

COSMIC EVOLUTION: THE CONTEMPORARY SETTING OF THEOLOGY

From her very origins the Church has gone through epochal crises. In the Apostolic Proclamation she turned from fanatical dietary and narrow ritual racism to the open world to make all men her Master's disciples. Rather than an extended and expanded Judaic religion, she became the Universal Catholic Church. In the Gentile world she faced the challenge of Gnostic dualism and elitism by centering on the true *gnosis* which was handed down from the Christ enfleshed in a real world. He was born of Mary the Virgin, suffered and died and rose again for our salvation. A harassed Christianity accepted the Constantinian conversion with politization of her ideals and structures, which endured to our own times. Similar was the involvement of medieval feudalism, the Gregorian Reform, the Reformation and so forth. These crises, says Walter Kasper, in his *Einfuehrung in den Glauben*, produce immense historic transformations: they create tremendous challenges to the faith which must always preserve its identity in change and its historic union with Christ. They obviously risk ruin, while providentially calling to the People of God for a deepening of faith and spiritual enrichment of the Church. Under the influence of the Holy Spirit they are *kairos* in her life, her theology, her mission. Rightly Kasper speaks of the frequent epochal turns (*Wende*) in her history.¹

The present crisis, I am inclined to think, is her supreme challenge, the most far-reaching and comprehensive, as it reaches out to the total reality from atom to cosmös. It affects the total structure of man in his bio-psychic reality, as it questions his origins in an evolving almost infinite universe. It penetrates his genetic structure and experiments with the entire future of the race. In a most comprehensive sense we are now facing the making of man and his world, his traditions, his social and economic structures, from which the sacred and the sacral have

¹Walter Kasper, *Einfuehrung in den Glauben* (2nd ed.; Mainz: Gruenewald, 1972), pp. 15f.

been exorcised.

In a study remarkable for its erudition and insight, *Man, Meaningful Goal of the Evolving Universe*, Hubertus Mynarek, priest-scientist-theologian, expounds the Christian evolutionary thesis, addressing himself to the studies of Teilhard de Chardin and his great but little known predecessor, Herman Schell, as well as an amazing mass of evolutionary evidence.

In the 19th and 20th century there was a final displacement of a cosmos statically or predominantly statically conceived by a universe which must be thought of as dynamic. The concept of evolution was applied to all spheres, levels, and ontic forms of the universe. Insight was gained into the far reaching bio-psychic relations and bonds between man and the animal realms. We learned of the dependence and conditionality of man upon matter and the play of forces in the cosmos.²

Though the crisis affects our whole race, our present concern is the Church and her life, her theology, her existence. According to Kasper we are witnessing today the culmination of the Enlightenment in which finally "man has become the measure of man, the center of all reality." He uses the sharp German term, *Bezugspunkt*, the point to which all is referred, from which all is perceived, judged, and fashioned. Here we have the "anthropological reversal": the result is transformation in every order, social-cultural-religious-political. Man in freedom and equality challenges authority in the family, the church, and society. No structure is immune, not even the genetic heritage which fashions man's future on our planet, and this, the most bold thrust of the crisis, involves moral problems.

Obvious, of course, is the accumulation of massive knowledge, stored and communicated: automation has progressed to the extent that it now seems to challenge the working of the human brain by answering all its computative questions, and paralleling the actual process of human thought!

Man and his world are secularized: we may say demythologized. It is not the theologians but the evolutionary scientists—a term

²Hubertus Mynarek, *Der Mensch, Sinnziel der Weltenwicklung* (Muenchen: Schoeningh, 1967) IX, adapted.

intentionally comprehensive—who look upon man as evolution-made-conscious—as having the power and will to continue evolution and even to fashion and direct its future in the production of a super race, a “brave new world.”

Now we, particularly the theologians, ask: What shall we accept in evolutionary research? (1) We must first of all accept the idea that a cosmic, organic, cultural evolution has taken and is taking place. Evolution includes man cosmically, organically. Biocultural evolution is peculiar to man. We should look upon evolution as a basic scientific fact without which we cannot understand human realities. (*NCE*, vol. 5, p. 676). We must repudiate the false dilemma: man or God, creation or evolution, matter or spirit. Rather we must recognize man and God, creation and evolution, matter and spirit. Creation itself demands evolution, development. Evolution demands creation. (2) Man is not an “alien observer” added to this universe: he is integrated into it organically, “participating bodily in the same complex process of organic derivation affecting the rest of the living world.” (*Ibid.*). (3) Theology has always taught that man alone in the universe can give formal glory to God. A mere non-intelligent universe can give a kind of “objective” glory, but through man the whole universe gives “formal” (external) glory to God. In a dynamic evolutionary universe man who is bound up with animal actualities, with pre-steps in subhuman reality, who is the unique mammal, manifests to us an essential novum in a total evolutionary existence. The cosmic development preaks in this uniqueness. This is not blind chance; it involves plan: creation and evolution: God.³

According to Professor A. Auer, Mynarek’s study clearly shows that evolution must be equated with a natural revelation of God’s dynamic act of creation.

Mynarek presents a new basis of finality deserving of special consideration. On the basis of a broadly balanced survey of natural science, philosophy and theology, and without infringing on the findings of empirical research, he shows the tendency toward a goal in evolution. The study places the Christian essential idea of man in the perspective of our evolutionary cosmos as such. Consistently

³*Ibid.* X.

and comprehensively indeed it reveals a strictly dynamic-evolutionary universe. For the first time the phenomenon of evolution and the position of man in the evolutionary perspective have been treated systematically from the philosophical and especially from the theological point of vantage, with the most rigid consideration of the findings of empirical research.⁴

Mynarek justly maintains that evolution truthfully reflects the historical and anthropological realities. However, he also affirms that our revealed doctrine, which he calls the theistic Christian religion, is able to "ground more deeply" than the natural sciences the idea of cosmic evolution, and is also able "to enrich essentially and in a measure to extend to infinity the idea of cosmic evolution indicated by the natural sciences." He has in mind "biological evolution" particularly. The reasoning is "philosophical-theological." On the same ground—particularly through our theological insight we conclude that this evolutionary culmination in man is based on a "comprehensive divine world plan." Most pertinent to our whole thesis is his final conclusion: the peak and crown of evolution is the God-man.

Because in Christ a man, through and through and in the most radical manner, belongs to God, a human nature is in hypostatic union with the divine, therefore this man in the fullest (ideal) sense is man. Hence the meaning and dignity of evolution is exalted by the fact that it not only cooperates in the origin of (imperfect) man, but in the Christian perspective, strains in its profoundest depth, toward the ideal and reality of Christ taking on human nature in its embrace. And in this human to-be every man in some way shares.⁵

We cannot fault Mynarek and those who accept his thesis for such exaltation of evolution in the divine *plan*, for the humanity of Jesus is the humanity of the divine *Logos*. As faith and theology teach, this humanity is infinite through the infinite grace of union. Our hearts leap up at the thought of the three interrelated and ascending steps in our

⁴This statement is adapted from the announcement of the study by the publisher (Schoeningh, Muenchen). It is taken from the *Tuebingen Theologische Quartalschrift*.

⁵Mynarek, *ibid.*, pp. 351ff: adapted.

evolutionary reflection: *anthropos, Christos, Theos*. Thus indeed the doctrine of the ancient faith with its all too imperfect Christocentrism is prepared and exalted in the divine *plan* by evolution: the substratum for man whose highest realization is the God-man is prepared by evolution: the cosmic basis is laid "for God to become the visible intra-cosmical dominant center of the universe." Magnificent is the conclusion:

The threefold evolution is manifested in a somewhat different perspective: the anthropocentric, the Christocentric, the theocentric evolution is directed to man who through Christ is divinized—made through grace partaker in the divine nature.⁶

THE THEOLOGIANS' CONCLUSIONS

Space and time restrict our discussion to the following areas: (1) We must rethink completely the ancient *Cur Deus homo* doctrine and place it in the very center of our Christology. (2) A penetrating analysis of the traditional presentation of original sin against a new biblical and scientific background is imperative. (3) The relation of nature and grace, of the natural and supernatural demands restudy and amplification in our systematic and pastoral theology. (4) We must pursue still further the probe into the value of the earthly vocation and the value of the Church and man in the evolutionary world. (5) The totally new problems emerging from evolutionary doctrine and the staggering claims of planned evolution with its experiment mankind can no longer be ignored. (6) The essential doctrine of evolution must be placed in the mainstream of theology. This involves, I think, a rehabilitation of Herman Schell, who as predecessor of Teilhard de Chardin has a unique message for our procedures today. And Chardin himself because of his true stature might well be viewed more objectively on the one hand and surely not be dismissed with a word about a monitum on the other.

In the kerygma in this delicate matter however it behooves us to be mindful of St. Paul's words regarding the dietary scruples of certain early Christians: "If food causes my brother to sin I will never eat meat

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 353.

again, so that I may not be an occasion of sin to him" (1 Cor 8:13). We must speak softly, truthfully, and prudently!

Cur Deus Homo

Our seminary manuals of theology deal with the motive of Incarnation as something casual or incidental. To the clear biblical and traditional evidence that the Logos became man to redeem a fallen race, they add speculation on what might have happened, had there been no sin. The views (mainly Scotistic and Thomistic) labored under a dual handicap: there is no before or after in the mind of God, no priority of decrees, nor can created influence affect the mind and will of God. We conclude that God by one eternal decree effected the creation of this our world (with its sin, permitted, not willed) in order to redeem it. Our thesis: redemption of an evolving universe, with Christ as its Redeemer-Center, was eternally decreed. The motive of creation is redemption.⁷

Original Sin

We have space only for a brief presentation of the traditional explanation of original sin with a statement of the more basic problems created for it by evolutionary science.

In the traditional concept mankind is placed by God in an original salvific order or state. One human pair, Adam and Eve, usually called our first parents, were specially formed by God, placed in an earthly paradise with preternatural and supernatural gifts. Usually this is called the state of original innocence. In the divine plan these gifts were to be transmitted to the descendents of the first parents—the entire race of men, provided Adam did not disobey a unique divine command. The disobedience of Adam (and Eve), an actual personal sin, cut off the entire race from this original state, a deprivation which is now called original sin. One man, Adam, was the center of this grace-perdition order. Restoration came through Christ, often called the new Adam.

⁷Cf. the writer's *The Everlasting Covenant* (Celina, Ohio: Messenger Press). Chapter One, "The Motive of Incarnation," treats the question at some length, leaning heavily on Felix Malmberg's, *Ueber den Gottmenschen*, QD 9 (Freiburg: Herder).

This view—and any similar to it—is monogenistic, static, sets up a dual order of grace (grace of God before the sin, grace of Christ after the sin).

The criticism of the biblical basis is concerned with the Genesis account and the words of St. Paul in Rom 5:12ff. Evolutionary science is concerned with what might be called the monogenistic basis for the origin and unity of the human race. At all times even before modern evolution was thought of, men have had difficulty with what seemed an almost arbitrary concept of God, particularly in regard to the unbaptized infants. To this we might add the difficulty presented by some writers: the transmission of grace and preternatural gifts by human propagation. And above all our current theology insists that original sin must be explained through Christ, union with Christ, and the historic situation in relation to him.

As to the Genesis account, our exegesis insists, leaving all else aside, that it does not speak of original sin in our traditional sense of guilt infecting the entire race. The view was widely held, according to Karl-Heinz Weger, that the Old Testament had no knowledge of original or inherited sin at all. Somewhat sharply the same author makes the following conclusion regarding the classical text of Paul, Rom 5:12ff:

Inherited sin as traditionally understood, i.e. a sinfulness of all men, conceived as fully independent of personal sins, immediately caused by Adam, in which the binding member is subjected to the dominion of sin, this inherited sin we do not find proved in Rom 5:12ff.⁸

The Council of Trent (D 787ff) restated the traditional doctrine in the monogenistic framework (no other would have come to the mind of the Fathers), but the thrust of the definition is the true existence of universal sin and grace and justification through Christ. The how of original sin is, it seems to us, a part of the presentation of doctrine which reflected the traditional concepts of a non-evolutionary, static

⁸Cf. Karl-Heinz Weger, *Theologie der Erbsuende, QD* (Freiburg: Herder). Cf. p. 78, on original sin in the OT: p. 100 concerning Rom 5:12ff. Note also the objection by Scharbert that evidence for the existence of original sin is found in the OT. See pp. 78ff for this view and Weger's criticism.

world and human race. Note well: herein is no denial of original sin. Rather the divine truth is "reset" in the new scientific Christocentric universe. One of the essentials of this new framework is a corrective scientific approach to monogenism.

On this point the attitude of Karl Rahner, probably the most prestigious spokesman of hardnosed monogenism, is significant. At about the same time as Pius XII placed a restriction on monogenism as irreconcilable with the oneness of the human race and its redemption through Christ, Rahner held that this monogenistic doctrine was, though not *de fide*, yet theologically certain. He has now receded from this position. In recent lectures (1970) and in his supplement in Karl-Heinz Weger's work on original sin, he cautiously holds that polygenism cannot be shown to conflict with the unity of the race and the nature of original sin. (Today practically no evolutionary scientists hold the monogenistic origin of man, though none deny the true unity of our race.) It seems obvious that the objections of Pius XII are no longer an obstacle to theological agreement with evolutionary thought in this matter.

Pursuing the matter a step further we note two incisive questions asked by Rahner regarding evolution and original sin: (1) Is the evolutionary concept of hominization in harmony with the state of innocence and the preternatural gifts? (2) Can the first man or men in the evolutionary concept of human origins be thought of critically as the subject of original sin involving the whole race of man (*peccatum originale originans*)?⁹

Current theological trends link original sin to Christ and his redemptive action in the world. Universal guilt and the communication of grace is the function not of one man, as the progenitor of the race, for Adam is simply to be viewed as man. Guilt is through all men, but in the perspective of normative forms in their relation to the "One Man" Christ.

This concept of the universal condition or special situation of man's inability to unite to Christ, who is the basic source of the unity of the race, underlies much of the current thought on original sin.

⁹ Weger, *op. cit.* Excurs by Rahner on p. 176. We have emended the questions slightly.

Pertinent is the thought of Rahner:

By original sin we must at least mean a general situation of damnation embracing all men prior to their own personal free decision, a situation which is nevertheless historic and not an essential condition (that is a condition belonging to their nature as such), one which has come to be through man and is not simply given in the fact of creatureliness.¹⁰

Similar is the notion of Hulsbosch:

Original sin is the powerlessness, arising from nature, of man in his incompleteness as creature to reach his freedom and to realize the desire to see God, insofar as this impotence is put into the context of a sinful world.¹¹

Despite the massive research in our current theology we are only in the first stages of any conclusive study on original sin. Clinging fast to the defined doctrine itself the theologian must continue valiantly to restate (not reject) the divine revealed truth in modern terms. A mere restatement of the traditional presentation is disservice to theology and baneful for our kerygma.

Nature and Grace

Christocentrism in our evolving universe calls for a realistic existential presentation of the supernatural character and gratuity of divine grace, even though we cannot readily unravel what is inextricably bound up with nature. But we can underscore the overwhelming presence of the three divine persons in and through Christ, communicated to us in and through him. We can and should look upon grace as lived and experienced in our individual and social life and work. Perhaps we should emphasize less the reification of grace, the hidden *res creata*, the quality, the habit, from which flows the divine indwelling. More to be stressed is the personal relationship and

¹⁰*Theological Investigations* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1965). Our quotation is from Peter de Rosa, *Christ and Original Sin* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967), p. 120. It varies slightly from the statement in *T.I.*

¹¹Quoted by Peter de Rosa, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

encounter with others, the experienced God-love in action. It is also to be suggested that nature be viewed not so much as complete, as static, or self-sufficient, nor as elevated by addition of the supernatural or the superimposed. The discussion is wide open and though realistic, difficult to grasp. Criticism of much traditional doctrine is not that it is false, far from it, but that especially in the kerygma it needs enrichment. Shall we say that man, as a free finite being called to union with God in Christ and capable of this union in conjunction with all his fellowmen, is the basis (nature) for the distinction between nature and its supernatural determination (*Bestimmung*) by grace? (Rahner).

The Earthly Vocation

M. D. Chenu offers valuable suggestions on the vocation of man in this desacralized world. Such a world is still God's world and it was not made to be shunned, but to be entered into, taken over, turned to Christ, its true center. Chenu speaks of the civilization of work, or civilization of technology. This should be an instrument of solidarity, world solidarity. As the petty groups, compacted, complicated, and intimate, give way to a world social order, the whole world of men must become close and intimate: every man in the universe is now our neighbor as never before in human history. Christ, says Chenu, recapitulates all the work of creation that has been built up through the centuries. The ancient splendid concept of Irenaeus, "recapitulation in Christ," is now splendidly reflected in our evolutionary Christocentrism in which the most remote and lowly of men is our brother in the tender care of the supreme Good Samaritan.

All the current morality of work, all the roots of professional life, in man, in the universe and in the community are thus elevated to the divine quality of praise, of offering, and liberation which are the three characteristics accomplished in the paschal act of Christ. (*DOC* 124)

With deep pastoral concern theology must face the autonomy of secular reality with all its interdependencies, the new structures, the new sense of world-social justice, the new concepts of the universal common good. New particularities arise claiming their place in special theologies: some one has waggishly referred to our increasing theology

of the "genitive," of the world, of woman, of politics (in a broad somewhat unclear sense), of hope, of violence, of revolution, of the future in countless forms, and of course of man. Recently some one has even written a theology of God.

The dilemma is inescapable. Man must commit himself to the eternal, which is inseparably bound up with the temporal. Can we close the gap between commitment to the eternal and the commitment to the temporal, between the holy and the human, between love of God and love of man and concern for man's world (Mooney)? Precisely here lies the challenge of any theology of the genitive. In the basic theology of man, man's origin (evolutionary and other) and his destiny in the world involve acceptance of the eternal.

Planned Evolution

On the basis of the evolutionary thesis: evolution has become conscious in man, with the corollary that this unique mammal-man—must strain forward in conscious-cultural-evolutionary movement if the race is not to degenerate totally,—on this basis scientists have established a planned evolution, experimentation with the human race as a whole. A mass of literature explains the program, the achievements, the hopes and visions. In his great work, *Experiment Menschheit*,¹² Paul Overhage lists and analyzes five broad experiments (there are twenty pages of bibliography) which deal with the most fundamental problems and at every turn challenge Christian thought and human life. The first two, (a) population restriction and control and (b) concern for health on a broad and extensive scale, are linked together. The third, (c) influence on environment and natural selection, is bound up with (d), experimental alteration of the biological heritage, and (e), the perfecting of human intelligence. All aim at the progress and the survival of the race.

The boldest of the experiments is the genetic engineering which seeks to create a new man—still belonging to the species homo though totally alien to any system now in existence. Some writers look to a future man with the beauty of Apollo, the imagination of Shakespeare, the sensitivity of Albert Schweitzer, the insight of Einstein. Others

¹²Paul Overhage, *Experiment Menschheit* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1969, 3).

foresee the cloning of masses of men with robot-like sameness (under fearful control). The risks are enormous: who can foresee where the experiments may lead: to evil genius or benign saint? Such planned evolution seems irreversible and therefore involves sinister unfathomable factors. But there can be little doubt: experiments will continue: Man is rarely possessed of power which remains unused.

Serious steps have already been taken: human ova have been fertilized by sperm and developed in test tubes. Part of the plan seeks to make fertilized ova available at appropriate occasions in fertilized ova banks long after the donors are dead. Simple charwomen could choose distinguished parents for their children, by shopping cautiously at the ova banks in our supermarkets. Actually frozen sperm has proved successful in the production of healthy children. And about 10,000 children are born annually through artificial insemination in our country.

Despite widespread discussion of contraception and abortion and artificial insemination, planned evolution as such has received little attention from our American theologians. But such planned evolution inevitably touches our traditional moral concepts of the family, of the husband and wife relation, and therefore of the whole social structure. It offers a serious challenge to the theologians which should at least be recognized.

Evolution in the Mainstream of Theology

In the past decades Catholic theology has profited immensely from cooperation with non-Catholic biblical scholarship. Progress has not been so evident in the attempt to integrate our theology and the natural sciences, largely because of the burden of hostility inherited from the late nineteenth century and the defensive attitude of the part of the Church. Progress in biblical study, however, and the inspiration of Teilhard de Chardin have done much to bridge the gap and to play a unifying role between the men of faith and the men of evolutionary science. And yet Eugen Biser takes a rather jaundiced view. In his mind the evolutionary thinkers are still not at home in Christian thought. Nor are the theologians, much less the simple Christians, at ease with evolutionary theory:

Despite all the publicity that came to Teilhard de Chardin, after his death, his effort to capture the citadel—as all such short cuts—served rather to deepen the scepticism. Since then, of course, some of his concepts have been seen to emerge in the new theological literature somewhat after the manner of stage pieces. But still we cannot at all speak of an assimilation of the evolutionary thought as such.¹³

No less gloomy is the verdict of Johannes Hemleben who says (*Biologie und Christentum*): “a chasm separates Christianity from modern biology today.”¹⁴

Were we to apportion the blame—for there is blame—we might well say that the most basic cause, apart from inherited prejudices, is the extreme sense of self-sufficiency on the part of both scientist and theologian, though for quite diverse reasons. In its nineteenth century beginnings science and philosophy have largely been linked with monistic atheism in various forms, which the Church could not but condemn. It is tragic that her condemnations were usually sweeping precisely because she was defending a most precious treasure, the divine revelation. Only after the first storm of disapproval has passed, do theologians grope for the truth underlying the hostile positions and seek to bridge over the gap between the presentation of faith and the postulates and findings of science. (In this we have an old historic pattern.)

In the particular area of our present concern the problem was immensely compounded by the fundamentalistic interpretation of Genesis and by the meager anthropological bases of evolutionary claims. The sources, the attitudes, the willingness to admit the evidence have created a new climate. At long last the evolutionary concept has entered into the mainstream of theology. We may now claim that the negative attitude of the late decades was really a departure—shall we call it temporary?—from the ancient position of the Church.

Our point is evident from the current enthusiastic rehabilitation of Herman Schell (died in 1906), who, despite the shadow of condemnation, anticipated all the basic ideas of Teilhard de Chardin,

¹³Note his review of Mynarek's study in *TR* (1970), No. 3, col. 219.

¹⁴Review of Hemleben's *Biologie und Christentum* in *TR* (1971), No. 3, col. 319 by Werner Boecker.

the wide acceptance of Chardin, the extraordinary welcome accorded Mynarek's epochal work by practically all his critical reviewers. The work of Schell, above all, assumes particular significance in the re-publication of his massive dogmatic works which now clearly justify the verdict of Friedrich Heiler: that Schell is the most significant Roman Catholic dogmatician of the last century. He is now looked upon as a classic source of our theology, classic source particularly for our "task of truly Catholic integration of the traditional treasures of faith and life with the modern scientific consciousness and the indispensable dialogue between Christian and non-Christian believers."¹⁵

We note of Schell that he replaces the static cosmos of the middle ages with the dynamic evolutionary universe. For him history is a "powerful process of becoming." "Evolution is the fundamental hallmark of all nature and reality." Total cosmic reality, Schell maintained, is dominated by the law of ascending evolution from the most primitive origins (*von den einfachsten Urspruengen an*).¹⁶

Schell insisted that theology must build a bridge to the world of science, not throw up a block impeding progress. We cannot fail to note that the great synthesis of Mynarek is considered the very first successful attempt at building this bridge:

We may say that Mynarek has been the first to treat systematically the phenomenon of evolution and the position of man in it from the philosophical and especially from the theological standpoint, with the most rigorous consideration of the findings of empirical research.¹⁷

Similar is the judgment of Biser who praises Mynarek's synthesis

¹⁵These lines were written by Josef Hasenfuss in the announcement of the new critical edition of Schell's *Katholische Dogmatik*. As Schell's successor at the University of Wuerzburg, he is our principal authority on his great predecessor.

¹⁶A more extensive statement of Schell's thought is found in the writer's paper, "Before Teilhard There Was Herman Schell," *AER* (May, 1972), pp. 325ff.

¹⁷*Theologie der Gegenwart*. Indicated in Hubertus Mynarek, *Der Mensch, Das Wesen der Zukunft* (Schoeningh, 1968). There is a consensus that Mynarek is the first to succeed in this truly gigantic task.

for his pointed emphasis "of the finalistic-dynamic view of the anthropological problem":

He is aided in this above all by close ties of his procedure with the thought processes of Herman Schell who through his explication of the concepts of "self-development" and "self-realization" frees the anthropological question from narrow one-sided causal reflection.¹⁸

If today we look back upon Charles Darwin and Karl Marx as the two most important figures in evolutionary history—as we indeed must—we can agree with Biser that these two by their evolutionary thought most impede the progress of the spirit. If theology is sceptical of both and they in turn are still far from feeling at ease with her then it is particularly significant that Schell most effectively stresses the movement of the spirit which their twofold thrust against traditional thought retarded.¹⁹

It is idle to speculate what might have been wrought in our theology had Schell not been restrained by magisterium and *odium theologicum*. How much greater would have been the freedom in Teilhard and in the whole movement of theology? But surely now we should be warned against hasty condemnation since these very men are now truly in the mainstream of theology. Today we should finally see in this perspective—not in the distorted view of our former theological manuals—that the phenomenon of evolution looms up in the Christian vision, and with might and grandeur calls for a true integration in the Christian image of world and man.

Huxley it was who said: medieval theology directed man to judge human life in the light of eternity, *sub specie aeternitatis*. I make the effort to see it anew *sub specie evolutionis*. This utterance Dobzhansky (1956, S. 122) took up and amplified: "Evolution must be rethought in the light of eternity and eternity in the light of evolution, and human life in the light of both."²⁰

EDWIN G. KAISER, C.P.P.S.
St. Joseph College
Collegeville, Ind.

¹⁸Review of Mynarek's study in *TR* (1970), No. 3, col. 219f. It should be noted that rapid advance in evolutionary study suggests some emendations of the present text. This review of Biser's is of special significance.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰Overhage, *op. cit.*, p. 438.