

written by a slate of respected Catholic scholars, and edited by the accomplished Ilia Delio, this embrace of Teilhard comes from within his own church. Delio is Director of Catholic Studies at Georgetown University and previous Professor and Chair of Spirituality Studies at Washington Theological Union. Much like Teilhard himself, Delio crosses the professional divisions between science and religion (holding dual doctorates in pharmacology and historical theology) but may be best known for her writings on spirituality. A lay Franciscan, she is a colleague and occasional copresenter with Father Richard Rohr, a New Mexico-based Franciscan spiritual teacher with a broadly ecumenical reach.

This volume is organized around the central Teilhard dictum that “the universe is still coming into being.” It is Teilhard’s evolving cosmos that is the focus here, along with the end to which it is evolving and the God who guides this process. For those unfamiliar or only casually familiar with Teilhard’s arguments, the first chapter (“Teilhard de Chardin: Theology for an Unfinished Universe” by John F. Haught) lays a scholarly but accessible groundwork for Teilhard’s evolutionary consciousness. Bemoaning a faith still moored in a premodern or early modern perspective, Teilhard sought to create a “metaphysics for the future” that encouraged a departure from static or even pessimistic visions of the future and instead offered the promise of an “omega point,” where all things converge into each other and into Christ. Teilhard the scientist, Teilhard the historian, and Teilhard the theologian all looked forward “with hope and love” because the cosmos had a purpose toward which it was being continually created.

Part One of this collection of thirteen essays explores this union of “theology and evolution” and includes not only the chapter by Haught, but also explorations of “Sophia: Catalyst for Creative Union and Divine Love,” “Evolution and the Rise of the Secular God” (by the book’s editor), “Teilhard’s Vision as Agenda for Rahner’s Christology” (which explores the influence that Teilhard had on the influential mid-twentieth-century Catholic theologian), and “Humanity Reveals the World.” As noted, the first chapter is both foundational and accessible.

Part Two addresses Teilhard’s philosophical vision. The first chapter explores the relationship between the thinking of Teilhard and that of Bernard Lonergan, a Jesuit philosopher-theologian. The second chapter in this section explores the relationship between metaphysics and morality (particularly in the political realm) in Teilhard’s thought, and the third defends him from the critiques raised by Sir

Peter Medawar, the mid-century British-Brazilian Nobel Prize-winning biologist and atheist.

Part Three turns to “Spirituality and Ethics for a New Millennium.” It includes chapters on “An Evolving Christian Morality,” “Teilhard de Chardin and the New Spirituality,” and Teilhard as “The Empirical Mystic,” which might now be my favorite description of this unique polymath. But it may be the title of another chapter in this section that best captures the personality and, indeed, the life goal of Teilhard: “The Zest for Life: A Contemporary Exploration of a Generative Theme in Teilhard’s Work” (by Ursula King).

Part Four consists of a single chapter: “Teilhard de Chardin: New Tools for an Evolutive Theory of the Biosphere” (by Luduvico Galleni), which attempts to deliver on the promise that the book be not merely a review of Teilhard’s thought but also an extrapolation of it into new arenas and questions pertinent to our own generation.

It is doubtless true that fewer volumes of essays by multiple authors are being published these days, as they are often of uneven quality and lack thematic coherence. This volume does not suffer from those flaws. While I have called attention to certain chapters (and believe some are more germane to a discussion of Teilhard than others), the contributions here are surprisingly uniform in terms of the quality of their research and insights. There is an occasional hagiographical tone but one expects this from a volume dedicated to the thinking of a particularly influential individual. If one is looking for a biography of Teilhard, a review of his writings, or a general summary of his ideas, other previously published volumes will do that better. This one does what it purports to do: it examines Teilhard’s themes to explore and extrapolate how we might continue to cocreate the unfinished universe in our own time.

*Reviewed by Anthony L. Blair, President and Professor of Leadership and Historical Studies, Evangelical Seminary, Myerstown, PA 17067.*

**ADAM, THE FALL, AND ORIGINAL SIN: Theological, Biblical, and Scientific Perspectives** by Hans Madueme and Michael Reeves, eds. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014. 352 pages. Paperback; \$26.99. ISBN: 9780801039928.

The debate over the historicity of Adam is well underway within evangelical circles, as witnessed by the *Christianity Today* cover article entitled “The Search for the Historical Adam” (June 2011 issue), Peter Enns’s 2012 Baker book *The Evolution of Adam*, and Zondervan’s publication of *Four Views on the*

# Book Reviews

*Historical Adam* in 2013. Questioning whether or not Adam existed certainly raises serious issues regarding the traditional doctrines of the Fall and original sin. A response by traditionalists and concordists was expected, and this book is just such an attempt.

Editors Madueme and Reeves clearly outline the intent of their book. "Our basic thesis is that the traditional doctrine of original sin is not only orthodox but is also the most theologically cogent synthesis of the biblical witness" (p. xii). The book unfolds in four parts: Adam in the Bible and Science, Original Sin in History, Original Sin in Theology, and Adam and the Fall in Dispute.

Of the fifteen contributors, there is only one scientist, a paleoanthropologist, whose contribution comes under the pseudonym "William Stone." He offers a good overview of the prehuman and human fossil record. However, a concordist hermeneutic ultimately directs his interpretation of the scientific evidence. "Stone" admits, "I expect the paleoanthropological record: a. to show that humans belong to a distinct 'kind' from other primates; and b. to be consistent with a single human lineage" (p. 55). Because of these presuppositions, he concludes that Adam and Eve were a "special creation" with "no ancestral lineage" to earlier creatures (pp. 55, 80) and places them "at the root of the *Homo erectus/ergaster* to *Homo sapiens* lineage about 1.8 million years ago" (pp. 78, 80). The obvious problem with this proposal is that *Homo sapiens* do not appear in the fossil record until 200,000 years ago.

The historical contributions are the most valuable part of the book and together they reveal that the Christian tradition fully embraced the doctrine of original sin and a historical Adam and fall. Peter Sanlon's examination of patristic theology underlines that original sin was not invented by Augustine, but was part of Christian tradition prior to him (p. 95). Of course, it was under Augustine's towering influence that the doctrine was explicitly defined and later incorporated into the Council of Carthage in 418 (p. 88). Robert Kolb presents an outline of Lutheran approaches to original sin. He notes that Luther assumed that "without [the doctrine of original sin] it was impossible to understand the Scriptures correctly" (p. 116). Luther contended that "the inherited sin" of Adam completely bound and corrupted the will of every human (p. 109). In this way, he reshaped and darkened the doctrine and rejected any "spark of positive potential in the inborn will" (p. 116). In reviewing the Reformed tradition, Donald Macleod sketches the emergence of realist and federalist views of the relationship between Adam and his

descendants (pp. 137–38). The former is a biological concept that suggests every human was once in the loins of Adam. The latter, which became Reformed consensus, proposes that Adam was the representative head of humanity.

The third part of this book focusses on biblical theology and systematic theology. The central argument is that the coherence of these two theological disciplines is utterly dependent on a historical Adam and Fall and belief in original sin. In dealing with biblical theology, James M. Hamilton exposes the concordist hermeneutic that undergirds his views. He contends that in the early chapters of Genesis, Moses offers "a universal explanation of all things" such as "migratory ranchers" (Gen. 4:20), "musical artistry" (v. 21), and "bronze and ironwork" (v. 22, p. 193). Not only does Hamilton disregard the evidence of Pentateuch source criticism, he seems to be completely unaware of the archeological record, because these three cultural advances do not arise in one generation as stated in Genesis 4. Herding appears 10,000 years ago; musical instruments, 40,000; bronze, 5,000; and iron, 3,000. Regrettably, Hamilton's chapter is stained by polemical slurs against Peter Enns. For example, he contends that "Enns is tone deaf" (p. 197), his work is a "shallow attempt" (p. 203), and for Enns "the Bible bows the knee to the authority of evolution" (p. 196). These comments strike me as those of someone who has not read the work of Enns with any care or objectivity.

In presenting the implications of original sin for systematic theology, editors Madueme and Reeves press all the rhetorical alarmist bells. They contend that "rejecting a historical Adam and original sin would leave us without a recognizable Christian gospel" (p. 210). In addition, they claim that the doctrine of original sin is "an irremovable part of any truly Christian, truly good news" (p. 209). And the alarms ring out even louder when Madueme and Reeves proclaim that if "original sin is denied, the more Christ becomes an example or a teacher instead of a savior ... No incarnation, death, and resurrection would actually be needed" (p. 223). And to conclude, they claim that dismissing the historicity of Adam and the effects of original sin "trivializes sin" and that "salvation need not entail a supernatural regeneration of my heart and very being, for I have no such need or incapacity" (p. 221). A pastoral chapter by Daniel Doriani continues the alarmist rhetoric. He asserts that the doctrine of original sin "must remain at the center of the church's preaching, especially its evangelism. If not for original sin, we would need no incarnation, no atonement, no gospel" (p. 258). As one who rejects both Adam and original sin, I found

these chapters inordinately disturbing in that they seem to view traditional systematic theology as inerrant.

The fourth part of the book includes, in my estimation, the best chapter—Thomas R. Schreiner's exposition of Romans 5:12–19. He begins by stating, "Clearly Paul believes Adam is a historical figure" (p. 271), and argues convincingly that "five times in verses 15–19 judgment and death are attributed to Adam's one sin" (p. 276). Schreiner contends that the "universal consequences of Adam's sin" were not limited to him only because "it introduced sin and death into the world," and he qualifies that "both physical and spiritual death are intended" (p. 272). In attempting to restrict the extent of death, Schreiner claims that reference to "the world" in Romans 5:12 "refers specifically to humans beings" (p. 272). With this being the case, it is not surprising that he completely dodges Paul's reference to the cosmic Fall in Romans 8:20–22. Of course, belief in the cosmic Fall has been falsified by the fossil record. Physical death has been in the world for billions of years prior to the entrance of human sin.

This book is an excellent demonstration of the entrenchment of concordist hermeneutics within modern evangelicalism. All the contributors assume that scripture reveals historical and scientific facts regarding human origins. None deal with the possibility that the biblical creation accounts and Pauline references to Adam are undergirded by an ancient Near Eastern conceptualization of origins, specifically the *de novo* creation of humans. This book also reveals the dictatorial power of Christian tradition and systematic theology, which, at times, seem to function like inerrant texts. It is worth noting that over half of the contributors have connections to Presbyterian theology, including training or teaching at Westminster Seminary or Concordia Seminary. The book might have been subtitled "Presbyterian Perspectives."

Interestingly, the introduction by editors Madueme and Reeves cites Article 31.3 of the Westminster Confession. "All synods or councils, since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err; and many have erred. Therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith, or practice; but to be used as a help in both" (xi; their italics). In the light of modern biblical scholarship and the evolutionary sciences, I conclude that *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin* continues within the Christian tradition that "many have erred." Had this book been written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the most important evangelical confessions of faith undergirding systematic theology were composed by young earth

creationists (e.g., Luther and Calvin), it would have been excusable. Despite my conclusion, I certainly recommend that evangelicals read this book, in the same way that I encourage my students to read Richard Dawkins and Ken Ham.

*Reviewed by Denis O. Lamoureux, Associate Professor of Science and Religion, St. Joseph's College, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2J5.*

**CAN ANIMALS BE MORAL?** by Mark Rowlands. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. 274 pages. Paperback; \$24.95. ISBN: 9780190240301.

In this well-written and carefully argued book, Mark Rowlands defends the claim that some nonhuman animals can, indeed, be moral. At the intersection of animal science, moral philosophy, and many faith-based perspectives on morality and human nature, this book is as much about what makes human animals moral as it is about what makes some non-human animals moral.

Rowlands is a much published analytic philosopher and the focus of *Can Animals Be Moral?* is primarily conceptual and philosophical rather than empirical and scientific. He does assume that the scientific evidence makes a *prima facie* case for the claim that some animals, especially social mammals, can be motivated to act by various emotions that have an identifiable moral content. These emotions are all species of concern for the fortunes of others, which he takes to be the hallmark of a moral attitude, such as compassion, sympathy, grief, courage, malice, spite, and cruelty. As a matter of fact, he himself believes that a wide array of animal studies provides us with a growing body of evidence that some animals do, in fact, experience such emotions and are motivated to act by them. But the concern of the book is not to present and evaluate the scientific evidence for such a factual claim, but rather, to clarify and explain the meaning of the central concepts involved in making such a claim; secondly, to develop an extended argument for the claim that some animals *can* be moral subjects but not moral agents; and finally, to defend that claim from philosophical objections that have been thought to be decisive by the vast majority of thinkers in the Western philosophical tradition. In the course of that defense he examines and rejects a deeply entrenched conception of reason and human cognitive functioning that has provided the basis for a widely held paradigm of what it means to be moral, a paradigm incompatible with animals being moral subjects.

The foundation for his larger argument comes in the second chapter, by far the most difficult chapter