*TheoRhēma* 9/2 (2014): 85-127

# SUPERNATURALLY INFUSED OR NATURALLY EMERGED SOUL? A STUDY OF THE APPEAL OF THEISTIC EVOLUTIONIST SYSTEMS TO DUAL ANTHROPOLOGY

*dr.* Gheorghe Răzmeriță
*Universitatea Adventistă din Chile, Chillán, Chile*

**Abstract**

The article studies the relationship between theistic evolutionism and the dualistic and sinful aspects of the human nature. This engagement proves essential to Adventist theology, with its particular creationism and anthropology. Two questions stand out in this study. First, how do the concepts of dualism and sin affect theistic evolutionism? Could some Adventist theologians who may be tempted to accept theistic evolutionism remain consistent with their biblical anthropology and still embrace theistic evolutionism? Besides the introduction and conclusion, the article is structured in three major sections: theistic evolutionist systems that integrate dualism, theistic evolutionist systems that do not integrate dualism, and an assessment of both options.

**Keywords**: theistic evolution, dualism, creation, Christian anthropology, fallen humanity, science and religion

Theistic evolutionist proposals for reconciling scientific evolutionism and Christian theology have become more noticeable to the general public when Pope John Paul II "shocked" the world with an explicit acceptance of the theistic evolutionist position in his 22 October 1996 address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.[1] His presentation increased the ongoing debate over theistic evolutionism with a resulting explosion of works pro or con.

John Paul II's presentation reveals also an intra-theistic evolutionist debate. Theistic evolutionism accepts the naturalistic

[1] Pope John Paul II, "Message to Pontifical Academy of Sciences," *L'Osservatore Romano* (30 October 1996): 3, 7.

scientific theory of evolution with the specification that God started and guided the process, thereby placing the evolutionary laws of development into the framework of the doctrine of divine providence. This specification implies that God directly intervened in the evolutionary history at one or all of the three major points theistic evolutionist systems postulate: cosmogenesis (the origin of the universe), biogenesis (the origin of life), and anthropogenesis (the origin of humanity).

It is these points that constitute the heart of the internal debate of theistic evolutionism. While the first point has been accepted unanimously by theistic evolutionists as a direct manifestation of God outside Himself, the latter two have been fiercely debated, with anthropogenesis receiving the most attention. The main question is whether biogenesis and anthropogenesis are direct supernatural interventions of God or manifestations of His providential guidance of the evolutionary process, whereby life and human consciousness have emerged out of the evolutionary processes themselves.

Generally, theistic evolutionists have offered two major evolutionary explanations for the origin of the rational, moral and religious human being with an immortal destiny. These explanations have been built upon the models of the two co-founders of modern evolutionism, Charles Robert Darwin[2] and Alfred Russel Wallace.[3] The first of these explanations follows Wallace's model of three supernatural (spiritual) interventions in

[2] Charles Darwin (1809-1882) has been credited as the founder of the modern theory of evolution, which places natural selection at the basis of its explanation of the mechanism of the evolutionary processes. Darwin's most famous work is Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (New York: New American Library, 1958).

[3] Alfred R. Wallace (1823-1913) was the co-discoverer of the theory of evolution through natural selection. He was president of The Land Nationalisation Society and elected as Fellow of the Royal Society. For Wallace's biography, selected writings, and other details, see Charles H. Smith, "The Alfred Russel Wallace Page" http://people.wku.edu/charles.smith/index1.htm (29 November 2013) or "The Alfred Russel Wallace Website," http://wallacefund.info (29 November 2013).

the course of evolution: origin of life, of consciousness, and of spirit. In the case of anthropogenesis Wallace presupposed that the human body has or could have developed in the process of a supernaturally guided evolution, while the human soul/mind was directly and supernaturally added ("superadded") to the body by a direct creative intervention of the universal spirit.[4] Numerous theistic evolutionist supporters throughout the history of the evolution-creation dialogue have held to this particular view, though they reject Wallace's spiritualism by replacing his impersonal universal spirit with God.

This position, however, is obviously possible only by appealing to the underlying doctrine historically accepted in Christian theology of dual anthropology, which postulates an essential distinction between the spiritual, immortal soul and the material, mortal body.[5] These theistic evolutionists are referred to in this work as "dual anthropology theistic evolutionists". The dual anthropology theistic evolutionists insist that the supernatural creation and infusion of the immortal soul is an indispensable requirement for the existence of a theistic evolutionist system. A century before John Paul II's statements, the Presbyterian biologist and theologian, George Macloskie, predicted:

> Evolution, if proven as to man, will be held by the biblicist to be a part, the naturalistic part, of the total work of his making, the other part being his endowment miraculously with a spiritual nature, so that he was created in the image of God.[6]

---

[4] Alfred Russel Wallace, *Darwinism: An Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection With Some of Its Applications* (London: Macmillan, 1890), 445-478.

[5] For one of the latest and most comprehensive, both historical and theological expositions and defense of Christian dualism, see John W. Cooper's *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).

[6] George Macloskie, "The Origin of Species and of Man," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 60 (1903): 273, quoted in David N. Livingstone, *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter between Evangelical Theology and Evolutionary Thought* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 96.

Not all theistic evolutionist proponents, however, follow this scheme and thus not all of them appeal to dual anthropology to support their theistic evolutionist system. Numerous important theologians and Christian scientists subscribe to solutions for the origin of life and humanity closer to Darwin's views of the gradual emergence of man, both body and mind (soul), through the processes of natural selection to the exclusion of any divine intervention.[7] One of these theistic evolutionist systems is Howard Van Till's concept of "optimally equipped creation."[8] He argues that creation is gifted with a self-organizing principle, so that there is no need for God's supernatural intervention in the evolutionary history. As these theistic evolutionists also reject dual anthropology, they are referred to in this paper as non- dual anthropology theistic evolutionists.[9]

Theistic evolutionism has come under sustained attack from both scientists and other Christians involved in discussing issues in science and theology. Their criticism focuses especially on the incompatibility of the evolutionary perspective with the Christian

---

[7] On Darwin's emergentist approach to anthropogenesis, see Charles R. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, 2d ed. [book on-line] (London: Murray, 1882, reproduced at the British Library Net, accessed 29 January 2006); available from http://pages.britishlibrary.net/charles.darwin/texts/descent/descent01.html; Internet. Having deliberately avoided the issue of the human evolution in his 1859 *Origin* for political reasons, Darwin returns to this topic in this later book. Here, Darwin, *Descent of Man*, 5-64, argues—based on morphological reasons—that man has gradually emerged from lower animals both body and mental/spiritual faculties, and that, Darwin, *Descent of Man*, 65-127, the mental/moral/spiritual difference between animals and humans are only in degree and not in kind.

[8] See Howard Van Till, "The Creation: Intelligently Designed or Optimally Equipped?" *Theology Today* 55 (1998): 344-364; Howard Van Till, *The Fourth Day: What the Bible and the Heavens Are Telling Us About the Creation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 249-271; Howard Van Till, "Theistic Evolution," in *Three Views on Creation and Evolution*, ed. J. P. Moreland and John Mark Reynolds (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 161-218.

[9] In this study, the non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists are also called "emergentists," referring to their concept that all reality, including the human soul/mind emerged through evolutionary processes as described by scientific evolutionists. The adjective "non-interventionist" connotes a similar idea, emphasizing their idea that God did not directly and supernaturally intervene in the evolutionary history.

Scriptures, ethics, and crucial aspects of theology. However, the discussion has generally stopped short of a more deeper study of ideas that apparently underlie the acceptance of theistic evolutionism, such as the appeal to dual anthropology, which claims to solve the serious problems of theistic evolutionist systems. On the other hand, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems themselves do not exhibit much explicit discussion on their appeal to dual anthropology and its specific role in their internal structure.

This situation generates several crucial questions, which deserve special attention and study. What does the appeal to dual anthropology accomplish in dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems? Is the solution of appealing to dual anthropology essential to the acceptance of theistic evolutionism or is it merely optional? If it is essential, in what way is it so? From another angle, might some theologians accept theistic evolutionism and ignore dual anthropology? Or, conversely, could theologians embrace dual anthropology and remain totally invulnerable to the theory of theistic evolutionism?

On a different plane, does dual anthropology really solve the theological problems of theistic evolutionist systems? The crucial concern of this question is the biblical-theological success and legitimacy of the usage of dual anthropology in theistic evolutionist systems, which represent an important part of the relationship between the biblical and modern scientific worldviews. This work aims to answer these vital questions. Ultimately, the purpose of the study is to investigate and to assess the role of dual anthropology in the acceptance of theistic evolutionist systems.

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, both historical-theological and systematic-theological methodologies are used. First, this research is historical-theological in nature, as it describes various theistic evolutionist systems, both those that do and those that do not appeal to dual anthropology. Second, this study assesses and evaluates the appeal to dual anthropology in theistic evolutionist systems from a biblical-theological

perspective. Although more theistic evolutionist proponents are generally referred to in the study, especially in the evaluative section, the descriptive section case-studies one dual anthropology theistic evolutionists and one non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist.

The study is divided into three major sections. Section one explores and describes one representative theistic evolutionist system that uses the concept of special creation and infusion of the soul into a pre-human body and thus appeal to dual anthropology. In this way, an attempt is made to identify the role of the appeal to dual anthropology as a solution to the problem of anthropogenesis within this system. Section two surveys the limits of the appeal to dual anthropology in order to understand and verify the essentiality of the appeal to dual anthropology as a solution to the anthropogenesis problem in theistic evolutionist systems. This section describes the theistic evolutionist system of a theologian who does not appeal to dual anthropology in his theistic evolutionist system. Section three synthesizes and assesses the role and the success of the appeal to dual anthropology in any conceivable theistic evolutionist system from the biblical-theological perspective.

## DUAL ANTHROPOLOGY THEISTIC EVOLUTIONIST SYSTEMS

This section proceeds as follows. First, it identifies and describes the position of a representative theistic evolutionist who appeals to dual anthropology. Second, a search is made for an explicit rationale and the proposed role of dual anthropology in one's theistic evolutionism. If explicit statements regarding this aspect are missing, then an attempt is made to identify it from the whole theological system of this theistic evolutionist proponent. Special consideration is given to essential Christian doctrines such as hamartology (the Fall, sin, evil), Christology and soteriology (the incarnation of Christ and the atonement), and eschatology (the resurrection and the Second Coming of Christ).

Dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents are found in various Christian denominations, thus making a selection more

difficult. Protestant theologians such as the Presbyterian Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield,[10] the Protestant stalwart of the concept of biblical inerrancy, and the most prominent Baptist theologian of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Augustus Hopkins Strong,[11] worked out their own ideas of how to accept the evolution of the body, while reserving the creation of human soul only to God.

Given the essentiality of dualism for Roman Catholicism, it is no surprise that the Roman Catholic theologians, such as Pope Pius XII and Pope John Paul II, are more prominent in the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist group. For multiple purposes, this work will study this position in Ernest Charles Messenger.[12]

Messenger rightly claimed to have proposed "the first full-length treatment of the subject [on evolution and religion] from the

---

[10] Ascending to the theological arena from his cattle-breeding occupation, B. B. Warfield (1851-1921) has become one of the most known Protestant theologians, connected to Princeton University. For his biography with a special study on evolution, see Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone, "Introduction," in *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, ed. Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 13-44. See also, David N. Livingstone, "B. B. Warfield, the Theory of Evolution, and Early Fundamentalism," *Evangelical Quarterly* 58 (1986): 69-83; David N. Livingstone and Mark A. Noll, "B. B. Warfield (1851-1921): A Biblical Inerrantist as Evolutionist," *ISIS: Journal of the History of Science in Society* 91 (2001): 283-304.

[11] Augustus H. Strong (1839-1921) served as a pastor in several districts between 1861-1872 before accepting the position of Systematic Theology Professor and President of Rochester Theological Seminary, position he held for the next forty years. In addition, Strong has also served as president of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, of the General Convention of Baptists of North America, and of the Rochester Historical Society, and also as chairman of the board of trustees of Vassar College. David Livingstone presents Strong as a "conservative theologian comparable to P. T. Forsyth in Britain and Martin Kahler in Germany through his propagation of what has been called 'progressive orthodoxy.'" See Livingstone, *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders*, 128. For a biography on Strong, see Augustus H. Strong, *Autobiography of Augustus Hopkins Strong*, ed. Crerar Douglas (Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1981).

[12] Ernest C. Messenger (1888-1951), former student at Louvain, was professor of philosophy at St. Edmund's College in England. He wrote actively on Christian history and theology in the middle of the twentieth century. His books include Ernest C. Messenger, *Two in One Flesh*, 2ded., 3 vols. (London: Sands, 1950) and Ernest C. Messenger, *Know Your Faith: A Refresher Course in the Catechism for Older and Younger Catholics* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, n.d.).

theological and Scriptural standpoint" among Catholic theologians.[13] His book, *Evolution and Theology*,[14] not only had an important impact on Roman Catholic theological thought, but also served as a detailed descriptive and explicative model of this type of theistic evolutionism and its approach to anthropogenesis.

Though repeatedly admonishing caution in accepting naturalistic evolution,[15] Messenger is quite convinced of the correctness of accepting this theory into a theistic framework. Having proposed a cooperative relationship between God's primary causality and secondary causes, Messenger states:

> As a result of this examination of the sacred text, we conclude that Holy Scripture, according to its plain and obvious sense, definitively teaches the origin of all living things from inorganic matter, by what may well be called "spontaneous generation." The fact that this teaching is contained in Scripture can hardly, we think, be denied. . . . We prefer to hold that Scripture really teaches spontaneous generation, and that this must be accepted as true.[16]

Messenger's theistic evolutionist system allows for as little intervention in the course of nature as possible. Even the appearance of life does not necessitate a special divine intervention, since God uses his secondary causality "wherever possible."[17] If some secondary causes described by the Fathers should be rejected due to their invalidity,

---

[13] Ernest C. Messenger, *Theology and Evolution: A Sequel to Evolution and Theology* (London: Sands, 1949), 172.

[14] Ernest C. Messenger, *Evolution and Theology: The Problem of Man's Origin* (New York: Macmillan, 1932). Part I of *Theology and Evolution* indeed shows the responses of various important Roman Catholic theologians, who both rejected and sympathized with Messenger's theory.

[15] See, e.g., Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 280; Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 215-216.

[16] Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 16 (italics and capitals his). See also, *ibid*., 33, 195-199.

[17] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 13-16. Commenting on Gen 1:11-12,24, Messenger declares: "Concerning the origin of *living things*, we note that in the case of *vegetation* and *terrestrial animals* other than man, Scripture definitely

> we ought to make sure that we cannot replace them by others before invoking the Divine intervention. Does not the theory of evolution provide a possible alternative to the idea of the production of life by stellar influences?[18]

Even if Messenger answers this question in the affirmative, he does not accept evolution without qualification. He is careful to set the borders of such acceptance right from the beginning. Thus, he tells his readers that he treats the subject within the limits of a historical interpretation of Genesis,[19] of the Catholic tradition,[20] of the 1909 Decree of the Biblical Commission,[21] and of the key Christian and Roman Catholic fundamental doctrines.

As *Evolution and Theology* reveals, one of these doctrines is the dualistic teaching of the nature of man. More than a simple dual anthropologist, Messenger places dual anthropology at the foundation of his approach. He insists that the discussion of human nature should precede that of anthropogenesis. He writes:

> This question [of human origin] is on a different footing from that of the origin of other living beings. Revelation and philosophy both have very definite teaching on the subject of man's nature, and as the question of his origin depends to some

---

asserts that these were all produced with the concourse of the *active power of inanimate matter*" (italics his). Messenger finds support for his idea in the writings of some Church Fathers, ibid., 17-79, 274. See also, Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 188-193.

[18] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 83. See also, *ibid*., 80, 84.

[19] *Ibid*., 6, 7.

[20] Messenger discusses related patristic material in order to support his position. *Ibid*., 19-84 (on the origin of life), 121-225 (on the nature and origin of man), 260-265 (on the formation of Eve).

[21] *Ibid*., 7. Messenger enumerates the limits set by the Biblical Commission: "(1) the creation of all things by God in the beginning of time; (2) the peculiar creation of man; (3) the formation of the first woman from the first man; (4) the original felicity of our first parents in the state of justice, integrity and immortality; (5) the precept given by God to man to prove his obedience; (6) the transgression of the Divine precept, at the persuasion of the devil in the form of a serpent; (7) the fall of our parents from that state of primaeval innocence; (8) the promise of a future redeemer." See also, *ibid*., 226-239.

> extent upon his nature, we shall begin by explaining exactly what we know for certain about that nature.[22]

Messenger starts his treatment by presenting his underlying premise that the soul and the body are two distinct entities: the immaterial, immortal soul and the material, mortal body, though the soul is the form of the body and composes a harmonious unity with it.[23] This unity appears at the functional level of the human being: in its operation, the soul works with the higher organic faculties—memory, imagination, and the affective faculties—which are situated on the cortex.[24]

It is this philosophical scheme that brings Messenger to two crucial conclusions regarding the origin of humans. First, the soul has its origin in God alone[25] and thus only the body could appear in an evolutionary process, and the only way the soul could unite with the body was by a special divine intervention of infusion echoing a soul-creationist scenario.[26]

Second, since the soul-creationist model cannot apply fully to the first appearance of man, Messenger notes that the immaterial and transcendent soul cannot be infused in an unfinished human organism. He explains:

> Human soul, being essentially the form of the human body, cannot inform a body which is not human, that is, one which does not possess what is essential for a human organism, or more particularly, one which does not possess the organs which are the essential seat of the higher organic faculties, or which does not possess the specific organization peculiar to these human organs. Similarly, from the moment when a body has an

[22] *Ibid*., 85. Messenger covers the whole discussion on pp. 85-90 in his book.

[23] *Ibid*., 86-87. Messenger, *Know your Faith*, 19-23, explains that the soul is immortal, the image of God in man, and that it is superior to the body, which is only temporal.

[24] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 85-87.

[25] *Ibid*., 87-88. For Messenger's discussion and acceptance of soul-creationism, see *ibid*., 88-90; Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 327-332.

[26] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 91-94.

> essentially human organization, it is necessarily animated by a human soul. This is summed up in the formula of St. Gregory of Nyssa, unanimously adopted in the schools: "the nature of the soul is always proportional to the body."[27]

For this reason, Messenger arrives at a twofold paradoxical conclusion: (1) Since a body having a human organization cannot be animated by a non-rational soul, and a body not having a human organization cannot be animated by a rational soul, it would be absurd to suppose that God could have created the first man by taking the body of a beast and substituting a spiritual soul for its non-rational one. (2) Since a body having the organization of a human body must of necessity be animated by a rational soul, it would be absurd to suppose that God made in the first place a body with human organization, but non-living, and then subsequently gave it life by infusing a rational soul into it.[28]

The only possibility out of this situation seems to Messenger to lie in the idea that God modified an existent animal to the necessary organization and then infused into it the soul: "*The body* [of the animal] *would first have to be modified.*"[29] Commenting on Gen 2:7, Messenger emphasizes:

> Our conclusion is that there is nothing in genesis ii.7 which, when rightly understood, disproves the theory of the origin of Adam's body by way of organic evolution.[30]

---

[27] *Ibid*., 87.

[28] *Ibid*. (italics his). Elsewhere, Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 193-194, Messenger declares that the idea of an immediate creation of Adam's body seems "nonsensical." Moreover, this type of presentation of the account of the creation of man "makes its literal sense ridiculous and impossible—a result which was doubtless quite contrary to his [Moses'] original intention."

[29] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 87 (italics his). He then explains this in a soul-creationist manner: "The soul of each human being is created by God, but this does not prevent us from descending naturally from our parents. And if natural evolution were supposed to extend to the human body, the creation of the soul of the first man would have been just as natural as the creation of the soul of any other human beings." *Ibid*., 92,

[30] *Ibid*., 116 (capitals his). Messenger claims that neither the Fathers, *ibid*., 121-224, nor the Church authorities, *ibid*., 226-239, reject the idea of a secondary causality in the formation of the body of man. See also, *ibid*., 120, 224-225, 275-276.

Elsewhere he elaborates:

> If the *second* part of Genesis ii, 7, describing the origin of Adam's soul, is metaphorical, then there is no reason why the *first* part, describing the origin of Adam's body, should not be equally metaphorical. Theologians and exegetes allow that we must not suppose that God really "moulded" Adam's body, as a potter moulds clay. Then why must we insist that the "dust of the earth" must be understood literally? Especially as these theologians and exegetes now seem quite prepared to abandon the literal sense when we read the "earth" produced the plants and animals. We have a right to call upon them to be consistent.[31]

Throughout his books, Messenger refers to several explanations for his insistence on appealing to dual anthropology in his theistic evolutionist system. From a philosophical perspective, he finds it paradoxical to imagine the development of morality and ethical intuition in a series of humans who were still in the process of developing mentality.

> Even from the merely philosophical point of view, it would seem difficult to believe that for many centuries and according to the "primary intention of nature" there could have existed a series of *intelligent beings incapable of choosing their own end*." This consideration "seems sufficient in itself to lead us to infer that Divine Providence would have arranged things in such a way that the first human being should possess a brain sufficiently developed, in the adult stage at any rate, to enable its owner to discern between moral good and evil, and thus to be capable of merit or demerit.[32]

These ideas lead Messenger to the theological reasons for his usage of dual anthropology in his theistic evolutionist system:

> If we pass from *philosophical* considerations to the *theological* hypothesis generally received today that Adam was constituted in the state of sanctity and justice from the first moment of his existence, then we may safely conclude that God would certainly have caused the virtuality existing in nature to produce a human

[31] Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 194 (italics his).

[32] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 92-93 (italics his).

> being with a fairly high mental development, without passing through the phases of inferior humanity supposed by Darwin and the evolutionists generally. If Adam was capable of sinning gravely, then he must have had the organism of a real *homo sapiens*. And it is quite conceivable that this required at least a special Divine Providence, and perhaps even a "special" Divine intervention, provided this term is not understood as excluding any collaboration by secondary causes, or again as introducing into the universe a being not intended and prepared for from the beginning of creation.[33]

Messenger's main point is clearly connected with the Christian doctrine of the Fall and, more specifically, with the Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin. In order to support these doctrines while keeping with evolution, Messenger emphasizes two ideas. One idea is that Adam's creation was definitively finalized with the infusion of soul into his body which had been prepared in the process of evolution. This event constituted Adam's "supernaturalization," an upward movement from beast to absolute perfection, whereby Adam was to become the only ancestor and progenitor of a holy human race. "It is certain," comments Messenger, "that a supernatural intervention was necessary in order that human nature in the person of Adam should be raised to the supernatural state of perfection from which it fell in consequence of Adam's sin."[34] Thus, Messenger concludes, the sin of Adam was a grave one because the record of Genesis shows him possessing "a well-formed intellect."[35]

The second idea of Messenger, which he calls upon to strengthen his reason for appealing to dual anthropology, is that there was only one man in whom God infused a "supernaturalizing" soul. Even if there existed other human-like beings before this man, as science seemed increasingly sure about,

---

[33] *Ibid*., 93 (italics his).

[34] *Ibid*., 96-97.

[35] *Ibid*., 98.

Messenger calls them "dust-man," non-human beings.[36] Eve herself was created after and from the "supernaturalized" Adam in order to signify "that *it was, so to speak, impossible, even for God, to bring into existence the spouse required for Adam, otherwise than by causing her to come from Adam*."[37] Adam was the only ancestor of the human race; if he fell from his supernatural order, the entire human race is fallen.

Commenting on Pius XII's criticism of ideas such as the gradual emergence of the soul and polygenism, Messenger is confident that

> it in no wise appears how such an opinion [polygenism] can be reconciled with those truths which the sources of Revelation and the acts of the Church's magisterium teach concerning original sin, which arises from sin really committed by the one Adam, and which has been transmitted to all by generation, and is present in each human being as something belonging to him.[38]

Indeed, dual anthropology allows Messenger's system to accept evolution up to the human body. Then, Messenger brings in the theological consideration of absolute perfection and holiness, wherefrom Adam fell into sin. A continuous upward development described by secular evolutionary scenarios would make both the Fall and original sin meaningless.

---

[36] *Ibid*., 115-116.

[37] *Ibid*., 256, 272-273 (italics his). Elsewhere, *ibid*., 95, he notes: "The transmission of the sin of Adam to all men, as taught by St. Paul in the New Testament (Romans v. 12 et seq., I Cor. XV.21 et seq.) has always been interpreted by tradition as a transmission by generation, and this interpretation has been defined as a dogma of faith by the Council of Trent (Session V, Can. 2 and 3). Moreover, the Church has always believed that all men, to whatsoever race they may belong, are subject to the original sin, precisely because they have descended from Adam by carnal generation; and further, that they have been redeemed by Christ, and need to be regenerated by baptism. It follows from this that St. Paul would have led the Church into error on a matter concerning the essential mission of the Church, if there were in existence men who, in point of fact, were not descended from Adam."

[38] Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 213.

Having salvaged the Fall, Messenger feels free to preserve intact the whole Christian theological system. As already noted, he describes the Fall as a historical event and takes sin as a universal state transmitted to the whole of humanity from Adam.[39] Elsewhere, he defines the Fall as Adam's "sin of disobedience, when he ate the forbidden fruit" and sin as "an offense against God, by any thought, word, deed, or omission against the Law of God," warning that sin can destroy the soul and condemn it to hell.[40]

This traditional description of the Fall makes Messenger remain within a sort of historical interpretation of the starting chapters of Genesis. The term "historical," however, means for Messenger keeping some of the elements of the creation-Fall story, such as the inbreathing of the soul into Adam's evolved body and the disobedient acts of Adam and Eve.[41] Christology is another point Messenger discusses. He subscribes to a sacrificial, substitutionary atonement of Christ. In the context of the mystical interpretation of the creation of Eve, Messenger notes that it deals with the relationship between the first Adam and the second Adam, "relations which belong to the very substance of the Christian doctrine."[42] These may be set forth as follows:

> God first of all created a holy human race, in the person of the first Adam; but this human race was contaminated in its origin by sin, so that from Adam there sprang a sinful race, instead of the holy race of which he should have been the source. But God, taking pity on the race of Adam, raised up a new Adam, who, by offering himself in sacrifice for the expiation of the disobedience

[39] See Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 95-96. Messenger states that, in contrast to God's initial intention for man to be a holy race, the Fall transformed man into a new species, a sinful race. See also, Messenger, *Two in One Flesh*, vol. 2, *The Mystery of Sex and Marriage in Catholic Theology*, 39-55, 223-224.

[40] Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 46, 8, respectively.

[41] See Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 6-7, 13-16.

[42] *Ibid*., 257.

> of the first Adam, satisfied the justice of God and became the sole source of a new holy race.[43]

In his *Know Your Faith*, Messenger gives evidence of a traditional Christology. Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man, incarnated for us[44] in order to "redeem us from sin and Hell." He "suffered to atone for our sins, and to purchase for us eternal life," "because His Precious Blood is the Price by which we were ransomed."[45] On the third day Christ was resurrected in body, thereby giving the Christian the assurance of final victory over death and symbolizing freedom from sin.[46] Then, Christ ascended to heaven where He provides a ministry both kingly and priestly in character.[47]

Messenger's eschatology comprises the discussion of death, judgment, hell, and heaven. A consistent dualist, Messenger views death as the separation of soul from the body as a consequence of sin, resulting in the death of the latter.[48] From another perspective, death is "the end of our earthly life," but not of all life. Rather, it is "the great change of transition, from a temporary and imperfect mode of existence to the fullness of our real and eternal life."[49] Judgment is of two kinds: particular, which takes place at death, and general, which takes place at the end of the world.[50] Hell and heaven are the places where the wicked or the saints, as respectively found in judgment, will be sent to spend their eternity.[51] Although Messenger attempts minor adjustments to his

---

[43]*Ibid.* Messenger notes that the sinful race propagated physically while the "new holy race" propagates spiritually. *Ibid*., 257-259.

[44]Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 48-52.

[45] *Ibid*., 54.

[46] *Ibid*., 57-58.

[47] *Ibid*., 58-59.

[48] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 95.

[49] Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 79.

[50] *Ibid*., 80-82, 84-87.

[51] *Ibid*., 87-90.

traditional theology, he remains within the framework of orthodoxy in the key doctrines of Christianity.

## NON-DUAL ANTHROPOLOGY THEISTIC EVOLUTIONIST SYSTEMS

This section describes the systems of the theistic evolutionists who do not appeal to dual anthropology in order to salvage traditional theology. These theologians are coming from across all Christian denominations, including Roman Catholics, such as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin[52] and John F. Haught.[53] But the vast majority of these theologians are coming from the Anglican community featuring such famous theologians as Aubrey Lackington Moore,[54] Frederick Temple,[55] and William Temple,[56]

---

[52] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) was both a Jesuit priest and a paleontologist. A standard biography on Teilhard is Mary Lukas's and Ellen Lukas's, *Teilhard: A Biography by Mary Lukas and Ellen Lukas*, new annotated ed. (New York: McGraw Book, 1981).

[53] John F. Haught (1942-) is currently Thomas Healey Distinguished Professor of theology at Georgetown University and Senior Fellow at Science and Religion Woodstock Theological Center. He has founded the Georgetown Center for the Study of Science and Religion (GCSSR) and has written many books in the area of dialogue between science and religion.

[54] A. L. Moore (1848-1890) was a liberal Anglo-Catholic Oxford lecturer and an Anglican priest. For more information on A. L. Moore's profile, see James R. Moore, *Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1979, 259-260.

[55] Arrived at the position of Archbishop of Canterbury from the Headmaster of the School of Rugby via the bishopric of Exeter and London, Frederick Temple (1821-1902) was a progressive Anglican theologian and church leader. He was among the first to promote the inclusion of natural sciences in the school curriculum. See Stephen Neil, *Anglicanism*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 274-275. For a biography of Frederick Temple, see Peter Hinchliff, *Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press), 1998.

[56] With studies in theology and philosophy at Oxford and active involvement in educational and political movements, William Temple (1881-1944) has been considered one of the most popular and influential archbishop of the contemporary Anglican Church. He was also one of the key persons and promoters of the Ecumenical movement. For a more detailed biography of

Arthur R. Peacocke,[57] Keith Ward,[58] and Ian Graeme Barbour.[59] Perhaps one of the best representatives of this group is John C. Polkinghorne, [60] "[o]ne of the greatest living writers and thinkers

William Temple, see F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948).

[57] Arthur Peacocke (1924-2006), ordained to priesthood in 1971, winner of the prestigious Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion and Le Conte Du Nouy Prize, was a Chaplain and Honorary Canon at Christ Church Cathedral in Oxford, organized the Society of Ordained Scientists, published numerous professional works and also science-religion interface books, worked as a professor at Oxford University for decades, was part of and worked as Vice President of the Science and Religion Forum and of Modern Church People's Union, Council Member of the European Society for the Study of Science And Theology. For an introduction to Peacocke, see "Arthur Peacocke," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Peacocke (29 November 2013).

[58] Keith Ward (1938-), a British philosopher and theologian, a fellow of the British Academy, is an ordained priest of the Anglican Church. He taught at or visited University St Andrews, University of London, King's College London, and Oxford, among others. For more information on Ward, see his personal website, "Keith Ward," http://www.keithward.org.uk/ (29 November 2013).

[59] Ian G. Barbour (1923-) has been acclaimed as the founder of the field of dialogue between Science and religion. Holding degrees in both science (physics) and religion, Barbour is Winifred and Atherton Bean Professor Emeritus of Science, Technology and Society at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota and has won the 1999 Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion. For a biography of Barbour, see "Ian Graeme Barbour," http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/june99/barbour_ bio.html (29 November 2013).

[60] The following introduction of John C. Polkinghorne (1930-) represents a general and sufficient portrait for the purpose of this research: ". . . a truly world-class scientist turned priest, currently one of two Revd FRS [Fellow of the Royal Society], and one of only 3 Revd KBEs [Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire] . . . a Fellow of the Royal Society, a Fellow (and former President) of Queens' College, Cambridge and a Canon Theologian of Liverpool Cathedral. . . . He was Chairman of the Science, Medicine and Technology Committee of the Church of England's Board of Social Responsibility, of the Advisory Committee on Genetic Testing (96-99) and of the publications committee of SPCK [Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge]. He chaired the joint working party on Cloning of the Human Genetics Advisory Commission and the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority. He served on the General Synod (90-00) and the Doctrine Commission (89-95) of the Church of England, and on the Medical Ethics Committee of the British Medical Association (89-98). . . . He was awarded the Templeton Prize for Science and Religion in 2002 and also in that year became the Founding President of the International Society for Science and Religion." Nicholas Beale, "Rev. Dr John Polkinghorne," http://www.starcourse.org/ (29 November 2013).

on science and religion"[61] and a dramatic preacher of a divinely ignited and supervised evolution. Indeed, fighting against a reductionist evolutionism[62] and simultaneously defending theism and evolutionism/theistic evolutionism,[63] Polkinghorne fuses theological eloquence with professional knowledge to call for revisions in theology.[64]

One such revision concerns the origin of the humans. To understand his anthropogenesis, a brief reconstruction of his view of evolutionary creation is helpful. God's creation, Polkinghorne suggests, occurred *ex nihilo* and developed along evolutionary lines. Out of His character of love, God self-limited himself in a kenotic act and offered the cosmos, not only humans, the freedom and the autonomy "to make itself."[65] This idea, Polkinghorne

---

[61] *Ibid*.

[62] See, e.g., his critique of reductionist biologists such as Richard Dawkins in John Polkinghorne, *Belief in God in an Age of Science*: *Terry Lecture Series* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1998), 11-12, 50, 78-80, 94. See also, John Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief: Theological Reflections of a Bottom-up Thinker* (London: SPCK, 1994), 28-29; John Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity: Questions to Science and Religion* (London: SPCK, 1994), 51-52, 59-60.

[63] Teism is a prominent, if not central, feature in Polkinghorne's focus on the science-theology interface. In Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 14, for instance, Polkinghorne agrees with Kingsley that God created the world to "make itself." Polkinghorne's term for theistic evolution would be *creation continua*. See Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 75-76.

[64] For instance, Polkinghorne calls theologians to use his "bottom-up" approach to revise traditional Christian doctrines. See, e.g., Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 90-91, 98. See more discussion on this in Polkinghorne's, *Science and Christian Belief*, 11-13. In his understanding, John Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk: Science and Religion in Dialogue* (Valley Forge: PA: Trinity, 1995), 63, it is more the duty of theology to correct its views in the light of science: "The need for consonance with the findings of science can be a healthy corrective for theology, whose persistent temptation is to indulge in ungrounded speculation."

[65] John C. Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality: The Relationship between Science and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1991), 102; Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 73-77. On the "kenosis" of God Polkinghorne states: ". . . God interacts with the world but is not in total control of all its process. The act of creation involves divine acceptance of the risk of the existence of the other, and there is a consequent kenosis of God's omnipotence. This curtailment of divine power is, of course, through self-limitation on his part and not through any intrinsic resistance in the creature. It arises from the logic of love, which requires the freedom of the beloved. . . . God remains omnipotent in the sense that he can do

declares, anticipating the naturally rising question, does not lead to deism because, in fact, God remains in the world, continuing to create it and care for it through the process *creatio continua*.[66] Besides the divine agency, the driving forces of this process are chance and necessity,[67] determined by the laws of the anthropic principle. The latter principle implies that the entire system is finely tuned towards crowning the evolutionary process with carbon-based and, at a later stage, self-conscious life.[68]

In this grand evolutionary perspective, it is no wonder that Polkinghorne views humans as emerging from animals.[69] His real concern lies with the emergence of the spiritual dimension of humans, which distinguishes them from the fauna. To solve this problem, he points out that humans could never have emerged in the short time the evolutionists allot to the process.[70] Thus, the only option remaining for him is the "existence of higher order organising principles, at work in the history of the world."[71]

---

whatever he wills, but it is not in accordance with his will and nature to insist on total control." In a similar way, God's omniscience is curtailed: God cannot know the detailed future simply because it has not occurred yet. Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 81. See also, Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 13; Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity*, 41-44; John C. Polkinghorne, "Kenotic Creation and Divine Action," chap. in *The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis*, ed. John Polkinghorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 94.

[66] Polkinghorne uses this concept very often in his writings. See, e.g., John C. Polkinghorne, *Science and Creation: The Search for Understanding* (London: SPCK, 1988), 54; Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 102; Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 75-80.

[67] In Polkinghorne's view, the concept of chaos does not imply an absolutely arbitrary and unpredictable course of the cosmos. See Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 1, 5-6, 10, 14, 19, 51-54, 60-66, 96-97; Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk*, 72-73; Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity*, 39-43.

[68] See Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk*, 68-72.

[69] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief,* 15-16.

[70] *Ibid*., 16-17; Polkinghorne, *Belief in God,* 94.

[71] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief,* 18; Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 94.

These organizing principles operated through a "continuous process"[72] in the animal world until it produced a developed creature with self-consciousness.

> Clearly consciousness is possessed by some of the higher animals but it seems likely that the further power of self-consciousness, with its concomitant ability to form expectations and plans for the future, only downed with the evolution of the hominid lines leading eventually to Homo sapiens [*sic*]. As that self-awareness developed, I suppose that a corresponding spiritual awareness of the presence of God also became part of the experience of these living beings.[73]

Elsewhere he states:

> That unconscious atoms combined to give rise to conscious beings is the most striking example known to us of the hierarchical fruitfulness of our universe, in which there is a nesting and ascending order of beings, corresponding to the transitions from physics to biology to psychology to anthropology to sociology.[74]

Polkinghorne explicitly rejects dual anthropology from his theistic evolutionist system and thus the possibility of a special creation and infusion of the soul. The "novelty," that is, the human spiritual dimension, in the process of evolution arises "not from the injection of something extra from the outside, but from the effects of greater complexity on the inside."[75] Humans, he asserts,

> are psychosomatic unities, indivisible animated bodies, and not a dual and separable combination of flesh and spirit. Such a view sits well with our experiences of the interdependence of mind and matter. . . . Needless to say, I cannot solve the problem of how brain and mind relate to each other, but I look for a solution along lines of a dual-aspect monism, a complementary account of matter in 'information'-bearing-pattern. . . . Such a stance takes

---

[72] Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity*, 52-53.

[73] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 89.

[74] *Ibid*., 50. See also, Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 99.

[75] Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity*, 53.

> our material constitution seriously but it does not capitulate to a reductionist materialism, for it asserts with equal vigour the existence of an irreducible mental pole in human nature.[76]

More than simply describing his own position, Polkinghorne emphasizes it by criticizing the dualistic solution to the human spirituality. First, he notes that the dualists have failed "to explain the relationship between these two varieties of experience," mind and matter. Secondly, the dualists cannot indicate the time of the creation and infusion of the soul, neither at individual nor at evolutionary levels. "Did the Australopithecines," Polkinghorne asks, "participate in the mental or did that have to await the arrival of, say, *homo erectus*?"[77] Thirdly, Polkinghorne gives his *coupe de grace*:

> It is, of course, a logical possibility that God allowed the physical world to evolve until it contained subsystems of a certain degree of complexity and then conjoined to those systems—either once for all in a transmittable way, or individually as each developed—a mental component that we call the soul. *If the mental and the physical are so separate, it is not clear why a high degree of complex physical is required before this happens*. There seems to be an implied restraint on the nature of the physical before it can be a fitting receptacle for the mental, which hints at a connection between the two, unexplained by the dualist theory.[78]

Polkinghorne's discussions on other theological perspectives shed more light upon his understanding of anthropogenesis and show how his theistic evolutionism determines his entire theological system. Apart from his modified picture of God— one

---

[76] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God,* 49-50. Polkinghorne returns to this theme at a later point, ibid., 55: ". . . God cannot interact with the psyche without also interacting with the physical process of the world, since we are embodied beings. There is no totally separate realm of spiritual encounter, divorced from the physical/mental reality of a dual-aspect monistic world, in which providence can act. God cannot touch our minds without, simultaneously and inextricably, in some way touching our brains as well." See also, Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 21, 24-25, 163-164.

[77] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief,* 19.

[78] *Ibid*. (italics added).

limited or self-limited in both power and knowledge [79] — Polkinghorne operates major changes in his understanding of the Fall, sin, and evil. In the first place, Polkinghorne does not dismiss the idea of the Fall: its effects are clearly evident in the human society. [80] What he cannot come to terms with is the biblical description of the way the Fall occurred:

> Yet we can no more believe that this [the sinful state of humanity] is the entail of a single disastrous ancestral act than we can believe that there was neither death nor thistle in the world before our forebears took that fatal step. It has long been understood that the powerful tale of Genesis 3 is to be understood mythically rather than literally. In part it portrays life as we now experience it, but that recognition does not remove the question of how these things came to be in God's supposedly good creation.[81]

In Polkinghorne's own view, the Fall occurred when, conscious of themselves and of God, humans chose to turn away from God towards themselves as self-sufficient beings. At what stage of the human evolutionary development did these events take place Polkinghorne—like his dual anthropology-theistic evolutionist colleagues whom he criticized for precisely the same—is ignorant, but the consequences of that "inversion upon the self" is "confirmed by the contemporary human condition."[82] Elsewhere,

---

[79] See Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 13-14. This point was presented above; see pp. 95-96 of this research.

[80] *Ibid.*, 88. Polkinghorne comments: "One recalls Reinhold Neibuhr's remark that original sin is the only empirically verifiable Christian doctrine! You have only to look around—or within—to see the slantedness of human nature, which frustrates human hopes and perverts human desires."

[81] *Ibid.* See also, Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk*, 63. In Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 99, he states: "How does this square with our knowledge that homo sapiens evolved from more primitive hominids, which themselves evolved from preceding animal life and ultimately from the inanimate shallow seas of early Earth, and that death was always present in the animal world? We detect no sign of a sharp discontinuity in the course of earthly or cosmic history, no indication of a golden age from which our present plight descends by degeneration." Of course, Polkinghorne takes the side of evolution.

[82] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 89. See also, Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 100.

Polkinghorne clarifies his understanding of the consequences of the Fall and its propagation in the human history:

> The consequence of that turning away from the divine presence would find embodiment in resulting cultural and social structures, thereby propagating from generation to generation an influence reinforcing the false assertion by the self of its autonomy.[83]

At this point, Polkinghorne's apprehension of evil and death helps one to better understand his view of the Fall. Death, including human death, Polkinghorne declares, is not a result of the Fall. Rather,

> There was death in the world long before there were our human precursors. After all, it was the extinction of the dinosaurs that gave us mammals our evolutionary chance. But the Fall, as I have described it, turned death into mortality. Self-consciousness made us aware of our transience—we could foresee our deaths—and alienation from the God who is the eternal ground for hope, turned that recognition into sadness and bitterness. In a similar way, the problems of living, symbolised by thorns and thistles, became causes of frustration and the expense of spirit.[84]

In order to solve the problem of evil, Polkinghorne postulates two forms of evil: the physical (cosmic and natural disaster) and the moral (human wickedness). Both of these evils emerged from the abuse of the freedom offered by God to the cosmos and to humans in his creation process.[85]

---

[83] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 15.

[84] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 89. See also, Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk*, 63: "death has always been the necessary price of new life."

[85] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 13-14, comments: "The apparently ambivalent tale of evolutionary advance and extinction, which Dawkins sees as the sign of meaningless world of genetic competition, is understood by the Christian as being the inescapably mixed consequence of a world allowed by its Creator to explore and realise, in its own way, its own inherent fruitfulness—to 'make itself.'" See also, John C. Polkinghorne, *Science and Providence: God's Interaction with the World* (London: SPCK, 1989), 65-66; Polkinghorne, *Serious Talk*, 74-75; Polkinghorne, *Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity*, 43-44; Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 99.

Consequently, there are two "Falls": of the physical cosmos and of the human. The cosmos, he asserts, is free to explore its future by itself and as such it

> must contain impermanence as the ground of change, death as the prerequisite of new life. Its blind alleys and malfunctions will produce what humans perceive as the physical evil of disease and disaster. In that sense the universe is everywhere 'fallen' and it has always been so. The goodness of creation, seven times reiterated in Genesis 1, is to be understood in terms of fruitful potentiality (the Anthropic principle) rather than initial perfection. Evolutionary cosmology is consonant with an Ireneaen picture of growth into fulfillment, rather than an Augustinian picture of decline from paradise. Once such a world evolves to the point of containing self-consciousness freely-choosing beings, it faces the possibility of a further 'fall' into moral evil, exemplified by lives of selfishness and rebellion. This, when it occurs, is then a new development in cosmic history, consequent on the new emergent of self-consciousness.[86]

Physical evil, thus, is treated as a component dimension of the evolving universe, only perceived as such at a later point in history by the emergent human in his "fall upward":

> Physical evil has always existed but it had not been perceived as evil until humanity's appearance (just as Paul said the sin was not recognised as sin before the experience of the Law made its nature manifest (Romans 5.13)). Thus we can understand that sin and 'death' (the recognition of mortality) came together with emergence of self-consciousness.[87]

Ultimately, Polkinghorne can go as far as to state that God himself is responsible for the whole drama of evil and even the Fall.[88]

This rather complex view of the Fall and sin has crucial implications for Polkinghorne's Christology, soteriology, and

---

[86] Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 99-100.

[87] *Ibid*., 100.

[88] *Ibid*.

eschatology. Thus, Christ was a historical person[89] and came into the world to eradicate the effect of the Fall, which is the alienation from God: "It is also the Christian understanding that the cross of Christ is the point of reconciliation, the way by which men can find their way back to God."[90]

The reconciliation follows the patristic principle "'what is not assumed is not redeemed.'" In order to break the chain of human lovelessness in way relevant to us, Jesus "had to be fully human and to enter a truly human experience." At the same time, "because what was sought was to release us from our alienation from God, God also had to participate in the deed. It was God who was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. Only in the God-man Jesus could human need and divine power find a meeting point."[91]

Then Polkinghorne asks the crucial question for Christology and soteriology: "Why is the culminating act of reconciliation a death? Why was not Jesus' life sufficient to reconcile us to God?" He answers: "Reconciliation involves forgiveness for the effects of the alienating forces which have been at work (for sin, as Christians say)." Forgiveness is a "costly business," due to the need of a "digestion of that hurt and the acceptance of those consequences." The "cost is not a punishment in which the forgiver exacts a shameful remorse from the one forgiven. It is a cost in which both share."[92]

---

[89] John C. Polkinghorne, *The Way the World Is: The Christian Perspective of a Scientist* (London: Triangle SPCK, 1983), 69-70. In Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 88-145, Polkinghorne discusses the historicity of Jesus in three consecutive chapters.

[90] Polkinghorne, *The Way the World Is*, 74-75. In a manner similar to Lewis, Polkinghorne does not miss the opportunity to mention evolution in his discussion of incarnation: "The incarnation must be at once continuous and discontinuous—discontinuous because it is a new act of God; continuous because it takes place within the evolving history of humanity." *Ibid*., 86.

[91] *Ibid*., 76.

[92] *Ibid*., 77.

Though this resembles somewhat the orthodox Christian Christology and soteriology, it becomes evident that Polkinghorne misses the substitutionary role of the death of Christ, which is foundational for these doctrines. In later writings, he excludes even such minor hints to substitutionary death from his discussion of Christology.[93]

Instead, Polkinghorne's emphasis falls on another aspect of Christology/soteriology/ eschatology: God's participation in the suffering of the world[94] and the establishment of the *eschaton* by the death and resurrection of Christ. Jesus did not come to give us extra advice in a difficult world, Polkinghorne states. "It is not advice that we need, but a transforming power to enable us to follow it." That power is the power of the new creation.[95]

Though this may sound perfectly orthodox theology, Polkinghorne's meaning of the new creation changes this impression. Explicitly leaning towards the Eastern Orthodox theology of *theosis*,[96] Polkinghorne sees in Christ's incarnation, death, and resurrection the beginning of that process. Here enters his eschatological speculation.

The end either by an infinite expansion or by an implosive collapse of the universe, Polkinghorne tells his readers, is imminent.[97] But, while any evolutionary scenario fails, Christianity offers this world a solid hope. This hope lies in the Christian

---

[93] Cf. Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 88-145; Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 30-44, 86.

[94] Polkinghorne, *The Way the World Is*, 73, explains: "What we are asked to consider is that in that totally isolated, totally helpless, figure hanging on the cross, we see God himself caught up and impaled on the contradictions of the strange world he has made. The Christian God is not a detached if a compassionate beholder of the sufferings of the world, he is a participant in them."

[95] *Ibid.*, 74.

[96] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 22-23; Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 167-168.

[97] Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 90; Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 162.

proclamation of resurrection, not in the survival of the soul.[98] Along with humans, the whole universe will be recreated; while the first creation was *ex nihilo* and was subject to evolutionary processes of a self-seeking meaning, the new creation will be *ex vetere* and will endure forever.[99]

This new approach in creation, Polkinghorne continues, was not possible with the old creation because that creation was created to be free, which implied, besides a degree of fruitfulness, frustrations and suffering.[100] Now, the old creation, in a mysterious way, "voluntarily returns" to God through the "Cosmic Christ" and, together with the living beings, will be taken to participate in deity. "The Eastern Orthodox notion that the ultimate destiny of the whole creation is *theosis* (deification) points us in a similar direction. One may say that panentheism is true as an eschatological fulfillment, not a present reality."[101] Thus, the new creation, becomes a panentheistic reality, and Polkinghorne's Christology and soteriology follow this line of thought.

## ROLE OF DUAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN THEISTIC EVOLUTIONISM

Having analyzed both dual anthropology theistic evolutionist and non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems, an

---

[98] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 162-164.

[99] *Ibid*., 167.

[100] *Ibid*. In a dramatic manner, Polkinghorne, *Belief in God*, 14, raises suffering at cosmic levels: "The cruciform pattern of life through death is the way the world is, not only in the familiar tale of biological life on Earth but also cosmically. We are here today because some five billion years ago a star died in the throes of a supernova explosion, scattering into the environment those chemical elements necessary for life, which it had made in the nuclear furnaces of its interior." Polkinghorne views resurrection as a new creation according to the informational pattern of humans preserved in the mind of God. See, e.g., John C. Polkinghorne, "Eschatological Credibility: Emergent and Teleological Processes," in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, ed. Ted Peters, Robert J. Russell, and Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 43-55.

[101] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 167-168.

evaluation and assessment of the role of dual anthropology in a general theistic evolutionist system is possible and necessary. The theistic evolutionist systems occur as a correlative factor in the confrontation between the established biblical-Christian theology and the new worldview provided by scientific evolutionism. As such, all the theistic evolutionist systems purport to both alleviate the assimilation of scientific worldviews into theology and, simultaneously, to salvage Christian theology from possible threats these worldviews might pose.

On its part, dual anthropology theistic evolutionist insists that its appeal to a dual anthropology is necessary and indispensable for the existence and functioning of a theistic evolutionist system.[102] In order to achieve its purpose, this system proposes the following scheme.

God created *ex nihilo* the initial matter and endowed it with potentiality for progressive development into new forms according to His plan. But this potentiality is limited by the impossibility of emergence of non-physical entities, such as moral self-consciousness and spiritual soul, out of the physical reality.[103] Consequently, in their anthropogenesis, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists allow that the body of the first human was produced by evolutionary processes under the supervision of God, while the human soul was directly created by God and infused into the evolved humanoid body.[104]

This strategy arises from two philosophical-theological considerations, directly connected to the role of dual anthropology for theistic evolutionist systems. The first proceeds from the perspective of a historically established dualistic ontology in Christianity, wherein the spirit is a substantial entity radically

---

[102] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 85.

[103] *Ibid.*, 13-16, 80-84;

[104] *Ibid.*, 87, 91-94, 116, 121-224, 226-239, 120, 224-225, 275-276; Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 194; Pope John Paul II, "Message to Pontifical Academy."

different from matter and not necessarily identical with mind.[105] For this reason, dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents cannot envision the human soul emerging within the material evolution. The human spirit thus must be originated only by a spiritual reality, which, in this case, is God.[106]

The second consideration deals rather with the broader Christian theological architecture. Given their sense of the destructive impact of evolutionism upon key Christian theological points such as theodicy, Christology, soteriology, and eschatology, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems propose to use dual anthropology as the connecting point between the two worldviews, Christian and evolutionary, simultaneously preserving both.[107]

In the obvious impossibility of reconciling the evolutionist "upward" and the Christian "downward" paths presented by the two opposing worldviews, dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems propose to appeal to dual anthropology. In this proposal, God led the process of evolution upwards to the formation of the

---

[105] See Benjamin D. Wiker, "Does Science Point to God? - Part II" [article on-line]; available from http://www.catholicculture.org/docs/doc_view.cfm?recnum=5415; Internet; accessed 28 April 2005. See also, Michael Ruse, "Belief in God in a Darwinian Age," in *The Cambridge Companion to Darwin*, ed. by Jonathan Hodge and Gregory Radick, Cambridge Companions to Philosophy (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 345.

[106] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 85-90; Messenger, *Know your Faith*, 19-23; Messenger, *Theology and Evolution,* 327-332.

[107] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 93; Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis: Concerning Some False Opinions Threatening to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine,* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_pxii_enc_12081950_humani-generis_en.html (5 July 2004), paragraphs 15-17, 29, 43; Pope John Paul II, "Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II," in Physics, Philosophy, and Theology: A Common Quest for Understanding, edited by Robert J. Russell, William R. Stoeger, and George V. Coyne (Vatican: Vatican Observatory, 1988), 115. Michael Ruse, "Belief in God in a Darwinian Age," in *The Cambridge Companion to Darwin*, ed. Jonathan Hodge and Gregory Radick, Cambridge Companions to Philosophy (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 345, notes that if the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists would not have distinguished the soul even from the mind, then they would not have any other device to resist a total surrender to Darwinist evolutionism.

human body. Then, God intervened directly and created a spiritual soul, the only matrix of morality and generator of immortality, thereby raising humanity to its utmost moral perfection and conditional immortality, an accomplishment impossible for physical-biological evolution. It was from that state that humanity fell into sin. The Fall established, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists feel free to present the biblical-Christian theological framework in a traditional manner.

Thus, it seems to the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists that the appeal to dual anthropology is the only way for a theistic evolutionist system to maintain the Fall and thus the elements of essential biblical-Christian Christological-soteriological structure as discussed above. One of these elements is a somewhat historical interpretation of the first chapters of Genesis. Even if dual anthropology theistic evolutionists generally regard Gen 1 and 2 as a theological myth, the immediate inbreathing of soul into the anthropoid body and the Fall provide a minimum biblical-historical foundation for the rising edifice of the biblical-Christian theology of Christ, salvation, and the new creation. Without these historical elements, the traditional view of the Bible would have been thrown into total havoc.

Coupled with this element, dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems claim to have the only theistic evolutionist possibility of avoiding and rejecting the theologically threatening polygenism by asserting that the creation of the human soul lifted to the absolute perfection and human dignity only a specific individual or a pair of human individuals while the rest of the humanoid creatures remained in the world of animals.[108] This devise strengthens the historicity of both Adam and his Fall, thereby fortifying the need for a historical Christ and His function as the second Adam and the sacrificial substitute for the first Adam.

---

[108] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 115-116; Messenger, *Theology and Evolution*, 213; Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, paragraph 37; Ruse, "Belief in God in a Darwinian Age," 345.

Man's sinfulness and mortality—another cornerstone theological element allegedly preserved in dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems—emerge from and characterize his fallen nature. The soul abused its freedom to rebel against God and man died. Death is the grave result of the Fall and human sinfulness and takes place by separation of the soul from the body, by which event the latter dies.[109] Having entered the world, sin affected the entire humanity throughout all times. It propelled itself by all means, both genetically, that is, physically, and spiritually. This dual anthropology theistic evolutionist idea of the universality of sin, then, appears somewhat closer to the biblical-Christian view, which views Christ as coming to lay down His life as an atoning sacrifice for the sin of humans and thus restore them.[110]

The dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents regard their appeal to dual anthropology as *crucial* for the task of theistic evolutionism to reconcile the evolutionary outlook of modern society with an authentic biblical Christianity. In their view, dual anthropology is the *only* way to maintain the core Christian theological structure of Fall-Christ-salvation, by lifting evolving man to an absolute state of moral perfection and of conditional immortality, wherefrom he fell into sin and death. But, in order to assess the veracity and efficacy of this claim for the role of dual anthropology in the broader theistic evolutionist systems, it must be verified. This can be done by comparing this device with the rest of the theistic evolutionist systems and by a critical assessment of this device in the light of a biblical-theological standard.

Like the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists, the non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents also endeavor to salvage Christian theology in a critical time. However, not seeing in evolution any threat for theology, they do not work to rescue

---

[109] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 95.

[110] *Ibid*., 257-259; Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 48-59; Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, par. 26.

theology *from* the potential threats of evolutionism. Rather, they fight to rescue Christian theology *through* evolutionism both from external threats and from internal, incoherent traditional Christian concepts. For instance, non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists see evolution rescuing the biblical concept of the divine immanence from a Deistic threat: God has continually been present in the world due to His manner of acting in it through the process of *creatio continua*.[111]

Another important biblical doctrine non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists think to have rescued through evolutionism is that of a unitary, monist nature of the human being. The non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists emphasize that modern biblical scholarship has successfully shown that dual anthropology had never been part of the biblical understanding and presentation of human nature. Evolutionism has helped challenge this Platonic concept, which had filtered into Christian theology and thus has supported the rescue of the truly biblical anthropology.[112]

Accepting evolution, non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists claim, helps them also correct aspects of traditional Christian eschatology. Thus, indeed, many non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems construct a doctrine of hell closer to the biblical concept. Instead of positing an eternally burning hell that awaits the souls of the wicked, they view hell as mostly the horror of the incurable sinners facing the eschatological annihilation of both body and soul. In addition, they correctly view the intermediate state of the dead not as a spiritual survival but as the preservation of the information of a particular human

---

[111] See, e. g., A. L. Moore, *Science and the Faith*, 184-185, quoted in J. R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies*, 263; A. L. Moore, "The Christian Doctrine of God," 73.

[112] See Ian G. Barbour, *Issues in Science and Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 361.

person in God's mind and resurrection as involving not only the body but both the body and the soul.[113]

Despite these corrective aspects, non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists present a more difficult problem in their approach to other foundational aspects of biblical anthropology and Christian theology. Notwithstanding J. R. Moore's intimation that the liberal non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists have defended Christian orthodoxy more successfully than the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists, the reality is that the former pay a huge and paradoxical cost for this defense.[114] In order to use evolution as a salvaging tool for Christian theology they trade away the latter's very core.

Lacking an instrument for lifting humanity to its absolute perfection and appealing to Irenaeus instead of Augustine for their view of evil and sin,[115] the non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists cannot postulate a fall into sin. The maximum they can allow for is a rather paradoxical "upward fall." Bernard Ramm catches successfully the nub of this non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist device:

> When man discovered conscience he did not feel guilty, but the very fact he could now feel guilty meant he had crawled up another step in the spiritual and moral development, and so it was an upward fall.[116]

---

[113] Polkinghorne, *Science and Christian Belief*, 162-164; William Temple, *Nature, Man, and God: Being the Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Glasgow in the Academic Year 1933-1933 and 1933-1934* (London: Macmillan, 1949), 454-460, 460-472.

[114] J. R. Moore, *Post-Darwinian Controversies*, 333-341.

[115] Polkinghorne, *Reason and Reality*, 99-100. For a brief introduction to Irenaeus's view, see Alister McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 229.

[116] Ramm feels irritated by this phrase hurled at the Christian orthodoxy by the liberal non-DA TEs. See Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 318. On this view of the Fall, see John Haught, *Responses to 101 Questions on God and Evolution* (New York: Paulist, 2001), 125-128; Keith Ward, *God, Faith, and the New Millennium: Christian Belief in*

This led the non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionists to radically change the rest of the foundational Christian theology, such as sin, Christ, salvation, and eschatology.

In order to keep the focus of this critical assessment on the role of dual anthropology in theistic evolutionist systems, this section avoids broader criticism, such as the inadequacy of the theory of evolution or of the theistic evolutionist systems for both scientific and theological reasons.[117] Instead, it elaborates only on those elements which relate to the appeal to dual anthropology in the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems.

The dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems have the burden of appealing to a biblically and theologically unfounded concept, dual anthropology. Though a refutation of dual anthropology is not the object of this study,[118] an increasing stream of theologians has shown this concept as both hermeneutically

---

*an Age of Science* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1998, 132-133; Ian Barbour, *Religion in an Age of Science* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1990), chap. 7.

[117] Many theologians who criticize TE generally do so in the spirit of William Jennings Bryan's dictum, "Theistic evolution is an anesthetic; it deadens the pain while Christian religion is being removed." William Jennings Bryan, *In His Image* (New York: Fleming H. Revell & Co, 1922), 127, quoted in Robert W. Cherny, *A Righteous Cause: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 173. George Gaylord Simpson represents the scientific community in showing theistic evolutionist systems inadequate from its point of view. Evaluating the efforts of LeCompte DuNouy, Edmund Sinnott, and Teilhard de Chardin to reconcile evolutionism with Christian theology, Simpson concludes: "Three great men and great souls, and all have flatly failed in their quest. It is unlikely that others can succeed where they did not, and surely I know of none who has. The attempt to build an evolutionary theory mingling mysticism and science has only tended to vitiate science. I strongly suspect that it has been equally damaging on the religious side, but here I am less qualified to judge." George Gaylord Simpson, *This View of Life* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964), 232, quoted in Paul A. Zimmerman, "Can We Accept Theistic Evolution?" in *A Symposium on Creation*, by Henry Morris et al (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968), 75.

[118] For anti-DA theologians, see, e.g., LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Conditionalist Faith of our Fathers: The Conflict of the Ages Over the Nature and Destiny of Man*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1965); Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? The Witness of the New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1958); Edward W. Fudge, *The Fire that Consumes* (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1994); Clark H. Pinnock, "The Conditional View," in *Four Views on Hell*, ed. William Crockett, 135-166 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.).

flawed and theologically threatening. [119] Several related observations of this broader discussion are especially important for the assessment of the appeal to dual anthropology in the theistic evolutionist systems, especially as this discussion is connected to the first reason of the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist appeal to dual anthropology, Christian traditional dualistic ontology.

A crucial point is that Gen 2:7, one of the foundational texts for the appeal to dual anthropology in dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems, does not in any sense intimate an "ensoulment" of a body, but rather describe the bringing of the human body to life. Even Erickson, a convinced promoter of dual anthropology, notes this problem in his criticism of theistic evolutionist systems:

> A second problem for the theistic evolutionist is the expression "and man became a living being" (Gen 2:7). The words translated "living being" are נפֶשׁ חיה (*nephesh chaiah)* which is the very expression used to denote the other creatures which God had earlier made (1:20, 21, 24). As we have seen, theistic evolution claims that the physical dimension of man developed from one of those earlier creatures. It follows that, like its progenitor, the physical dimension of man (which God infused with a soul) must necessarily already have been a living being. But this tenet of theistic evolution contradicts the statement in Genesis 2:7 that man *became* a living being when God formed him and breathed into him the breath of life.[120]

---

[119] These theologians charge that DA is rooted in Greek philosophy, not in biblical anthropology. See Froom, *The Conditionalist Faith*, 1:272-275, 930-978, 1073-1079; Cullmann, 8, 30-35; Cullmann, et al., *Immortality and Resurrection*; Fudge, *Fire that Consumes*, 6-7, 23-31; Pinnock, "The Conditional View," 148-149. Fudge, *Fire that Consumes*, 4, emphasizes that "ultimately the case against DA "rests on Scripture. Only Scripture can disprove it." Elsewhere, ibid., 209, he suggests that the problem with the DA understanding of the concept of the immortal soul, is a reversed order of its exegesis: "Traditionalists have often ignored the Old Testament, oversimplified the intertestamental material, and read the New Testament in the light of that misunderstanding. They have been strong in defense of biblical authority but weak in using the Bible."

[120] Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 483 (italics his).

Some critiques see still another inconsistence of the dual anthropology and its appeal in theistic evolutionist systems with the Bible. If the creation of Adam's body out of the dust of the earth meant in reality man's emergence out of the animal world, then, Adam's death should mean a return of man to the animal level, which is obviously untrue because God's judgment was expressed in terms of dissolution of the body.[121] Though the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists might consider this observation ridiculous by appealing to a mythological interpretation of the Genesis account, it evidently shows one of the many inconsistencies of the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist biblical interpretation.

Despite Erickson's note that difficulties inherent in the appeal to dual anthropology cannot disprove theistic evolutionist,[122] if dual anthropology is indeed an unbiblical concept, then, due to the key role given to dual anthropology in the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems—that of both facilitating the acceptance of the evolutionary worldview and keeping intact the essential biblical-Christian theology—dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems fail in their enterprise. They claim to save Christian essential orthodoxy with a device that is by itself unbiblical, thus placing the legitimacy of appealing to dual anthropology under a crushing question mark. From another angle, they attempt to save Christian essential orthodoxy and

---

[121] Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 483, notes: "The word *dust* . . . occurs not only in Genesis 2:7 but also in 3:19, 'You are dust, and to dust you shall return'. If we understand it in 2:7 to represent an already existing creature, we are faced with two choices: either the meaning of the term must be different in 3:19 (and in 3:14 as well), or we have the rather ludicrous situation that upon death one reverts to an animal. It should be noted that in those severe degenerative cases where a person becomes virtually subhuman, the change occurs prior to actual death. It would be better, then, to let the reference to dust in 3:19 (the clearer) interpret that in 2:7 (the less clear)." See also, Zimmerman, "Can We Accept Theistic Evolution?" 68-69, 71.

[122] Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 483, notes that one of the arguments "advanced against theistic evolution is that it militates against the unity of the human personality. But the unity between the physical and spiritual dimensions of man does not seem to be sufficiently absolute to disprove the theory that the two dimensions originated in different ways."

reconcile it to evolutionary science appealing to a philosophical concept rejected by the latter.

Other writers, though building on these fundamental observations concerning the incompatibility of the Bible and evolution, evaluate the theistic evolutionist systems from a broader theological perspective, namely, starting from the discussion on the nature of God or theodicy. In his PhD dissertation, for instance, Marco T. Terreros argues that "the concept of death before sin cannot be incorporated within the evangelical theology without altering the soundness and theological integrity of the system."[123]

The dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents fail in their endeavor to solve human mortality in relation to the Fall, which is as important as the issue of human morality. In agreement with Christian traditional dual anthropology, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist proponents view death as the separation of soul from the body resulting from the sin committed by the "supernaturalized" human, namely, the evolved anthropoid body infused with the spiritual immortal soul.[124] This dual anthropology theistic evolutionist definition of death appears successful only at first sight; a closer analysis reveals at least two essential problems of this approach.

The first is related to the ecological environment of the first human couple which constitutes the background of the second

[123] Marco T. Terreros, "Death before the Sin of Adam: A Fundamental Concept in Theistic Evolution and Its Implications for Evangelical Theology" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1994), quoted from the abstract. It is interesting to note that Michael Anthony Corey, "Evolution and the Problem of Natural Evil: A Theological Response to Evolution-generated Pain and Suffering that Seeks to Preserve the Divine Goodness through the Use of a Deistic Interpretation of Modern Neo-Darwinism" (Ph.D. diss., The Union Institute, Cincinnati, OH, 1996), argues to the contrary on the same issue. He concludes that "the natural evil that is generated by evolution is indeed fully consistent with the existence of a perfectly good and all-powerful God" because "this type of natural evil is ultimately "good" in an instrumental sense." *Ibid*., quoted from the abstract.

[124] Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 79; Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 95.

problem. Even if one would accept the solution of the immortal soul in order to solve the problem of human absolute perfection and conditional immortality before the Fall, [125] the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists are not able to solve the problem of natural evil and animal death before the Fall. Such Bible passages as Gen 3:14-19 and Rom 8:19-22 give evidence that these natural evils occurred precisely as a *consequence* of man's Fall and had not preceded it.

Arguing against the idea that evil and death preceded the Fall, Richard M. Davidson highlights several crucial points: (1) Gen 1 emphatically characterizes God's creation was good; (2) the vegetarian diet of both animals and humans rules out pre-Fall predation; (3) Gen 2:4b-6 indicates that the world was not affected by anything not good; (4) Gen 3 presents death as an accident and a surprise; (5) the fact that the ante-deluvian world was condemned precisely for an exceedingly high level of violence rules out the existence of violence in God's initial creation; (6) prophecies such as Isa 11:6-9; 25:8; 65:17; 66:22; Hos 13:14; Rev 1:18; 20:14; 21:1 promise a restoration of the pre-Fall world, wherein death and evil were obviously absent.[126]

The second major problem with the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist attempt to solve the problem of the Fall and death by means of appealing to dual anthropology relates precisely to human death in connection with the Fall. The crucial issue here is that the Bible clearly presents death as a *consequence* of the Fall: death entered the world through sin (Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 15:21).[127] But

---

[125] Zimmerman, "Can We Accept Theistic Evolution?" 70-74.

[126] Richard M. Davidson, "The Biblical Account of Origins," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14 (2003): 38-43. Davidson follows closely the work of Jacques Doukhan, "Where Did Death Come From? A Study in the Genesis Creation Story," *Adventist Perspectives* 4: (1990): 16-18. See also, Marco T. Terreros, "Is All Death a Consequence of Sin? Theological Implications of Alternative Models," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14 (2003): 163-167, 172.

[127] See also, Zimmerman, "Can We Accept Theistic Evolution?" 70-74. Commenting on Rom 5:12, Terreros, "Is All Death a Consequence of Sin?" 167, highlights that "Paul says that death reigned *from* the time of Adam, not before" (italics his).

death can only be a consequence of the Fall if man was enjoying immortality, albeit conditional, before the Fall. This death can be understood as either including the physical body or being a "spiritual" death only. If one follows the first choice, one could speculate, on dual anthropology theistic evolutionist premises, that man started to share in the immortality of the soul at the "supernaturalization" (infusion), though this is not explicitly affirmed by its proponents.[128] However, even in such a case, the Bible should say, not that death *entered* the world through sin, but rather that death *returned* to man, *affected* him or *stayed* with him, the possibility of avoiding it lying in avoiding sinning.

On the other hand, if the death resulting from sin is presented merely as a "spiritual death," while man was never meant to be physically immortal, then we clash with the biblical information on physical death as consequence of sin: "for dust you are and to dust you will return" (Gen 3:19, NIV). The death presented by the Bible as the consequence of the Fall is in no case "anything less than physical death."[129] The literary arrangement of the stories of Adam's Fall and the curse that came upon him, Cain's murder of Abel, and the patriarchs' deaths in a progressive and united string presented in Gen 2-5 emphasize that the death which came as consequence of the Fall was a physical one. Key NT passages such as 1 Cor 15:21-22 and Rom 5:12-19, too, indicate that Adam's physical death was a penalty for his sin.

Closely associated with these ideas is a theological observation on the idea of "supernaturalization" of the pre-humans. The "supernaturalization," which elevated the body of the pre-human to both humanity and immortality, was not produced by the mere union of an immortal soul with the mortal body. Otherwise this

---

[128] The dual anthropology theistic evolutionists seem to imply that the physical death was inherited by the human body from the animal world and thus contrasted to the immortal soul. Cf., Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 86-87, 95; Messenger, *Know Your Faith*, 19-23, 46, 79.

[129] Nigel M. De S. Cameron, *Evolution and Authority of the Bible* (Exeter, GB: Paternoster, 1983), 52. See also Terreros, "Is All Death a Consequence of Sin?" 161.

phenomenon would still be replicating itself in post-Fall humans. The immortality of this supernatural entity, the soul, then, does not explain the conditional immortality conferred to Adam. A particular sanctifying quality of the immortal soul is needed for that.[130] This makes the necessity for such a supernatural entity problematic.

Related to these theological observations is the question of God's dealing with the human body, both at creation and in the end, a problem that the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists share with their non-dual anthropology counterparts. All the theistic evolutionist systems depict a God who slowly evolved the body, but they do not use the same age-long process for the body's resurrection. In other words, these systems fail to explain why there was no need for a special intervention on the part of God in the formation of the human body, while there is a need for His direct, instantaneous intervention for its resurrection.

All these observations reveal that dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems do not solve the problem of the Fall and death as its consequence—the crux of the core of Christian theology—as they claim to, by appealing to dual anthropology. In this case, dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems (as also do the rest of theistic evolutionist systems) fall at the Fall.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that the role of the appeal to dual anthropology as designed by the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems arises from the traditional Christian ontology and targets most forthrightly the preservation of the core of biblical-Christian theology, theodicy (hamartology), Christology, soteriology, and eschatology. The assessment of this appeal shows that this device, while not *absolutely* essential to theistic evolutionist models, represents their best hope for reconciling

[130] Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, 95, stipulates that this quality is sanctifying grace, lost by the soul as a consequence of the Fall.

evolutionism with Christian theology. From this perspective, the dual anthropology theologians are more vulnerable to accepting a theistic evolutionist system and, vice-versa, the Christians who would like to embrace a more viable theistic evolutionist system would do so best by embracing dual anthropology.

However, dual anthropology has received sustained legitimate criticism both from other theistic evolutionist proponents and from non-theistic evolutionist critics. Thus, despite the apparent theological success of the appeal to dual anthropology among the rest of the theistic evolutionist systems, a biblical-theological critique of it shows its inadequacies. The appeal to dual anthropology fails to solve the tension between its description of pre-Fall death and the biblical insistence that death is the consequence of the Fall. Thus, this appeal fails to preserve the biblical concept of the Fall itself, the cornerstone of the core Christian theology.

In this situation, the theistic evolutionist systems face a dilemma. On one hand, while returning to a more adequate biblical anthropology and (in a limited way) eschatology, by its emergentist approach, the non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist models have been forced by the same emergentist approach to explicitly revise the doctrine of the Fall and sin, thereby undermining the core biblical doctrine of Christ and salvation. On the other hand, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems, while claiming to rescue what non-dual anthropology theistic evolutionist systems undermine, especially the Fall, fail at this very endeavor. In addition, the dual anthropology theistic evolutionists propose to salvage the core Christian doctrines of sin, Christ, salvation and eschatology by appealing to an unbiblical philosophical concept. Seemingly, then, in opting for a theistic evolutionist system, one faces the choice between (1) holding a biblical anthropology but abandoning the core of the biblical-Christian doctrines of sin-Christ-salvation for the sake of the modern-philosophical concept of evolutionary emergentism and (2) appealing to the unbiblical Platonic philosophical concept of dual anthropology in an anyway-failed

attempt to preserve that core. This situation, however, appears more as an impasse than a choice.

The relationship of the theistic evolutionist systems with science offers another perspective to the problem. Theistic evolutionism claims to reconcile science and Christian theology. However, according to the present research, in order to embrace a theologically viable theistic evolutionist system, one has to appeal to dual anthropology or, at least, admit a special divine intervention. But in this way, paradoxically, such a theistic evolutionist partisan would succeed in his endeavor in that he accepts the scientific concept of evolution, but, at the same time, by appealing to dual anthropology, he would push further away modern scientists, who are essentially monistic.

Ultimately, this study establishes two conclusions. First, the appeal to dual anthropology does not solve the persistent problems of theistic evolutionist systems, in spite of seemingly providing the best theistic evolutionist alternative for preserving Christian theology. Second, unrelenting and irremediable internal incoherencies plague all theistic evolutionist systems and the theistic evolutionist approach as a whole. This prevents any of them individually and the theistic evolutionist approach as a whole from representing a viable model of reconciliation between the scientific evolutionary worldview and the biblical doctrine of creation.