

Subsequent discussion expressed appreciation for Finn's proposal as a heuristic device which offered a better framing of ethical debate than the traditional division of capitalism v. socialism. Questions focused largely on clarification of Finn's framework, asking how a variety of ethical concerns about the economy might fit within the proposed analytical scheme.

KENNETH R. HIMES, OFM  
*Washington Theological Union*  
*Washington, D.C.*

---

Theme: Congar's Theological Anthropology and His Doctrine of Salvation

Convener: Mark E. Ginter, Saint Meinrad School of Theology

Moderator: Charles Dautremont, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Presenter: Fred Jelly, O.P., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary

Respondents: James Christie, United Church of Canada

Lucian Turcescu, University of St. Michael's College

According to Congar, theology's most urgent task is to develop an adequate anthropology. This thesis propelled Jelly to elucidate the contours of Congar's attempts at a contemporary Christian anthropology. Jelly began by summarizing Congar's answer to the question, "What is salvation?" Congar's four principal convictions about salvation are these: (1) salvation denotes a destiny beyond life and death; (2) Jesus Christ is the way to this salvation; (3) even this present life derives meaning from the hope in an eschatological destiny; and (4) salvation means freedom from "frustration," i.e., sin. The pivotal conviction is the second. Since Christology informs soteriology, any theological anthropology fundamentally must focus on the person of Jesus Christ—fully human and fully divine. Congar's Christology re-presents the biblical and conciliar formulations of the first seven ecumenical councils. The Catholic ecclesiology and Mariology that logically proceed from this Christology continue to pose ecumenical challenges today.

James Christie reflected on the "ecumenical receivability" of Congar's soteriology, Christology, ecclesiology, and Mariology. Christology presents the greatest challenge in a plurality of worldviews among multifaith perspectives. Where would Congar place himself on the soteriology continuum: exclusivist, inclusivist, pluralist? Furthermore, how do we translate patristic categories of the ecumenical councils into a dynamic Christology more consistent with Einsteinian and post-Einsteinian physics? Granted, the ecclesiologies of Catholicism and Protestantism do operate quite differently. Even more so is the vexing question of Mariology.

Lucian Turcescu took up Jelly's invitation to explore the ecumenical implications of the Mariology that ensues from the commonalities of Catholic

and Orthodox Christology. He focused upon the ecumenical repercussions of the recently discussed Catholic proposal to consider a papal dogmatic statement proclaiming Mary as "Co-Redemptrix, Mediatrix of All Graces and Advocate of the People of God." Turcescu finds Congar to be a reliable Catholic voice in supporting a distinction made by Orthodox writers between theology and dogma, on the one hand, and devotion, on the other. This unwelcome proposal confuses dogma and devotion, resulting in an obscuring of Revelation, and, thus, hampering ecumenical unity.

Following the responses, Jelly answered Christie's questions by opening the floor to other Congar experts. Several participants who had written on Congar concurred that he could be placed on the soteriology continuum as "inclusivist." Although he rejects Rahner's term of "anonymous Christian," due to its technical baggage, he accepts the idea of implicit faith for non-Christians who faithfully follow their consciences. The unique salvation of Christ does not extend, though, to whole non-Christian religious bodies as such.

Also in response to Christie, the issue was raised about sin vis-à-vis the corporate Church. Congar certainly acknowledges the sin of individual members of the Church, but he also pointed out the corporate culpability of the Church.

The *Josephinum Journal of Theology* will publish the full texts of all three papers.

MARK E. GINTER

*St. Meinrad School of Theology*  
*St. Meinrad, Indiana*

---

Topic: Theological Anthropology, the Material Universe, and the Moral Order

Moderator: John R. T. Berkman

Presenter: Mark F. Johnson, Marquette University

Respondent: Lisa Sowle Cahill, Boston College

There were twenty-three persons present for this session, the purpose of which was to examine the importance of theological anthropology (understood by the presenter as the discipline that studies the action and direction of human persons) for moral theology. Generally speaking, Johnson wished to provide a theological metaethics for defending the possibility of there being intrinsically bad actions regarding the human body, whereas Lisa Cahill thought that such a position, at least as developed by Johnson, had a number of problems.

In a paper focusing largely on Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, Mark Johnson argued that the central organizing principle of Aquinas's ethics is his notion of human beings as being in the "image of God." Since for Aquinas what it means for a human to be in the image of God is (a) to possess and act with intellect and will, and since (b) a human being is functioning most perfectly as the image of