confronting oneself with it.” Theology apprehends and confronts itself with the historical reality of its context: (i) noetically “realizing the weight of historical reality” (Medellín, option for poor); (ii) ethically “shouldering the weight of historical reality” (e.g., the University of Central America’s 1970–1989 efforts); and (iii) in the unitive moment of freedom and praxis: “taking charge of the weight of historical reality” (taking the poor down from the cross).

ROBERT A. LASSALLE-KLEIN
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

RENAISSANCE/MODERN THEOLOGY

Topic: Doctrinal Development and the Tübingen School
Convener: Robert A. Krieg, University of Notre Dame
Moderator: John E. Thiel, Fairfield University
Presenters: Michael J. Himes, Boston College
Grant Kaplan, Boston College
William E. McConville, Siena College
Respondent: Donald J. Dietrich, Boston College

John Thiel set the stage for the discussion by recalling that the Catholic theologians at the University of Tübingen were among the first scholars to address the issue of the development of church teachings. Then he introduced the four speakers.

Michael Himes explained in his essay, “Johann Sebastian Drey and Johann Adam Möhler on Doctrinal Development,” that Drey (1777–1853) and Möhler (1796–1838) shared both an opposition to Deism and also a reliance on an organic notion of history in their reflections on the dynamic character of doctrine. They tried to show that God had not chosen to step aside after the act of creation but remained active in history. In this effort, they worked with a notion of history that they had derived from the work of J. G. Herder (1744–1803) and G. W. F. Hegel (1770–1831). Yet they differed with each other in that while Drey stressed the Holy Spirit’s guidance in the unfolding of the church’s teachings, Möhler emphasized the influence of human freedom. Hence, Drey held that heresy can aid in the unfolding of the truth. Möhler added, however, that heresy is a sin, since it is an abuse of freedom.

Grant Kaplan discussed the notions of history and revelation in his paper, “Historical Revelation and Living Tradition in Johann Evangelist Kuhn.” Insisting on the Holy Spirit’s ability to act in time and space, Kuhn (1806–1887) recognized the role of specific events in God’s self-communication to the human family. He opposed, therefore, D. F. Strauss’s view of history as well as Deism. Moreover, Kuhn acknowledged the role of the human subject in the reception of
divine revelation. The objective reality of the divine word is mediated through the subjective appropriation of this revelation by the believing community in the course of time.

William McConville added to the picture of the Tübingen School in his essay, “Franz Anton Staudenmaier on Dogmatic Development.” Staudenmaier (1800–1856) challenged not only Deism but also “supernaturalism.” He maintained that “history is the form of revelation, and revelation is the content of history.” In other words, the “divine idea” discloses itself in the drama of human affairs. To be concrete, although heresy is not necessary, it can be useful in bringing about a fuller understanding of God’s self-communication.

In his response to the three papers, Donald Dietrich called attention to the fact that the Tübingen theologians were broad-minded scholars who had entered into a dialogue with the thought of their day. By their lives and writings, they demonstrated that the answers of one age may not adequately address the questions of the next. Further, they themselves generated ideas that today require rethinking. For example, rejecting the “liberal” emphasis upon the autonomy of each person, they adopted the metaphor that human life is “organic,” that is, that all aspects of life and all people are interconnected. Unfortunately, this idea, pushed to the extreme, was used to justify fascism in the twentieth century.

The concluding discussion highlighted the intellectual vigor and courage of these theologians. We also noted that time had not permitted a presentation on another Tübingen scholar, Johann Baptist Hirscher (1788–1865).

ROBERT A. KRIEG
The University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

Topic: Doctrinal Development in the Early Church
Convener: Alexis J. Doval, Saint Mary's College of California, Moraga
Moderator: Dolores Lee Greeley, Saint Louis University
Presenters: Robert J. Daly, Boston College
            Mary Ann Donovan, Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley

Robert J. Daly focused his presentation on the issues of realism and spiritualism in the development of patristic eucharistic theology. Beginning with a selective list of authors covering a span of eight centuries of Christian history from Origen of Alexandria (185–ca. 254) to Berengar of Tours (1010–1088), he concluded that there was a strong tension between the realistic and spiritualistic understandings of the Eucharist. Development in this regard was not always in the direction of progress. Origen’s theology of the Eucharist was highly spiritualized, while that of Hilary of Poitiers and Gregory of Nyssa was quite