

markets in a just economy, issues in which theologians and others have reasoned differences of opinions rooted in Gospel values.

Finn made several proposals to encourage dialogue. We must seek to describe the other's position in a way the other would endorse. We need to find arguments that are persuasive not simply to those in our own group, but also to those in groups we critique. We must not rely on unfalsifiable causal explanations. Lastly, we must recognize that interdisciplinary conversation is not necessarily interspectival conversation. Since other disciplines have the same scandal of silence between left and right, if radical and conservative theologians dialogue only with similarly radical or conservative economists, the scandal of silence has not been addressed.

THOMAS J. POUNDSTONE

*Saint Mary's College of California
Moraga, California*

ESCHATOLOGY

- Topic:** Bodily Resurrection and the Persistence of the Graced Self
Moderator: Anthony J. Godzieba, Villanova University
Presenter: Bernard P. Prusak, Villanova University, "The 'Body'
in Bodily Resurrection: Catholic Perspectives"
Respondent: William Loewe, Catholic University of America
Presenter: Anthony J. Godzieba, Villanova University, "Greshake/Ratzinger/
Postmodernism: The 'Subject' of the Afterlife"
Respondent: Peter Phan, Catholic University of America
Presenter: Philip J. Rossi, SJ, Marquette University, "Charles Taylor:
The Dissolution of the Self and the Retrieval of Spirit"
Respondent: Thomas Hughson, SJ, Marquette University

Bodily resurrection, the afterlife, and theological anthropology were this session's main concerns. Anthony Godzieba introduced the papers, at first glance seemingly disparate, by commenting on their shared anthropological concerns and thematic links: from contemporary theologies of bodily resurrection (Bernard Prusak) to the fundamental theological and anthropological issue of bodies and personal identity (Godzieba) to a particular postmodern anthropology with important implications for theology (Philip Rossi).

Prusak's detailed overview of major contemporary Catholic theologies of bodily resurrection demonstrated fundamental developments since the 1960s and

agreements among the various positions. But he also emphasized the ambiguities in the way such terms as "matter" and "body" had been understood and employed theologically. His own proposal retrieved the classical distinction between particular and general judgments in a more dynamic way and applied it to resurrection. He advocated viewing human identity as "forged through all our personal/bodily relationships," yet remaining incomplete at death until the end of history when "all the notes which form the melody of an individual person's life," including their effects on others and on history, "become fully integrated within the . . . once and for all completed symphony of history and creation." William Loewe, in his appreciative response, pointed out the limits to any theologian's understanding of God's action "carried out on the far side of death" and emphasized the necessity of acknowledging the crucial role of the Holy Spirit (echoed in the *soma pneumatikon* of 1 Cor. 15) in bodily resurrection, understood here as transformative completion of the integral self and the self's definitive incorporation into the body of Christ.

Godzieba asked how theology might elucidate the character of everlasting life in a postmodern context critical of transcendence and of unified notions of the self. He summarized the Greshake-Ratzinger debates over the intermediate state and the soul's immortality (where both seek broader definitions of identity and "bodiliness"), as well as some postmodern arguments for the "death of the self." He then used these arguments as a catalyst for recommendations concerning a postmodern Catholic anthropology and eschatology which might fortify faith in transcendence and hope for the postmortal perdurance of the self (e.g., viewing the whole person as an accumulated "history of effects" which depends upon but which is also projected beyond the material-empirical substratum of the body). Peter Phan's sympathetic response (read in his absence) sought to extend Godzieba's recommendations further through the use of ecofeminist categories which emphasize interdependence alongside independence, the decentering of humanity as sole goal of creation, a definition of "salvation" which includes the fulfillment of all creatures' physical needs, and an ethics of solidarity. Phan, too, argued for a view of personal identity which is realized over time and is incomplete at death, and characterized the risen self as "not constituted by the reunion of his or her soul with its body but by the community of the self with the triune God, other selves, and the entire cosmos."

Rossi's paper examined the account of personal identity proposed by Charles Taylor in *Sources of the Self* (1989) and highlighted its "theological subtext." Taylor argues that human selves are realities fundamentally animated by "spirit," that is, founded upon transcendence and a divine affirmation which are both beyond human projection. The attempt to articulate "'spirit' as the core of human (self-)identity" is, for Taylor, the most "illusion-free" story we can tell about ourselves, our moral choices, and the values we hold, and is preferable to the inadequate, illusion-ridden naturalist story of modernity as well as the current postmodern story that all is finitude. In this "retrieval of spirit" Rossi detected

various Augustinian echoes, most notably a movement inward, outward, and upward to grasp the "horizon of grace" which grounds our hope for meaning and our relations with others. "Spirit is, first of all, being in the presence of the Other who welcomes all that is other." In his affirmative response, Thomas Hughson drew attention to the Augustinian nature of Taylor's project, to the complex makeup of the self which could only be adequately clarified by a truly interdisciplinary approach, and to the necessity of theology for bringing Taylor's unarticulated horizon of "divine affirmation" to clarity.

ANTHONY J. GODZIEBA
Villanova University
Villanova, Pennsylvania

FUNDAMENTAL/SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

- Topic: The Impact of Historicity on Theological Disciplines
Moderator: Gary Macy, University of San Diego
Panelists: Florence Morgan Gillman, Gary Macy, Patricia Plovovich,
and Norbert Rigali, Dept. of Theology, University of San Diego

This panel was formed to discuss how contemporary approaches to the study of history affect different branches of theology. The panelists from the University of San Diego represent the fields of systematics, moral and historical theology and biblical studies.

I. Patricia Plovovich—Systematics. Historicity is now a category implied in most theological reflection. Recognized as an ontological condition of existence, historicity is a condition of faith's appropriation of revelation experienced and expressed in historical-cultural specificity. Thus history and culture attain the status of theological loci or sources. The recognition of historicity enriches the systematic repertory by revisiting traditional sources now studied by interpretative methodologies utilizing history and culture. It opens theological dialogue to voices suppressed, forgotten or unnoticed in the past by supporting theological construction rooted in the experience of particular social groups. The recognition of historicity vitiates confidence in unitary methods and hermeneutics of the past. It forces systematics to review its conception of the theological task, to engage the historical disciplines in creative dialogue and to search for transcultural categories and methods which abet dialogue in the present.