Science and religion

Sirs — This is to reply to comments (Letters, January 24) on my review of Richard Dawkins's The God Delusion (“A deadly certitude,” January 15). F. Jamil Ragep, of the McMillan Institute for Islamic Studies, disagreed with my statement that after the death of Abu Hamid al-Ghazali in 1111, there was no more science worth mentioning in Islamic countries. In support, Ragep mentioned the development of trigonometry, but this was primarily the work of al-Battani (858–929) and al-Buni (797–865), long before al-Ghazali. He also mentioned the conception of a moving earth, and referred to mathematical and conceptual tools that were essential to the Copernican revolution. But Copernicus credited the idea of a moving earth to Aristotle (in a passage he subsequently deleted) and Nicholas of Cusa. The Muslim astronomer on whom Copernicus chiefly relied was al-Battani, who died 200 years before al-Ghazali.

There were talented Muslim scientists after al-Ghazali, but their work found no place in Islamic society. For instance, Ragep mentioned the discovery of the pulmonary circulation of the blood. I presume that he was referring to Ibn al-Nafis (1288). Ibn al-Nafis did propose the pulmonary circulation of the blood, but his theory had no effect in the Islamic world, perhaps because for religious reasons he did not demonstrate its truth by the dissection of animals. Ragep also pointed to "the first large-scale astronomical observations". There were great observatories in the Islamic world used largely for predicting prayer times and the Muslim lunar months. In 1277, Taki al-Din built an observatory in Istanbul comparable to Tycho Brahe's famous observatory in Denmark. But on the instigation of the Chief Mufet, al-Din's observatory was destroyed by a squad of janissaries, and had no impact on astronomy, while Brahe's observatory provided the data that made possible the work of Johannes Kepler and Isaac Newton. It is too strong to say that there was no science at all in the Islamic world after al-Ghazali, but such science as there was led to nothing important. Certainly the great period of Islamic science came to an end more than a century and a half before. Nor has it been revived. A 2002 survey by Nature identified just three areas of science in which Islamic countries excel: desalination, falconry and carpal rejuvenation. Nikolai Tolstoy asked why, if religion is harmful, it has not been discarded, and why some eminent scientists are religious. I think that the promise of life after death is sufficiently attractive to account for the survival of even among eminent scientists. But surveys show that religious belief is far less prevalent among scientists than in the whole population.

Letters signed with Terry Eagleton's quip, that for Dawkins to write on theology is akin to "somebody holding forth on biology whose only knowledge of the subject is The Book of Birds!" I had better explain more fully why I disagree with Eagleton's comparison. Biology is a real science. It has agreed methodologies for studying evolution and some problems by reason and experiment. No one today seriously disputes the pulmonary circulation of the blood, or the germ theory of disease. Of course there are still open questions in biology, but research in biology is cumulative; so much has already been learned, and the techniques and the experimental tools now available require much more sophisticated training than that issues in biology really have to be left to experts. In contrast, disagreements in theology go on forever, with no way of ever settling anything, which is not surprising since it does not deal with anything real. For the same reason, unlike biological discoveries, theological doctrines lead to nothing useful. As a phenomenon of intellectual history, theology, like astrology, deserves careful study, but as a body of knowledge, again like astrology, it is not worth taking seriously. It is precisely the experience of working in a real science that best qualifies Dawkins to the hollowness of theology. James Ramsay says that "theological language is abusive, not exact." Both he and Leslie Hinton eloquently describe their rejection of religion as a way of life, but I cannot tell from their letters if they think it has anything definitive to say about the supernatural. If not, then Ramsay and Hinton provide further evidence that Dawkins's critique of religion is valid.

Sir — Steven Weinberg's review of Richard Dawkins's The God Delusion contains some inaccurate remarks about the history of Weinberg's discipline, mathematical physics. If the contemporary debate between religious thinkers and defenders of "scientific" conceptions of the world is to be constructive, we must recognize the historical specificity of the current positions. The fault lines of the raging debate about intelligent design, and related matters, may remain permanent, but the relation between science and religion was decidedly different in the era of modern physics's emergence. For instance, although contemporary physicists like Weinberg may not understand Sir Isaac Newton as having provided a scientific conception of natural phenomena and of their natural laws, their characterization reflects a decidedly anachronistic picture of Newton's own conception of his work.

Weinberg contends that Newton's theory of gravity in Principia mathematica challenged religion because it provided a natural explanation of various phenomena, such as the planetary orbits. This was certainly not Newton's own understanding of his theory; indeed, in the first edition of the Principia, published in 1687, Newton argued that the solar system could only have been given its current configuration by the intervention of a wise and intelligent being. Weinberg misrepresents Newton again when he connects the "argument from design" refuted by Newton's explanations of the world.

In fact, Newton himself endorsed a version of the design argument, and in the very text in which he presents his explanations of natural phenomena. In the famous "General Scholium," added to the second edition of the Principia in 1713, Newton writes that "the diversity of created things" could only have arisen "from the ideas and the will of a necessarily existing being." More generally, Newton made it clear that discussing God by analysing the phenomena of nature is a proper part of his natural philosophy. The task now confronting us, then, is to understand precisely why science and religion are understood as conflicting with one another, given their interrelation in the past.

Andrew Janiak
Department of Philosophy, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708

Arberry's version

Sir — Much as I enjoyed Robert Irwin's article "Wine in the Koran" (January 20), I was disturbed by his comment that A. J. Arberry's pioneering translation of the thirteenth-century al-Tabrizi's Kitab al-Tahabib is "very poor indeed". I have read the translation by Charles Perry, compared it with the Arabic original, and with Arberry's version, and can say with all confidence that the new translation is by far the most exquisitely literal rendering I have ever encountered, linguistically speaking, at times verging on incoherence. While correcting some of Arberry's mistakes, the new translation has a good share of its own inaccuracies. Arberry's rendering makes a good read. It has grace which the new version utterly lacks.

Nawal Nasrallah
12 Meredith Road, Salem, New Hampshire 03079

An unlovely puddle

Sir — In his review of David P. Mindell's The Evolving World (January 19), Simon Conway Morris says that "Mindell's own attempt to produce a rather weak version of Daniel Dennett's 'universal acid' of Darwinism, in itself an incompatible concept given that the theory of evolution itself should be no more immune to this metabolic dissolution than anything else". This completely misreads the main point of my metaphor. As I said when introducing it, "People fear that once the universal acid has passed through the monuments we cherish, they will cease to exist, dissolved in an unrecognizable and unlovely puddle of scientific destruction. This cannot be a sound fear: a proper educational explanation of these phenomena would leave them still standing but just denatured, unified, placed on a more secure foundation." (Darwin's Dangers, p. 19.) And yes, of course, the theory of evolution is itself a fruit of the tree of life, just like the beaver's dam and the spider's web, but much more beneficent from several millennia of cultural evolution in addition to genetic evolution. All the design in the theory has to come from somewhere—no tidy books allowed—and the "genius" of Darwin and his successors is an explicable natural product as the slyness of the fox. There is nothing inherent in this natural product; it is itself a product of evolutionary processes.

Daniel Dennett
Center for Cognitive Studies, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Pappanozza

Sir — J. C. N. (January 26) asks whether anyone has ever tried to cook from a recipe in a novel. During the past few months I have enjoyed "pappanozza" — "potatoes and onions boiled a long time, mashed into a paste with the back of a fork, then dressed with an abundance of olive oil, strong vinegar, freshly ground black pepper and salt," from Andrea Camilleri's Excorius of Tindari, and my wife has cooked "burning pericigno" from his latest novel The Scarf of Naxos — pasta with a tangle of olive oil, half an onion, two cloves of garlic, two salted anchovies, a teaspoon of flaked capers, black olives, tomatoes, basil, half a pinecone, Pecorino cheese, and black pepper"; though our recitation with the pinecone meant that we didn't quite achieve the "alternating gauntlets of extreme agony and unbearable pleasure" that Camilleri's gentleman hero Inspector Montalbano experiences.

We have also been tempted to try out some of the more esoteric recipes in James Hamilton-Paterson's last two books, Cooking with Fernet Branca and Amazing Grace, but his supply for smoked salt seems to have gone out of business and we haven't yet succeeded in obtaining a freshly killed badger.

David Matthews
27 Temple Fortune Hill, London NW11

Sir — J. C. asks whether anyone has ever tried to cook from a novel or poem "with recipes." Thomas Hardy's short story "The Three Strangers" contains the following: "Now the old meal of those days, brewed of the purest first-year or maiden honey, four pounds to the gallon — with its due complement of white of eggs, cinnamon, ginger, cloves, mace, rosemary, yeast, and processes of working, boiling, and cliffing — tasted remarkably strong; but it did not taste so strong as it actually was." I made this recipe years ago; it had quite a kick.

Humphrey Clucas
19 Norman Road, Sutton, Surrey