

Trinity. Muller noted problems both with Zizioulas's scriptural exegesis and with the theological coherence of his position.

The discussion began with a concern over Zizioulas's disassociation of immanent and economic Trinity. It was suggested by one participant that any statement about the immanent Trinity not derived from the economic Trinity would be Gnosticism. Groppe pointed out that Zizioulas bases his Trinitarian theology on eucharistic worship, which from Groppe's point of view is an element of the economy of salvation. Another participant argued that perhaps Zizioulas's disassociation of immanent and economic Trinity was meant to remind us that the Trinitarian life of God is inexhaustible mystery.

The question of freedom in God was also raised. One participant suggested that God's decision to be as communion is the act by which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit exist. Such an act ensures the ontological freedom of the Son and Spirit, even though Son and Spirit are from the Father. Groppe maintained that by identifying freedom with the Father's unoriginateness, Zizioulas implicitly denies ontological freedom to the Son and Spirit. Furthermore, Muller observed, Zizioulas's emphasis on the monarchy of the Father seems to contradict his emphasis on communion. Another participant, taking up Muller's observation that there is no necessity in God according to Zizioulas, suggested that we should not limit ourselves to the distinction between necessity and freedom, thereby reducing the meaning of freedom to free choice. If the meaning of freedom is reduced to free choice, then the Father generates the Son out of the Father's free choice. Muller agreed that this was Zizioulas's position, problematic as it is. Groppe suggested that for Zizioulas the Father generates the Son not out of free choice but out of a freedom of love that overcomes the opposition between free choice and necessity. Finally, one participant suggested that distinguishing between created and uncreated origination might preserve the ontological freedom of Son and Spirit.

ANTHONY KEATY

*St. John's Seminary
Brighton, Massachusetts*

* * * * *

MISSIOLOGY AND MISSION THEOLOGY

- Topic: Reconciliation: Missiological Gift and Challenge
 Conveners: Stephen Bevans, Catholic Theological Union
 Colleen Mary Mallon, St. John's University, New York
 Moderator: Colleen Mary Mallon, St. John's University, New York
 Presenters: David Burrell, University of Notre Dame
 Tim Muldoon, Mt. Aloysius College
 Respondent: Jeanne Evans, Marymount Manhattan College

This session of the Missiology and Mission Theology program group brought together two insightful and contrastive talks as a means of exploring the conference theme of reconciliation. By offering talks that addressed respectively the question of reconciliation and the church's mission *ad extra* and *ad intra*, the session generated renewed appreciation for the capacity of dialog-with-difference to illuminate aspects of self-understanding hitherto unrecognized.

David Burrell introduced the session with an exploration of how the three Abrahamic faiths, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, might break new ground in interreligious dialogue by paying attention to the opportunities that a tripartite dialogue opens for growth in knowledge and relationship. In particular, Burrell explored how the contemporary political crisis involving all three religions can serve as an opportunity for both greater self-understanding and deeper appreciation of the difference and dignity of the other. To that end Burrell suggested that the current impasse in Jewish-Christian dialogue might be helped by a triadic conversation that included the relation of religion and power in Islam. By juxtaposing elements of Jewish-Christian history and Muslim-Christian history, Burrell retrieves not only the legacy of conflict and mutual epithets of unbeliever but also the counterstreams of cooperation and relationship as evidenced in the theological dialogue led by Louis Massingnon, Georges Anawati and Robert Caspar. The work of these pioneers and those that followed have facilitated mutual illumination and offer a way of engaging in comparative theological inquiry without eliding the differences that are integral to the religious identity of each Abrahamic faith. Burrell closed his paper by affirming that the way to interreligious understanding is through the journey of friendship. Only true friendship can navigate the present conflictual situations, exposing both false religious consciousness and the unfaith of those who practice power and violence.

Tim Muldoon engaged the topic of reconciliation by reflecting on the mission of the postmodern church in the U.S. and its need to address the post-Vatican II generation. Muldoon presented nine theses that could effectively guide the church's approach to young Catholics. Central to Muldoon's perspective is the supposition that in a postmodern world the mission of the church is its *raison d'être*. Mission and identity are expressed less through schemes of inculturation and more from the loci of the gospel-imbued daily lives of ordinary Christians. Mystagogy becomes the model for mission in such a postmodern church and requires of ecclesial leaders and catechists communication skills more akin to coaching than teaching. Mystagogy, modeled after Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian (Acts 8:28-29), expresses the church's willingness to help human beings bring to perfection the gifts that God has already bestowed upon them. This is particularly important when addressing the relationship of young Catholics to popular culture; while young people may lack the ability to articulate elements of Catholic faith in terms that correspond to the catechism, Muldoon warns that it would be a mistake to fail to appreciate the ways that young people have already appropriated the gospel. A postmodern church must listen for Christ

already present in the aspirations and culture of the young, particularly as they are reflected in the idiom of human rights. Efforts to help the young make the connections between the language of human rights and the language of theological anthropology (such as correlating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with *Pacem et Terris*) furthers their sense of connection to the church and its mission. Muldoon cautioned against the use of certain "hot button" issues (abortion, homosexuality, birth control) as barometers for church membership because the very process of mystagogy requires time and patience as young people grow and develop into more complete ownership of the church's moral teachings.

In response to the two presenters, Jeanne Evans raised questions and observations that introduced a lively discussion among the participants. Expressing appreciation for Muldoon's recovery of mystagogy and his attention to popular religiosity as a ground for affective religious expression, Evans wondered if it is possible to bridge spirituality and social justice for the post-Vatican II generation? Commenting on Burrell's thesis that the current crisis engulfing the Abrahamic faiths offers an opportunity for deepened mutual theological understanding, Evans noted that all three Abrahamic faiths share spiritual, mystical and prophetic traditions that call believers to relationship and friendship beyond conflict.

COLLEEN MARY MALLON
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York

* * * * *

BIOETHICS AND HEALTHCARE

Topic: The Disabled: Reconcilers for Our Humanity
 Convener: David F. Kelly, Duquesne University
 Presenters: Mary Jo Iozzio, Barry University
 Mark Miller, St. Paul's Hospital
 and St. Thomas More College, Saskatoon

In her paper, "Temporarily Non-Disabled: The Impermanent (Impertinent?) Modifications of Genetic Abnormalities," Mary Jo Iozzio offered a critique of the medical model in the context of genetic manipulations proposed as remedies for disabilities. In particular, she emphasized the dangers of genetic screening followed by abortion of fetuses found to suffer from "disabilities" or anomalies. She noted that

many people in the disability community hold that the medical model presumes a normative position that confounds the lives and real experience of people with disabilities and labels them deviant; further, the medical model denies and minimizes, through a variety of remedial accommodations, the manifold