

mentioned the Virgin of Guadalupe in only one poem, this poem shows her recognition of this image of the Virgin as a bridge between the indigenous Aztec and the Spanish cultures. This is manifest in symbols such as roses (flowers symbolic of truth in the Aztec world), the angel under the virgin's feet (in Aztec imagery intensifying the divine significance of the image), the rays of the sun surrounding the virgin (potentially related to the Aztec sun god), and the moon under the Virgin's feet (an image associated with the Aztec fertility goddess).

Sor Juana's discussion of Christ also reveals feminist concerns. In comparing Christ to Narcissus (in her drama *Divine Narcissus*), she changes Ovid's myth by having Narcissus fall in love with the composite image of Human Nature and Grace, both female characters. Thus the main image is not one of egocentricity but of love and mutuality, implying the depth of relationship between God and humanity. In her *Respuesta*, she focuses on Christ's beauty in an image recalling Teresa's *Interior Castle*: the face of Christ as a crystal through which the rays of divinity are seen. She also presents Christ as divine wisdom, particularly in scenes of the Passion where Jesus is seen to suffer because of the ignorance of others (the Pharisees who do not know who he truly is and the soldiers who mock him as a king). In discussing Christ as the Divine Word, Sor Juana even uses the feminine *palabra* instead of the masculine (and more customary) *verbo*. Sor Juana is seen to be an independent and self-determining woman, faithful to the traditions of her cultures, even as she reinterprets them in feminist ways.

Jeanette Rodriguez noted that Sor Juana used stylistic devices to obscure what might have been seen as offensive: her critique of the powerful. Characteristic of her work is the mixture of two cultures, the Spanish and the native. Her theology also integrates the affective and the imaginative.

LILLIAN BOZAK-DeLEO
Molloy College
Rockville Centre, New York

CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING

- Topic: Reformists and Radicals in Theological Economic Ethics
Convener: Todd Whitmore, University of Notre Dame
Moderator: Thomas Poundstone, St. Mary's College of California
Presenters: Gregory Baum, McGill University, Montreal
Daniel Rush Finn, St. John's University, Collegeville

In the first presentation, Baum considered what alternative socioeconomic model should be supported in opposition to the model of neoliberalism toward which we are moving, a model which Baum characterized as accepting massive unemployment and as opposing public welfare. The traditional opponent to neoliberalism has been the Keynesian welfare-state model which strains after full employment and which supplies a safety net for those who cannot manage. However, in response to the creation of a permanent sector of marginalized people, Baum said that the alternative model of "community development" is gaining support. He described this model as an expanding network of self-help groups and organizations among the economically marginalized. It mobilizes the excluded, rescues them from the destroying isolation characteristic of modern-day poverty, and helps them to create community. In this model, the goal of full employment is replaced by the full activity characteristic of self-mobilization, and the bureaucratic welfare state is replaced by community development which responds to the needs experienced by the local community. It is set up through a process of social learning involving the help givers, clients, and volunteers. The government remains involved, not as the master planner, but simply as one source of support. The ideal person in this community development model, unlike the self-reliant individual of the neoliberal and welfare-state models, is an interdependent, cooperative person.

Baum expressed uncertainty as to where he stood in this debate about socioeconomic models. While he declared that, to him, only an economy based on cooperation is acceptable in terms of the Gospel and that the community development model deserves support, he expressed hesitancy on several grounds: he is not ready to regard the goals of full employment and state-organized welfare as outmoded; he fears governments might look upon their support of community development as the only effort of job creation that they are willing to make; he is suspicious of communitarian movements because they often turn to oversimplified solutions and are often hostile towards outsiders; and he thinks this model presupposes a culture of generosity and self-restraint for which contemporary society lacks the spiritual resources.

In his presentation, Finn analyzed the reasons for the scandalous absence of dialogue between the left and the right on issues of economic morality. He began with a series of pairs of statements, one which both radicals and reformists could agree upon, and one which reformists reject, to illustrate the need for a more careful and nuanced conversation if we are to have dialogue. He then noted two tendencies of radicals. First, many focus so much attention on political critique that they obscure the economic dimensions of increasing the productivity of the poor. Second, they tend not to push beyond prophetic denunciation towards substantive and constructive moral discourse. On this second point, Finn cited the writing of some liberation theologians who apply the vivid refrain of "victims and executioners," not only to areas in which there is moral unanimity such as in the condemnation of death squads, but also to issues such as the role of

markets in a just economy, issues in which theologians and others have reasoned differences of opinions rooted in Gospel values.

Finn made several proposals to encourage dialogue. We must seek to describe the other's position in a way the other would endorse. We need to find arguments that are persuasive not simply to those in our own group, but also to those in groups we critique. We must not rely on unfalsifiable causal explanations. Lastly, we must recognize that interdisciplinary conversation is not necessarily interspectival conversation. Since other disciplines have the same scandal of silence between left and right, if radical and conservative theologians dialogue only with similarly radical or conservative economists, the scandal of silence has not been addressed.

THOMAS J. POUNDSTONE

*Saint Mary's College of California
Moraga, California*

ESCHATOLOGY

- Topic:** Bodily Resurrection and the Persistence of the Graced Self
Moderator: Anthony J. Godzieba, Villanova University
Presenter: Bernard P. Prusak, Villanova University, "The 'Body'
in Bodily Resurrection: Catholic Perspectives"
Respondent: William Loewe, Catholic University of America
Presenter: Anthony J. Godzieba, Villanova University, "Greshake/Ratzinger/
Postmodernism: The 'Subject' of the Afterlife"
Respondent: Peter Phan, Catholic University of America
Presenter: Philip J. Rossi, SJ, Marquette University, "Charles Taylor:
The Dissolution of the Self and the Retrieval of Spirit"
Respondent: Thomas Hughson, SJ, Marquette University

Bodily resurrection, the afterlife, and theological anthropology were this session's main concerns. Anthony Godzieba introduced the papers, at first glance seemingly disparate, by commenting on their shared anthropological concerns and thematic links: from contemporary theologies of bodily resurrection (Bernard Prusak) to the fundamental theological and anthropological issue of bodies and personal identity (Godzieba) to a particular postmodern anthropology with important implications for theology (Philip Rossi).

Prusak's detailed overview of major contemporary Catholic theologies of bodily resurrection demonstrated fundamental developments since the 1960s and