HISPANIC/LATINO THEOLOGY

Topic: Evangelizing the Evangelizers
Convener: Roberto S. Goizueta, Boston College
Presenter: Orlando Espín, University of San Diego

In his paper entitled “Toward the Construction of an Intercultural Theology of Tradition and Popular Catholicism,” Orlando Espín argued for greater collaboration between contemporary scholars concerned with articulating the theological implications of popular Catholicism and scholars developing theologies of Tradition. Such collaboration is essential for an appropriate appreciation of popular Catholicism as the ordinary framework for determining the legitimacy of beliefs or practices that claim continuity with Catholic Tradition and/or Catholic identity. (Espin emphasized that he was not suggesting that popular Catholicism was either the only or the principal criterion, but the “ordinary” criterion of legitimacy.) Popular Catholicism is thus the ordinary framework within which Tradition changes and develops.

Given this understanding of the relationship between popular Catholicism and Catholic Tradition, Espín asserted that theologies of Tradition should take an intercultural approach. Such an approach is appropriate and necessary in a context of globalization since an intercultural perspective would be attentive to the victims of globalization while recognizing the dynamic character of interaction among cultures and the increasingly fluid character of cultural and geographic borders. Espín went on to describe the process of globalization, the “deterritorialization” of cultural and symbolic goods, and the impact this process is having on the poor, the majority of the world’s population. The process of globalization exacerbates asymmetrical distributions of power and resources, a fact of particular significance for the Catholic Church since two-thirds of all Catholics live in the Third World.

Espin drew on the intercultural philosophy developed by Prof. Raúl Fornet-Betancourt of the University of Bremen as an important dialogue partner for Catholic theologians seeking to address this globalizing reality from the perspective of Third World popular Catholicism. As opposed to theories of enculturation, an intercultural approach reflects more accurately our contemporary global reality by proposing a notion of “culture” that avoids the tendency to objectify culture (i.e., the tendency to perceive religious faith or truth claims as “things” that exist independent of culture and, only subsequently therefore, must be “en”culturated). Espín insisted that an intercultural approach should resist not only the modern tendency toward universalization but, at the same time, the postmodern tendency toward relativization.

Numerous participants raised questions of both presenters and a lively discussion developed. The questions helped the group to draw out some of the nuances of the San Fernando rituals, as shown on the video. Several questions
helped us probe the significance U.S. Hispanic popular religion for sacramental theology, as well as the significance of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz for contemporary theology.

ROBERTO S. GOIZUETA
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

CHRISTOLOGY

Topic: Christology in Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue
Convener: Tatha Wiley, St. Olaf College
Presenter: John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Catholic Theological Union, Chicago


Chapter 4 of Vatican II’s Nostra Aetate represents one of the most profound theological changes introduced by the Council. Gregory Baum has termed it the most radical reformulation of the ordinary magisterium introduced at Vatican II. In a few short paragraphs the council repudiated almost two thousand years of Christian theology regarding Jews and Judaism. Against the traditional view of Jews as displaced from the covenant because of unfaithfulness and deicide, the council reaffirmed their continued covenantal relationship after the Christ event. Since so much of classical Christology was premised on this notion of Jewish replacement, Nostra Aetate becomes a major challenge for Christological retinking in the postconciliar church.

In the almost four decades since Vatican II, a number of theologians have tried their hand at reformulating Christology in a way that takes into account the teaching of Nostra Aetate. One attempt to do this has been through the notion of a single covenant linking Jews and Christians. Monika Hellwig was an early advocate of such a single covenantal notion arguing that Jews and Christians share a common messianic vision, though each may work somewhat differently in carrying it out. The late Episcopal scholar Paul van Buren, in his trilogy on the subject, saw Israel as consisting of two branches which were connected though distinct. For van Buren it is not a question of the Church now suddenly abandoning its historic proclamation of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. But Jesus was not the Christ in one crucial sense. He was not the long-awaited Jewish messiah. And so post-Easter Judaism remains a religion of legitimate messianic hope rather than of spiritual blindness or outdated messianic expectation. Where van Buren ultimately wound up on the christological question in his published writings was the proclamation of Jesus as “Israel’s gift to the Gentile church.”

The second major post-Vatican II perspective on the Christian-Jewish relationship has revolved around the positing of a double covenant. Franz Müßner and I have been principal proponents of this approach in our writings. The