Tilley’s paper identified three issues as arising for Catholic theologians from the second half of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. The first had to do with the idea of the “terminal quest”—of a search for an answer to a set of questions beyond which no further question is thought necessary. Tilley noted that Buddhists and Christians identify the terminus of the conceptual question about origins differently: Buddhists (or at least this text) by asserting the beginninglessness of the causal series, and Christians by asserting God as *causa sui*. The second issue was that of the relation between bodiliness and mindfulness, with specific attention to the fact that dualism between mind and body was not a problem for Üāntideva, but is a difficulty for many Christian theologians. The third issue was that of the relation between *ūnyātā* and *pleroma*: does the Buddhist affirmation of emptiness entail or suggest that extinction is the proper end of the human?

Dan Arnold provided a response to Tilley in which he addressed all of Tilley’s concerns from the perspective of an expert in Buddhist Studies. He acknowledged the importance of Tilley’s concerns, and, for the most part, the accuracy of his understanding of the text. But he emphasized that the affirmation of emptiness has nothing to do with nihilism or extinction, but rather with a distinction between the two truths, according to which the ultimate truth about particulars is that they are as they seem—which is the same as to affirm emptiness of them.

The lively discussion that followed focused upon the questions raised by Tilley and Arnold, and also upon the methodological question of how a Christian theologian’s work and approach to work might be altered by serious reading of an alien text like the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. It was agreed that there would be such alterations (as Aquinas’s work and approach to work was altered by serious reading of Aristotle), but that the nature of such changes could not easily be known in advance.
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Martin Connell considered the vocation of the liturgical theologian in the context of the United States culture. The paper had three parts. Part one considered the aversion to ritual in canonical nineteenth-century American literature as the foundation for contemporary suspicion of ritual experiences. The
authors discussed included Ralph Waldo Emerson ("Self-Reliance," 1841), Emily Dickinson (Poem #324, 1862), and Walt Whitman ("Song of Myself," 1881). Part two highlighted the sixteenth-century turn from the Bible as a text of communal ritual celebration to a text for individual inspiration. The invention of the printing press was the medium for the unprecedented reproduction of the scriptures, so that the believer and God were imagined in relationship without the need for the community as God’s medium. This individualism was made accessible and rendered without religious practice in the authors mentioned in Part one. Part three posited four challenges to liturgical theologians in the United States that would address the necessity of communal experience—as the medium of truth—something between the hegemony of American individualism and the self-proclaimed creed as “one nation under God.” These theses took up the issues of practical theology, sensory experience, pneumatology, and the impoverishment of the Catholic imagination.

Judith Kubicki began by briefly considering the vocation of theology in general, arguing that theological scholarship, a work of discipleship, involves a mutually interpretive dialogue between Christian tradition and the contemporary situation. Liturgical theology focuses on symbolic activity, since liturgy is comprised of a complex of symbols mediating theological meaning. Dialogue involves the tradition and the culture regarding the meaning generated by symbolic activity in the contemporary Church. The liturgical theologian needs to interpret symbols, not because they are the goal of worship, but because their authenticity is crucial to the work of Jesus Christ in our time. Although liturgical symbols come from creation and involve fundamental human actions, they are part of the network of culture that mediates reality in every time and place. The vocation of the contemporary liturgical theologian is to keep alive a sacramental (symbolic) consciousness that speaks to the contemporary situation. Three aspects of our contemporary world challenge that symbolic consciousness: (1) the cultural possibilities and limitations of traditional symbols in a world Church; (2) peoples’ shifting relationship to nature or creation and the ecological crisis; (3) the shift from the modernist viewpoint (that inspired the reforms of Vatican II) to the postmodern perspective of the present moment.

Approaching the topic personally, Richard McCarron explained “liturgical theologian” as more a matter of who he is than what he does, as a matter of not simply defining himself in terms of a career but more deeply as a person in relation to God, the Christian community, and wider humanity. While living out several vocations, being a liturgical theologian comprises the formal and public vocation whereby he brings his gifts as a scholar and teacher of liturgy, hermeneutics, and theology to the mission of the Chicago Theological Union and the Church. Still, all vocation is rooted in baptism and the universal call to holiness that every Christian lives out in a variety of ways in particular contexts. He highlighted three aspects his vocation as liturgical theologian require of him: (1) keeping a vibrant and productive engagement of academy, clergy, and the liturgical assembly; (2) witnessing to the fullness of the theological task, namely,
that all systematic and constructive theology must lead to doxology and that, in the end, doxology extends to commitment; and (3) allowing his students to refine his vocation by reminding him that what matters is not so much imparting knowledge about liturgy as helping them to know liturgically, to cultivate a competence for being people of celebration, vision, and mission.

Also approaching the topic autobiographically, Susan Roll explained that for her vocation has always meant a call to the whole person, not reducible to the traditional vocations to celibacy, marriage or (often as a sort of third choice) single life. Her lifelong sense of call as a liturgist, a theologian, and a pastoral minister is best situated in this broader framework. She finds the three intertwined like threads, and further argued that each of the three could, with only slight adjustments, have been exercised apart from her “vocation” in the traditional sense. Roll suggested three important aspects of the contemporary call of the liturgical theologian: (1) the call to tell the story, describing the evolution of the church’s worship and thereby teaching that change is normal and natural, for which the best illustrations are the fourth century and the twentieth-century Liturgical Movement; (2) the call to redefine and expand what is meant by the tradition, recognizing that tradition is not only dynamic and fluid but also a product of social location; and (3) the call to address the credibility crisis in the church today, recognizing the healing power of good common worship.
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Duffy’s presentation, “Genes, Original Sin, and the Human Proclivity to Evil,” reflected upon both the inherently selfish genetic heritage humans have received from their evolutionary forebears and their self-transcendent nature, which is open to redeemability and an eternal destiny. This provided the key example for Schaefer’s description and application of her “A Method for Reformulating Catholic Doctrine.”

Duffy’s program is to mount a constructive theology of original sin, attempting to protect and reformulate the core truth contained in that traditional concept, which is “that deeply rooted within the human being is a proclivity to evil”—an inherent tendency to sin. This persists within a human individual and communal nature which is essentially good and called to an ever deeper