

If you think that Oxford is the centre of the global intellectual community, you will want to have this book on your shelf. If you suspect that Oxford only offers an eddy in the world's ocean of intellectual thought in matters of science and religion, then may be not. There are scarcely any ideas here that were not discussed at a Colloquium on Science and Religion I attended back in 1977 at Seminary. It was stimulating then, but that was forty years ago. Now it all seems so provincial, so Oxford.

Jesus came preaching the Kingdom of God. He did not come to provide intelligibility and coherence to our understanding of the universe (as the title of the book suggests he might) but rather to take our hearts by storm and turn our sense of reality 'upside down'. Paul, as we know, found the philosophy of his time stultifying and unhelpful in expressing the Resurrection Gospel but like us all, because our minds are in a goldfish bowl in terms of time and space, he could not escape 'swimming in its waters'. As Christians we all have to ask what understanding of reality (philosophy) is most compatible with Jesus' gospel of the kingdom of God. Fortunately there is a wide range to choose from. It is the task of Christian theologians to help us. This where I have a problem with McGrath's book, 'Enriching our Vision of Reality'.

Where is there any discussion of Whitehead's process philosophy, by far the most challenging vision of reality that any Englishman has devised and the most consistent with contemporary physics and mathematics? Do I find any discussion of the philosophy behind Liberation theology or serious engagement with the philosophy of Teilhard de Chardin, the most compatible of philosophies with the Christian gospel today? The philosophies of John Dewey and Ortega y Gasset are quoted in passing, but not in such a way that helps us understand their implication for contemporary studies in Science and Religion. Why would he choose to have a section on the theology of Tom Torrance when H.H. Farmer is so much the superior 'natural' theologian? So I could go on, but may be I am being unfair. McGrath does give the scientifically inclined reader a taste of the intellectual adventure that is theology today and for that we can be thankful.