

divine revelation. The objective reality of the divine word is mediated through the subjective appropriation of this revelation by the believing community in the course of time.

William McConville added to the picture of the Tübingen School in his essay, "Franz Anton Staudenmaier on Dogmatic Development." Staudenmaier (1800–1856) challenged not only Deism but also "supernaturalism." He maintained that "history is the form of revelation, and revelation is the content of history." In other words, the "divine idea" discloses itself in the drama of human affairs. To be concrete, although heresy is not necessary, it can be useful in bringing about a fuller understanding of God's self-communication.

In his response to the three papers, Donald Dietrich called attention to the fact that the Tübingen theologians were broad-minded scholars who had entered into a dialogue with the thought of their day. By their lives and writings, they demonstrated that the answers of one age may not adequately address the questions of the next. Further, they themselves generated ideas that today require rethinking. For example, rejecting the "liberal" emphasis upon the autonomy of each person, they adopted the metaphor that human life is "organic," that is, that all aspects of life and all people are interconnected. Unfortunately, this idea, pushed to the extreme, was used to justify fascism in the twentieth century.

The concluding discussion highlighted the intellectual vigor and courage of these theologians. We also noted that time had not permitted a presentation on another Tübingen scholar, Johann Baptist Hirscher (1788–1865).

ROBERT A. KRIEG

*The University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana*

EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

- Topic: Doctrinal Development in the Early Church
Convener: Alexis J. Doval, Saint Mary's College of California, Moraga
Moderator: Dolores Lee Greeley, Saint Louis University
Presenters: Robert J. Daly, Boston College
Mary Ann Donovan, Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley

Robert J. Daly focused his presentation on the issues of realism and spiritualism in the development of patristic eucharistic theology. Beginning with a selective list of authors covering a span of eight centuries of Christian history from Origen of Alexandria (185–ca. 254) to Berengar of Tours (1010–1088), he concluded that there was a strong tension between the realistic and spiritualistic understandings of the Eucharist. Development in this regard was not always in the direction of progress. Origen's theology of the Eucharist was highly spiritualized, while that of Hilary of Poitiers and Gregory of Nyssa was quite

realistic and grossly materialistic. How can such a striking change be explained? Daly suggests that we find the answer in the anti-Arian polemical context. Ambrose affirmed the common fourth-century Antiochene doctrine of the somatic real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. However, in contrast to the Greek fathers, Ambrose's eucharistic theology does not have a strong sense of the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer. He thus ends up giving the eucharistic mystery a very narrow focus on the words of institution. This leads in succeeding centuries to a narrowing of the western eucharistic tradition.

Mary Ann Donovan addressed the issue of church authority. She focused on the text of Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.3,2, "Every Church should agree with this Church . . ." Because of the extreme importance of this passage it is necessary to understand it not in isolation but in the broader context of Irenaeus' teaching on the church and the Holy Spirit. In this text Irenaeus argues that the authority of the Roman church is based upon its outstanding fidelity in conserving what was received from the apostles. Yet in another passage in *Adv. haer.* III.24,1 he balances his presentation of the church as locus of authoritative teaching with that of the church as place of the Spirit, where, under the Spirit's action the faith renews itself and the church in which the faith lives is also renewed. Donovan reminds us that we must recognize the problems within texts and be careful not to resolve our arguments based on a single text. The entire work of an author and its context must be considered if we are to ascertain its place in the development of doctrine.

In the stimulating and enriching discussion which followed, the twenty-two participants queried the presenters and shared with one another from their own area of expertise. What was the reaction of Irenaeus with other ancient centers of the Christian faith? What was so threatening to Christian faith in the teachings of the gnostics? How did the changing polemical context continue to influence the understanding of the realism and spiritualism issue in the development of eucharistic theology? What is the meaning, role, and function of image, sign, and symbol in the understanding of eucharistic theology? Both of these topics, authority and eucharist, have critical relevance for ecumenical discussion and hope for the reunion of churches today.

DOLORES LEE GREELEY

St. Louis University

St. Louis, Missouri