

helped us probe the significance U.S. Hispanic popular religion for sacramental theology, as well as the significance of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz for contemporary theology.

ROBERTO S. GOIZUETA
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

CHRISTOLOGY

Topic: Christology in Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue
 Convener: Tatha Wiley, St. Olaf College
 Presenter: John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

Fr. Pawlikowski's summary of his paper, "Christology in Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue," follows.

Chapter 4 of Vatican II's *Nostra Aetate* represents one of the most profound theological changes introduced by the Council. Gregory Baum has termed it the most radical reformulation of the ordinary magisterium introduced at Vatican II. In a few short paragraphs the council repudiated almost two thousand years of Christian theology regarding Jews and Judaism. Against the traditional view of Jews as displaced from the covenant because of unfaithfulness and deicide, the council reaffirmed their continued covenantal relationship after the Christ event. Since so much of classical Christology was premised on this notion of Jewish replacement, *Nostra Aetate* becomes a major challenge for Christological rethinking in the postconciliar church.

In the almost four decades since Vatican II, a number of theologians have tried their hand at reformulating Christology in a way that takes into account the teaching of *Nostra Aetate*. One attempt to do this has been through the notion of a single covenant linking Jews and Christians. Monika Hellwig was an early advocate of such a single covenantal notion arguing that Jews and Christians share a common messianic vision, though each may work somewhat differently in carrying it out. The late Episcopal scholar Paul van Buren, in his trilogy on the subject, saw Israel as consisting of two branches which were connected though distinct. For van Buren it is not a question of the Church now suddenly abandoning its historic proclamation of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. But Jesus was not the Christ in one crucial sense. He was not the long-awaited Jewish messiah. And so post-Easter Judaism remains a religion of legitimate messianic hope rather than of spiritual blindness or outdated messianic expectation. Where van Buren ultimately wound up on the christological question in his published writings was the proclamation of Jesus as "Israel's gift to the Gentile church."

The second major post-Vatican II perspective on the Christian-Jewish relationship has revolved around the positing of a double covenant. Franz Müssner and I have been principal proponents of this approach in our writings. The

double covenant notion, it needs to be emphasized, continues to posit an ongoing connection between Judaism and Christianity at their very roots. But it argues more strongly for a distinctiveness between Judaism and Christianity after their eventual split than does the single covenant. Double covenant perspectives tend to strongly emphasize an incarnational approach to Christology rather than interpreting the Christ event in terms of the fulfillment of Jewish messianic prophecies. Such a stress allows for the maintenance of Jews and Christians as distinct faith communities despite their continued bonding.

In recent years new scholarship on the first few centuries of the Christian-Jewish relationship by both Christians and Jews has forced some reconsideration of how we image that relationship. It is now apparent that the split between church and synagogue was far more prolonged than we once thought. Evidence now exists that well into the third century CE, and even later in a few places in the East, Christians continued to attend synagogue services on a regular basis and apparently were welcomed by their Jewish neighbors, although we do not know what role the Christians played in the service. This new perspective on origins has forced reconsideration of the claim that Jesus founded a new entity called the church in his lifetime.

As a result of this new information certain scholars have now begun to offer new images of the relationship between Jews and Christians. The late Hayim Perelmuter and Alan Segal have used the image of "siblings." The Protestant theologian Clark Williamson has depicted the relationship as one of "partners in waiting." Mary Boys has spoken of Jews and Christians as "fraternal twins." And Daniel Boyarin, in an ongoing scholarly project still in process, has emphasized "coemergence" as the basic way understanding the Jewish-Christian relationship. All of these new images have their strengths and weaknesses. At this moment I personally lean the most towards "siblings." But the process of rethinking the relationship, and by definition, the meaning of Christology, must continue in the light of this new evidence. We also need to reflect on the meaning of Christology in light of the Holocaust, something about which I have published a number of pieces. For if we must rethink the notion of God after the Holocaust, then *ipso facto* there is need to rethink Christology as well.

Fr. Pawlikowski and the forty participants in the session engaged in a lively discussion about the developments in Christology and Jewish-Christian relations presented in his paper.

TATHA WILEY
St. Olaf College
St. Paul, Minnesota