women's experience and the best (and often disregarded) Western moral tradition.

Both Our Cry for Life and En la Lucha / In the Struggle brought out very serious questions concerning (and substantial dialogue on) how traditions and experiences of particular human groups can relate to issues regarding the "universally human."

This year's workshop exposed many Euro-American theologians to the work of some of their Latino colleagues. It further pointed to the need for continuing and expanding the dialogue, as it affects the theological enterprise. Approximately thirty-five participants shared in this year's workshop.

ORLANDO O. ESPÍN University of San Diego San Diego, California

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY GROUP

MURRAY'S SHIFT FROM A CONCEPTUALISTIC TO A HISTORICALLY EMBEDDED CHRISTOLOGY

Presenters: Charles Curran, Southern Methodist University
Leon Hooper, Woodstock Theological Center
Thomas Hughson, Marquette University

The presentations focused on Murray's systematic theologies of the 1930s through 1967. It was noted that (1) Murray was more comfortable with the Christ of Nicea than with the Jesus of Nazareth, i.e., that his Christologies remained firmly in an intellectualist tradition, and (2) that his early Christology was shaped by the Catholic manualists, while his late theology relied heavily on the trinitarian theology of Lonergan. At issue was whether Murray's work in all its forms represents a tradition in sharp discontinuity with present christological approaches, or whether it both mirrored and facilitated a shift from conceptualistic and ahistorical Christologies to the contemporary focus of Catholic Christologies on history.

Hooper outlined the conceptualism of Murray's earlier manualist theology. For the early Murray, theology foundationally represented the redemption of theoretical intelligence. It took the beatific vision as its primary model for human participation in God's life, understanding redemptive truth as timeless, essentially ahistorical and asocial. Curran described the fundamental dualism in Murray's

approach to theological and natural law truth, and to social roles within the Church. Three of Murray's breaks with manualist conceptualism and dualism were then discussed: (1) his mid-1940s insistence that lay theology must be anchored in the biblical record of Jesus, that its finality was in history, and that it shapes the entire (not simply speculative) human person; (2) his gradual situating of even systematic, trinitarian theology within history; and (3) parallel challenges Murray posed in 1937 to Scheeben's highly obediential, paternalistic theology and after the council to Roman Catholic emphasis on authority and obedience (Hughson). Consistent across these shifts are notions of the redemption of human intelligence and grace as empowering the full person—both intelligence and the human person gradually understood as fully historical and social.

Subsequent discussion focused on Murray's natural law/theology dualism. Appeals made in the 1970s to Murray presented a choice between either natural law or theological languages in public discourse. Given our present recognition of the limits of enlightenment rationalism (and natural law theism) in shaping public character, it was suggested that both natural law and revealed theological languages can claim a necessary place in public discussion. Our problem then becomes: how, and on what grounds, we might bring those languages into the public forum in a nontotalitarian manner that encourages the virtues necessary for contributing to our pluralistic, historical societies and churches. Murray's mid-1950s insistence that natural law principles develop in history, and postconciliar insistence that the Church turn to history to find Christ, offer some foundations for such an ethic, even while he preserved a Catholic emphasis on the importance of reasoning for addressing both civic and theological issues.

LEON HOOPER, S.J.

Woodstock Theological Center

Georgetown University

Washington, D.C.