Although his grasp of contemporary sciences is solid, G.’s presentation of a contemporary scientific framework of the soul is at times laboriously technical. We are led through various pathways of molecular genetics, the human respiratory system, and neural connections (to name a few) that are fascinating but insufficiently integrated into his religious discussion of mind/soul. Perhaps it would have been helpful to begin with a brief history of the human soul rather than with a philosophy of the mind that too quickly plunges into technical insights of emergence and neuroscience, obscuring a discussion of the soul.

Despite the heavy doses of science, G. contributes to our understanding of human mind and soul as emergent integrative processes. He concludes that the soul is not a substance but “a constellation of constitutive relationships that enable real possibility in a human person” (206). His book contributes to an emerging discussion of soul that departs from the medieval past. The theological implications loom large, not least of which concern areas of salvation, eschatology, and the journey into God.
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Masterson wryly acknowledges that he is pursuing a currently unpopular objective, namely, spelling out a metaphysics and natural theology. He seeks to explain the meaning of the theistic claim that “God created the world” (2) and to adduce compelling reasons for concluding that this claim, properly understood, is true. As his argument proceeds, M. pays close attention to Wittgensteinian linguistic philosophy (chap. 4) and the phenomenological wing of postmodern philosophy (esp. chap. 9), both of which suppose that M.’s project is futile. His account of such opposed views is sensitive and judicious, and his defense of the value of his style of rational theological argumentation elegantly positions his approach as complementary to them. In particular, he finds common cause with their alternative philosophical frameworks around the liminal human experiences that bespeak depth of meaning and mystery. Calling them “ciphers of transcendence,” M. contends that philosophical analysis of such experiences yields the rational basis for affirming divine creation. Oddly, M. does not invoke philosopher-theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher, who, despite his Kantian allergy to metaphysics, built an entire theological system around the dependence relation manifest in human cognition and moral action. Nevertheless, these features are rather original to M.’s argument and constitute its most impressive virtues.

The substantive metaphysical argument itself is careful, clear, and compact. It is deployed in support of a traditional end, namely, “God envisaged as pure act of infinite perfection” (12). M.’s construal of this view is more consistent than the Anselmian and Thomistic views that inspire it because M. affirms the world’s dependence on God and denies mutual dependence. M.’s antecedents in this viewpoint appear to have intended such a nonmutual real relation between creatures and God, but they allowed other features of their God theories (such as a realistic view of miraculous answers to prayer) to interfere with the purity of the asymmetric relation of dependence. Like Schleiermacher, M. is impressively consistent in this regard, which makes the resulting theological framework compelling and unusual in an era intoxicated by God-world mutuality.
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