

# KING'S THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

<i>EDITORIAL</i>	1
Atheism, Hatred and the Love of God in <i>The End of the Affair</i> <i>Stewart R. Sutherland</i>	2
An Introduction to Nag Hammadi Studies <i>T.V. Smith</i>	9
Anxiety and the Future in Teilhard de Chardin <i>Melvyn Thompson</i>	15
A Decade of Theology at King's: a Personal View <i>Graham Stanton</i>	22
The Gospel in a Secular Culture: Christianity and the Modern University <i>Colin Gunton</i>	25
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	
<i>FACULTY NEWS</i>	

- 27 *Ad.Haer.* I.24.4.
- 28 The Christology of this document is discussed in K.W. Tröger 'Der zweite Logos des grossen Seth-Gedanken zur Christologie in der zweiten Schrift des Codex VII Nag Hammadi' *Studies VI* (1975) pp. 268-276.
- 29 See S. Arai *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis* (Leiden 1964) especially pp. 100-105.
- 30 This passage is discussed in B. Pearson, 'Anti-Heretical Warnings in Codex IX from Nag Hammadi' *Nag Hammadi Studies VI* (1975) pp. 145-154.
- 31 For example, Epiphanius *Panarion* 55.9.1f; Hippolytus *Refutatio* 7.36.
- 32 See B. Pearson, 'The figure of Melchizedek in the first Tractate of the Unpublished Coptic-Gnostic Codex IX from Nag Hammadi' in C.J. Bleeker (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions* (Leiden 1975) pp.200-208.
- 33 That this correlation is found in a number of Nag Hammadi texts, as well as in the anti-gnostic writers, was convincingly demonstrated by Elaine Pagels, 'Gnostic and Orthodox views of Christ's passion: Paradigms for the Christian's response to persecution?' a paper read at the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale University, March 1978.
- 34 c.f. Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* VII.106, where Basilides is said to claim an apostolic tradition going back through Glaucias to Peter, while Valentinus claims one deriving from Paul.
- 35 See J.D. Turner, 'The Book of Thomas the Contender from Codex II of the Cairo Gnostic Library from Nag Hammadi', *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 23* (Missoula 1975).
- 36 See the discussion of this type of Christianity by H. Köster in J.M. Robinson and H. Köster, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia 1971, pp.126-143.
- 37 C.W. Hedrick in Robinson (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, p. 249.
- 38 E. Pagels *The Gnostic Paul. Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia 1975).
- 39 On this document, see M. Peel, *The Epistle to Rheginos; A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection* (London, 1969); L. Martin, 'The Anti-Philosophical Polemic and Gnostic Soteriology in The Treatise on the Resurrection', *Numen*, Vol. 20 (1973) pp. 20-37; J. Ménard, 'La notion de "résurrection" dans l'Épître à Rheginos', *Nag Hammadi Studies VI* (1975) pp. 110-124.
- 40 So L. Cerfaux, 'De Saint Paul à L'Évangile de la Vérité', *New Testament Studies*, Vol. 5 (1958/9), pp. 103-112.
- 41 See H. Schneemelcher, 'Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* Vol. 75 (1964) pp. 1-20. (K. Barrett, 'Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period', *New Testament Studies* Vol. 20 (1973/4), pp. 229-245.
- 42 G. Schenke, ' "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia" Eine gnostische Offenbarungsrede in koptischer Sprache aus dem Fund von Nag Hammadi', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 99 (1974) pp. 731-746. c.f. also Y. Janssens, *Le Codex XIII de Nag Hammadi, Le Museon* Vol. 87 (1974) pp. 341-413, especially pp. 409-410.
- 43 See the brief discussion by R. Wilson, 'The Trimorphic Protennoia', *Nag Hammadi Studies VIII* (1977) pp. 50-54.
- 44 The gnostic Heracleon wrote the first commentary on John's Gospel: see E. Pagels, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis* (Nashville 1973). On the use of John's Gospel in gnosticism, see. W. Von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Giessen 1932) pp. 60-115; J.N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge, 1943) pp. 47-66 M.F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel* (Cambridge, 1960) pp. 96-111.

## ANXIETY AND THE FUTURE IN TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

Melvyn Thompson

A first reading of *The Phenomenon of Man* would suggest that Teilhard's view of the future is straightforward, although couched in unfamiliar language. A summary of it might run as follows:

The world is evolving, and produces more and more complex beings with correspondingly greater degrees of consciousness. This may

be traced from the atom through the living cell up to man. Yet evolution does not stop with man. It continues in terms of his development, particularly in his social relationships, until the noosphere (the thinking layer on our planet made up of all the human minds and relationships) reaches a point where it forms a single personal whole - the completion of the human evolution - a point Omega. Since man is the lead-

ing shoot in evolution on this planet, this is also the culmination of the whole evolutionary process. But Omega is more than that - for a Christian it represents the point which fulfils the expectations of the coming of the Cosmic Christ. Following Ephesians, he sees this Omega point as the moment when the whole cosmos will be subject to Christ, prepared and unified for that moment through the whole evolutionary process.

Since the natural completion of the earth at Omega corresponds to the moment of the Parousia, we must work for the development of man as a preparation for Christ. Such a view is optimistic. We cannot die out as a species, or blow or pollute ourselves out of existence, nor can resources fail us, for we are assured that man must reach Omega, and total fulfilment.

I want to suggest that this almost universally held view of Teilhard's work is indefensible on both scientific and theological grounds. More than that - the literary style in which it is presented is both confused and confusing, and it does not reflect the personal origins of Teilhard's thought - which are of a very different order from those of our outline.<sup>1</sup>

From the scientific side, criticisms of Teilhard can come from two angles. The first concerns his use of orthogenesis - that is, the idea that there is definite evolutionary direction and impetus which dictates the way in which a species will evolve. The debate on this originated in the Darwinian and Lamarckian views of evolution in the last century, and is really of historical interest only. The theory of orthogenesis has been almost universally rejected since the earlier part of this century - and yet, because it seemed necessary to support his general view of things, Teilhard continued to advocate it right up until 1955, and the suggestion could be made that he does not follow the scientific process of moulding his views to fit the evidence, but seeks to accept only evidence that suits his views.<sup>2</sup>

The second line of attack, and one that is more obvious to the non-specialist in the field, is that Teilhard refuses to accept that the earth could fail man. In other words, he is prepared to dismiss natural accidents, failure of resources or pollution. We see even more obviously since Teilhard's day that these are factors that cannot be dismissed in speaking of

the future. And it cannot be inevitable that man is the one species that is not going to be replaced in the dominant position by some other.

We know that scientific thought suggests only degrees of probability. What Teilhard claims - and needs in order to justify his religious affirmations - is a degree of certainty that science just does not possess.

The general criticism from science - well illustrated by Medawar's critical review of *The Phenomenon of Man* in *Mind* - is that Teilhard has inspiring musings and a style of writing which cover over a lack of proper scientific method. In other words, his theology has spoiled his science when he speaks of the future.

From the theological point of view there are many criticisms that could be raised, and some were given in an article accompanying the official condemnation of his views by Rome in 1962.<sup>3</sup> But for our purposes let us simply note two features of what he says about the future.

1. The Parousia comes at the end of the evolutionary process, at the point where the whole world comes to its fulfilment at point Omega. We have millions of years to go before this can come about, and thus any sense of urgency and immediate challenge is removed from his eschatology. Where is the element of unexpected crisis and judgement? Where is there a sense that the existing world order is to be shaken? Even if the statements he makes about the universal Christ at Omega are exactly the same as those in the New Testament, surely the very fact that all the events are placed at an infinite distance in the future must change their theological significance.

2. The second point really follows from the first. Because his eschatology is wedded to his evolutionary scheme of thought, the judgment that comes with the universal Christ is automatically bound to endorse the validity of his evolutionary orthogenesis. In other words, the universal Christ must approve what makes for evolutionary success. However Teilhard himself might wish to avoid this conclusion, it is clearly implied in the whole structure of his thought. Since Christ only finds completion at Omega, and Omega depends upon a certain evolutionary scheme, then the content of the Christian proclamation must clearly endorse that scheme.

In a sense then, one could say that his science has spoiled his theology. Thus if he is forming a natural theology, based on an evolutionary form of thought, then clearly his structure has come to *dominate* over his content of Christian revelation.<sup>4</sup>

If we are not to dismiss his work, it is essential that it be taken away from the confines of either the scientific or the theological parameters, and be studied in the context of Teilhard's own life and disposition.

In his basic spiritual orientation, Teilhard was a mystic. This is clear from his earlier works, and especially in *Christ in the World of Matter*. There he looks at a picture of the heart of Jesus, the host in the monstrance, and the pyx round his neck bearing the sacrament, and sees the influence of each of them as expanding outwards to make the whole universe vibrant and illuminated from within, and then withdrawing back into themselves. Perhaps the best known of his visionary expressions is *Tha Mass on the World* which starts:

Since once again Lord . . . I have neither bread, nor wine, nor altar, I will raise myself beyond these symbols, up to the pure majesty of the real itself, I, your priest, will make the whole earth my altar and on it will offer you all the labours and sufferings of the world.

Written on a scientific expedition in the Ordos Desert in Asia, this illustrates two main themes in his spirituality. One is the unity of all things in the religious vision; but the other is the offering to God of the whole of human life with its effort and suffering. This expresses the tensions which he had experienced since his first personal crisis of 1902 concerning the scientific and the religious sides of his personality and their apparently conflicting claims. His spirituality, as well as wanting to see a convergence of all things upon Christ, sought also a synthesis of love of the world and love of God. This is most clearly seen in what many hold to be his greatest work - *Le Milieu Divin*.

Towards the end of his life, Teilhard was to look back and be quite surprised to find that by the time of *Le Milieu Divin* the basis of his spirituality had already been formed (that is, by 1926). That was before his evolutionary

cosmology had taken on its specific form.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, in terms of chronology, as well as literary form, what we have in the later Teilhard is a spiritual visionary *Gestalt*, which is then couched and expressed in scientific terms - his theology and his science coming *second* to his spiritual intuition and personal needs.

One detailed study of the development and formation of Teilhard's personality as a contributory factor in his style of writing has come up with the suggestion that he should be regarded as writing *Christian Science Fiction*<sup>6</sup> - since this might be the nearest literary form what we have in his main body of work. He uses the language of science to express basic insights about the future that are derived from sources other than science itself - which I see as the basic difference between the work of science fiction and that of future studies. This case could be argued convincingly, especially since Teilhard was an avid reader of H.G.Wells, and felt that he had more in common with him than with the Roman theologians!

Look, for example, at the impetus behind that superb story *The Time Machine*, where the time traveller returns to the Present and tries by his stories of the future to explore with his friends the implications of what is happening now on Earth. Then turn to the last part of *The Phenomenon of Man* where Teilhard speaks to the future - there we have the same impetus although the style is quite different. With Wells it is the future of a collective humanity, for Teilhard it is the spiritual unification of mankind, but many parallels are to be found.

Yet one should not take this similarity too far, mainly because the most significant book by Wells for Teilhard was *First and Last Things*, which is quite unlike his early scientific romances, but is a statement of personal faith in the future unification of man and the need for a single goal for humanity. Several passages from this could be passed off as the work of Teilhard with little danger of discovery.

Yet the matter is rather more complex, since Teilhard's work appears on three levels, of which only the first is generally used in presenting his work.

The first is that of his books and essays. This is the systematic presentation of his thought for his friends, and sometimes for his

Jesuit superiors in order to show the orthodox nature of his writing.

The second is his letters. Some of these are of general interest, such as the *Letters from a Traveller*, but more interesting for our purpose are the more recently published letters to some of his Jesuit colleagues in *Lettres Intimes* which show the background to some of his struggles with the hierarchy.

Thirdly, we have the daily *Journal* which he wrote since 1915. It was his habit to spend some time each morning writing down his thoughts and intuitions as they came to him - and they thus represent the deepest and most interesting of the levels. We see the actual workings of Teilhard's mind before systematisation, and also the sketches for what are later to be turned into essays. The content of these *Journals* reveals quite a different Teilhard from that of his more public works - much more daring in his thought and quite unorthodox.<sup>7</sup>

Another curious feature, which is almost unknown, is that there appears to have been a certain amount of censorship of Teilhard's work. This has been done partly by those Catholic scholars who have sought to show that his thought is orthodox - I would like to give two brief examples of this:

In 'A Note on Progress' in *The Future of Man* Teilhard seems to contrast two groups of people. On the one hand there are those who see that the world is moving, and anxiously look towards the future; and on the other you have those who deny any movement, and insist on defending the past. What is curious is that the membership of the two groups appears to be nowhere stated. *But* there is a passage omitted from the published versions, part of which reads:

'Humanly speaking, I am incomparably nearer to W. James, to Bergson, to Wells than to the Masters of Rome. The spiritual connection between the latter and myself is only established very far away - at the limit - in Christ: with the former my sympathy is immediate, radical and profound. That is the brutal truth.'<sup>8</sup>

Once that is reinserted the whole essay becomes clearer, as do many other factors concerning

Teilhard's spiritual identity.

Another important example is the essay called "The Eternal Feminine" in which de Lubac claims to show the true meaning of the essay of the same name by Teilhard through a consideration of the *Journal* material underlying it. In fact he is highly selective in what he considers and leaves out all the more controversial material - in particular, all references to *Batzac's* novels and spiritualisation of sexuality (which provides such an important starting point in Teilhard's thought on the place of the feminine) are omitted. Taken as a whole, the essay by de Lubac, in the absence of a translation of the original *Journal*, can only be seen as an attempt to cover up the truth, rather than reveal it.<sup>9</sup>

Yet this is hardly surprising when you consider the stated criteria of truth that de Lubac takes in his interpretation of Teilhard. Speaking of Teilhard's Christological titles,<sup>10</sup> he said:

'If these are to be correctly understood, by which I mean both in an acceptable sense and in the sense the author intended . . .'

By "acceptable" de Lubac clearly means acceptable to orthodoxy, and he is not prepared to consider an interpretation which is true to the author but not orthodox.

This sort of Catholic interpretation, which dominates the whole of Teilhardian studies, makes a strong natural/supernatural division, and allows Teilhard's scientific cosmology and his religious statements to stand apart - and as such, we have seen that they rightly come under criticism from both science and theology.

To understand the basis of Teilhard's language, especially about the future, it is necessary to take into consideration the whole of his work and his attitude, noting especially what is known of the most personal stages in the development of his thought.

As a clue, let us look again at the outline of *The Phenomenon of Man*. As we trace its description of evolution, it appears at first sight to form a unified whole. We start with the formation of the atom, then up to the molecule, then the megamolecule, cell and simple life

forms. Within the tree of life we mount up through more and more complex forms until we reach man. And then with the increase in complexity and consciousness, the future is seen in terms of a complexification of the social bonds between men, leading to a perfection of the process of personalisation as we come together, converging upon this single whole - Omega.

With this first glance (and Teilhard does everything he can to encourage us) we start to see the process of social development as following the same laws that combined atoms into molecules - the whole thing from the first gathering up of the formless multitude to Omega being one single outworking of a law of complexity consciousness.

But there is one great exception to this progress, and it occurs as Teilhard describes the present moment for man. It is termed "The Problem of Action". In *The Phenomenon of Man* this comes at the end of Book Three where man's present dilemma and anxiety is caused by his confrontation with the incredibly enlarged dimensions of time and space revealed to him by modern science.

Here only, at this turning point where the future substitutes itself for the present and the observations of science should give way to the anticipation of a faith, do our perplexities legitimately and indeed inevitably begin. Tomorrow? But who can guarantee us a tomorrow anyway? And without the assurance that this tomorrow exists, can we really go on living, we to whom has been given - perhaps for the first time in the whole story of the universe - the terrible gift of foresight?

Sickness of the dead end, the anguish of feeling shut in . . . This time we have at last put our finger on the tender spot.

What makes the world in which we live specifically modern is our discovery in it and around it of evolution. And I can now add that what disconcerts the modern world at its very roots is not being sure, and not seeing how it could ever be sure, that there is

an outcome - a suitable outcome - to that evolution. (p. 229)

And this theme can be traced through many (indeed, most) of his works. What it amounts to in terms of the whole book is this - up to the point of the present moment evolution seems to have been dominated by the law of complexity consciousness, and if man is willing to cooperate with that law, then evolution will continue to move in the direction that leads to Omega. But with his ability to reflect upon his situation, man is tempted to go on strike against the whole enterprise unless he has some assurance that his efforts will not be wasted,

When Teilhard says that the observations of science should give way to the anticipation of a faith, he is really saying that the whole of what he describes concerning the future is *dependent* upon man overcoming his anxiety. It is the minimum assurance required if man is to continue to live and develop. For he has to accept that, without man's conscious cooperation, this whole evolutionary scheme cannot continue.

However much the convergence of man in the future may appear to be a scientific hypothesis, we can see that (as he presents it) it is in fact a *metaphysical prescription of tranquilisers and stimulants*. It has tranquilisers sufficient to stop us being paralysed by anxiety at the thought that evolution is going nowhere and that the human species will simply die out without reaching its ultimate goal. It also has stimulants sufficient to keep alive our interest in the future and the value of our part in forging it.

The erratic boulder in the uniform soils of phenomenological description is *man's anxiety* and the effect that it has upon his willingness to cooperate with his own evolution.

Thus "the problem of action" can be taken as the *axial point* around which Teilhard's writing pivots. All that belongs to the past is used to show the significance of the human dilemma, and all that is suggested of the future is what is needed to overcome it.

Thus instead of seeing the *future* as Teilhard's main concern, it might be more accurate to say that *anxiety* is his main concern, and that his preoccupation with the future is his way of overcoming it.

Why should Teilhard have posed the question of the future in this way? Well, the

answer to that is being revealed the more we find of the second and third levels of his material - his private letters and *Journals*. What is very clear is that from childhood Teilhard had suffered bouts of intense *anxiety*. Even as a young academic working for his PhD in Paris, he wrote to his parents that long walks in the streets were good for his nerves.<sup>11</sup> And as a child, his craving for the permanence of rocks and metals was contrasted with his sense of loss of his own impermanence.<sup>12</sup> There is evidence for this, and for the depressions which accompanied it later on in life, throughout the period of his writings. As one example, let me quote from a letter (written in English) in 1940:

To be true I do not know (nor did any doctor understand exactly) what was the matter with me. A kind of mental dizziness and anxiety ('Psychasthenia', told me with a smile the best clinician in Peking): in fact an old acquaintance of mine, since I had touches of it since I was a boy. Very unpleasant. But the best remedy, I was told and I had already found out myself, is to go on as if nothing happened. To have my book to write was the best cure. Now I feel much better.<sup>13</sup>

In another letter of 1948 we find him saying that he had been assured by the doctors that his depression was fundamentally of organic origin, but aggravated by his anxiety; and in one of 1950 he calls nervous anxiety his birthright.

The other element in his disposition which goes with this is his claustrophobia and need to breathe freely. Even the thought that the world could be a closed system brought on this horror of being shut in.<sup>14</sup> What is more, if we examine the "problem of action" passages, both in *The Phenomenon of Man* and in his other works, we find that he often speaks of disgust, nausea, claustrophobia and the inability to breathe - as characterising man's present situation when faced with the unknown and closed in future.<sup>15</sup>

It seems to me, now, that there is no way in which a full interpretation of Teilhard's works can possibly escape from the fact of his personal disposition. As we noted right at the

start, what he says about the future cannot be understood in the parameters of either science or theology, and the reason for this is now clear: what he says needs to express his own situation, and he is using the two main elements in his life - religion and science - in order to do so. *His conviction is that if others reflect upon their own situation they will see the dilemma in the same terms as himself.* And it is because of this that he can claim as universally true what he first and foremost experienced within himself.

He found that there were for him two sources of comfort. The one was a joining of the the religious and the human vectors of activity. This is best expressed in the essay *The Heart of the Problem* where he feels that man's transcendent-religious impulse needs to be joined to the neo-humanist (seen in embryo in Marxism) commitment to the future of man's development. Without this he claims that the religious element will not be seen as relevant to man's deepest hopes, and the neo-humanist element will be in danger of being a depersonalising force - making men work together rather as insects (termites, etc.). This corresponds exactly to the double vocation of his own life: his religious side, with its ultimate assurances, giving to his scientific side an ultimate goal which in itself it could not claim.

His other comfort was the sense of convergence. This came originally from his mystical intuitions - his feeling that all things were being gathered together in Christ. Originally his pantheistic tendency led him to seek to lose himself in the multiplicity of beings, but he saw in the evolutionary process the sense of everything holding together from above (or ahead) in the single point which drew all things onwards. It is such a gathering into Christ which lies behind the 'scientific' language of evolutionary convergence.

Another aspect of this experience is his understanding of the feminine, and of the role of sexuality generally. This is little appreciated in works on Teilhard, mainly because the scope of it is only seen in his *Journal* material. Briefly, following the ideas of Balzac, the sexual convergence of men and women is the means of producing - not simply physical offspring but spiritual growth. It is love therefore which unites - and the release of spirit in sexual union provides him with the image he

needs for expressing how the union of the whole of mankind can preserve, and even enhance, the individual person. The union of all things comes through the Feminine.<sup>16</sup>

The important point here is that it was his double vocation, affirmed over and over again, to love God and to love the world, along with the inspiration of the feminine, that triggered off his creativity and provided an answer on the personal level to his anxiety and depression. *And yet in his writings these two things form the answer to man's anxiety and are the basis of the hope of Omega.*

What I want to suggest therefore is that Teilhard's whole scheme of thought - however much it may be related to science or theology - is basically a work of autobiography; it can only be understood in its entirety in the context of his life and its emotional and spiritual needs. *What he says about the future is dominated by anxiety, and his optimism is affirmed only in the face of his own despair.*

So the basic question is this: does man act, and then upon reflection discover what his commitment to the future means? Or, does he sit paralysed with anxiety until the future is guaranteed and he is able to act with confidence of the result?

I cannot but feel that the former is as true as the latter. If it were not so, how could one ever give an account of *heroism*? What would self-sacrifice mean if its ultimate guarantees were given? What is challenge, if the future holds no ultimate risk for us? And what is crucifixion if resurrection is already guaranteed?

The scientists say that Teilhard is wrong in assuming that he can know what the future holds for the species, and that he denies the very real possibilities that things on this planet may turn out differently. He claims it as a matter of *faith* that his future must lead to an Omega. *I would suggest that it is an essential part of the Christian challenge that the future is a matter of risk.*

It may well be that Teilhard's view of the future is important, and I would not want to challenge it. What I do challenge is the certainty that he claimed for it, which I believe to be necessitated by his anxiety rather than by the facts upon which he seems to base his views.

## NOTES

1. I do not intend to deny that this is a valid interpretation of *The Phenomenon of Man*, but that work does not show the many levels of his thought if taken in isolation from his other essays and notes.
2. His main defence of orthogenesis was made in 1951 and 1955. For its significance in his thought see two articles in *Harvard Theological Review* - G.B.Murray "Teilhard and Orthogenetic Evolution" 60:281-295 (1967) and R.B.Smith "Orthogenesis and God Omega" 62:397-410(1968).  
Teilhard seeks to show that cerebral growth is the central axis of evolution, and thus that man is the leading shoot.
3. *L'Observatore Romano* accompanied the 'Monitum' of the Holy Office with an article listing errors in the following -  
The concept of creation; the relation between the Cosmos and God, the relation between creation, incarnation and redemption; the lack of distinction between matter and spirit; evil and sin.
4. This is an example of a general problem with systematic Theology. The language and structures of thought in which theology is expressed will always colour the content of the Christian proclamation - but when does such colouring reach the point of distortion?
5. This comment is from his essay "The Heart of Matter". In very general terms, one can see his mysticism and spirituality developing prior to 1926, and then through the 30's the more structured evolutionary cosmology.
6. This is one of the ideas put forward by Hugh Cairns in his thesis on "The Identity and Originality of Teilhard de Chardin". He tests Teilhard's writings against the Journal material and other personal information, and is able to show the inadequacy of many other widely accepted interpretations.  
One introduction to his thought least open to such criticism is that by N.M.Wildiers (Collins, Fontana 1968) which accurately reflects the personal elements.
7. Mostly unpublished, but 1915-1919 available in French (Fayard 1975).
8. Cited in Cairns thesis (as above Note 6), Edinburgh 1971, from a typescript in the Paris *Fondation*.
9. Lubac's essay is in the book of the same title (Collins) and Teilhard's is in *The Prayer of the Universe* (Collins, Fontana 1973).
10. *The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin* p.188.
11. *Letters from Paris* p.37 (October 1912).
12. In "The Heart of Matter" (1950) - a translation of which is to be published by Collins early in 1978.



13. *Letters to Two Friends* p.148 (written by Teilhard in English).
14. This is most vividly expressed in "The Death Barrier" (1955) in *Activation of Energy* p.403, but is found throughout his works.
15. In "Zest for Life" (1950) in *Human Energy* p.237 he describes man as being revolted by life, like a sick man faced with a banquet.
16. See "The Eternal Feminine" in *Prayer of the Universe*.

## A DECADE OF THEOLOGY AT KING'S: A PERSONAL VIEW

Graham Stanton

First impressions are always interesting, even if they turn out later to have been mistaken. When I first came to King's in 1970, I knew that a number of very distinguished scholars taught in the Faculty of Theology and that the College was well-known for excellence in many disciplines, but I knew very little else. I was struck immediately by the concern of the teaching staff for the academic and general welfare of every individual student. The friendliness of my colleagues was sometimes embarrassing: it was often difficult to slip away from conversations over coffee with distinguished senior colleagues in order to give a lecture or take a tutorial!

The ability of the students turned out to be almost as varied as their backgrounds. I have always enjoyed teaching gifted students, but also less able students who are keen to learn and are not afraid of hard work. I quickly found that a number of my students fell into the latter category. Many students who began the first of their three years at King's without outstanding qualifications made very considerable progress. This often surprised me—and it still does! As a team of teachers my colleagues were able to mix assistance, encouragement and stimulus in the right proportions in order to produce growth in understanding and maturity of judgment. And this is what University teaching is all about. The University teacher does not supply all the answers on a plate, nor even all the questions. But he or she should assist students to know how to go about finding and evaluating for themselves possible answers to the right questions.

Eight years later these first impressions do not need to be modified at all: they still stand to the

credit of the Faculty today. But two further first impressions have been modified to a certain extent over the years. At first I liked the B.D. degree very much. Perhaps this was partly because it is so similar to the B.D. degree I had taken myself in New Zealand. In both cases the degree was demanding and required competence in all the main branches of Theology. I still like the general ethos of the present London B.D., but there are good reasons for introducing a new degree, about which I shall say a little more below.

When I first came to King's I was confused by the complexities of the history and the constitutional position of the Faculty of Theology within the College. In 1958 the University established several teaching posts in Theology which were grafted into the Theological Department at King's which had been engaged primarily in training Anglican ordinands. By 1970 almost half of the students were not Anglican ordinands and were studying Theology for a wide variety of reasons. So in some ways the Faculty was engaged in two related but different tasks at the same time.

In earlier years students who were not Anglican ordinands sometimes said that they felt that they were second class citizens within the Faculty, but with the one exception of the Chapel services this was not my own experience. It has always seemed a little odd that ordained non-Anglicans should be able to share in the ministry of the Word in the College chapel but not in the ministry of the Sacraments. I know that I am touching on sensitive and complex issues and that changes cannot easily be made. And I am bound to add that as a staunch Free