Latino/a theologies, and the conversation with African American theologies has not been able to develop in a significant way.

How do Latino/a and Black Catholic theologians cooperate? One repeated suggestion was a transformation in the self-understanding of these theologies, whereby African American and Latino/a theologies could no longer perceive themselves as authentic unless each results from a dialogical context. Hence, Latino/a theologies could not understand themselves as sufficiently Latino/a if they ignored or excluded the Black theological contributions, not as a "politically correct" strategy, but by the conscious incorporation of Black categories of theological analysis into Latino/a theological discourse. The same, in the other direction, would need to occur in African American/Black theologies. Much was discussed in this and in the earlier joint session. Much was accomplished. And significant avenues for collaboration were opened at this year's convention.

ORLANDO O. ESPIN
University of San Diego
San Diego, California

+ + +

MEDIEVAL THEOLOGY

Topic: Issues in Post-Thomistic Theology
Convener: Michael Gorman, The Catholic University of America
Moderator: Michael Gorman, The Catholic University of America
Presenter: Stephen Brown, Boston College
Presenter: Michael Miller, Mount St. Mary's College

Once again, the medieval group's program was set on the basis of an open paper call with blind refereeing. Stephen Brown's paper was titled "The Debate over the Character of Theology in the Early Fourteenth Century." Brown began by noting that when Durandus wrote the prologue to his commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, he spoke of three meanings of the word "theology." The first meaning is the foundational meaning: the revelation that God has given to us in the Scriptures. All other forms of Christian theology rest ultimately on this revelation. The second meaning of theology is theology as science or as a deductive discipline. The third meaning is what he called "declarative and defensive theology." In this last version, the theologian does not deduce new truths but instead focuses on the premises or starting principles themselves.

Aquinas is usually portrayed in the early 14th century as a scientific or deductive theologian, and the best example of "declarative and defensive theology" in this era is the Franciscan Peter Aureoli. Aureoli, however, argues that all the great Christian theologians were in fact also "declarative and defensive" theologians. He even argues that Aquinas practiced this kind of theology. Such a theology had four goals: to define technical terms precisely; to defend the faith

against errors and heresies; to find suitable analogies or illustrations to help people better understand the truths of the faith; and to provide arguments that show that the truths of the faith have a reasonableness to them. If we look at Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, or any of his theological treatises, we discover that in fact he did often carry out these four roles of "declarative and defensive" theology. Most succinctly, Aquinas expresses this in his exposition of Boethius' *De Trinitate*, q. 2, a. 2, reply to 4: The principles of the Christian faith "...are also defended against those who attack them, as the Philosopher argues against those who deny principles. Moreover, they are clarified by certain analogies, just as principles that are naturally known are made evident by induction but not proved by demonstrative reasoning." In the discussion that followed, the speaker and the members of the audience further clarified the various senses in which high scholastic theology was "scientific."

Michael Miller's paper was titled "Molina's Misleading Use of Aquinas in Defense of his Doctrine of Middle Knowledge." Miller discussed Luis de Molina's creative solution to the problem of God's foreknowledge, focusing on how Molina builds support for his theory by deceptively appearing to support the traditional understanding of eternity as articulated by Thomas Aquinas. This is the explanation of the surprising tone of Molina's *Concordia*. Instead of attacking Thomas directly, as one might expect, Molina ostensibly defends Thomas' understanding of eternity in Disputation 48 against several criticisms offered by Duns Scotus and Durandus. Then he goes to great length in the first part of Disputation 49 to explain how Thomas would have certainly accepted the doctrine of *scientia media*, if only a few simple points were made clear. Molina intentionally and quite shrewdly twists Aquinas' definition of eternity, which he at first accurately formulates as "a simultaneous whole comprising all time that is altogether outside of time," to include his own belief that eternity is to be defined as an infinite duration. Overall, the attitude of the discussion in these two sections is decidedly pro-Thomas, and only at the end of Disputation 49 is it made clear that the arguments apparently given by Molina to support Thomas were in fact offered to criticize and correct Thomas' point of view. The point of this strategy was to gain acceptance for his own approach by cloaking it in Aquinas's authority. In the discussion that followed, the speaker and the members of the audience made some distinctions concerning the precise content of the doctrine of middle knowledge and also explored further the precise motives and the success (or lack of it) of Molina's strategy.

MICHAEL GORMAN
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.