SCIENCE, FAITH AND THE IMPASSABLE DIVIDE IN STANLEY JAKI'S THOUGHT

Alessandro Giostra*

Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Marche – Ancona- Via Piave, 55 – 63078 – Spinetoli (AP), Italy

(Received 16 March 2017, revised 27 March 2017)

Abstract

Stanley Jaki's thought forms part of the contemporary debate about the Science-faith interaction. In that area of investigation his position can be deemed to be very original, as he contrasted and contested all those worldviews supporting the insubstantiality of faith and the absolute priority of the scientific approach. In what follows the main arguments of Jaki's vision on the relationship between Science and faith are highlighted. The opinions expressed in his works can be summed up in the following points: a realistic worldview, the decisive influence exerted by Christian theology on the birth of Science, and a limit between the dominions of Science and religion.

Keywords: Christian, origin, science, realism, inertia

1. A realistic worldview

"Philosophy, which is a message addressed to others by some means, has […] to be, before anything else, about objects". [1] According to Jaki, a true worldview consists in registering objects whose reality implies the distinction between the world and mind, the last not being reducible to the physical dimension of brain. Only objects, indeed, can impose on mind and generate a correct approach to knowledge: "The road that connects Philosophy and exact science is a one-way road. One can travel from Philosophy to Science, but not from Science to Philosophy, unless one confuses Science with the philosophy which scientists throw around their science". [1, p. 54]

Science consists in a system of equations relating to quantitative data gathered in the material world. That quantitative description on material reality presupposes the existence of a Universe as a coherent totality of interacting objects. Thus, trusting in that worldview implies the belief in causality as a substantial part of correlating phenomena. The pristine form of physical reality is the only possible area of Philosophy which precedes Science, the latter being the quantitative correlation of observational data. In other words, Jaki's realistic vision is based on the existence of a Universe as a coherent whole of interacting objects. That is the belief in a world as a totality, in which causality is the reason

*E-mail: giostra.al @libero.it, tel.: +393470696507

allowing humans to grasp the interactions within matter. The ultimate source of that causality and sameness of nature lies in God's power to create and keep everything in existence. The universal sameness, indeed, lies in the divine creation aimed at establishing a God-man covenant. We know that our ability in understanding the world is an integral part of Revelation and a fundamental premise of exact science which contemplates a real and coherent universe, ruled in each of its parts by the same physical laws. Revelation just announces the existence of natural laws forming part of the covenant between God and humans. "Thus says the LORD, He who gives the Sun to light the day, Moon and stars to light the night; Who stirs up the sea till its waves roar, whose name is LORD of hosts: If ever these natural laws give way in spite of me, says the LORD, Then shall the race of Israel cease as a nation before me forever". (Jeremiah 31.35-37) Thus, scientific investigation presupposes the assumption of some basic metaphysical principles, namely the intelligibility and simplicity of nature, the uniformity of phenomena and their reciprocity. "The farther physics gets in exploring the vast reaches of space, or the minute detail of matter, the more numerous and obvious will be its contact points with metaphysics." [2]

The above mentioned conceptions are the reason why a coherent look at history provides evidence on behalf of the origins of Science in the Christian context. Therefore, the scientific discourse not only implies the existence of a real universe, but its birth occurred in a milieu wholly influenced by the Incarnation of God as an actual historical reality. Modern science originated in the Scientific Revolution, namely the age from the publication of Copernicus' *The Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres* (1543) until the issue of Isaac Newton's *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (1687). During that period, indeed, the main protagonists of Science believed in God as the Creator of a universal mathematical harmony. Jaki's idea of the Christian origin of Science can be considered the continuation of the results achieved by Pierre Duhem, who discovered the continuity between modern science and Medieval philosophy of nature.

2. The origin of Science

The peculiarity of both Theology and Science means the impossible presence of scientific contents in the Bible [3]. In some passages, Luke 12.56-57 being one, Revelation announces a universal perspective going beyond Science. An eschatological dimension overcoming any scientific account is a distinctive feature of the Pauline Letters too. Christian ontology, according to Ephesians 1.10-13 and Colossians 1.16-17, deals with salvation in the fullness of times and the absolute priority of Christ as the Alpha and Omega of the world. Christian Revelation played a key role in the emergence of the modern scientific thought. Creation out of nothing, the clear cut distinction between God and matter, the Trinitarian dogma and, more specifically, Christ as the Only Begotten, determined the neglect of natural pantheism and finalism as a key step towards the achievement of Science. Jaki succeeds thereby in answering why the origin

of Science can be found in the Christian context and not in those ancient milieus which preceded Christianity, and where a high level of mathematical knowledge had already been achieved. In sum, despite the only salvific goal of Revelation, Jaki upholds the fundamental role of the biblical message for the emergence of exact Science. Historians of science deem Newton's three laws of Physics to be the final moment of the Scientific Revolution. Only the second of them ($F = m \cdot a$) was originally conceived by Newton; the other two laws, indeed, can already be found in the works of other authors. The core of those laws consists in the first of them, namely the principle of inertia. Descartes was the first scientist to define inertia correctly and he had learned that principle during his stay in the Jesuit college of La Flèche. However, the first formulation of inertia dates back to Jean Buridan's theory of impetus: "Also, since the Bible does not state that appropriate intelligences move the celestial bodies, it could be said that it does not appear necessary to posit intelligences of this kind, because it would be answered that God, when He created the world, moved each of the celestial orbs as He pleased, in moving them He impressed in them impetuses which moved them without His having to move them any more except by the method of general influence whereby He concurs as a co-agent in all things which take place […] and these impetuses, which He impressed in the celestial bodies, were not decreased nor corrupted afterwards, because there was no inclination of the celestial bodies for other movements. Nor was there resistance which would be corruptive or repressive of that impetus." [4]

Impetus, however, still shows an influence exerted by Aristotelian philosophy of nature. The eternal motion of spheres is connected with the absence of friction in the ether and the Aristotelian perfection of the heavens. The 'inclination' of moving bodies is closely linked with their inner goal and due to finality, as another typical tenet of Greek philosophy. Furthermore, Buridan explicitly spoke of an inertial circular motion of spheres; he and his contemporaries couldn't avoid that mistake.

However, some great novelties make impetus an innovative idea. After creation, the Universe does not need any further intervention by God, apart from that Creator-creatures generic interaction through which the world is kept into existence. So, nature is an independent reality, ruled by laws established by God's will since the beginning. This worldview liberated nature from the remnants of animism, and that is why Buridan refuses the presence of celestial intelligences as instrumental causes of the planetary motions. Thus, the theological ground in Buridan's theory lies in its being founded upon creation out of nothing and de-animization of the Universe, in opposition to pantheist visions. Creation out of nothing by a transcendent God implies a nature made of creatures sharing the creatural condition. According to Buridan, the impetus regulated motion throughout the Universe and that conception anticipated the commonality of natural laws, namely the core of the Newtonian synthesis. Furthermore, creation out of nothing made a substantial contribution to the achievement of the modern laws of motion. A linear temporal dimension, made of past, present and future, contrasts the existence of a great year of the

Universe. In other words, eternal cycles did not allow the linearity of phenomena and discouraged investigation into Natural science, as events are considered necessary. Principles, such as the world eternity, typical of the Aristotelian cosmology, had been officially condemned in Paris in 1277, where all the distinctive features of the divine transcendence have been reasserted. So, Buridan "belonged to that intellectual trend (greatly catalyzed by the decision of 1277) in which emphasis was laid on the ability of God to create any kind of world" [4, p. 72].

In Jaki's mind the Platonic dialogue *Phaedo* represents a very meaningful origin of the pantheistic conception in the Greek context [3, p. 17-19]. In that dialogue Plato, through the words of Socrates, tells that in his youth he had adopted the Anaxagorean cosmology, because of the presence of *Nous*, the supreme intelligence providing bodies with what was the best for them. In sum, Anaxagoras had suggested to Plato the real structure of the Universe, namely its own purposeness and teleological necessity. In the following lines, however, Plato highlights the reasons why he abandoned soon Anaxagoras' worldview: despite the presence of the ordering Nous, it uses only physical explanations to interpret phenomena [Plato, *Phaedo*, 97a-100a]. Plato's decision was due to find a teleological reason for phenomena. Modern science rejected finalism, as it is founded upon the mathematical account of phenomena which, under the same conditions, occur invariably. Plato was convinced that the adoption of a mechanistic science implied the adoption of a broader mechanistic philosophy. Thus, he deviated from the quantitative approach and "his procedure was a classic case of throwing out the baby (mechanistic or quantitative science) with the bathwater (mechanistic philosophy)" [3, p. 18]. Plato's universal finalism culminates in the conception of a universal soul, expressed in the *Timaeus*. The belief in a living world has been a distinctive feature of Aristotelian cosmos too; it deals with animated celestial bodies, whose inherent vitalism determines their own circular motions. The presence of absolute landmarks, indeed, is typical of the heavenly animated bodies [Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, II, 12, 292a; II, 2, 284a-285b].

3. Creation

The dogma of creation out of nothing brought about a new natural vision, as it denies the existence of a universal soul and describes a world formed only by mere creatures. Just this model opened the way to the Newtonian physics. Newton not only believed in God, but he also admitted the divine intervention in natural processes. Although Newton was follower of a kind of Unitarian doctrine, in his mind God constantly corrects the irregularities of planetary movements. His worldview influenced by a voluntarist theology, implied the full dependence of the Universe on divine action. God's intervention in natural phenomena opposes the deistic conception of a clockwork universe, which was esteemed very favourably by many eighteenth century thinkers [3, p. 26]. Moreover, the linearity of the temporal dimension, as a consequence of the

dogma of creation out of nothing, helped in achieving the basic laws of motion. In Buridan's thought, indeed, "the Universe is not only created out of nothing, but also created in time" [3, p. 26]. Time is a creature, and a temporal dimension existing before the divine creation is unconceivable. The linearity of time contrasts all those philosophies affirming the existence of a great year of the world and eternal cycles, and, according to Jaki, that vision encouraged the investigation of physical processes, whose laws just presuppose the linearity of temporal dimension.

The Scientific Revolution emerged as the progressive abandonment of the Aristotelian worldview. The faith in the Biblical Creator, having put all creatures on the same level, represents an opposition to the Aristotelian cosmology, founded upon the existence of divine bodies. Aristotle, indeed, divided the Universe into two different zones: while in the sublunary zone, generation and corruption among the four elements occur, in the celestial part, bodies are incorruptible, divine and perfect. So, the rectilinear and imperfect motion of the elementary zone is distinct from the perfect and circular movement of the ether, the fifth element forming the celestial spheres [Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, I, 268 b11 – I, 269b 18]. The dissolution of such a universal model is a basic tenet of the Newtonian synthesis which establishes the same laws of motion as ruling any kind of bodies. Thus, the unification of celestial and terrestrial physics began with Buridan's view and, in a broader sense, the Medieval revision of Aristotle's natural philosophy.

Another basic principle of the Christian faith is considered by Jaki essential for the birth of Science. Humans are made in image of God, so their rationality is able to understand the rationality of the Universe as a creature. The modern experimental method, based upon the reproducibility of phenomena, is just an outcome of the substantial role played by humans in the world, as natural processes take place in accordance with exact mathematical laws which reflect the rationality of the created world. An evident confirmation of this Jaki's opinion can be found in the works of Galileo Galilei. At the end of the first day of the *Dialogue on the two chief systems*, Galilei distinguishes two different kinds of knowledge: an extensive sort of mathematical learning, which is infinite and proper of God, and the intensive one belonging to human mind. The human intellect, although it is inferior to God's as regards to the dimension and speed of knowledge, is able to grasp some absolute truths, namely the mathematical laws of nature. The ability to achieve that kind of knowledge renders human mind similar, although inferior, to God's and allows man to take part of the divine rationality of the world; the mathematical language of nature is just the distinctive feature of that divine rationality [5]. A universe created by the Word (*Logos*) is a readable reality, and Galilei expressed his Christian inspired worldview in the metaphor of the book of nature, "which is continuously open before our eyes - I mean the Universe - but before we can understand it we need to learn the language and recognize the characters in which it is written. It is written in the language of Mathematics, and its characters are triangles, circles, and other geometrical figures, without which it is humanly impossible to

understand a word of what it says. Without these, it is just wandering aimlessly in a baffling maze". [5, p. 115]

In conclusion, the reliance placed on mathematical knowledge by Galilei and other main figures of the Scientific Revolution, is grounded upon the Christian theology of creation. Just the creation of man, made in image of God as His own privileged creature, led Galilei to declare: "indeed, when I consider how many and how marvellous are the things which men have been able to do and understand, I perceive all too clearly that the human mind is among the most excellent works of God" [5, p. 229].

4. Christology

In many passages of the New Testament creation exhibits its Christological dimension: "for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him" (Colossians 1.16). Jesus' power of creating and keeping everything in existence, is strictly connected with his being announced as the Only-Begotten (*Monogenes*). That Christological peculiarity enlarges the gap between a cosmology derived from Christendom and a pantheist view originated in the ancient Greek thought. In Jaki's mind, the adoption of the Christian belief, based on Christ as the Only-Begotten, totally rejects the idea of the Universe as an outcome of an emanationistic process. In Plato's Timaeus, for example, the Universe is esteemed to be one and only-begotten as the most perfect imitation of the eternal paradigms: "In order then that the world might be solitary, like the perfect possible animal, the creator made not two worlds or an infinite number of them; but there is and ever will be one only-begotten and created Heaven" [Plato, *Timaeus*, 31 a-b]. Thus, "we may now say that our discourse about the nature of the Universe has an end. The world has received animals, mortal and immortal, and is fulfilled with them, and has become a visible animal containing the visible-the sensible God who is the image of the intellectual, the greatest, best, fairest, most perfect-the one only begotten Heaven." [Plato, *Timaeus*, 92c]

Some Greek philosophers and the heirs of their thought deemed the Universe to be a *monogenes*, namely a divine physical structure, as an emanation from a first principle. "Hence the strict divinity of the heavens and also the non-divinity or partial irrationality of the regions below the moon within the Graeco-Roman perspective." [4, p. 79] The animistic view finds its vastest articulation in Plotinus' cosmology, which can be considered the fullest expression of that philosophical arrangement. In his vision reality consists in a series of levels, One – Intelligence – Soul -, each higher ones radiating into the next lower. That kind of cosmic process is deemed a necessary outcome of the *hyperpleres* of the One, namely its super-abundance of being, bringing about an eternal process giving the world its existence. Physical reality is the result of the lower aspect of Soul, that is nature, which projects itself upon matter, the negative receptacle for the unfolding of the lowest feature of Soul itself. Therefore, Plotinus' pantheist

conception aims at finding an explanation for the presumed best of all possible worlds and clashes with the principles of a free creation out of nothing. The existence of a universal soul, astrology as the discipline linking microcosm (individual soul) with macrocosm (cosmic soul), and a negative corporeal dimension of matter as the lowest level of the universal process, are the distinctive features of Plotinus' universe which is the result of a cosmic inevitability. "The lending of that dominion to any other being would have meant turning a mere creature into a Creator, a doubling, so to speak, of the essentially one God." [6]

The Christian doctrine brought about a new cosmological perspective and the vision which had been cultivated by philosophers for many centuries was entirely upset: "educated converts to Christianity had to demote in their thinking the Universe from a divine rank to the rank of a mere creature" [7]. The announcement of Christ as the Only Begotten Son of God completed that theological path which had already started with the Old Testament creation out of nothing. Therefore, it had been rigorously excluded the possibility of a divine structure for the Universe which is arranged by modern science as ruled, in each of its parts, by the same natural laws. Those laws form part of a material reality which is distinct from God, even if it is the result of His universal design, and whose rationality fully involves human ability of understanding its inner structure. A world created by Christ, the Logos made Flesh, can only be regulated by physical laws reflecting a universal logical order.

5. The stillbirths of Science

The absence of the Christian theological tenets brought about what Jaki defines the *stillbirths of Science.* They are typical of other religious contexts, although they preceded the Biblical Revelation by many centuries**.** In what can be considered Jaki's most important work, the Hungarian researcher highlights the fact that in the old Chinese, Indian, and Egyptian milieus, even if a high level of mathematical learning had been achieved, the basic laws of motion were not formulated [8]. As regards to the ancient Greek thought, the general contents of Aristotle's cosmological pantheism have already been discussed in this essay. In Jaki's conception, the great mistake of the Aristotelian theory of motion consisted in believing in the teleological disposition of natural bodies. That inherent finality determined the natural motion of bodies and made them occupy their proper place in the world. Just that conception, as Jaki remarks, led to the statement according to which the speed of the free fall of bodies depends on their own weight [Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, III, 2, 301b]. "Once in the grip of so many equivocations or misplaced analogies, even a genius like Aristotle could readily be lured into formulating the grandly erroneous law: twice the weight, twice the speed of fall." [3, p. 42]

As a matter of fact, monotheism firmly rejects pantheism, but it has not been enough to bring about the birth of Science. Christian monotheism distinguishes itself for its belief in the Only Begotten and the absence of such a

divine figure in the Islamic and Hebrew contexts led some representatives of those religious beliefs to become pantheists or adopt cosmological views influenced by pantheism. A first confirmation of Jaki's theory can be found in the works of Maimonides (1135-1204) who believed in the Aristotelian distinction between terrestrial and celestial zones. According to his worldview, the Universe is divided into three categories of beings, which reflects the process of the divine creation. Following the creation of separated intelligences and celestial spheres, that ends at the sphere of the Moon, the creation of the zone subjected to generation and corruption started. In other words, Maimonides' vision of the Cosmos was influenced by both Aristotelian cosmology and the emanationstic model establishing the formation of separated intelligences from which all beings receive their existence. The final result consists in an animated universe as an organic entity coming from the creating activity. Even if Maimonides neglected the eternity of the world to state the beginning of time, just the action of God set out the universe in accordance with an emanationistic view [9].

The absence of an Only Begotten is the reason why Science did not arise in the Islamic world too. That is the argument highlighted by Jaki in one of his last booklets, in which he dealt with the alternative approaches developed by Christianity and Islam to the scientific progress [10]. Also in the Islamic culture, although coranic revelation announces creation out of nothing and linearity of time, notwithstanding some important contribution to mathematical science, the basic laws on the motion of bodies were not achieved. Jaki shows that Avicenna had already conceived a sort of inertial motion, but his trust in Aristotelian cosmology prevented him from formulating the first form of the inertial principle, as Buridan did about three centuries later. Avicenna's theory on motion affirmed the existence of a *mail*, an Arabic word indicating an inclination. It was a kind of impressed force "which was capable of continuing the action in a body after the original motive force was no longer operative" [11]. According to Avicenna, there were two sorts of *mail*, natural and violent, corresponding to the two kinds of motions indicated by Aristotle. However, in the view of the Persian philosopher, a body is able to receive violent *mail* in proportion of its weight and that conception shows Avicenna's dependence on Aristotelian physics. "Newton would have been no less stunned on being told that it was a famous medieval Muslim, Avicenna, who conceived first of inertial motion but failed to perceive its importance as if shackles covered his eyes. The shackles were the basic laws of Aristotelian cosmology, which Avicenna, being a pantheist at heart and a Muslim only in appearance, fully accepted. According to Aristotelian pantheism the Universe was divinely perfect, therefore spherical and forever in a circular motion. Since a circle contains no privileged point, a circular motion does not evoke an absolute starting point. Being captive to that world view, Avicenna could not find in it an invitation to apply there his idea of inertial motion. With that the Muslim world lost its most distinct opportunity to be the first with the formulation of a physics that would give control over the physical world." [10, p. 16]

Averroe's (1126-1198) thought represents another demonstration on behalf of Jaki's theories. His own solution conciliating both creation and eternity of the world is a compromise between Coranic monotheism and cosmic pantheism. In the *Inchoerence of the Inchoerence of Philosophers* he proposes a middle course model of the Universe between the two alternatives and exhibits creation as a continuous process excluding the beginning of the world in a specific moment [12]. Averroe's vision can be found also in the *Decisive Treatise*, in which he maintains his own opposition to the creation out of nothing of the Universe, as something that happened in a specific time, and supports the idea of a continuous generation of matter [13]. Summarizing, in Averroe's thought God, by way of final causality, is the creator of the Universe insofar as he draws it from potentiality into the actuality of existence. That is a model for creation that does not entail a temporal beginning of the world and a starting moment of time.

In conclusion, Jaki remarks that the absence of Christian theological principles gave rise to the *stillbirths* of Science. This is because whilst in Christian doctrine the outcome of the emanation from the Father is Christ, in other philosophies the emanation from God is the Universe. So, those other pantheist philosophies and/or religions shaped cultural contexts which prevented natural researchers from achieving the birth of Science as a purely quantitative description of phenomena.

6. The mirage of conflict

The quantitative nature of Science, in which measurements carry out the most important function, as contrasted with the salvific aim of religion, rejects any possibility of a serious and irresolvable conflict: Science and religion lie on two sides of a divide which is impassable, conceptually that is, precisely because of the respective role of quantities in both. Properly religious (or genuinely humanistic) information cannot flow to the other side, nor can strictly scientific information flow in the opposite direction [14]. All of the past and present errors in this area of investigation are due to the misunderstanding about the respective dominions of those disciplines. In Jaki's mind, the first mistake is made by authors supporting concordism. The Bible does not contain any scientific meaning and the history of Science registers repeated unsuccessful attempts to show the connection between biblical texts and scientific conclusions. On the other hand, there are many errors by those scientists using Science to demonstrate the insubstantiality of faith. A scientific discourse can only start from recognizing the physical reality, whose creation is not a scientific matter. The emergence of matter from nothing cannot form part of scientific research, as the 'nothing' cannot be defined in scientific terms. Therefore, the scientific failure of those theories upholding concepts such as the creation of matter out of nothing or its eternity, clearly shows a methodological error. Even the Galileo case can be interpreted in this perspective, as his judges could have handled the question in a different way had they referred to the right considerations, in order

to go to the root of the Science-religion interaction. The condemnation of Galilei is often considered an instance of the Church's closeness towards scientific rationality. In Jaki's opinion, Galilei committed the 'quantitative' error of believing the motion of the Earth to be demonstrated, while the error of the Church consisted in trusting in the Bible as a book including some basic physical truths. That is the reason why "in that classic clash between Science and Christian religion, Galileo proved to be a better theologian than Bellarmine and others, whereas the latter had the better of a strictly scientific point: they rightly insisted that Galileo in vain claimed that he had provided an experimental proof of the rotation and orbiting of the Earth. It was clear that in doing so he contradicted some of his own statements." [3, p. 24] In the contemporary age considerable confusion is generated also by some atheist supporters of the Darwinian theory. In addition, that theory has given rise to Social Darwinism, a dangerous vision holding there to be a natural selection in society, considered as a sort of inescapable system. Although Science would prove definitively Darwin's hypothesis, that demonstration would not imply any negative consequences for faith. A similar serious error is made by students who refuse to analyze that theory in order to keep the literal interpretation of some biblical passages. Thus, "there may be clashes between Science and religion, or rather between some religionists and some scientists, but no irresolvable fundamental conflict" [15].

7. Conclusions

It's possible to draw a conclusion from the whole of Jaki's investigation on the faith-Science interaction. The distinctive features of both, Science and faith, exclude the possibility of a real conflict between those two disciplines. The meaning of Science could be very misleading, as long as it deals with a great variety of researches. The scientific discourse consists in a rigorous recourse to measurements implying the use of numbers. In Jaki's view, Christian faith is based upon revelation, whose tenets have nothing to do with quantities and measurements. Science, as a quantitative description of nature, rejects any kind of pantheism, and presupposes a realistic metaphysical conception, according to which the existence of universal natural laws allows the reduction of phenomena into mathematical equations. Christian revelation, although not including scientific descriptions, has provided humanity with such a worldview. The Universe, as the outcome of the action by the Supreme Logos, has got an inner rationality. Human beings, made in image of God, are provided by the Creator with the means to grasp the natural laws as part of revelation. Creation out of nothing marks a distinction between God and creatures; moreover, the idea of Christ as the Only Begotten Son of the Father, has further eliminated any possible belief in a world animated by divine entities. In the mind of Greek and Roman philosophers "the expression 'only begotten' (monogenes or unigenitus) had the Universe for its supreme reference point" [4, p. 79]. In the Medieval age, there were also many Jewish and Islamic cosmologists who, despite the

monotheistic character of their faith, considered the world as an emanation from a first principle. Only Christians have deemed the Universe to be a mere creature, and only in their perspective the distance between Creator and creature has been preserved. "It was, historically speaking, the first manifestation of the saving grace which the Christian doctrine of salvation in and through Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of the living God, provided for science." [4, p. 80] The resulting view that Jesus can be seen as the 'Saviour of Science', in that sense in which He is the Creator of everything, is an evidence, although it is not expected to gain quick acceptance. All the writings of Stanley Jaki are a vital contribution to this consideration.

References

[1] S.L. Jaki, *Means to Message*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1999, 8.
[2] S.L. Jaki, *The Relevance of Physics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1966, 367.
[3] S.L. Jaki, *Christ and Science*, Real View Books, New Hope, 2000, 1-4.
[4] S.L. Jaki, *The Savior of Science*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 2000, 57.
[5] W.R. Shea and M. Davie, *Galileo: Selected Writings*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012, 228-230.
[6] S.L. Jaki, *God and the Cosmologists*, Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh, 1989, 152-153.
[7] S.L. Jaki, *Bible and Science*, Christendom Press, Fort Royal, 1996, 71.
[8] S.L. Jaki, *Science and Creation: from Eternal Cycles to an Oscillating Universe*, Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh, 1986.
[9] N. Abbagnano, *Storia della Filosofia*, vol. II, Tea, Milano, 1995, 246-249.
[10] S.L. Jaki, *Jesus, Islam, Science*, Real View Books, Royal Oak, 2001.
[11] E. Grant, *The Foundations of Modern Science in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, 94.
[12] Averroes, *Incoerenza dell'Incoerenza dei Filosofi*, UTET, Torino, 1997, 200-201.
[13] Averroes, *Il Trattato Decisivo sull'Accordo della Religione con la Filosofia*, BUR, Milano, 1999, 73-77.
[14] S.L. Jaki, *The Impassable Divide or the Separation between Science and Religion*, Real View Books, New Hope 2008, 2.
[15] S.L. Jaki, *The Mirage of Conflict between Science and Religion*, Real View Books, New Hope, 2009, 10.