

## NOTES

### WAS VATICAN II EVOLUTIONARY? A NOTE ON CONCILIAR LANGUAGE

An increasing number of studies have recently been devoted to continuity and discontinuity in the life of the Church and in its theology.<sup>1</sup> The question of doctrinal development as it once was raised by Newman has now become part of a larger question of identity development. What is a Christian? Where is the Church? For some, the new questions are inevitable concomitants of the Church's efforts to become more effectively present to the contemporary world. For others, they are unnecessary uncertainties which John XXIII unleashed for us when he opened his Council.

In any case, Vatican II is generally regarded as a watershed, and its evolutionary view of the world is frequently proposed as the basis for a far more discontinuous kind of continuity in Church life than Roman Catholics had previously been accustomed to. During the Council an evolutionary framework had been adopted for theology by such popular books as Schoonenberg's *God's World in the Making*.<sup>2</sup> Ten years later Juan Luis Segundo's *Evolution and Guilt* once again emphasized the basic contrast between immobilist and evolutionary systems of thought.<sup>3</sup> But how evolutionary, in fact, was the Council itself? The question is an immense one, and here I propose only to make suggestions about its language. Does that language indicate in any way that the fathers were speaking in terms of the emergence of something truly novel in Christianity? Or was it "only the world" they were seeing in a new way? Is it really possible to have a new vision of one, Church or world, without at the same time seeing the other anew as well?

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin is widely recognized as one of the guiding presences at Vatican II, and it has become commonplace to associate his name with Catholic thought's irreversible commitment to a dialogue with evolutionary theory. Earlier studies had sought to promote such a

<sup>1</sup>To mention only articles bearing on the question which have recently been published in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*: J. W. O'Malley, S.J., "Reform, Historical Consciousness, and Vatican II's Aggiornamento," *TS* 32 (1971) 573-601; L. J. O'Donovan, S.J., "Evolution under the Sign of the Cross," *ibid.*, pp. 602-26; A. Dulles, S.J., "The Church, the Churches, and the Catholic Church," *TS* 33 (1972) 199-234; Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "Continuity amid Structural Changes," *TS* 35 (1974) 415-40; Raymond J. Devettere, "Progress and Pluralism in Theology," *ibid.*, pp. 441-66.

<sup>2</sup>Pittsburgh, 1964.

<sup>3</sup>Maryknoll, N.Y., 1974.

discussion,<sup>4</sup> and in 1950 Pius XII's Encyclical *Humani generis* had proposed a reconciliation between the teaching of faith and a moderate evolutionism.<sup>5</sup> But by common consensus it was Teilhard who made the issue of an evolutionary world view unavoidable for intelligent faith within the Catholic Church. Protestant and Catholic writers alike have commented on his influence at the Council, during which, as a matter of fact, the flood of Teilhardian literature reached its peak. His name is never mentioned in the conciliar documents themselves, in the official notes, in the relations of the committees, or in the *modi* of the fathers. But it is well known how significantly the successive drafts of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World were shaped by theologians from the University of Louvain, together with French bishops and *periti*, many of whom were especially familiar with Teilhardian thought.

Bishop Otto Spülbeck of Meissen noted four occasions on which Teilhard's name was mentioned in the aula during the discussion of the Pastoral Constitution. It was his own view "that Teilhard's optimism in judging the world process, his effort on behalf of developing all concealed possibilities, his 'Yes' to the entire creation in all its stages of evolution, his struggle for a unified and inclusive conception and view of the world in which every spiritual endeavor of mankind would be integrated, all this accompanied the writing of the text [of the Pastoral Constitution] from the very beginning."<sup>6</sup> Spülbeck thought that chap. 3 of the Constitution shows the clearest Teilhardian characteristics, but he also

<sup>4</sup>In the nineteenth century: M. D. Leroy, *L'Evolution restreint aux espèces organiques* (Paris, 1891); J. A. Zahm, *Evolution and Dogma* (Chicago, 1896). Especially noteworthy in the development up to Pius XII's Allocution to the Papal Academy of Sciences in 1941 and then to *Humani generis*: Henry de Dorlodot, *Le Darwinisme au point de vue de l'orthodoxie catholique 1: L'Origine des espèces* (Brussels-Paris, 1921); E. C. Messenger, *Evolution and Theology: The Problem of Man's Origin* (London, 1931); E. C. Messenger, ed., *Theology and Evolution* (London, 1949); P.-M. Perier, *Le transformisme: L'Origine de l'homme et le dogme* (Paris, 1938).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Johannes Feiner, "Der Ursprung des Menschen," in *Mysterium salutis* 2 (Einsiedeln, 1967) 566. On the magisterial documents, see Zoltan Alszegey, S.J., "Development in the Doctrinal Formulation of the Church concerning the Theory of Evolution," in *The Evolving World and Theology* (*Concilium* 26; Glen Rock, N.J., 1967) pp. 25-33. In more detail, Maurizio Flick, S.J., and Zoltan Alszegey, S.J., *Il creatore* (3rd ed.; Florence, 1964) pp. 250, 269-71, 274-303.

<sup>6</sup>Otto Spülbeck, "Teilhard de Chardin und die Pastoralconstitution," in Johann Christoph Hampe, ed., *Die Autorität der Freiheit* 3 (Munich, 1967) 86-97, at 86-87. See also Spülbeck's essay "Fortschrittsglaube und Evolution," in Ulrich Schöndorfer, ed., *Der Fortschrittsglaube—Sinn und Gefahren* (Graz, 1965) pp. 85-107. Giovanni Caprile, S.J., notes seven references to Teilhard in the Council aula: *Il Concilio Vaticano II* 4 (Rome, 1966) 257, 263, 265, 278; 5 (Rome, 1966) 76, 105, 153.

saw arts. 13–14 as indirectly contradicting Teilhard's optimism with regard to the problem of evil.

The Orthodox theologian Olivier Clement has also remarked a general Teilhardian influence in *Gaudium et spes*. He criticizes the text, however, for failing to make use of Teilhard's Eucharistic insights, "while his systematic work, his evolutionism, is so often present in the smallest detail."<sup>7</sup>

Sigurd Martin Daecke, on the other hand, contends that specifically Teilhardian themes can be found in the Pastoral Constitution only in anthropological and sociological questions which belong to the "threshold of theology." Thus, in the document's theology of God, Christ, the Church, or the relation between God and the world, Teilhard's thought would be absent entirely. "Where Catholic interpreters must falsify Teilhard's thought in order to be able to affirm it," Daecke maintains, "at these central theological passages, there is no trace left in the Constitution of an influence of Teilhard's thinking."<sup>8</sup> This opinion, at the other end of the spectrum from Spülbeck's, comes from one of the earliest German-language students of Teilhard and reveals a more radical reading of his intentions than has been common in Catholic circles; for in Daecke's view the "official change in attitude" towards Teilhard at the time of the Council resulted from various oversimplifying interpretations which then allowed him to be considered "orthodox."<sup>9</sup>

On balance, however, I think the most exact judgment we can expect on Teilhard's impact at the Council is the reserved assertion by Henri de Lubac that there was indeed "a certain influence, at least indirect and diffuse, on some orientations of the Council."<sup>10</sup> J. C. Hampe, Charles Moeller, and others have expressed the same view.<sup>11</sup> Much the same, in fact, can be said for Catholic thought in general today: to the extent that it is positively affected by Teilhard, the influence is a diffuse one bearing more on orientations than on specific contents; there does not seem to be a "Teilhardian school" in any recognizable sense of the term.

<sup>7</sup> "Gedanken eines Orthodoxen Laientheologen," in G. Baraúna, *Die Kirche in der Welt von heute* (Salzburg, 1967) pp. 503–29, at 525. Cf. Joseph Fitzer, "Teilhard's Eucharist: A Reflection," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 34 (1973) 251–64.

<sup>8</sup> "Das Ja und das Nein des Konzils zu Teilhard," in J. C. Hampe, *op. cit.*, pp. 98–112, at 106.

<sup>9</sup> For Daecke's own interpretation, see his *Teilhard de Chardin und die evangelische Theologie: Die Weltlichkeit Gottes und die Weltlichkeit der Welt* (Göttingen, 1967).

<sup>10</sup> *Athéisme et sens de l'homme: Une double requête de "Gaudium et spes"* (Paris, 1968) p. 130.

<sup>11</sup> Hampe, *op. cit.*, p. 17; Moeller, in Herbert Vorgrimler, ed. *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* 5 (New York, 1967 ff.) 72; likewise Caprile, *op. cit.* 5, 585, and Sergio Bonato's unpublished thesis for the University of Genoa, *La presenza del pensiero di Teilhard de Chardin nei lavori del Concilio Vaticano II* (1967) p. 207.

## EVOLUTIONARY TERMINOLOGY

Whatever view is taken of Teilhard's influence on the Christian anthropology of *Gaudium et spes*, there seems to be a widespread consensus on the historical-evolutionary conception of the world which the Constitution repeatedly presents in its descriptive analysis of the contemporary world. "Evolution" is the concept which particularly interests us here, expressed in the Latin text by various forms of the words *evolvere*, *evolutio*, *evolutivus*. By far the most frequent usage of these terms in the conciliar texts is to be found in the Pastoral Constitution, although they also occur in other documents, as will be noted below. In addition, the problem of "evolutionary modernism" was discussed at the Council during the debate on the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, but the term itself did not find its way into the final text. In *Gaudium et spes* one can distinguish at least five senses of the Latin *evolvere* and its derivatives, variously translated in English as "develop," "unfold," "evolve," etc.; in German as *entwickeln*, *entfalten*, *Evolution*, etc.; and in French as *développer*, *déployer*, *évolution*, etc. Not surprisingly, since the original text was composed primarily in French, the French text of the final document shows the greatest linguistic variety, with nine different groups of words being used for the Latin forms of *evolvere*.<sup>12</sup>

There is a first and most general sense of the term which refers to the "trend" and "development" of the world, without specifying the agent of the increasing complexity which is thus globally described. Thus, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World speaks of "the current trend of the world (*hodierna mundi evolutione*)," "the modern development of the world (*hodierna mundi evolutione*)," <sup>13</sup> while the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity refers to "the unfolding (*evolutionem*) of problems."<sup>14</sup>

A second and more frequent usage of terms derived from *evolvere* refers to man's own efforts towards active development of human life, efforts

<sup>12</sup> See the "Index terminologicus" in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche—Das zweite Vatikanische Konzil* 3 (Freiburg, 1968); also Xaverius Ochoa, *Index verborum cum documentis Concilii Vaticani secundi* (Rome, 1967). Less helpful is J. Dereta and A. Nocent, O.S.B., ed., *Synopse des textes conciliaires* (Paris, 1966). With regard to the linguistic fate of the Pastoral Constitution, the Louvain theologian Philips is reported to have said one day, adapting the story of the man who fell among thieves: "Textus cecidit in latinistas" (Philippe Delhay, "Histoire des textes de la Constitution pastorale," in *L'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps: Constitution pastorale "Gaudium et spes"* 1 [Paris, 1967] 228, n. 5).

<sup>13</sup> GS, nos. 3, 10; also no. 91. The texts of the Council will be referred to according to the first initials of their Latin titles. The English translations are taken from *The Documents of Vatican II*, gen. ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (New York, 1966).

<sup>14</sup> AA, no. 29.

because of which men can “justly consider that by their labor they are unfolding (*evolvere*) the creator’s work.”<sup>15</sup> The Declaration on Christian Education speaks of “the harmonious development (*evolvendas*) of . . . physical, moral, and intellectual endowments,”<sup>16</sup> and the Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity urges lay people to be acquainted with their national culture and to “develop (*evolvere*) it in accordance with modern conditions.”<sup>17</sup> In a specifically religious sense, the latter Decree speaks of the need to “develop” (*evolvi*) a new convert’s Christian sense during the time of the catechumenate.<sup>18</sup>

Related to this second meaning, there is a third, more restricted, and specific usage of *evolvere* with respect to the pursuit and development of knowledge. Speaking of the need for international co-operation in population studies, the Pastoral Constitution urges that “Catholic experts in all these aspects should skillfully pursue their studies and projects and give them an ever wider scope (*latius evolvant*).”<sup>19</sup> As far as I have been able to determine, this usage is a relatively rare occurrence, otherwise to be found only once in the Declaration on Christian Education and once again in the Declaration on Religious Freedom in its expression of intent to “develop (*evolvere*) the doctrine of recent Popes.”<sup>20</sup>

A fourth usage, by far the most frequent, can be considered a generalization of the second. It refers to “cultural, economic and social evolution (*evolutionem*),”<sup>21</sup> or, more specifically, to progressive change in one of these orders. Such evolution is sometimes spoken of in the context of the socialization of the modern world.<sup>22</sup> “God’s Spirit, who with a marvelous providence directs the unfolding (*cursum*) of time and renews the face of the earth, is not absent from this development (*evolutioni*),”<sup>23</sup> which is further spoken of as “an evolution (*evolutionem*) towards unity.”<sup>24</sup> The Church is expressly said to profit and to be enriched by this “history and development (*evolutione*) of humanity.”<sup>25</sup>

Finally, a fifth usage refers to the way reality is perceived and understood by contemporary man: “The human race has passed from a

<sup>15</sup> *GS*, no. 34; similarly, nos. 33, 41, 67.

<sup>22</sup> *GS*, nos. 6, 23, 42, 75.

<sup>16</sup> *GE*, no. 1; see also nos. 5, 8.

<sup>23</sup> *GS*, no. 26.

<sup>17</sup> *AG*, no. 21.

<sup>24</sup> *GS*, no. 42.

<sup>18</sup> *AG*, no. 13.

<sup>25</sup> *GS*, no. 44.

<sup>19</sup> *GS*, no. 87.

<sup>20</sup> *GE*, Intro.; *DH*, no. 1.

<sup>21</sup> *GS*, no. 73, and nos. 6, 23, 26, 42, 44, 56, 66, 69, 75. Cf. *SC*, no. 129; *UR*, no. 12; *AA*, no. 7; *AG*, no. 41; *OT*, no. 3. Note also that *GS*, no. 74, speaks of the common good *dynamic* understood. A related question here would have to do with the theology of development contained in the encyclicals of John XXIII and Paul VI.

rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary (*evolutivam*) one";<sup>26</sup> "historical studies make a signal contribution to bringing men to see things in their changeable and evolutionary (*evolutionis*) aspects."<sup>27</sup> These two texts are among those in *Gaudium et spes* which are most often quoted and discussed, and they are also undoubtedly the most important official Church references of recent years to evolutionary thought.<sup>28</sup> Important as they are, however, it should be noted that "evolution" is used in these texts in an extremely general and undefined sense. As in the other four usages, the context is that of an emphasis on historical development and man's approach to it. It is difficult to distinguish exactly between the senses intended for the words "dynamic," "historical," and "evolutionary." In the final analysis, it seems, one must be satisfied with the global notion of an ever more rapidly changing world in which historical man finds himself posed with the questions of meaning and justice.<sup>29</sup>

#### HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In fact, as Moeller has pointed out in his account of the redactional history of the Pastoral Constitution, a Christian cosmology, co-ordinating a view of history and of the universe under the sign of God's plan of salvation, was one of the themes present in the preparatory texts of Mecheln and Ariccia but absent in the final version approved by the Council.<sup>30</sup> Marie-Dominique Chenu, writing on the fourth chapter of the document and on no. 41 in particular, remarks similarly that the cosmic dimension of the economy of salvation receded rather notably into the background in the final draft, "as had always been the case among the

<sup>26</sup> *GS*, no. 5.

<sup>27</sup> *GS*, no. 54.

<sup>28</sup> See Giuseppe Alberigo, "Die Konstitution in Beziehung zur gesamten Lehre des Konzils," in Baraúna, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72; also Charles Moeller, "Der Aufstieg der Kultur," *ibid.*, pp. 283-84.

<sup>29</sup> Thus I agree with Segundo that "Vatican II does not take up universal evolution as a topic, nor does it discuss how this process operates" (*op. cit.*, p. 139); however, Segundo does not analyze any of the language referred to above. Walter Kern, on the other hand, seemingly takes the term "evolutionary" in *GS*, no. 5, in its narrower sense (*Mysterium salutis* 2, 541, no. 70); he expresses himself more carefully, however, with regard to *LG*, no. 48, and *GS*, no. 12 (*ibid.*, p. 542).

<sup>30</sup> *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* 5, 72; see also pp. 22, 51, 59-62. On the history of the text in addition to Caprile and Delhaye, see René Laurentin, *L'Enjeu du Concile* (4 vols.; Paris, 1963-65); Henri de Riedmatten, "Histoire de la Constitution pastorale sur l'église dans le monde de ce temps," in *L'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps: Constitution "Gaudium et spes," Commentaires du Schema XIII* (Paris, 1967) pp. 42-92; Roberto Tucci, S.J., "Introduzione storico-dottrinale alla Costituzione pastorale 'Gaudium et spes,'" in *La chiesa e il mondo contemporaneo nel Vaticano II* (Turin, 1966) pp. 17-134.

Latin theologians, for whom Augustinianism's spiritualism and psychologism had interiorized salvation in an extreme way."<sup>31</sup>

It is certain, at any rate, that the Council nowhere addresses itself specifically to the relation between organic evolution in the strict biological sense and human evolution in the more general, historico-cultural sense. This is scarcely surprising when one reflects on the multivalent history the idea of evolution itself has had. In Latin the word *evolvere* originally meant to "unroll" or "roll forth," and in the classical period it came to have the special signification of unrolling a scroll. In the Middle Ages, however, the more books with leaves replaced scrolls, the more the frequency of the word's usage declined. It was then reintroduced into modern literature in the seventeenth century, when the Cambridge Neoplatonists used it to refer to the entire unfolding of historical time which is simultaneously present to God. In the eighteenth century the Swiss naturalist and philosopher Charles de Bonnet proposed a theory of natural development of all creatures from preformed miniatures in their respective germ cells. For Bonnet, "the process of individual growth was an 'unfolding,' i.e., an 'evolution' in [the] classical sense [described above], and it was this meaning of 'evolution' that entered the French language."<sup>32</sup> This is why French authors until recent decades have generally referred to Darwinian evolution as *transformisme*; similar usage was reflected in the Latin of scholastic textbooks.

In Germany, on the other hand, the idealist philosophers were replacing the common idea of progress with that of *Entwicklung* as a metaphysically grounded and interpreted development or evolution. Here "e-volution" was understood as the unfolding of what had always been germinally present. Reflecting on the French Revolution of 1789, Herder and Kant had both drawn contrasts between revolutionary and evolutionary developments in society. The dialectical relationship between the two was particularly emphasized in 1834 by Franz von Baader's book *Über den Evolutionismus und Revolutionismus*.<sup>33</sup> Gradually in the nineteenth century the idealist conception was appropriated by natural science. There it was translated, in a Darwinian sense, from the realm of philosophical speculation to that of empirical

<sup>31</sup> "Die Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt von heute," in Baraúna, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-47, at 242. While Chenu notes the omission of the cosmic dimension in no. 41, he also emphasizes its implicit presence in nos. 38-39. For a contrary view on no. 39, see Alfons Auer, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* 5, 199-200.

<sup>32</sup> Charles Singer, *A Short History of Scientific Ideas to 1900* (Oxford, 1959) p. 501; cited by Richard H. Overman, *Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of Creation* (Philadelphia, 1967) p. 31.

<sup>33</sup> Ernst Benz, *Evolution and Christian Hope* (Garden City, N.Y., 1966) pp. 65 ff.

research. It was likewise translated from a teleological principle into a causal one.<sup>34</sup>

It is helpful to recall this history of the evolutionary idea (here, of course, only hastily sketched) when reading current theological discussions of the question. Often one notices that theologians vacillate between the classical, "idealist" meaning of the term and the modern, "scientific" meaning. Nor is it rare for an author apparently to include both poles at once in his conception of evolution, as when Johannes Hurzeler states that "evolution (i.e., nonconstancy, changeability, confinement in time, the development of the complex out of the simple) is the most general law of the biosphere, if not of the entire material creation as a whole."<sup>35</sup> This situation is still further complicated by the fact that even representatives of the modern selection theory of evolution consider the discussion of generalized evolution an open one—not to mention questions of special evolutionary theory.

In conclusion, I am suggesting some care in our reference to Vatican II's evolutionary conception of the world. We should not assume that the dialogue begun between theology and evolutionary theory was concluded by the Council, nor that a *rapprochement* between evolutionary theory and the theology of creation has been simply supplanted by the recent (and indispensable) emphasis of many writers on Christianity's social responsibility. It is accepted scientific practice to refer to both organic and psychogenetic development as being aspects of one evolution.<sup>36</sup> This may remind political theologians, when considering man's responsibilities for the future, that no science dealing with man can afford to forget the natural basis for his historical development—least of all theology, which understands God's redemptive purposes as directed to a world He continually creates in goodness but which man alone disfigures.

We have indeed traveled far since 1893, when T. H. Huxley wrote at the height of the romantic period in evolutionary theory: "One of its greatest merits, in my eyes, is the fact that it occupies a position of complete and irreconcilable antagonism to that vigorous and consistent enemy of mankind—the Catholic Church."<sup>37</sup> We have traveled far, but

<sup>34</sup> Emil Brunner, *Das Ewige als Zukunft und Gegenwart* (Zurich, 1953) pp. 19–20. Brunner represents a typically theological understanding of "causal" concepts in science; and yet there does seem to be a tendency for neo-Darwinians to erase the distinction between descriptive and causally explanatory concepts; see James Collins, "Darwin's Impact on Philosophy," in Walter J. Ong, S.J., ed., *Darwin's Vision and Christian Perspectives* (New York, 1960) pp. 33–103.

<sup>35</sup> "Evolution und Monogenismus/Polygenismus," *Orientierung* 28 (1964) 196.

<sup>36</sup> See Sol Tax and Charles Callender, eds., *Evolution after Darwin 3: Issues in Evolution* (Chicago, 1960) 107; also Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving* (New Haven, 1962) p. 22.

<sup>37</sup> Cited in Philip G. Fothergill, *Evolution and Christians* (London, 1961) p. 13.

we certainly carry questions with us still. Modern biblical studies have clearly played an important role in overcoming the initial conflict between the theory of evolution and the teaching of Christian faith. But for the most part these studies have been concerned primarily with protology. Only recently has Catholic exegesis begun to investigate the eschatology of Scripture with an explicit awareness of the questions posed by the evolutionary viewpoint.<sup>38</sup>

This reflects not only the increasingly emphasized correlation between protological and eschatological statements in theology, but also a gradual shift in the central interest of the discussion between evolutionary theory and theology. Crucial importance is attached no longer to questions about chronological origins but rather to those about structural foundations. The latter cannot, of course, be divorced entirely from the former, if one wishes consistently to take account of the temporal, historical conditions of all human action and reflection. But it is the fundamental horizons of human understanding and action which are now seen to be in question, even when the issue under discussion is immediately one of origins. No advances in the understanding of the beginnings of our cosmic situation and history can reach any further than our understanding of the possible horizons of our present comprehension and decision. Even where questions of origins seem to deepen our understanding of man and his destiny, it appears that this deepening essentially flows from the free awareness which itself first makes the question of origins possible and which subsequently seeks to integrate the question into a more comprehensive and adequate approach to the world.

When we ask how old man is and when the human species began, we are asking who he now is and what his future may be. The question for science is still too mysterious for theology to be allowed any smug confidence about it. While the Second Vatican Council may have begun to use a language more akin to contemporary culture's, its promise of concern for the further study of man is still not fulfilled. And although theology should not indeed be expected to provide us with new facts about man's evolution in nature and history,<sup>39</sup> I would argue that it should fulfil a heuristic function of helping the human sciences to ask more adequately their basic questions about what is new and important in our world. For we are at that point of human evolution where we must

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Anton Vögtle, *Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos* (Düsseldorf, 1970) p. 12. Vögtle does observe a certain Teilhardian influence in authors like André Feuillet, *Le Christ, Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (Paris, 1966), and Nikolaus Kehl, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief* (*Stuttgarter biblische Monographien* 1, 1967).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Langdon Gilkey, *Religion and the Scientific Future* (New York, 1970).

be conscious of man's whole situation if we are not to abuse it wholly. The powers we can today enthrone in place of the Lord of an evolving universe are more destructive than ever. Where, then, and to whom can we direct our greatest wonder, as we reflect admiringly with Bronowski on the power of our forward-looking imaginations? Is our free awareness entirely our own, or do we receive it as a gift from an infinite Giver who is also our goal? It is my own conviction that political responsibility and scientific commitment, today as ever, can draw their power nowhere more assuredly than from the worship of this constant Presence.

*Weston School of Theology*

LEO J. O'DONOVAN, S.J.