

terms of such a metaphysics. I think that our response today must be to preach the self-revealing God as He is found in the Scriptures, and to practice what we preach. The atmosphere of our time is charged with invitations to believe in (or to deny) God. Rather than be pre-occupied with formulating arguments, we must live the Good News and preach it. People today are moved by the convictions and commitments of their fellowmen. Our lives should witness to our belief that Jesus is indeed the fullest revelation of the Father.

Some object that we have no direct access to being; in faith we achieve communion with Being. I think that we certainly do constrict Being when we place it within a metaphysical system; no human science can adequately embrace God. But this inadequacy is no excuse for rejecting a metaphysics about God; natural theology and "pure" theology are impossible without metaphysics. We need metaphysics, but we must also remember that it is the proclamation of the Good News about Jesus (not a metaphysics about the transcendent God) which will move our neighbors to believe and love.

WILLIAM J. FINAN, O.P.

Washington, D. C.

EVOLUTION AND THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN. By Stephanus Trooster, S.J. Glen Rock. Newman Press. 1968. 138 pp. \$4.95.

What are we to do when our secular knowledge gives us one picture of the world and our religious knowledge gives us a contradictory one? We can sequester the two pictures in different corners of our mind, but that is not satisfactory for long. We can hold fast to the traditional formulations, come what may, or we can let our science dictate our theology; but these are both simplistic approaches. Some kind of reconciliation must be attempted.

Dutch theologians are currently trying to reconcile the evolutionary world-view and our traditional notions of original sin. Doctor Trooster gives us a résumé of how the discussion has gone thus far and makes a few suggestions of his own. In particular, he stands somewhere between his mentor, Piet Schoonenberg, who is very conscious of the tradition, and Hulsbosch, whose theology is more philosophical. Trooster cannot accept the traditional picture of a superhuman Adam in paradise nor can he equate Adam with Everyman or reduce original sin to cosmic immaturity.

He does assert, however, that a more accurate reading of the Scriptures will give us an understanding of original sin more in keeping with the modern world-view (and within the limits defined by the Council of Trent). The Scriptural account of Adam in the Garden was meant more as theology than history and should be read as such. It is "pro-

tology," an account of what God has had in mind for man from the very *beginning*, his project that will only be realized completely in the *end-time* (eschatology). What is described in the concrete imagery of Eden is this project or promise or plan (and this may never have been realized historically).

What is further described is the rejection of this project from the very outset by *ha'adam*, the man. But "the man" is not simply universalized mankind nor Everyman. Adam is both historical figure and "corporate personality." He represents the solidarity-in-sin of all mankind, the way Moab represents the solidarity-in-sin of all Moabites and the way Christ represents the solidarity-in-grace of all Christians. As the notion of corporate personality was lost in the Greco-Roman world, original sin had to be expressed in terms of "human nature" which each individual receives from the first of the species, Adam. But something else is lost in the transition, viz., by personal sins the individual expresses his solidarity-in-sin and perpetuates the sinful environment, into which the next generation is born. Not only has Adam's sin brought death and suffering into the world, our sins perpetuate it. In this Biblical mentality, therefore, the doctrine of original sin does not excuse us because of an inherited weakness or evolutionary immaturity but rather emphasizes our responsibility for the presence of evil in the world. This is Trooster's conclusion.

Trooster's opinions will naturally be of interest to the professional theologian. But of even greater value for the general reader is Trooster's synthesis of current European scholarship on original sin. He makes use of Renckens on the first chapters of Genesis, Dubarle on the Biblical notion of original sin, Lyonnet on the exegesis of Rom. 5:12 ff. He includes Jeremias' historical researches on infant baptism in the early Church and Schoonenberg's exegesis of the decrees of Trent. His source material alone commends this short book to anyone wishing to keep abreast of current theology.

MATTHEW RZECZKOWSKI, O.P.

Washington, D. C.

RELIGIOUS SYMBOLS AND GOD. A Philosophical Study of Tillich's Theology. By William L. Rowe. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968. 245 pp.

Tillich can be considered either as a philosopher or as a theologian. Though Rowe prefers to approach his topic largely from a philosophical viewpoint, he begins by analyzing at length the main features of Tillich's attempt to develop a Christian theology for our time as an effort both to precisely state the content of the Christian message and to make it relevant in man's contemporary situation. Tillich's claims against funda-