

Phan commends as courageous and opportune Farrelly's unabashed reliance on philosophy in the face of current antimetaphysical trends both in deconstructionist philosophies and in antifoundationalist theologies. However, he questions, for both pedagogical and substantive reasons, the separation of the treatment of belief in God and belief in the Christian God.

In his critique, Guarino pointed out the major ontological presuppositions to which Farrelly alludes in his work but does not develop at length, that is, the realist view of the unity and universality of human nature. After reflecting on the impact of postmodern nonfoundationalism on fundamental theology, Guarino notes that Farrelly's project is opposed by several strong epistemological currents today, and he raises several questions about foundational theology relevant to issues raised by Farrelly.

Discussion participants raised the pedagogical issue of where to locate the study of foundational theology in a specifically seminary curriculum, noting that, in most cases, it is not an issue personally engaged by the students. Nor is it provoked by external forces usually until they have had theological reflection on pastoral experience with disaffected believers who have left the church to find God.

ROGER E. McGRATH

*St. Mary's Seminary and University
Baltimore, Maryland*

THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

IN THE IMAGE OF CHRIST: PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES FOR CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY

Panelists: Mary Aquin O'Neill, Mt. St. Agnes Theological Center for Women
William M. Thompson, Duquesne University

The discussion focused on the anthropological problems raised in speaking of women as in the image of Christ. In an article forthcoming in the *Scottish Journal of Theology* ("Women and 'Conformity to Christ's Image': The Challenge of Avoiding Docetism and Affirming Inclusivism"), Thompson criticizes a contemporary form of docetism that preserves belief in women as images of Christ at the expense of the reality of Jesus' humanity, especially his maleness. To departicularize Jesus' humanity, Thompson argues, is akin to "neu-

terizing women," "desexualizing human and Christian existence," and "desanctifying sexuality." At the same time he rejects an antidocetic trend which places excessive stress on the maleness of Jesus and consequently suggests that women are not really and effectively *imagines Christi*. Stressing that what God makes possible in the Incarnation through the Spirit is not duplication, but a genuine communion that requires togetherness and difference, Thompson proposes a "participative" rather than a "duplicative" approach to being "in Christ."

O'Neill questioned whether this provides a genuine way forward for women since women participate in the divine life only through "the Son." Turning to Elizabeth Johnson's feminist Christology (*She Who Is* [New York: Crossroad, 1992]), O'Neill observed that, for Johnson, the maleness of Jesus has only social significance, with the cross functioning as the final "kenosis of patriarchy." While Johnson draws on the resurrection, Wisdom Christology, and the Body of Christ, O'Neill remarked that in each case "maleness is attenuated, at best."

In her own construction of an anthropology of mutuality, reciprocity, or *communio* ("The Mystery of Being Human Together," in *Freeing Theology*, ed. C. M. LaCugna [San Francisco: Harper, 1993] 139-60), O'Neill criticizes not only a docetic Christology, but also an androgynous Christology "in which Jesus is imagined as complete in himself, embracing the possibilities of female as well as male being." Noting that "no human life, not even that of Jesus, can embrace both sides of the human experience at the same time," O'Neill proposes that a retrieval of the figure of Mary as well as that of Jesus is crucial for a theological anthropology that takes embodiment seriously.

The discussion that followed included:

- the importance of distinguishing between the terms *imago Dei*, *imago Christi*, "image of Jesus," and *in persona Christi*;
- the question of whether we image Christ as individuals or in communion with one another;
- the Asian perspective that to be in the image of someone (e.g., Buddha) does not require sexual resemblance;
- the value of Caroline Walker Bynum's work on the "transformation of flesh" and the common communion in the flesh that is experienced in the process of human generation;
- lessons to be learned from the iconoclast controversy; and
- the significance of sexuality in all human experience and relationships.

The session concluded with the question: What difference does "difference" make and who decides?

MARY CATHERINE HILKERT
Aquinas Institute of Theology
St. Louis, Missouri