ERA

IRM PAPER REVIEW 2003-04

Referee ID	Alan Bundy
Paper ID	The Computational Modelling of Religious Concepts

Type of Paper	This paper supports an hypothesis with experimental or theoretical evidence, describes a new application of a technique, proposes and evaluates the technique as a model of a natural system and identifies and motivates a new problem.
Claims	Computational techniques can provide a deeper understanding of religious concepts. If true, this would open up a whole new field of computational theology, so is potentially very significant.
Evidence	Two cute examples of computational metaphors are given. However, the evidence that these deepen our understanding is weak.

	For instance, no examples are given of previously intractable problems which are rendered more accessible using these metaphors.
Summary	**The paper develops a new field of computational theology. It uses existing computational techniques to model various religious concepts. For instance, the use of 3 mutually recursive functions to illustrate the holy trinity, i.e. how it is possible for 3 objects to be 1, and the use of user intervention in a running program as a metaphor for miracles.**

(Marks on a scale 1-4, with 1 being the best)

Section	Mark	Motivation
Relevance	**(2) Mostly relevant**	**The paper provides a computational model of various religious concepts. To the extent that religious concepts can be considered as natural systems, this is a kind of cognitive science. However, the work does not exactly fit under previous headings as it extends the meaning of informatics.** --- **The paper is relevant to the following keywords:**

Section	Mark	Motivation
		Cognitive Science
Originality	(1) Trailblazing	The paper provides a computational model of various religious concepts. To the extent that religious concepts can be considered as natural systems, this is a kind of cognitive science. However, the work does not exactly fit under previous headings as it extends the meaning of informatics.
Significance	(3) Not very significant	Two cute examples of computational metaphors are given. However, the evidence that these deepen our understanding is weak. For instance, no examples are given of previously intractable problems which are rendered more accessible using these metaphors.
Validity	(3) Contains errors that require correction	The author has not adequately demonstrated that the computational metaphor deepens our understanding of religious concepts. He offers only his personal enlightenment as evidence of an advance. Examples need to be given of previously intractable or inadequately solved theological problems that are better solved in this way. The

Section	Mark	Motivation
		work of A. Kludge describing the attempt to build a robot with high moral standards, is relevant to Computational Theology, but has been ignored by the author.
Presentation	(2) Good	Well written, but using Hacker's usual hyperbolic style.
Overall	(1) Clear accept	The methodology is faulty and the paper is insufficiently significant to justify publication.

Corrections	Give examples of retractable theological problems which are made more accessible by the use of these models.
Comments	This work may be blasphemous.
Referee Confidence	(2) Confident

Save Review - Start Over

ERA v2.0 developed by Massimo Caporale for the University of Edinburgh