4 Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (A & C Black 1991), p. 8.
5 Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* p. 25; Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *Hearing Mark, A Listener's Guide* (Trinity Press International 2002), p. 100; Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand* p. 250.
6 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison* (SCM Press Ltd. 1971), p. 370. This letter was the first to be written after the failure of the July plot against Hitler's life, when Bonhoeffer's own agony of waiting entered a different phase.
7 R H Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of Mark* (Oxford 1950), p.53, which is referred to by Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* p. 324.
8 Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* p.324.
9 Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah, From Gethsemane to the Grave, A Commentary on the Four Gospels,* Volume One, (Geoffrey Chapman 1994), p. 195.
10 Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* p. 196.
11 Romans 8. 18–25.
12 Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man, A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus,* (Orbis Books 1988) pp. 346–348. Myers recognises Mark's deconstruction of the apocalyptic discourse, and sees the call to vigilance as being primarily addressed to the reader, with the discipleship community being exhorted to embrace the world as Gethsemane.
13 Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison* p. 370.

Advent addendum: further preparations for the Lord

Alain Tschudin

Given that the article "Preparing the Way for the Lord" was published in its unrevised form, it seems necessary to provide some orientation for readers concerning the substantive differences between that draft and the intended final manuscript. Initially, when seeking to describe the relationship between science and religion- specifically between evolution and Christianity- I chose the metaphor of a boxing match, to convey the conflict and tensions that existed between the two camps. As my explicit aim in the article was to promote conciliatory dialogue between the two parties, the "fight" metaphor no longer seemed appropriate and was excised from the revised version. In the printed article, however, fossils from the earlier

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2003.tb06320.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

metaphor remain, e.g. "This is a mighty punch to pack" (p.522) should read "This is a formidable assertion" and "the bout" (p.526) is reconceived of as "the engagement" with the world.

Coming to the debate from this central notion of "engagement" (with its focal points on negotiation, conflict resolution and reconciliation), I suggested that perhaps one impasse was the lack of appreciation of Christian love on the part of "crusading atheists" (p.524). The final article does not define the "myriad of possible reasons" related to this lack, precisely to avoid a misreading of my position. The examples included in the published version were listed neither to attribute intention to, nor to antagonise the atheistic militants; rather they were intended to suggest potential reasons for the status quo. Again, the suggestion is that a model of dialogue can transcend the conflict inherent in its *kampf* counterpart.

The article represents a preliminary attempt to synthesise Christian theology with evolutionary theory and serves as an introduction to a more detailed, forthcoming treatment of the topic. In advance of this, it appeared reasonable to anticipate some concerns relating to the nature of Christ. Paragraph 2, p.524 describes the necessity of balancing the scales between the depiction of Jesus within the historical context of evolution, with its complementary counter-ballast of de Chardin's "Cosmic Christ". To achieve this, I suggested "offsetting the conception of the revealed, continuous nature of the man Jesus", with the mystical discontinuity of the Messiah, encountered in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Here I refer to continuity as evolutionary continuity, in the sense that Jesus shares the same biological, psychosocial and cultural capacities as other human beings, who by virtue of our evolutionary nature and common descent, share our ancestry with the rest of creation. By the same token, I use discontinuity to refer to a sense of radical otherness, that is, to a phenomenon or entity that does not share the continuous thread of creation through evolutionary time.

Finally, some other points require clarification. The word omitted at the bottom of p.525 is "perspective" and under the reference section, the author Robert Hinde is incorrectly cited as "Kinde". Please note that these and other minor points have been addressed and corrected in the final manuscript, which is available on e-mail from the Editor, or from me at ajct4@cam.ac.uk.

Please note that the original article was adapted with permission of Templeton Foundation Press from the forthcoming Spiritual Information, edited by Charles L. Harper, Jr, © 2003

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2003.tb06320.x Published online by Cambridge University Press