

toward a perfect and homogeneous totality. For Pannenberg, the full understanding of the totality of being, made possible by the end of history, is the full expression of every particular being, within the embrace of the infinite Being. Everything, in Pannenberg's interpretation, is rooted in Christ's resurrection, which anticipates the end of history, thus initiating the salvation of the world. This is the crucial idea that distinguishes him sharply from Hegel: Pannenberg sees Christ's resurrection precisely as that moment of history in which the final reconciliation between time and eternity begins, that is, the moment *of* history in which the *end* of history begins. In a sense, Pannenberg's effort could be summarized as the attempt to present in a philosophical fashion, on the basis of Hegel's thought, what the poet T. S. Eliot had written in his Chorus VII from *The Rock* about the Incarnation:

Then came, at a predetermined moment, a moment in time and of time,

A moment not out of time, but in time, in what we call history: transecting, bisecting the world of time,

A moment in time but not like a moment of time, a moment in time, but time was made through that moment: for without the meaning there is no time, and that moment of time gave the meaning.

Throughout his informative book, P. shows how, paradoxically, Pannenberg sets out to use Hegel's philosophy against Hegel, in order to gain a deeper understanding of some fundamental elements of a "classic" Christian view.

*DePaul University, Chicago*  
*Boston College*

EMANUELE COLOMBO  
ROCCO SACCONAGHI

CREATOR GOD, EVOLVING WORLD. By Cynthia Crysdale and Neil Ormerod. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013. Pp. xiv + 168. \$18.

Written for the "ordinary person in the pew" (xiii), this book addresses the apparent incompatibility between science and religion to the end of "expanding [the] faith vision" (xiv) of the generally educated and, presumably, believing reader. The work that Crysdale and Ormerod have produced elicits as many scientific insights as it does theological insights; common conceptions of both God and the cosmos are exposed in a nuanced and fairly accessible manner. In their view, the debate between science and religion presents not only a false dichotomy but also a false choice that the ordinary person feels compelled to make. To resolve the issue, C. and O. construct a single worldview—based primarily on Bernard Lonergan's transposition of the theology of Thomas Aquinas—that is consistent with both core Christian beliefs and the best of modern science.

After a first chapter that surveys the relevant elements from the history of the relationship between (mostly modern) science and religion, the

book turns to a treatment of the evolving world and its transcendent Creator God. Far from being a universe of absolute randomness, the evolving world consists of regularity and probability, two mutually creative aspects of a world process that results in both stability and novelty. Using more popularly written science texts to provide data in support of this view, the authors also employ as a heuristic structure Lonergan's explanatory notion of emergent probability—a “dance of order and chance” (39) according to which the world unfolds. Emerging smoothly from this discussion (in chapter 2) regarding a clearer understanding of the nature and role of change in the cosmos are the questions (raised in chapter 3) about a God that is believed to stand to this changing creation as its unchanging Creator: Is such a God even meaningful in light of scientific evidence, and if so, would not a God that changes along with creation be a more adequate understanding? If the first question is answered in the affirmative, the authors give to the second question a respectful, reasonable, but still resounding no. The findings of modern science neither obviate the need for God, nor require that God be in time; the classical conception of God as absolutely transcendent “sits more than comfortably with everything modern science is telling us about the universe” (56).

The final three chapters (nos. 4, 5, 6), along with a brief conclusion, take up the further and interrelated questions raised by the present defense of classical theism in the face of an evolving cosmos. They explore the meaningfulness of such ideas as purpose, human freedom and God's providence, human ethics, and the notion of a personal God. In each case, the resolution of the difficulty lies in the idea of God's absolute transcendence. It is perhaps the greatest strength of the book that it has located the key to these difficulties in just this idea. If there are any lacunae in the exposition of the intelligibility of God's transcendence, they are not so much substantive as emphatic. For instance, the conception of God's primary causality as the cause of the existence of all secondary causes is true as far as it goes, but without explicit treatment of God's operation in those secondary causes, a significant point risks falling through the cracks—one not irrelevant to the concerns of the book. God not only gives secondary causes their being; God also operates in their operations. To be sure, this idea is implicit in the text, in lines such as the following: “God is the cause of . . . everything that exists or occurs” (127). And there can be no doubt that its explicitation would significantly complicate an already difficult set of ideas. Still, and especially in chapter 5 on the relationship between human freedom and God's providence, the omission of the word “operation” in this discussion is noticeable.

It is no small achievement to have produced a work that confronts the “poor theology and poor science” (17) that has so often dominated the science and religion debate with the explanatory power of “a transposition

of some of the ideas from classical theism, with strong hints from Lonergan's engagement with modern scientific method" (xiii). The authors' judgment that getting one's head around these ideas, though admittedly difficult, is both "worthy of our efforts [and] necessary for our times" (xiii) is, I think, a correct one. Anyone interested in engaging in this debate, whether for popular or scholarly audiences, ought to include this work in their considerations. The ideas presented have the capacity to open new avenues of inquiry and reflection in an otherwise gridlocked conversation.

*Boston College*

NICHOLAS DISALVATORE

CHRISTIANITY IN EVOLUTION: AN EXPLORATION. By Jack Mahoney. Washington: Georgetown University, 2012. Pp. 188. \$26.95.

Evolutionary science, in Mahoney's view, has proven that the human species has evolved by natural processes from a subhuman species, which renders untenable Christian belief in original sin—and thus in the Immaculate Conception—and other Christian beliefs dependent on this doctrine. For example, concupiscence and death are natural factors in an evolutionary world and do not require a theological explanation such as the Fall. Humanity has no need of redemption. Humans who are not christified fail to reach evolutionary escape velocity to become immortal (the soul is not naturally immortal). They simply cease to exist, which renders hell unnecessary.

M. maintains that God became human not to atone for sins, but to advance the human species to a new level of existence and moral activity. Agreeing somewhat with Franciscan theology, M. writes that God would have become incarnate—for "altruism's" sake—even if there were no sin. Moreover, because humans emerge into a graced world, the nature-grace distinction is superfluous.

Furthermore, Jesus' bloody death on the cross was not a propitiatory sacrifice saving us from the wrath of an angry God and from sin, nor was it required that he die violently. Jesus took on death as an evolutionary fate, defeated it, and attained a new form of communion with the Trinity that he shares with us so that we can survive after death.

The Eucharist, for M., is not a propitiatory sacrifice but a communal, liturgical celebration of Christ's death as the supreme instance of the divine "altruism" of the inner-trinitarian life—Jesus is its human face—that builds the church into Christ's evolutionary community. Because priestly ordination is not for offering sacrifice, its restriction to men should be eliminated.

My questions to M.: Should not the scientific evidence for the mitochondrial Eve, as well as the findings of Ian Tattersall and Chris Stringer (to give only two examples), have made you more hesitant to deny original sin? In legitimately criticizing the Vulgate reading of Romans 5:12, did you not too