

vide a holding environment for people in this new place. The Holy Spirit, the ultimate holding environment for the world's living and learning, seeks in myriad ways to build up this kind of container for the healing of our common humanity.

ELIZABETH E. CARR

Smith College

Northampton, Massachusetts

THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- Topic: Pneumatology in Theological Anthropology
Convener: Anne M. Clifford, Duquesne University
Moderator: Anne H. King-Lenzmeier, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul
Presenters: Nancy A. Dallavalle, Fairfield University, "The Role of the Spirit in Late Modernity: Safeguard of Particularity"
 Janice M. Poorman, University of Notre Dame, "In the Spirit We Are One: Pneumatological and Anthropological Foundations for Interreligious Dialogue"

The task for theology today is both to take pluralism seriously and to respond to religious diversity. In their papers on pneumatology and theological anthropology Nancy Dallavalle and Janice Poorman engaged in this task. In "The Role of the Spirit in Late Modernity: Safeguard of Particularity," Dallavalle observed that recent constructive pneumatologies emphasize the Spirit's activity in the multiplicity, rather than in the unity, of creation. Focusing on the work of Reformed theologian Colin Gunton, author of *The One, the Three, and the Many: God, Creation, and the Culture of Modernity*, Dallavalle noted that he criticizes both modernity and postmodernity as, paradoxically, simultaneously individualistic and homogeneous. Moreover, both are profoundly gnostic in their prizing of rationality and their antimaterialism. Gunton's response is a doctrine of God, an anthropology, and a theology of creation all characterized by a relational ontology that strictly preserves particularity-in-otherness, a particularity that is maintained by the Spirit both in the Godhead and in creation. The Spirit both crosses boundaries enabling that which has spirit to be open to what is other than itself and sustains the relation of otherness which establishes the other in its true reality. The Spirit does this by maintaining relations that do not violate what creation is; humanity, for example, brings nonhuman creation to perfection not through instrumental use, but through a relationship of dominion.

Dallavalle concluded her presentation by questioning whether Gunton's focus on relation and particularity was as satisfactory for anthropology as for theology, arguing that human relations are always mediated by complex social structures that can distort the perception of various particularities. She noted that Gunton cites the particularity of sex, yet dismisses the work of feminist theologians.

In the second paper, "In the Spirit We Are One: Pneumatological and Anthropological Foundations for Interreligious Dialogue," Poorman addressed questions dealing with the reality of religious pluralism. She critiqued the theologies of religious pluralists (e.g., John Hick, George Lindbeck and Paul Knitter). Each, for different reasons, fails to lay pneumatological or anthropological foundations that remain fully identified with Christian tradition and yet allow all humanity to be drawn into the one mystery of grace. Poorman, therefore, proposed that Christian inclusivists offer a greater contribution to interreligious dialogue than do religious pluralists because the inclusivists do not sever the unifying link among all human beings—the Spirit of Jesus Christ who draws all human beings into the one mystery of grace. Inclusivists lay theological foundations for interreligious engagement without relativizing Christian truth claims regarding the transformative power of the Spirit.

Poorman closed her presentation by arguing that in the debate among Christians concerning pluralistic and inclusive approaches to dialogue there may be considerable value to an inclusivist position that does not call for all religions to be absorbed into one, but rather for all humanity to be included in the one mystery of grace.

The presentations were followed by an animated discussion that focused almost exclusively on interreligious dialogue and the relative merits of pluralist and inclusivist positions. It was argued that emphasis on the universality of grace presumes an openness to "the other as other" because the Holy Spirit is the source of the novelty of the world's religions. One participant involved in interrelations dialogue with Buddhists pointed out that Christian understandings of the Holy Spirit and grace are unintelligible to them. It was suggested that, since conversations about beliefs are difficult in interreligious dialogues, it might be better to join persons of other faiths in prayer and religious practices than to focus on specific doctrines.

In the business meeting that followed, directions for the next two conventions were discussed. In 1997, the session will be on the body. The steering committee agreed to explore further the possibility of joining with the comparative theology group for the 1998 convention to continue the conversation about theological anthropology and interreligious dialogue.

ANNE M. CLIFFORD
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania