School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh
Informatics Research Methodologies 2003/04

Paper Report Form

Your name: Alan Bundy

The paper: The Computational Modelling of Religious Concepts

1 Kind of Contribution

3. Experimental or theoretical evidence supporting a hypothesis.
4. Describes a new application of a technique.
5. Proposes and evaluates the technique as a model of a natural system.
8. Identifies and motivates a new problem.

2 Precis of the Paper

The paper develops a new field of computational theology [8]. It uses existing computational techniques to model various religious concepts [4,5]. 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. These examples provide experimental evidence of the hypothesis that computational techniques can provide a deeper understanding of religious concepts [3].

3 Correctness and Completeness of the Paper

1. The methodology employed by the authors is faulty.
3. There are major omissions in the paper.
4. The reported research is not in a completed state.
5. Related research is not adequately compared.

Justification

The author has not adequately demonstrated that the computational metaphor deepens our understanding of religious concepts [1,4]. 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 [3]. The 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 [5].

4 Significance of Research

1. *What hypotheses or claims are tested by the reported research? How significant are they?*

   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.

2. *What kind of evidence is provided to support (or refute) these hypotheses? What are the outcomes of this testing?*

   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.

3. *Assess the importance of the reported research on a scale of 1 (trivial) to 5 (major breakthrough). Justify this assessment.*

   2. Amusing coffee room examples – no more.