

## Reconciling Darwin's Evolution with Aquinas' Concept of Man as *Creatio Imago Trinitatis*

Reuel Rito N. Seño

Theology and Religious Education Department, De La Salle University  
reuel.seno@dlsu.edu.ph

**Abstract:** Richard Dawkin's *The God Delusion*, Victor Stenger's *God: The Failed Hypothesis*, Robert Winston's *The Story of God*. What do these works of scientists have in common? They are one in accusing Christianity of being a spirituality that goes against science. A perfect example would be the issue of contradiction between Darwin's Evolution on the one hand and the biblical Concept of Man as *Creatio Imago Dei* on the other hand.

This paper clarifies that while there seems to be an obvious contradiction between scientific evolution and biblical creation, Catholic spirituality is open to reconciling these two. This is made possible by using the anthropology of Thomas Aquinas. This work is divided into four parts: (1) The rigid literal hermeneutics of the Protestants; (2) The loose spiritual hermeneutics of the liberals (e.g. Gay bible); (3) The balanced hermeneutics of Aquinas that does justice both to the biblical text and to external science. (4) The Holy Trinity as a means to reconcile both creation and evolution.

It is hoped that far from degrading man into a monkey, the paper will help us discover the wisdom of God in creating beautiful human beings that have evolved through the ages.

**Key Words:** Creation, Evolution, Thomas Aquinas, Trinity

### 1. INTRODUCTION

*"Truth cannot contradict truth"* – St. John Paul II

Richard Dawkins, an English biologist, in his book *God Delusion* says that "a supernatural creator almost certainly does not exist and could never have existed because the belief in a personal god qualifies as a delusion, by which he defines as "a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence". (Dawkins, 2006)

Victor Stenger, American scientist in his book *God: The Failed Hypothesis* argues that "there is no evidence for the existence of a supreme being and that such an existence while not impossible, is improbable". There is great scientific evidence from cosmology or the study of the cosmos under the auspices of particle physics and quantum

mechanics showing us that "the universe has existed and will exist without the need to posit for the existence of a creator." (Stenger, 2007)

English scientist, Robert Winston, in his so-called groundbreaking book *The Story of God*, examines the understanding of worship through the ages as far as the primitive worship of our ancestors are concerned, its gradual development up to our modern times and concludes where this worship of a supreme deity will lead people today, especially how it may speak much about their faith and even the faith of generations to come. (Winston, 2006)

What do these thinkers and scientists have in common? What is that train of thought that runs through their writings that can best describe this

so-called never ending conflict between faith and reason, between science and religion, and ultimately between evolution and creation? They are one in accusing Christianity of being a spirituality that goes against science, a mindset or way of thinking that is necessarily not without its contradictions and anomalies.

The issue of that this paper would like to delve into is the so-called “contradiction between evolution and creation”, that is, Darwin’s Evolution on the one hand and the biblical Concept of Man as *Creatio Imago Dei*, created in the image of God, on the other hand.

This paper will clarify that while there seems to be an obvious contradiction between scientific evolution and biblical creation, Catholic spirituality is open to reconciling these two. Catholic spirituality is so beautifully characterized by catholicity, from the Greek word *katholikos*, which means “universal” that it is open to possibilities that are typically unheard of and even contradictory, that it can reconcile two concepts however conflicting, contradictory they maybe. This is made possible by using the anthropology of Thomas Aquinas, on how the human person is not only created in the image and likeness of God but that through the concept of *creatio imago trinitatis*, created in the image of the Holy Trinity, there is really no contradiction between truth and another truth, between science and religion, between evolution and creation.

## 2. THE RIGID LITERAL HERMENEUTICS OF THE PROTESTANTS

“Biblical literalism” is a term used differently by different authors concerning biblical interpretation. It can be equated to the dictionary definition of literalism: "adherence to the exact letter or the literal sense (Accessed from Biblical Literalism:[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblical\\_literalism#cite\\_note-literalism-1](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblical_literalism#cite_note-literalism-1)).

“Biblical literalism” is a term used differently by different authors concerning biblical interpretation. It can equate to the dictionary definition of literalism: "adherence to the exact letter or the literal sense", where literal means "in accordance with, involving, or being the primary or strict meaning of the word or words; not figurative

or metaphorical". This approach often obscures the literary aspects and consequently the primary meaning of the text (Ramm, 1980).

This Christian fundamentalist and evangelical hermeneutical approach to scripture is used extensively by fundamentalist Christians, in contrast to the historical-critical method of mainstream Christianity. Those who relate biblical literalism to the historical-grammatical method use the word "letterism" to cover interpreting the Bible according to the dictionary definition of literalism.

In the book Protestant Biblical Interpretation, Bernard Ramm, a Baptist theologian and apologist within the broad Evangelical tradition said that “only in the priority of literal exegesis is there control on the exegetical abuse of Scripture. By the “exegetical abuse of Scripture” we mean all interpretation in the history of the Church and in the histories of cults which forces strange and unbiblical meanings into Scripture by some form of allegorical interpretation (meaning by the “allegorical” any kind of reading into Scripture secondary or tertiary or even quaternary meanings). In the history of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture it is not denied that there is a literal, historical, or grammatical sense to Scripture, but it is depreciated. It is the “fleshly” or the “superficial” understanding of Scripture. However in making such a value judgment the allegorists are generally blind as to how much literal interpretation they actually employ to get their own allegorical program moving” (Ramm, 1980).

The main burden of doctrinal teaching must rest on the literal interpretation of the Bible. In our treatment of general hermeneutics we maintained that the literal meaning of the Bible was the first and controlling principle for the understanding of the Bible. This principle is to be carried over into doctrinal interpretation” (Ramm, 1980).

## 3. THE LOOSE SPIRITUAL HERMENEUTICS OF THE LIBERALS

The so-called loose spiritual hermeneutics of the liberals has its origins in liberal Christianity, also known as liberal theology, covers diverse philosophically and biblically informed religious

movements and ideas within Christianity from the late 18th century onward. Liberal does not refer to Progressive Christianity or to a political philosophy but to the philosophical and religious thought that developed as a consequence of the Enlightenment. (Accessed from Wikipedia on Liberal Christianity: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal\\_Christianity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Christianity))

Liberal Christianity, broadly speaking, is a method of biblical hermeneutics, an undogmatic method of understanding God through the use of scripture by applying the same modern hermeneutics used to understand any ancient writings. Liberal Christianity did not originate as a belief structure, and as such was not dependent upon any Church dogma or creedal statements. Unlike conservative varieties of Christianity, liberalism has no unified set of propositional beliefs. Instead, "liberalism" from its inception embraced the methodologies of the Enlightenment as the basis for interpreting the Bible, life, faith and theology. (Accessed from Wikipedia on Liberal Christianity: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal\\_Christianity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Christianity))

The word "liberal" in liberal Christianity originally denoted a characteristic willingness to interpret scripture according to modern philosophic perspectives (hence the parallel term modernism) and modern scientific assumptions, while attempting to achieve the "Enlightenment ideal" of objective point of view, without preconceived notions of the authority of scripture or the correctness of Church dogma. Liberal Christians may hold certain beliefs in common with Catholic Christianity, Orthodox Christianity, or even Christian fundamentalism. (Accessed from Wikipedia the free Encyclopaedia on Liberal Christianity: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal\\_Christianity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Christianity))

The theology of liberal Christianity was prominent in the Biblical criticism of the 19th and 20th centuries. The style of Scriptural hermeneutics (interpretation of the Bible) within liberal theology is often characterized as non-propositional. This means that the Bible is not considered a collection of factual statements, but instead an anthology that documents the human authors' beliefs and feelings about God at the time of its writing—within a historical or cultural context. Thus, liberal Christian theologians do not claim to discover truth propositions but rather create religious models and concepts that reflect

the class, gender, social, and political contexts from which they emerge. Liberal Christianity looks upon the Bible as a collection of narratives that explain, epitomize, or symbolize the essence and significance of Christian understanding. (Accessed from Wikipedia the free Encyclopaedia on Liberal Christianity: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal\\_Christianity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Christianity))

Let us take for example "The Queen James Bible", also known as the Gay Bible, which is a new assault on Biblical orthodoxy and sexual purity. In it, the 1769 King James Bible has been reproduced with only a very few select verses altered especially the ones that relate to homosexuality. The Queen James Bible is a perversion of the original text and is the result of obvious prejudices against the original Hebrew and Greek texts in order to make homosexual practices appear acceptable. (Saraceno, May 5, 2016, Accessed from Catholic Endtime Truths on Queen James Bible: <http://catholicendtimetruths.com/queen-james-bible-gay-bible/05/05/2016>).

#### 4. THE BALANCED HERMENEUTICS OF THOMAS AQUINAS

The balanced hermeneutics of Aquinas does justice both to the biblical text and to external science in the same way that Catholic Biblical Interpretation is a middle-ground between the biblical literalism on one hand and the loose liberal hermeneutics on the other hand.

Peter Kreeft, a professor of philosophy at Boston College and The King's College; author of numerous books as well as a popular writer of Christian philosophy, theology and apologetics said in his book, *The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*: "Human brains arrived in the universe by evolution, you say. Yes, and I think Aquinas would say that evolution is an excellent example of cosmic design, evidence for God. He'd say the arrow of evolution flies to the target of human brains only because it's guided by the intelligence of a divine archer. Aquinas would not be among the anti-Darwinian fundamentalists today. I think if he saw the atheist bumper sticker of the Christian fish with the word Darwin in it, he would not understand the intended irony; he would interpret it as an argument for theism (Kreeft, 2009).

Does evolution contradict what Aquinas means by creation? According to Kreeft, “Clearly not, because the two ideas answer two very different questions: how did human biological life begin, and how did matter begin? Matter cannot evolve into man until it first exists, and evolution says nothing about that. Also, evolution says nothing about the existence of human soul. Souls leave no fossils. So a direct divine creation of the human soul and biological evolution of the human body are quite compatible (Kreeft, 2009).

Thomas Aquinas solved most questions by making distinctions, and that’s surely what he would have done here. He would also distinguish the question of the material cause from the final cause, and he’d reject the evolutionists’ claim that evolution took place by chance, without a final cause or design; and he’d say that’s not a scientific question, but a philosophical and theological question. Design isn’t something science can empirically observe and mathematically measure. The current controversy between evolution by mere chance and intelligent design isn’t a scientific question, but a philosophical question, it is also not a religious question and I think Aquinas would criticize both sides for confusing these three kinds of questions” (Kreeft, 2009).

Aquinas would have no theological difficulties with evolution and this can be answered through the concept of how divine providence work. So, how does divine providence work? Aquinas answers this question by using the principle that “grace perfects nature”. Like a good manager, God governs the world by His subordinates. Aquinas says: “Since things which are governed should be brought to perfection by government, this government will be so much the better in the degree that the things governed are brought to perfection. And it is a greater perfection for a thing to be good in itself and also the cause of goodness in others than only to be good in itself. Therefore God so governs things that He makes some of them to be causes of others in government; as a master, who not only imparts knowledge to his pupils but also gives them the power of teaching others.” Thus, this is the most basic reason why Aquinas would have no theological difficulties with evolution. In fact, he would see the use of natural forces such as “natural selection” as showing more perfection in God than special creation of each species by miracle. Miracles happen, but rarely.

Providence differs from miracle mainly by its use of “second causes,” or natural rather than supernatural forces. Aquinas is very much opposed to the rather popular religious idea, associated with fundamentalism, that there is some sort of rivalry between God and the world (Kreeft, 2009).

He writes: “Some have understood God to work in every agent in such a way that no created power has any effect in things, but that God alone is the immediate cause of everything done. But this is impossible. First, because the order of cause and effect would be taken away from created things, and this would imply lack of power in the Creator, for it is due to the power of the cause that it bestows active power on its effect. Second, because the active powers which are seen to exist in things would be bestowed on things to no purpose if these powers really accomplished nothing through them.” (Kreeft, 2009).

In his address to the plenary session of the pontifical academy of the sciences, Pope Francis says that “You are addressing the highly complex subject of the evolution of the concept of nature. I will not go into the scientific complexity, which you well understand, of this important and crucial question. I only want to underline that God and Christ are walking with us and are also present in nature, as the Apostle Paul stated in his discourse at the Areopagus: “In him we live and move and have our being” (Acts 17:28). When we read the account of Creation in Genesis we risk imagining that God was a magician, complete with an all powerful magic wand. But that was not so. He created beings and he let them develop according to the internal laws with which He endowed each one, that they might develop, and reach their fullness. He gave autonomy to the beings of the universe at the same time in which He assured them of his continual presence, giving life to every reality. And thus Creation has been progressing for centuries and centuries, millennia and millennia, until becoming as we know it today, precisely because God is not a demiurge or a magician, but the Creator who gives life to all beings. The beginning of the world was not a work of chaos that owes its origin to another, but derives directly from a supreme Principle who creates out of love. The Big Bang theory, which is proposed today as the origin of the world, does not contradict the intervention of a divine creator but depends on it. Evolution in nature does not conflict with the notion of Creation,

because evolution presupposes the creation of beings who evolve (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008).

Christoph Cardinal Schonborn, in "Creation and Evolution" says that "the possibility that the Creator also makes us of the instrument of evolution is admissible for the Catholic faith. The question, though is, whether evolutionism is compatible with the belief in a creator. This question presupposes, again, that a distinction is made between the scientific theory of evolution and the ideological or philosophical presuppositions of the entire evolution debate. Can concordism be tenable? Schonborn said that it is untenable. Concordism an opinion that is widespread nowadays, claims that theology and the theory of evolution can never come into conflict, because the two disciplines move about in two completely separate realms. There must be intersections between theology and the natural sciences, between believing, thinking and investigating" (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 92).

Belief in a Creator, in his plan, his "rule over the earth", his guidance of the world to a destination set by him, cannot remain without points of contact with the concrete exploration of the world. Therefore it is true that not every variation on the theory of evolution is consistent with faith in creation (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 92).

The thesis that the interplay between genetic mutation and natural selection is a sufficient explanation for the development of new forms of life is an acceptable supposition. For if mutation and selection are sufficient to explain this development, there is actually no reason why blind matter could not be the first origin of life – a thesis that is incompatible with the Christian doctrine of creation (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 93).

Alfred North Whitehead's iconic remark about those Darwinists who rejected any and all purposefulness in nature is well known: those who devote themselves to the purpose of proving that there is no purpose, constitute an interesting subject for study" (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 95).

A human being experiences himself as someone who sets purposes and goals. Human activity is quite unthinkable in any other way than as goal-oriented activity. There is practically no example of activity that is more goal-oriented than

scientific activity, and especially work in the natural sciences (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 95). "What we can in fact see and observe in nature are not plans or an intention, but at most the product thereof. We see teleology, goal-oriented activities, and an ordering of nature that is purposeful and also beautiful (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 96).

Does "nature" act as though she had goals? Is a very good question to ask in the face of so-called randomness of the universe. Is there really purpose in everything on earth and under the heavens? St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Quinque Viae*, Five ways of proving the existence of God, specifically the fifth of his "proofs of God's existence", has pointed out an intellectual path in this regard that leads farther. "Natural bodies, which have no intelligence themselves, act as we can see, in a goal-oriented manner to attain what is good for them. They achieve their end, not by chance, but intentionally. But they achieve it, not by their own intention, for they have no intelligence, but rather through an intellect that directs them toward their end, as the archer directs his arrow. We call this intellect, which directs all natural things to their end God (ST I q.2, art.3).

There is a fascinating passage from St. Thomas that very vividly makes clear how the working of "God the Creator" can be conceptualized, how He "establishes" nature's finality for her and in her. The passage is especially helpful inasmuch as it compares nature to art, or technology (for one can translate *ars* in this way). "Nature is distinguished from art/technology only in the fact that nature is an internal principle of causality, while art/technology is an external principle." In order to explain the "internal principle" nature, Thomas uses a comparison: "If the art of shipbuilding were immanent to wood, then the nature of wood would produce the ship, as normally happens through the art." And somewhat later in the passage Thomas clarifies once again: "Nature is nothing other than the plan of a certain art/technology, namely, of God's art, which is placed in things and through which the things themselves are directed toward their definite end. And again Thomas illustrates this with the metaphor of shipbuilding: "It is as though the builder of a ship could impart to the pieces of wood the ability to move by themselves so as to produce the form of the ship" (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 97) (CF In Physic. Lib. 2, I. 14, no.8).

Martin Rhonheimer, a Swiss academic philosopher and a priest of the Catholic personal prelature Opus Dei comments: "Nature behaves purposefully (as though she were acting intelligently and according to a plan), but since no intelligent and intentional efficient causes can be discerned in nature herself, this intelligent cause must be found outside of nature". (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 98)

Just as the ship leads to the question, "Who built that?" so too the manifest experience of purposefulness, order, and beauty in nature leads to the question, "Where do these things come from?" The theory of evolution with its scientific method cannot give an answer; it can only investigate those causes at work in nature that can be identified empirically. "Therefore the theory cannot claim, either, that the theory of evolution proves that there is no designing God, whose mind is the cause of nature and of its evolution." (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 98) (CF Rhonheimer, Pro Manuscripto, 11).

The deliberate restriction of one's way of observing to what is quantifiable, computable, and measurable, to material conditions and correlations, has made possible the enormous achievements of the natural sciences. But it would be extremely problematic if someone tried to declare everything that is thereby methodologically excluded from consideration to be simply nonexistent – starting with the reason and free will that make this methodological choice possible in the first place (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 98-99).

It is true: the genetic code of the human being is only very slightly different from that of the chimpanzee. Yet only the human being can arrive at the idea of investigating his genetic code and that of the chimpanzee as well! (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 99).

Darwin's famous work is entitled *The Origin of Species*. But are there such things as species in the first place? Can a purely quantitative method grasp them? Is there any place at all in evolutionary theory for them? Is not everything we call species just a momentary snapshot of the wide river of evolution? Are not concepts such as species, genera, kingdoms just nomina or mere words without a reality corresponding to them? By the eyes of the mind grasp very well the fact that there

is a species called "cat". (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 99).

The need to rely on the "eyes of the mind" becomes even clearer when we deal with a question that today is dismissed in many quarters as "unscientific" because it is ultimately a metaphysical question lying beyond what is purely material: the question about the substantial form. What about this substantial form that begs for answers? "Whereas common sense thinks that things like trees or elephants are precisely things, independent beings that are more than the mere sum of their material components, the materialistic theory of evolution reduces them to mere epiphenomenal fluctuations of matter, which thus becomes the sole and ultimate substantial reality within the cosmos. (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 100) In the final reckoning then, there would be no trees and no elephants, but only transient aggregates of material qualities" to which we assign these names. (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 101) Therefore one priority in overcoming the materialistic view of evolutionism is regaining the concept of form.

The great Swiss zoologist Adolf Portmann particularly emphasized the point of the concept of "form" in his critique of Darwinism. Every living thing manifests itself as a form, as an expression of an interiority that is more than its material components. Although detailed biochemical research can methodically disregard the question about form or figure, it is not to become blind science for it cannot in the long run ignore the question of what makes a plant and a dog what they are precisely.

Just as the physician must not regard the sick person as a liver, a heart, or some isolated organ, but rather as this human being whose heart is sick or healthy, so too the biologist who is studying a living thing will always seek to see it as a whole and to regard all its details as elements of the living whole. As Hans Urs von Balthasar puts it well, [man] will make every effort to "see the form" without which his instrumentation for measuring remains blind. "Seeing the form", however, is also the way to detect traces of the Creator. (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 101).

To read God's traces in creation: Is it the business of science? Or is it not? Scientists of former times, from Copernicus through Galileo to Newton, were convinced that it is. Besides the book

of the Bible, they are acquainted with the book of creation, in which the Creator speaks to us in legible, audible language (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 101 - 102).

God speaks in the language of His creation. His creation is able to hear Him, to listen to Him, and understand Him. Is that ultimately the reason why modern science developed on the native soil of the Judeo-Christian belief in creation? The oversimplified materialistic understanding of science mistakes the letters for the text. Studying and analyzing the material letters is the prerequisite for being able to read the text. But they are not the text itself; rather, they are its material conveyors (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 102).

Science restricts itself to the material conditions, that is, “one-handed” and thus “one-sided”. It is lacking in what distinguishes man as man: his gift or talent for rising above material conditions by means of understanding and intuition and pressing onward to the meaning, the truth, and the “message of the author of the text” (Miller, 2008, 102).

Cardinal Schonborn ends by quoting the homily of Pope Benedict XVI: Christ’s Resurrection, if we may borrow the language of the theory of evolution, is the greatest “mutation”, absolutely the most crucial leap into a totally new dimension that there has ever been in the long history of life and its development: a leap into a completely new order that does concern us, and concerns the whole of history. (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 105) It is a qualitative leap in the history of “evolution” and of life in general toward a new future life, toward a new world, which, starting from Christ, already continuously permeates this world of ours, transforms it, and draws it to itself (Homily of Pope Benedict at the Easter Vigil, April 15, 2006).

Robert Spaemann, arguably the foremost Roman Catholic philosopher in Germany today whose focus is on Christian ethics is known for his work in bioethics, ecology, and human rights. Although not yet widely translated into languages other than his native German, Spaemann is internationally known and his work is highly regarded by Pope Benedict XVI. During the discussion Cardinal Schonborn writes “The late Swiss physician Paul Tournier, who founded a movement of doctors called *Medecine de la Personne*, always used to say: a doctor has two

hands. He must have a really good command of the natural sciences. But he also needs another hand in order to be a good doctor: empathy, intuition, the holistic view. Ultimately, he does not have to deal with a liver or a heart, but rather with a human being who has a liver disease or coronary problems. Only when he uses both hands together is he a good doctor. We must always pose the reflexive question about the subject within the natural sciences as well (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 126).

It is indeed fascinating to see the achievements of the biosciences, yet all cannot be found among the chimpanzees, even though they possess a genome that is 99 percent the same as ours, but only among human beings. Only man pursues science. The reflection on what it means to be able to pursue science is the prerequisite for the existence of science. For if this “step back” were not taken, there would be no scientific theory, either. What we miss in the discussion on evolution is the reflection on the one who is investigating evolution. As Egon Friedell once said ironically, “Man became capable of evolutionary theory, after a long history of evolution” (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 127).

Nature is legible, that is, it is written in an intelligible language, that the book of creation can be decoded. As Thomas Aquinas said: *Res inter duos intellectus constituta*. A thing is established between two reasons, namely, divine reason that has devised it and human reason that can fathom it (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 127).

The unity of reality is a central category for the discussion between philosophy and the natural sciences. If one assumes at the outset, as you have done, an insurmountable dualism in our ways of knowing then the problem of unity and of the possibility of dialogue arises. You have – at least indirectly – mentioned the possibility of regarding those material functional correlations as the necessary conditions for human life, so that a hierarchical understanding of reality becomes visible in the background. Then the question arises to what extent science helps philosophy and theology to recognize meaning (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 134-135).

The theology of Thomas Aquinas started from the contingency of the world and distinguished within the world between those things that occur by necessity and those things whose variability is built into creation (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 139).

Fundamentally every reality is striving for something: *Omne agens agit propter finem* (Everything that acts, acts for the sake of an end). If that is true, one must assume that there is a striving toward goals in inanimate matter, too (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 151-152). Scientists in their observation of the entire universe, from the Big Bang down to the present time, scientists have found a line between chaos and order that could be a sign of the Creator (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 157). The reason why Darwin assumed the notion of small steps was because he wanted to oppose very deliberately the catastrophe theorists of the early nineteenth century (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 157).

Pope Benedict XVI said that “It is not a question of deciding either for a creationism that is closed off from science as a matter of principle, or else for a theory of evolution that has its own gaps and yet overplays its hand and is unwilling to look at the questions that go beyond the methodological possibilities of the natural sciences. Rather, it is a question precisely of this interplay of the various dimensions of reason, in which the path to faith opens up as well. If between ratio and fides you emphasize *scientia* or *philosophia*, then what is fundamentally at stake is regaining a dimension of reason that we have lost. Without that dimension, faith would be confined to a ghetto and thus lose its significance for the whole of reality and of human existence” (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 161).

He continues, “To a great extent the theory of evolution cannot be proved experimentally, quite simply because we cannot bring 10,000 generations into the laboratory. That means that there are considerable gaps in its experimental verifiability and falsifiability due to the enormous span of time to which the theory has reference to” (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 162).

The scientific enterprise has opened up major dimensions of reasoning that previously had not been accessible and has thereby provided us with new knowledge. But in its joy over the greatness of its discoveries, it tends to confiscate dimensions of our reason that we still need. Its findings lead to questions that reach beyond its methodological principles and cannot be answered within science itself (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 163).

Peter Schuster who is a renowned theoretical chemist and known for his work with

the German Nobel Laureate Manfred Eigen in developing the quasispecies model has made great strides in the understanding of viruses and their replication, as well as theoretical mechanisms in the origin of life. He said that with respect to life as well, the area between order and chaos is such a narrow corridor. “If we look now at the process as whole, this long corridor from the Big Bang through the origin of life down to the origin of man, then this testifies to a plan that I do not find in science, which if course observes the individual process. This corridor can be the work of a Creator” (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 165-166).

Johannes Lehmann-Dronke said that “All theories of evolution start from the assumption, which is regarded as self-evident, that all material things, since they consist of certain “fundamental building blocks”, are constructed according to a sort of “modular construction principle” and should be understood accordingly. According to this view, no really new thing can exist, only an increasing complexity in the mutual association of the “building blocks”. What manifests itself in such a so-called “higher development” of the given material realities is only something that is already present, in an ever changing phenomenal form. (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 166).

Theologians today agree to a great extent that there must be some sort of intersection between God’s creative work and the empirical reality of the world, but not about what this intersection consists of. One very widespread middle ground makes use of an ontological scheme: “God works in the world as First Cause by means of secondary causes, namely, the forces of nature and of man. To some extent today there is insistence, at least at certain points, on a direct intervention of God in the world (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 189).

The religious world of ideas must be in some correlation with the everyday or scientific or ethical world of ideas, and of course vice versa. That is why the plane of intersection between belief in creation and the theory of evolution is to be found above all within the framework of the categorical concept of creation (Horn and Wiedenhofer, 2008, 191).

## 5. THE HOLY TRINITY AS MEANS TO RECONCILE BOTH CREATION AND EVOLUTION

In the previous section it was mentioned that even though our so-called “close relatives” the chimpanzees possess a genome that is 99 percent the same as ours, and that the genetic code of the human being is only very slightly different from them only we human beings pursue the sciences. We have taken great strides in not only the sciences but even the arts, economics and the flourishing of civilization. There are greatly a lot of things that sets us apart from the other primates that truly may place thorough evolutionists down the path of oblivion that the so-called “missing link” will forever remain a missing link for lack of scientific or historical artefact to prove that we indeed came from the apes.

Aristotle distinguishes among the living things the three types of souls, that which animates a body or matter: the vegetative soul, the sentient soul and intellectual soul.

But what precisely was needed to cross the threshold that distinguishes us from our close counterparts? It is the intellectual soul or human soul, or theologically, the spiritual soul. “This could not come from hominid parents since they did not possess it. It could not even have come from a general kind of super-elevating motion that transformed one species into another in the world of plants and animals. Rather, it demands a new and special motion, for the human soul is a spiritual substance without parts and without matter and so can only be created directly by God. What is needed is an “exceptional and absolutely unique” kind of super-elevating motion. The generative action of these hominids who were the closest to being human cannot give rise to a true human unless this super-elevating motion elevates their activity” (Arraj, 2004).

Arraj continues “It is the spiritual soul that is at the root of genuine language, for it allows us to transcend concrete situations and comprehend the universal principles that they embody. It is the human soul that allows us to have a qualitatively different form of self-awareness that allows us to know, and know that we know. And the spiritual soul is at the root of our artistic creativity and our continual innovation. It is the

creation of the spiritual soul that finally uncouples the brain from its creations. (Arraj, 2004)

In another research paper of the author there is specific study on the semantics of marriage, under the section of The Creative Language Faculty, which distinguishes us human beings from the other sentient creatures. It is held that ‘the child has an innate theory of potential structural descriptions that is sufficiently rich and fully developed’ so that he is able to determine, from experience in which a signal occurs, which ‘structural descriptions may be appropriate to this signal, and also that he is able to do this in part in advance of any assumption as to the linguistic structure of this signal’ (Seño, 2014).

To acquire a language, a child must devise a hypothesis comparable with presented data – he must select from the store of potential grammars a specific one that is appropriate to the data available to him. The child as a human creation would naturally reflect intrinsic human capacity in its internal organization. Hence, the general features of language structure reflect not so much the course of one’s experience but rather the general character of one’s capacity to acquire knowledge’. The language faculty as composed of two factors: Each language is the result of the interplay of the initial state and the course of experience. We can think of the initial state as a “language acquisition device” that takes experience as “input” and gives the language as an “output”, an output that is internally represented in the brain. From mere observation from the earliest stages, it reveals that the young child knows vastly more than experience has provided for him or her and at ‘peak periods of language growth, a child is acquiring words at a rate of about one an hour, with extremely limited exposure under highly ambiguous conditions’, which is extremely unexplainable in whatever way one may review it (Seño, 2014).

Of course, the environment matters a lot and yet the general course of development and the basic features of what emerges are predetermined by the initial state’, which renders it quite pre-eminent. We can think of the initial state of the faculty of language as ‘a fixed network connected to a switch box; the network is constituted of the principles of language, while the switches are the options to be determined by experience’. Thus, it supports our contention that the language faculty

is neatly embedded within the broader architecture of the mind or the brain (Seño, 2014).

There are three observations according to Noam Chomsky of the creative aspect of language use. It is innovative; free of control of detectable stimuli, either internal or external; and it is coherent and appropriate to the situation. Thus, its innovativeness is seen in its being entirely new, not a repetition where it was universally claimed that language is representable as a stored set of patterns, over learned through constant repetition and detailed training. It is not only innovative and potentially infinite in scope but also free from the control of detectable stimuli, either external or internal and it is because of this freedom from stimulus control that language can serve as an instrument of thought and self-expression (Seño, 2014).

This capacity for human language itself sets us apart from the apes, chimpanzees and other hominids and for that matter even from the other creatures of the earth.

If there is no contradiction between evolution and creation, then why is it more appropriate for God to create through evolution?

First, it is to manifest more God's glory. According to Thomas Aquinas, God communicates His glory to His creatures by giving them a participation in His existence. But more than existence, God further upgrades beings not just by creating them, but also making them participate in His causality. If God governed alone, things would be deprived of the perfection of causality" (Summa Theologiae, I.103.6, ad 2)

Second, evolution is the most efficient way for God to use non-personal causes to generate novel and adaptive life forms on a dynamic and ever changing planet. This saves humans from planetary wide extinction.

Third, God did not "waste" life in the evolutionary process. There is purpose and meaning in the process of evolution from one life form to the next.

Fourth and lastly, God created the diversity of creatures because no single creature can adequately reflect the perfection of God.

Man being *imago dei*, image of God reflects the Trinitarian ordering of reality. "Let us make man in our image and likeness" (Genesis 1).

The Trinity is reflected in a specific way in God's creation to the extent that the natural capacity of the creature allows such a reflection.

Thus, the best reflection of the Trinity in the creation known to us can be most discernible in that nature which is the closest in nobility to divine nature, namely, the divine part of man – the human soul.

## 6. CONCLUSION

We have seen that Thomas Aquinas, one of the so-called great synthesizers of ancient times has synthesized well philosophy and theology; reason and faith, science and religion; even evolution and creation.

He has forever set the middle ground with how the proper way of biblical hermeneutics is to be done and not done, that is, what one must avoid specially with subscribing to the extremes: biblical literalism on one hand from the fundamentalists and the loose liberal hermeneutics of the liberals on the other. One has to do justice, both to the biblical text and to external science; and this definitely goes the same way for the relationship between creation and evolution.

Indeed, there are still among us who say that there can never be a one-on-one correspondence between evolution and creation nor even concordism, an opinion that claims that theology and the theory of evolution can never come into conflict, because the two disciplines move about in two completely separate realms can never be an absolute thing in itself.

We have been presented in various degrees from points of views of theology, philosophy, biology and the other sciences the credibility of both evolution and creation theory. There is truth in creation and yet there is also truth in evolution. We are led to aver what Pope John Paul II said about the truth. "Truth cannot contradict truth."

Indeed, concordism can never be tenable, that is a so-called "one on one correspondence" that is why there has to be something that could help us in reconciling creation with evolution and vice versa. What could it be? It is none other than Man as *creatio imago trinitatis*, created in the image of the trinity – the unity in diversity.

The Trinity is reflected in a specific way in God's creation to the extent that the natural capacity of the creature allows such a reflection.

The gradual unfolding of the trinity is like the gradual evolutionary process, quite nearer to the themes of process philosophy and process theology. God gradually reveals Himself, though the fullness of which is in the coming of Christ.

Thus, the best reflection of the Trinity in the creation known to us can be most discernible in that nature which is the closest in nobility to divine nature, namely, the divine part of man, is that of the human soul. That which is intellectual, that which is from God and by nature is ordered back to Him.

## 7. REFERENCES

- Aquinas, T. (1964). *Summa theologica*. United Kingdom: Blackfriars.
- Aristotle (2015). *The Physics*. Tatian: Aeterna Press.
- Arraj, J. (2004). *Can Christians still believe? The beginning of the universe, evolution and human origins, original sin, and the Jesus of history and the Jesus of faith*. Oregon: Inner Growth Books.
- Brandon, Z. (2015). *The Thomistic account of creation and contemporary science in Thomistica.org*. (Accessed from: <http://www.thomistica.org/problems/creation/contemporary-science-and-the-thomistic-account-of-creation/>).
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God delusion*. United Kingdom: Bantam Books.
- Dictionary.com (August 2016). *Literalism*. Retrieved from Dictionary.com website: <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/literalism?s=t>
- Horn, S.O., and Wiedenhofer, S. (Editors) Miller, M.J. (Trans.) (2008). *Creation and evolution: Conference with Pope Benedicy XVI in Castel Gandolfo*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Kreeft, P. (2009). *The modern scholar: The philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*. Maryland: Recorded Books.
- Ramm, B. (1980). *Protestant Biblical interpretation*. Michigan: Baker Publishing Group.
- Saraceno, J. (May 5, 2016), Accessed from Catholic Endtime Truths on Queen James Bible: <http://catholicendtimetruths.com/queen-james-bible-gay-bible/05/05/2016>
- Seño, R.R. (2014), *The Semantics of marriage in the light of Noam Chomsky's innate structures*. Appeared in Colloquia Manilana. Quezon City: Philippine Dominican Center for Institutional Studies.
- Stenger, V. (2007). *God: The failed hypothesis*. US: Prometheus Books.
- Wikipedia. (August 2016). *Biblical literalism*. Retrieved from Wikipedia the free Encyclopaedia website: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblical\\_literalism#cite\\_note-literalism-1](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblical_literalism#cite_note-literalism-1)
- Wikipedia. (August 2016). *Liberal Christianity*. Retrieved from Wikipedia the free Encyclopaedia website: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal\\_Christianity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Christianity)
- Winston, R. (2006). *The story of God*. United Kingdom: Bantam Books.
- Wotlya, K. (1996). *Address of Pope John Paul II to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences*.