

The Trajectory of Christianity's Track Record for Claims About the Natural World — 15

Phil Stilwell

Independent Scholar

ORCID: [0009-0009-3725-8682](https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3725-8682)

Revised August 2026

Central claim

Christians who treat their tradition's claims about the natural world as evidence of a specially reliable revelation should expect some public advantage over historically constrained human inquiry: accurate guidance unavailable to the surrounding culture, predictive success, or correction that precedes external empirical pressure. Across four selected domains, public inquiry instead supplies a correction, null result, or safer discriminating practice, after which religious interpretation rejects, narrows, or reclassifies the earlier claim. This portfolio fits ordinary cultural development better and weakens that revelatory-reliability claim. The conclusion does not make science and Christianity inevitable enemies, disprove theism, or exclude a revelation model that promises no natural-world advantage—but such a model cannot use this record as confirmation.

Preview:

Target claim	Expected difference	Historical pressure	Rational conclusion
Christian natural-world claims evidence specially reliable revelation.	Relative to ordinary cultural development, some hard-to-anticipate accuracy or correction should precede outside pressure.	In the selected domains, public inquiry supplies correction, null evidence, or safer practice; religious interpretation responds afterward.	The portfolio favors ordinary cultural development for these claims and lowers their value as public evidence of revelation.

This is a comparative philosophical appraisal of four documented case clusters, not a census of Christianity, a numerical likelihood estimate, or a claim that religious people did not contribute to science.

Visual preview:



The infographic maps the paper's test: a claim of specially reliable revelation predicts some public informational advantage; four selected case clusters instead display correction, null evidence, or safer practice supplied by public inquiry. It is a conceptual map, not a measured historical curve or a census of Christianity; the evidence ledger and stated limits govern the conclusion.

Abstract

Christians sometimes treat their tradition's historical engagement with the natural world as evidence of a revelation that enjoys privileged access to truth. That evidential use creates a comparative expectation. Relative to ordinary cultural development, a specially reliable revelation should yield at least some accurate natural-world guidance that was difficult for its surrounding culture to obtain, some risky prediction that succeeds, or some correction that precedes external empirical pressure. This paper evaluates that expectation through four documented case clusters: scriptural and ecclesial involvement in geostatic astronomy; creationist resistance to deep time and common ancestry; supernatural claims about illness and intercessory prayer; and the partial medicalization of possession and exorcism. The cases are historically different, Christianity is internally diverse, and religious institutions and individuals have also supported scientific work. Those facts defeat a simple warfare story. They do not erase the narrower evidential pattern: publicly testable inquiry supplies the durable correction, null result, or safer discriminating practice, while religious interpretation rejects, narrows, or reclassifies the earlier claim after the pressure arrives. Taken cumulatively, this portfolio is more expected under ordinary cultural development than under a revelation model invoked to predict special reliability about nature. The result is comparative and defeasible. It neither establishes metaphysical naturalism nor disproves theism. A revelation model may restrict its aims to worship, moral formation, or salvation and predict no scientific advantage. But once it makes that retreat, the natural-world record no longer functions as public confirmation of privileged revelation. The rational response is to trust empirically accountable methods for claims about nature and to demand an independently motivated reason before exempting a failed religious claim from the same standard.

Keywords: Christianity; revelation; history of science; methodological naturalism; reliability; likelihood; evidence

1. The Claim Under Pressure

This paper is addressed especially to Christians and apologists who use Christianity's natural-world record as evidence that the tradition was guided by a source with knowledge unavailable to ordinary human authors. The challenge is direct. If a religious tradition has privileged revelatory access to truths about nature, its public record should contain some advantage that ordinary cultural development does not readily predict. It should sometimes know early, predict correctly, or correct itself before the surrounding evidence forces the correction. A record that instead mirrors local assumptions and updates after outside discovery is weak evidence for privileged access.

The target must be stated precisely. A *God-concept* is a specified conception of a deity, not theism in general. The target here is not every deity, every Christian doctrine, or every account of inspiration. It is the **revelatory-reliability model**: a Christian community or canon is guided strongly enough by an informed deity that its serious claims about the public natural world should display some reliability advantage over ordinary historically constrained inquiry. The model is intentionally modest. It does not demand a modern science textbook in antiquity, perfect agreement among believers, or an unbroken record of correct interpretation. It asks for some positive difference commensurate with the evidential claim being made.

The comparator is the **ordinary cultural-development model**. On this model, religious texts and traditions are produced, interpreted, and revised by human communities whose natural knowledge largely reflects their time, inherited authorities, institutional incentives, and available methods. Religious people can be brilliant investigators, institutions can support science, and theological commitments can sometimes motivate inquiry. Yet no special informational channel is expected. Corrective progress should therefore track better observations, instruments, experiments, and criticism rather than distinctive revelatory foresight.

These models are not exhaustive metaphysical options. A theist can accept ordinary cultural development for most religious natural-world claims. A non-theist can overstate the historical conflict. The comparison concerns one evidential use: whether the selected record confirms a specially reliable revelation.

The expected-difference bridge

1. If Christianity's natural-world record is public evidence of specially reliable revelation, that record should contain some accuracy, prediction, or early correction that is more expected under revelatory guidance than under ordinary cultural development.
2. In the four case clusters assessed here, publicly testable inquiry supplies the durable correction, null result, or safer discriminating practice; religious interpretation then rejects, narrows, or reclassifies the earlier claim.
3. That portfolio is more expected under ordinary cultural development than under the revelatory-reliability model.
4. Therefore the portfolio weakens, rather than confirms, the use of these natural-world claims as public evidence of specially reliable revelation.

The last step uses the law of likelihood in ordinary form: evidence favors the hypothesis under which it is more expected (Sober, 2008). This does not assign numerical probabilities, and it does not convert a selected historical portfolio into a randomized experiment. The argument is directional. Its force depends on the quality and representativeness of the cases, the distinct information they contribute despite shared history, and the strength of the expectation built into the revelation claim.

2. Historical Discipline: No Simple Warfare Story

Any cumulative claim about “Christianity and science” risks becoming history by slogan. The modern categories of science and religion did not exist unchanged across the periods being compared. Christian actors occupied multiple sides of scientific controversies, and theology sometimes supported, redirected, or absorbed natural inquiry. Historians have therefore rejected both an inevitable-conflict story and an equally simple harmony story (Brooke, 1991; Harrison, 2015). Recent historiography treats complexity as a rule of method: reconstruct the actors, institutions, concepts, and local stakes of each case before drawing a larger pattern (Qidwai, 2024).

That warning changes this paper's argument in three ways. First, the evidence unit is not “Christianity lost and science won.” It is a more specific sequence: a natural-world claim receives religious authority; public inquiry supplies a better account, a null result, or a safer discriminating practice; and religious interpretation then rejects, restricts, or reclassifies the earlier claim. Second, the argument distinguishes institutional conflict from evidential comparison. A church may support astronomy while also policing a particular interpretation. A Christian scientist may produce a natural explanation that later pressures a religious claim. The social mixture does not decide which method produced the reliable result. Third, the paper does not infer from several episodes that every future supernatural claim must fail. It asks which model better fits the selected trajectory.

This calibrated target also avoids an opposite mistake. Historical complexity is not a solvent that dissolves every pattern. If every conflict disappears whenever religious actors contribute to science, or whenever politics joins theology in an institutional decision, the record becomes unfalsifiable. A mixed cause can still include an evidentially important appeal to scriptural or ecclesial authority. The task is to identify that component without pretending it was the whole cause.

3. A Four-Strand Evidence Ledger

The paper's cumulative case rests on four case clusters. Each contributes a different kind of pressure and has a different limit. Table 1 makes those roles explicit.

Case cluster	Religiously weighted claim	Public correction or test	Comparative pressure	Limit
Astronomy	Geostatic or geocentric readings were defended with scriptural and ecclesial authority.	Telescopic, mathematical, and dynamical inquiry displaced the old physical picture.	The correction came through public inquiry, not revelatory foresight.	The Galileo affair also involved politics, personalities, and internal Christian science.
Deep time and life	Young-Earth chronology, separate creation, or anti-evolution claims retained biblical authority in important Christian movements.	Geology, radiometric dating, genetics, paleontology, and biogeography converged on deep time and common ancestry.	Resistance persisted after the relevant empirical program matured.	Many Christians accept evolution and deny that scripture teaches natural science.
Illness and prayer	Some disease and recovery claims invoke punitive or beneficent supernatural agency; intercessory prayer is sometimes offered as an observable intervention.	Controlled distant-prayer research has not established a clinical benefit.	A clear supernatural effect was not recovered when a narrow claim became testable.	Trials do not test every prayer practice, providential aim, or private religious value.
Possession and care	Distress and unusual behavior have been interpreted through demonic-possession frameworks.	Contemporary exorcism practice increasingly incorporates medical and psychological screening.	Reliable care depends on external clinical expertise even where a spiritual interpretation remains.	Medicalization does not show that every historical case had one diagnosis or that spiritual meanings vanish.

Table 1: Evidence ledger for the cumulative comparison. No row independently establishes the conclusion; together they test whether revelatory reliability appears before or only after public correction.

3.1 Astronomy: authority joined a complex scientific dispute

The Galileo affair is neither a cartoon war between a lone scientist and universal religious darkness nor an irrelevant political misunderstanding. The documentary record shows disputes about telescopic evidence, physical arguments, biblical interpretation, institutional jurisdiction, and the permissible status of Copernicanism. Galileo's own letters argued that scripture should not be used as a technical astronomy manual, while ecclesial proceedings in 1616 and 1633 made the interpretation of scripture and the authority to settle the issue part of the conflict (Finocchiaro, 1989). The Catholic intellectual world also included able Jesuit astronomers, and the available physical case for Earth's motion developed over time. Those facts block triumphalist simplification.

The evidential point survives the complication. The durable correction did not arrive as a clearer revelation from within the authoritative apparatus. It was stabilized by observations, mathematical success, improved mechanics, and later physical theory. Gregory Dawes argues that the episode exposes a recurring difference between institutions that bind claims to inherited authority and practices that make revision central to knowledge production (Dawes, 2016). One may dispute how general that lesson is, but the local asymmetry is plain: scripture-based confidence did not anticipate the winning astronomy, and reinterpretation followed the empirical pressure.

This is not evidence that Christian belief prevented all astronomy. It is evidence against using this episode as confirmation that revelation supplied a special natural-world advantage. Ordinary cultural development expects mixed religious participation, institutional resistance, and eventual reinterpretation once a better model becomes unavoidable.

3.2 Deep time and common ancestry: correction without revelatory lead

Creationism provides a different test because it is not one seventeenth-century controversy. Young-Earth and separate-creation movements developed through particular Protestant histories, institutions, and media networks; they do not represent all Christianity. Ronald Numbers documents both their internal diversity and their modern organizational development (Numbers, 2006). Many Christian traditions now accept an old Earth and evolutionary common ancestry, and some interpret that acceptance as a mature reconciliation rather than a defeat.

Again, the narrower comparison concerns timing and source. The evidential basis for deep time and evolution comes from mutually supporting research programs in geology, physics, genetics, paleontology, and biogeography. The National Academies' synthesis describes evolution as the only tested, comprehensive scientific explanation for the diversity of life supported by overwhelming evidence, while explicitly noting that many religious believers accept it (National Academy of Sciences and Institute of Medicine, 2008). That compatibility matters socially and theologically. It does not turn the result into revelatory foresight.

The portfolio would look different if authoritative Christian sources had reliably distinguished common ancestry from competing ancient expectations, or if a Christian revelatory method had generated risky, successful predictions before the scientific evidence matured. Instead, the most conspicuous predictive and unifying gains come from ordinary inquiry, while acceptance within Christianity tracks later hermeneutical adjustment. The case therefore pressures a claim of privileged natural knowledge without requiring the claim that Christianity as a whole is anti-scientific.

3.3 Illness and intercessory prayer: a narrow supernatural claim meets a test

Historical claims about disease as divine punishment are too diverse to summarize as one Christian theory of medicine. Christians built hospitals, practiced medicine, argued over contagion, and interpreted illness in moral, providential, and natural terms. The cleaner evidential case is narrower: when distant intercessory prayer is presented as a cause of improved clinical outcomes, controlled research can test whether the specified protocol produces a detectable difference.

The STEP trial randomized 1,802 coronary bypass patients and found no reduction in complications from distant intercessory prayer. Patients certain that they would receive prayer experienced more complications than patients uncertain of receiving it, a result the authors did not treat as evidence of benefit (Benson et al., 2006). A Cochrane review of ten trials involving 7,646 participants found no clear effect on death or general clinical state and judged the evidence equivocal rather than a proof for or against a deity (Roberts et al., 2009).

These results are frequently overread. They do not test every form of prayer, every conception of providence, or the psychological and communal value of praying. A deity might decline to cooperate with an experiment. But this reply has an evidential price. If no controlled outcome is expected because the deity's reasons are opaque, then favorable recoveries cannot straightforwardly function as public confirmation of intervention. The model can preserve logical possibility or claim private meaning; it cannot count every positive story as evidence while treating controlled null results as irrelevant.

This strand supplies a valuable bridge between history and method. The issue is not that a supernatural explanation is false by definition. It is that a publicly advertised causal claim did not establish the expected difference when the comparison was designed in advance.

3.4 Possession and clinical screening: a bounded institutional adaptation

Christian scriptures and later traditions contain possession and exorcism narratives, but historical sufferers cannot simply be assigned modern diagnoses after the fact. Symptoms, categories, and social meanings change. The strongest claim is therefore not that psychiatry has retrospectively explained every possession case. It is that contemporary religious practice increasingly relies on medical and psychological expertise to distinguish conditions before authorizing exorcism.

Nicole Maria Bauer's study of Roman Catholic exorcism describes a process of medicalization and professionalization in which exorcists incorporate clinical screening while retaining a theological category of possession (Bauer, 2022). That hybrid arrangement is more careful than an opposition between religion and medicine. Whatever function it serves within exorcism discourse, it concedes that responsible practice must engage clinical expertise. It does not establish that medicine has displaced possession or that screening reliably decides every case. Its narrower evidential contribution is that a tradition claiming spiritual discernment has adopted public clinical safeguards to reduce error.

This strand partly concerns institutional adaptation rather than a cleanly falsified theory. Its contribution is correspondingly modest. It shows the direction in which reliability improves: toward differential diagnosis, evidence-based care, and safeguards against treating distress as spiritual attack by default.

4. Why the Strands Converge

The cases should not be multiplied as if they were independent coin tosses. Astronomy, creationism, prayer, and exorcism share institutions, interpretive habits, and the broader development of modern inquiry. The argument therefore makes no product-of-probabilities calculation. Their cumulative force comes from a repeated relation across distinct domains:

1. A religiously serious natural-world claim or explanatory category is present.
2. Publicly testable inquiry supplies a more successful account, a null result, or a safer discriminating practice.
3. The reliable correction is stabilized through observation, prediction, experiment, and criticism.
4. Religious interpretation then narrows, accommodates, or reclassifies the earlier claim.

The repeated sequence matters because the revelatory-reliability model is not merely a compatibility claim. It is offered to explain why a tradition deserves special confidence. If the model contributes no observable lead—no accurate warning, prediction, mechanism, or correction before outside pressure—ordinary cultural development predicts the trajectory at least as well and with fewer auxiliary stories.

Methodological naturalism earns its role here by performance, not by metaphysical decree. It is the working commitment to seek causes that can be compared through public evidence and revised when they fail. Gregory Dawes allows that theistic explanations might be explanations in principle but argues that they face demanding standards of specificity, independent support, and explanatory virtue in practice (Dawes, 2009). That distinction prevents a cheap victory. The paper does not exclude agency language by rule; it asks what difference the proposed agency makes, what outcome would count against it, and whether the claim survives comparison.

Science is fallible and institutionally human. Its history contains error, prestige effects, exclusion, fraud, and resistance. The relevant contrast is not between a flawless science and a foolish religion. It is between correction mechanisms. A method that records failure, exposes claims to independent check, and can replace prestigious theories has a structural advantage over a model whose setbacks can always be absorbed into hidden purposes or reinterpretation. The first can be wrong and learn. The second can be made compatible with every result, but compatibility bought that way is not confirmation.

5. The Strongest Replies and Their Price

5.1 Revelation need not teach science

The strongest Christian reply is not to defend every natural-world claim. It is to deny the expectation. Scripture and tradition may aim at worship, moral formation, covenant identity, salvation, or relationship rather than at scientific instruction. Richard Swinburne, for example, argues that revelation can convey truth through analogy, metaphor, genre, and historically false presuppositions, with biblical interpretation disciplined by church teaching and

independent knowledge of science and history (Swinburne, 2007). On such an account, a scientifically mistaken presupposition need not be the asserted revelatory content.

This reply succeeds against an indiscriminate demand for technical accuracy. It also changes the evidential claim. A revelation model that predicts no special reliability about nature is not disconfirmed merely by natural-world error. But neither is it confirmed by the natural-world record. Christians may have good reasons grounded elsewhere for accepting the model. The historical trajectory cannot do the apologetic work of showing privileged access to natural truth.

5.2 Accommodation is expected, not a retreat

Accommodation holds that communication must use the concepts available to its first audience. The reply explains why ancient texts may speak within ancient cosmologies rather than supplying modern theory. It also fits a general truth about communication: effective speech adopts the listener's language and background assumptions.

The difficulty is calibration. Accommodation can explain familiar surface forms, but an unrestricted appeal predicts no difference between revelation and ordinary human authorship. A bounded version needs a principle identifying which false presuppositions a truthful communicator may use, which harmful errors would be corrected, and what positive content remains independently recognizable as revelation. Without such a principle, every mismatch is labeled accommodation after discovery. That preserves coherence but not evidential discrimination.

5.3 Science and religion answer different questions

Gould's proposal of nonoverlapping domains assigns empirical facts to science and questions of meaning or moral value to religion (Gould, 1999). As a rule for peaceful division of labor, it blocks many manufactured conflicts. As history, it cannot erase episodes in which religious authorities or movements made factual claims about Earth's motion, age, living kinds, illness, or observable prayer effects. The boundary is a constructive settlement, not a description of every earlier claim.

If a Christian position now accepts the boundary consistently, this paper has little quarrel with it. The natural-world record then belongs to empirical inquiry. The cost is again apologetic: empirical successes cannot be selectively recruited as evidence of revelation while failures are reassigned to a separate domain.

5.4 Christianity helped create or sustain science

Christian institutions preserved learning, funded universities and observatories, and supplied concepts, patrons, and investigators important to natural philosophy and modern science. Historians have shown many relations of support and mutual transformation, not just conflict (Brooke, 1991; Harrison, 2015). This fact corrects any story in which science advances only by removing religious influence.

Institutional contribution, however, differs from revelatory information. A Christian astronomer's success may show intellectual excellence and a religious motivation to study nature. It does not by itself show that a supernatural channel supplied the winning claim. The comparator already expects religious people in Christian societies to participate in ordinary cultural development. To favor revelatory reliability, the evidence must identify an advantage attributable to the revelation model rather than to human curiosity, instruments, mathematics, or criticism.

5.5 The portfolio is selected and incomplete

This objection is correct. The four clusters were selected because they are prominent in science-and-religion debate, each exposes a different form of pressure, and each has a public corrective record. They are not a

preregistered sample of every Christian natural-world claim. Selection weakens any frequency claim and blocks numerical likelihoods.

It does not make the cases irrelevant. A claim of special reliability can be tested by prominent failures when those failures occur in domains where authority was asserted and where a public corrective record exists. The right response is proportional: treat the portfolio as directional evidence, search for counterexamples, and specify in advance what would reverse the result. The conclusion is not “Christianity has never been right.” It is that these cases do not confirm privileged revelatory reliability and collectively fit ordinary cultural development better.

6. What Would Change the Result?

A serious comparison must be reversible. Several kinds of evidence would strengthen the revelatory-reliability model:

- a clear natural-world teaching, securely early in date and interpretation, that was improbable given its cultural setting and later independently confirmed;
- a risky prediction derived from a distinctively Christian revelatory source before the outcome, with failed alternatives recorded rather than forgotten;
- a reliable correction generated by the revelatory method before external empirical inquiry forced it;
- a repeatable supernatural intervention whose conditions and theological relevance are specified in advance and whose effect survives independent testing; or
- a principled accommodation rule that predicts both where ancient presuppositions will remain and where revelatory correction should appear.

The ordinary cultural-development model is also vulnerable. A robust portfolio of such cases would be awkward for a model expecting no special informational channel. One isolated match might be coincidence or later interpretation; multiple independent, risky, temporally secure successes would shift the comparison.

Until such evidence appears, the appropriate asymmetry is methodological. Claims about the public natural world should be proportioned to public evidence. Religious meaning may remain important to communities, and metaphysical questions remain open. But a protected claim should not receive evidential credit for favorable outcomes while its failures are assigned to metaphor, mystery, hidden purpose, or misinterpretation without an independent rule.

7. Conclusion

Christianity's relation to natural inquiry is too complex for a permanent-war story. Christian actors have opposed, supported, practiced, and reshaped science; the categories themselves have changed across time. That complexity corrects the rhetoric of a simple march from superstition to reason. It does not rescue the narrower claim that the selected natural-world record confirms specially reliable revelation.

Across astronomy, deep time and common ancestry, intercessory prayer, and possession-related care, publicly accountable inquiry supplies the reliable correction, null result, or safer practice. Religious interpretation then rejects, narrows, accommodates, or reclassifies the earlier claim. No case in this portfolio supplies the expected revelatory lead: a hard-to-anticipate accuracy, risky successful prediction, or correction that precedes external pressure. The cumulative record therefore fits ordinary cultural development better and counts against using these claims as public evidence of privileged natural knowledge.

The principal boundary is equally important. The argument does not disprove theism, establish metaphysical naturalism, or show that a revelation concerned with worship, moral formation, or salvation must teach science. A Christian may adopt such a restricted model coherently. What cannot be done without a double standard is

to use the natural-world record as confirmation when it looks favorable and withdraw every testable expectation when it does not.

The practical implication is plain: for beliefs about nature, trust methods that specify differences, risk failure, preserve contrary outcomes, and correct themselves in public. If a revelatory claim is offered as an additional source of knowledge, ask what it predicts, what would count against it, and where its distinctive reliability appears before the correction is already known.

A. Formal Reconstruction of the Central Thesis

Plain-language premise–conclusion sequence

- P1.** If Christianity's natural-world record publicly confirms specially reliable revelation, then relative to ordinary cultural development it should contain some difficult-to-anticipate accuracy, risky successful prediction, or correction that precedes external empirical pressure.
- P2.** In the four assessed case clusters, publicly testable inquiry supplies the durable correction, null result, or safer discriminating practice; religious interpretation responds afterward, and no revelatory lead of the specified kind is established.
- P3.** A portfolio with that pattern is more expected under ordinary cultural development than under the revelatory-reliability model.
- P4.** Evidence favors the compared model under which it is more expected.
- C.** Therefore this portfolio favors ordinary cultural development over the revelatory-reliability model for the assessed natural-world claims and weakens the use of those claims as public confirmation of specially reliable revelation.

Validity and premise support

The inference from P3 and P4 to C is valid as a comparative evidential consequence: if the portfolio is more expected under ordinary cultural development, then it favors that model in the stated comparison. P1 supplies the expected-difference bridge that makes the evidence relevant; P2 supplies the historical record; P3 is the defeasible comparative judgment drawn from them. Logic alone does not establish P1–P3. Their support is conceptual and historical, and P2 is bounded by a selected rather than exhaustive portfolio. The conclusion therefore does not deductively disprove the revelatory-reliability model. Strong anticipatory successes, a better-specified accommodation rule, or a broader counter-portfolio could weaken or reverse the comparison. Models that predict no natural-world advantage remain outside the direct disconfirmation, but they cannot use this record as the claimed public confirmation.

References

- Bauer, N. M. (2022). The devil and the doctor: The (de)medicalization of exorcism in the roman catholic church. *Religions*, 13(2), 87. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13020087>
- Benson, H., Dusek, J. A., Sherwood, J. B., Lam, P., Bethea, C. F., Carpenter, W., Levitsky, S., Hill, P. C., Clem, D. W., Jain, M. K., Drumel, D., Kopecky, S. L., Mueller, P. S., Marek, D., Rollins, S., & Hibberd, P. L. (2006). Study of the therapeutic effects of intercessory prayer (STEP) in cardiac bypass patients: A multicenter randomized trial of uncertainty and certainty of receiving intercessory prayer. *American Heart Journal*, 151(4), 934–942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2005.05.028>
- Brooke, J. H. (1991). *Science and religion: Some historical perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dawes, G. W. (2009). *Theism and explanation*. Routledge.
- Dawes, G. W. (2016). *Galileo and the conflict between religion and science*. Routledge.
- Finocchiaro, M. A. (Ed.). (1989). *The galileo affair: A documentary history*. University of California Press.
- Gould, S. J. (1999). *Rocks of ages: Science and religion in the fullness of life*. Ballantine Books.
- Harrison, P. (2015). *The territories of science and religion*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226184517.001.0001>
- National Academy of Sciences and Institute of Medicine. (2008). *Science, evolution, and creationism*. National Academies Press. Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/10.17226/11876>
- Numbers, R. L. (2006). *The creationists: From scientific creationism to intelligent design* (Expanded). Harvard University Press.
- Qidwai, S. (2024). History of science, religion and the “big picture”. *BJHS Themes*, 9, 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bjt.2024.25>
- Roberts, L., Ahmed, I., Hall, S., & Davison, A. (2009). Intercessory prayer for the alleviation of ill health. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (2), CD000368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000368.pub3>
- Sober, E. (2008). *Evidence and evolution: The logic behind the science*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511806285>
- Swinburne, R. (2007). *Revelation: From metaphor to analogy* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199212460.001.0001>