

Luther's, combines a *theologia crucis* with a vigorous affirmation of "worldly" existence? Second, while I applaud the editors' determination to use writings from different phases of Barth's life, I worry that the large number of texts in play, as well as the wide range of topics engaged, may prove daunting for some. Undergraduate classes that assign this book will likely have to isolate excerpts for study while directing students to linger over the detailed notes provided at the end of each part. Third, I would have liked the editors to identify some possible lines of critique, especially with respect to Barth's treatment of non-Christian religions and Barth's insistence on the indispensability of calling on God as Father—two topics of obvious importance in contemporary theological discussions.

These concerns, however, do not detract from my admiration for the volume as a whole. This distinctive and stimulating collection is an important contribution to the study of spirituality, and it will be gratefully received in various quarters of the academy.

PAUL DAFYDD JONES  
*University of Virginia, USA*  
[pdj5c@virginia.edu](mailto:pdj5c@virginia.edu)

*What Are Biblical Values? What the Bible Says on Key Ethical Issues.* By John J. Collins. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019. ix + 285 pages. \$20.00 (paper).

doi:10.1017/hor.2023.67

An alternate title for Collins's cogent, lucid, and persuasive text on the use of the Bible as an ethical guide might be *How Responsible Readers Can Interpret and Apply Scripture's Moral Teachings and Authority* because the central argument of this accessible and timely book is that readers must acknowledge and accept responsibility for interpreting and applying biblical texts while evaluating the moral authority of different parts of Scripture. The question here is not so much what the Bible *says* about key ethical issues but how responsible readers are to mine this resource in an ethical fashion.

Collins begins this fine guide on the responsible use of Scripture as an ethical teacher with three caveats. First, he questions whether the biblical text *says* anything about ethics except through a reader's interpretive lens, inviting us to accept responsibility for how we read the moral lessons of Scripture. Next, he reminds readers of the complexity and contradictions found among biblical statements about differing ethical issues, making it problematic to assert that "*this* is what the Bible teaches." And finally, Collins challenges readers to deal with the fact that numerous biblical texts support practices (like slavery

or the conquest of Canaan) that are not only highly objectionable to our modern (post-Enlightenment) sensibilities, but also profoundly inconsistent with Scripture's own call to love the neighbor.

Collins next reminds us that the ethical perspectives of biblical authors were framed by a grasp of creation, covenant, and eschatology different from contemporary audiences, making it treacherous to translate specific ethical norms as if written for or with modern sensibilities. It is not just that the Bible addresses different issues or comes to differing judgments. Biblical authors and audiences inhabited a different theological landscape and breathed a different philosophical atmosphere, and forgetting this undermines the translation and application of biblical values to our modern setting.

With these caveats and contexts in mind, the main body of the text explores what ethical guidance the Bible offers regarding issues such as abortion, capital punishment, homosexuality, gender, marriage, the environment, violence, and social justice. Unsurprisingly, Collins eschews simple answers, acknowledges how the biblical framework and diverse range of positions complicates matters, and challenges us to acknowledge texts (especially around violence and gender) whose teaching and authority must be questioned. In addition, Collins examines and evaluates a variety of contemporary scholarly approaches to troubling biblical texts and warns of the dangers of inserting modern sensibilities into biblical interpretation to avoid hard decisions about the authority of these texts. Better, Collins thinks, to report what you find and let the chips fall where they may.

This thoughtful exploration of biblical teaching on various ethical issues offers a handful of valuable lessons. First, it is possible to discern a hierarchy of scriptural values (with love of God and neighbor at the summit) to interpret and evaluate specific ethical statements. Second, even within the biblical corpus, there is a pattern of critiquing and reforming earlier teachings. Third, certain biblical texts or teachings are deeply inconsistent with more central biblical values. Each of these lessons suggest that contemporary readers also have a responsibility to interpret and evaluate biblical texts.

While this important text reminds readers of the need for and difficulties of interpreting what the Bible *says* about important ethical issues and models this conscious and scholarly process in the examination of several contemporary issues, the book's most important contribution is the reminder that readers have the responsibility to decide what authority they are going to grant to biblical passages supporting deeply objectionable practices, and how they are going to determine whether a biblical teaching is morally obligatory.

Collins's own answer to this question seems to be that we need to read the Bible as a whole and alongside other sources, bringing together critical

moral judgments informed both by our appropriation of Scripture's most basic values and a larger ethical worldview sustained by a careful and broad reading of ethical wisdom from a variety of sources.

PATRICK T. MCCORMICK  
*Gonzaga University, USA*  
[mccormick@gonzaga.edu](mailto:mccormick@gonzaga.edu)

*Varieties of Atheism in Science*. By Elaine Howard Ecklund and David R. Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. viii + 216. \$26.99.  
 doi:10.1017/hor.2023.71

One of the common misconceptions in the late modern West is that practitioners of science are necessarily forced to align themselves with materialistic, atheistic worldviews. As Elaine Ecklund and David Johnson succinctly state: "A particular kind of atheist scientist has thus become the public face of the science community. As a result, many members of the public think that all scientists are atheists and all atheist scientists are New Atheists, militantly against religion and religious people" (6). Although the stigma concerning the connection between atheism and science is ubiquitous, especially in American and British societies, the authors of *Varieties of Atheism in Science* carefully document and delineate several ways in which scientists describe their affinity with and understandings of religion. This is why the book is peppered with firsthand quotations from scientists who speak for themselves about their professional work and whether a certain type of unbelief is necessitated by the scientific enterprise.

Consequently, anecdotal evidence is consistently utilized by Ecklund and Johnson to demonstrate that scientists do not usually embrace a militant style of atheism (i.e., the kind of atheism that characterized the New Atheist writings in the mid-2000s). The number of firsthand testimonies that are documented in this book helps to bring the abstract nature of the science and religion dialogue into a conversational mode, helping the reader to not only see how multifaceted interdisciplinary dialogues can be, but also how scientists view the interrelatedness of faith and science. This well-written book will help to serve college instructors and undergraduate students to overcome the confirmation bias that unwittingly affirms that all scientists are militant atheists.

The stereotype of the dogmatic atheist scientist continues to persist unabated, especially at the grassroots level. Deep within the stereotypical thinking concerning the atheist scientist is the kind of univocal thinking (i.e., a mindset that has abandoned the analogous way of perceiving reality)