

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

easily sidestep the Apostle Paul's comparison of the one man Adam—who brought sin and death—to the one man Jesus who brings eternal life (1 Cor 15:21; Rom 5:19)? What do you think about the theory of the “pre-Adamites?” Are we not baptized “for the remission of sin”? Are there not several “Fall” stories? Is not original *sin* to be understood analogously? If the doctrine of original sin is primarily aimed at stressing an all-good God who creates everything good, which sin corrupts, what sort of God creates a world in which sin is “statistically necessary”? Does not all creation groan (Rom 8:22) because something went horribly wrong with the evolutionary process at a very early age—a view underscored even by many evolutionary scientists? Would you accept the theory of some theologians who understand Adam's sin as the first, which, like the snowball turning into an avalanche, culminates in the murder of God on the cross—humanity's true Fall? Is Rahner's view correct that concupiscence and death, as experienced *now*, cannot be explained solely in natural terms?

If you minimize sin and its effects as a “Jewish preoccupation,” why did Jesus become sin (2 Cor 5:21) and the Father send the Son “as expiation for our sins” (1 Jn 4:10)? Moreover, does not the Apostle Paul interpret Jesus' life, death, and resurrection as the recapitulation, transformation, and sublation of Israel's entire history?

Do you not have a narrow, univocal understanding of Christ's sacrificial death on the cross? Is not an “angry God” absent from Anselm of Canterbury's classic, *Cur Deus homo*? Could one, for example, understand Jesus' sacrifice as a peace offering that provides the one blood—one life—between God and humanity? Is it not the Father who sacrifices his Son out of love for us (Jn 3:16)? Did not Christ sacrifice himself to carry out the Father's will that Satan be defeated? Did not the Christ *have* to suffer these things and then enter into his glory (Lk 24:26; Acts 3:17)? Would you agree with Rahner that the Eucharist is the sacrament of Christ's unique sacrifice on the cross? If the Eucharist is not a sacrifice, then will you undertake the rewriting of the Sacramentary? Would not your line of argumentation have been more cogent had you explicitly purposed to reject a narrow and univocal understanding of the doctrines you examine?

M. has written a creative, thought-provoking, but ultimately unconvincing book that pays insufficient attention to several Christian scientists and theologians who have proposed ways in which doctrines and evolutionary science can be reconciled with one another. Catholic theology is not well-served by a full-frontal attack on Scripture, the Fathers, conciliar statements, and *lex orandi, lex credendi*—tradition at its best. The development of dogma is not an excuse for the denial of dogma. Rahner advises those who have difficulty with dogma and doctrine to be patient and to think even more deeply.