

balance of a contemporary "dominant consciousness" of a hermeneutics of suspicion toward the institutional Church when it comes to discernment of the Spirit.

Mary Catherine Hilkert continued somewhat in the vein of her colleague, Catherine LaCugna, and raised questions about how to discern the authentic actions of the Spirit. These questions become especially acute when we consider the finite and sinful condition of humanity. A theology of *δοξα* does not relieve us of the vigilant process of discernment in a humanity beset by limitations. Hilkert suggested that Schillebeeckx's notion of "negative experiences of contrast" might provide an appropriate nuance to some of Rahner's categories for openness to the spirit, especially when attempting to discern "the prophetic and unsettling irruptions of the Spirit." In a sinful, unjust world, there are human experiences which constitute a "no" to the way the world is. But these experiences, according to Schillebeeckx, are possible only because there is an already "open yes" to the possibilities of a better world.

Marc Ouellet provided, if I interpret him correctly, a Balthasarian slant to the discussion. His primary concern was that a purely Rahnerian approach to pneumatology presented a "pneumatology from below" perhaps at the expense of a "pneumatology from above." He pressed Rahnerians to respond to the question, "What is the relationship between the human spirit of openness in transcendence and the Holy Spirit?" Another concern was the apparent lack of scriptural and traditional warrants in a Rahnerian pneumatology. Do we deal with the Spirit of the Gospels or with the systematic idea (via German idealism) of the Spirit? Ouellet ended his presentation with a suggestion that an adequate pneumatology must be not only trinitarian and christological, but even Marian (a refreshing Balthasarian nuance, I presume).

JOHN W. ALVERSON
Carlow College
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Seminar on Elizabeth Dreyer's "Narratives of the Spirit: Recovering a Medieval Resource"

Moderator: Mary McKay, Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles

Panelists: Raymond Lucker, Bishop of New Ulm

M. Carmel McEnroy, "Tir na nOg"

Harry McSorley, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto

The conversation engendered by the panelists and including approximately twenty-five other participants, focused on a few points of content from the original presentation, and on Dreyer's method.

In their responses to Dreyer's paper, both Luckner and McEnroy thanked her for highlighting the Spirit as source of prophecy. In Luckner's opinion, there is an obvious tension between the prophetic impulse and the unifying impulse of the Spirit at work in the Church today. Recalling that the renovation of Catholicism which was expressed in Vatican II was preceded by nearly a century of preparation—a century often marked by tension—Luckner observed that the Church appears now to be in a similar ferment. He suggested that some ecclesiastical leaders are so anxious to preserve unity that they are fearful of prophecy. Like Luckner, McEnroy directed her comments to contemporary applications of Dreyer's research. Affirming Dreyer's demonstration that the Spirit speaks in women as well as men, and Nuth's insight into the Spirit's youthfulness, McEnroy suggested that the Divine Spirit is most active in people outside the ordinary arenas of power. Even so, the flourishing of the Spirit's gifts is not guaranteed; McEnroy echoed Rahner's warning that the Spirit can be stifled by lack of recognition or by inertia.

These comments by panelists prompted a lively passage of discussion. It was proposed that "the opposition" be somehow institutionalized in the order of the Church, so that no individual or group could claim to speak for the Spirit without dealing with alternative insights. Such a structure might at least allow for and at best encourage the emergence of prophetic voices. Some participants named associations of Catholics who understand their discussions and actions in this way, that is, as unofficial but necessary "countervailing forces" within the Church, intended to preserve openness to the Spirit. McSorley emphasized that not even open dialogue guarantees accurate discernment of the truth; there is no easy answer to Dreyer's question, "Whose is the voice of the inspired person?"

Other points of discussion pertained to Dreyer's method. McSorley commended her use of primary texts which can reflect a community's experience, while at the same time he cautioned against overestimating Julian of Norwich's impact on her own era. He invited a more nuanced interpretation of Augustine's works on Church unity. And he suggested other medieval figures, especially major Reformation theologians, whom Dreyer might consider in her continuing research. Espin encouraged Dreyer to include theologians from the Iberian peninsula, and to research practices of popular religiosity as indicators of practical pneumatology in the Middle Ages.

MARY MCKAY
Mount St. Mary's College
Los Angeles