

apocalyptic Christology of Revelation illumine. When justifying faith transvalues intellectual conversion, it transforms the intuitive dimensions of faith into narrative Christology and the inferential dimensions of faith into doctrinal Christology. The transvaluation of personal moral and sociopolitical conversion in justifying faith completes the doctrinal elaboration of the theoretical meaning of the hypostatic union by elucidating its practical consequences in an ethical context. The transvaluation of the two forms of moral conversion forces a rethinking of the meaning of Christian charity and gives rise to a liberation theology for the United States.

A "Works in Progress" period followed the session's formal presentation and discussion. Participants reported on recently published and current projects underway. This dimension of the Christology meeting will be a part of the 2003 program. Participants are encouraged to offer short explanations of their current work. Distribution of an abstract is welcome.

TATHA WILEY

St. Olaf College

Northfield, Minnesota

+ + +

CHRISTOLOGY SPECIAL SESSION

Topic: *Jesus, Symbol of God: A Discussion with Roger Haight*
 Moderator: Tatha Wiley, St. Olaf College
 Presenter: Roger Haight, Weston School of Theology

In this special evening session convened by the Christology Group and attended by some 300 members, Roger Haight engaged in a dialogue with reviewers of his book and attendees about the thrust, assertions, and import of his recent volume, *Jesus, Symbol of God*. Haight offered a synopsis of and response to the book's 38 reviews by summarizing ten key assertions of the volume, the questions or criticisms most frequently raised by reviewers about those ideas, and his response or clarification of the central ideas.

Haight emphasized the legitimacy of his genetic method—a "Christology from below" that works from what can be known about the original process by which the church's doctrines were constructed in response to the life, death, and resurrection of the historical Jesus. He offered and defended this method as an important framework for posing Christological questions and formulating a credible contemporary Christology.

The ten key assertions specifically engaged and defended by Haight included the following.

(1) *A Genetic Method*. Christology from below represents a major shift of imaginative framework. A genetic method leads one through the process and

logic of the original construction of the doctrines about Jesus. One can chart the historical genesis of Christology.

(2) *Representation of the Jesus Material*. Carrying out a genetic method binds the imagination to the this-worldly Jesus, thus reinforcing that Jesus was a human being. This is a major shift because doctrine and tradition have schooled the Christian imagination from above to see Jesus first as God, who took on or added a human nature.

(3) *The Easter Experience*. Jesus' paradigmatic resurrection was into God's sphere and thus not a historical (empirical) experience. The continuation of an historical, genetic approach shifts a consideration of the Easter experience, for which a broadly historical structure is provided symbolically in the Emmaus story. God raised Jesus. Jesus the person is really risen and lives within the sphere of God.

(4) *Pluralism of New Testament Christologies*. That there is a pluralism of New Testament Christologies is a fact established by exegesis. This pluralism may be considered normative for the church.

(5) *The Construct of a Symbol*. The structure of a symbol is dialectical. It holds together in tension two perceived or experienced realities that are not the same. As synonymous with "sacrament" it describes a plausibility structure for (not explanation of) an understanding of the unity of the humanity and divinity of Jesus.

(6) *Interpretation of Nicaea and Chalcedon*. Important suppositions here are that these are classical doctrines, that the language of these doctrines no longer works in a postmodern culture, that hermeneutical theory allows an interpretation that preserves their point in a different language, and that there may be a variety of such theological interpretations consistent with the common Christian experience that grounds the doctrines. The criterion of adequacy of any Christology is its ability to explain the experience of salvation mediated through Jesus.

(7) *The Meaning of Salvation*. The experience of salvation, an answer to the religious question, is the anthropological ground of Christology. The essence of the experience of salvation in the Christian framework consists in an encounter with a personal, saving God. Love of neighbor must be translated into social terms.

(8) *Jesus Christ vis-à-vis Other Religions*. Characteristic of our postmodern situation, the question of the evaluation of Jesus within the context of other religions is prior to and a condition of the response to the more Christological question. Many Christians implicitly assign other religions a status roughly on a par with Christianity. One can formulate an orthodox Christology that builds upon and includes this attitude.

(9) *Christology Proper*. Christology must respond to and be intelligible in our current situation, faithful to the tradition of Christian witness, and motivate the Christian life. Appealing to the pluralism of New Testament Christology and our current religious pluralistic situation, proposed here are two distinct languages for Christology and how they may be held to the norms for Christology.

(10) *God as Trinity*. Behind a Christology from above is the doctrine of the trinity with high tritheistic tendencies. A Christology from below demonstrates that the doctrine of the trinity is derivative; its whole value depends historically and logically from Christology. By itself, it cannot logically support a Christology from above.

TATHA WILEY
St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota

+++

THEOLOGY AND THE NATURAL SCIENCES

- Topic: Religion and Genetics
 Conveners: Thomas A. Shannon, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
 William R. Stoeger, Vatican Observatory, The University of Arizona
 Presenters: Thomas A. Shannon, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
 Zachary Hayes, Catholic Theological Union
 "Adam and Eve, Modern Genetics and Original Sin"

Hayes began the dual presentation emphasizing the need to move from the general conversation between theology and the sciences to a discussion of an individual doctrine in terms of recent scientific findings. Such a focus exemplifies John Haught's "contact" model for relating science and religion. "Original sin" provides such an example. Bringing a specific set of theological issues into confrontation with the discoveries of the sciences generates a new set of interesting problems and insights.

Shannon began the conversation by presenting the conclusions that paleontology, anthropology, and population genetics have tentatively reached concerning human origins. He stressed humanity's profound biological solidarity with all other living creatures and the gradual decentering of human beings' earlier presumed privileged place in the biosphere. Though we possess a uniqueness and a special dignity, we are the outcome of a long process of evolution from the most primitive forms of life, and we carry a record of that process in our genome. Orangutans and humans share a common ancestor, which existed between ten and sixteen million years ago; and chimpanzees, gorillas, and humans share a common ancestor which flourished between five and eight million years ago. Despite these conclusions, the relationship between humans and subhumans is complex and unclear, particularly our relationship with Neanderthals. Shannon went on to describe the two competing theories of the origin of contemporary humans—the dominant "out of Africa" theory and the "multiregional" theory, and traced the likely series of migrations that support the former. What is clear, in any case, is that an original pair of humans ("Adam"