors are present in chapter 6, one can only hope that as a chemist Jimmy Davis wrote more accurately about chemistry and physics than was the case with biology. No biologist would write: "Not only do the macromolecules occur in the same proportions, but they have the same functions in all cells" (175). Even if we ignore quibbles over the second phrase, the idea that macromolecules occur in the same proportions in different kinds of cells disregards the different roles of cells and different uses of macromolecules. Comparing the makeup of fat cells and muscle cells demonstrates why this statement is wrong. Fat cells store triglyceride (fat) macromolecules and thus have a high proportion of fat to proteins. Muscle cells contract using protein motors and thus have a relatively high proportion of protein to fat. Finding different cell types with the same general proportions of macromolecules would be surprising.

When it comes to genetics and cell biology, the authors appear to have been out of their depth. This is understandable and not nearly as disappointing as the failure to take information discussed in the science chapters and apply the philosophical introduction given in the first three chapters. Reading about water's amazing properties and how they make life possible is interesting if you are reading about it for the first time. What made it interesting for me was thinking about the various ways different philosophical and religious approaches might view the information. It was disappointing to finish wading through it all to be informed that "water is a unique molecule; some

people consider that a mark of design" (157). This is hardly a revelation. I want to know *why* some people think water's uniqueness is a sign of design and why others may not. I want the philosophical foundation laid in the first three chapters applied to this information. That it isn't applied makes all the information about materials such as water, carbon, and the periodic table of the elements an informative chemistry lesson but misses an opportunity to provide a much more profound lesson.

The final chapter, "Awe and Wonder," makes an enthusiastic if unfocused argument from aesthetics. While this is an important and often ignored argument for a benevolent Creator, again it is only loosely connected with the chapters on science. Even more frustrating is the Epilogue, where the reader is informed, "this book has no conclusion" (233). What a pity that a book that started out with such promise could muddle to this end. So many potential and interesting conclusions suggest themselves, but instead the epilogue drones off into a befuddled discussion of Michael Behe's Irreducible Complexity (IC). Here the level of confusion is startling: IC "may be an example of the infinite regress so feared by the philosophers of old." In the previous paragraph the immune system is presented as no longer being IC, but no one ever claimed that it was. In his book defining IC, Michael Behe discusses the immune system in Chapter 6, "A Dangerous World." Because it is in reality several systems, Behe never argues that the entire immune system is IC. Instead, in a section entitled "Step by Step," Behe argues that three components are necessary for B-cells antibody production to work and this may be IC. However, B-cell antibody production is only one part of one system (*Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* [New York: Free Press, 1996]). After this, steam engines and Zeppelin airships are reduced to steam coming from a kettle and ash sailing up a chimney. This is so simplistic that it is not worth arguing over. What is revealed is a profound misunderstanding of concepts fundamental to the Intelligent Design movement. For a book with "Intelligent Design" in the title, this is appalling.

That the authors do not understand what Intelligent Design (ID) is about is not a surprise that requires reading to the end of the book. Anyone reading the introduction would be startled to read: "The Intelligent Design Movement is concerned that people believe in God as the cause of the universe and everything in it." Such statements in print are extremely unhelpful to the ID movement. While this accusation is frequently made by those opposed to ID, it is patently and profoundly wrong. ID is about removing theological preconceptions about data before asking whether it is best explained in terms of natural or intelligent causes.

What should be done with *Designer Universe*? Recommending that anyone read it is almost out of the question, especially given the excellent books on Intelligent Design already available (see, e.g., William A. Dembski, ed., *Mere Creation: Science, Faith and Intelligent Design*. [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998]); Phillip E. Johnson, *The Wedge of Truth: Splitting the Foundations of Naturalism* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000]); M. J. Behe. *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* [New York: Free Press, 1996]). But the first three chapters of Davis's and Poe's book are difficult to ignore. Readers looking for information about different philosophical and theological approaches to the question of design in nature and its meaning will find these chapters useful. Because the rest of the book contains inaccuracies and fails to apply the earlier lessons, it is difficult to recommend reading it. Those interested in questions raised in the first three chapters may want to lobby Davis and Poe to get this book right. With a year's sabbatical, a rigorous editor, and lots of effort, *Designer Universe* could become a great book.