

his epistemology; a Greco-Roman cultural focus dominated Newman's perspective, a viewpoint narrower than contemporary intercultural perspectives; and his "antidemocratic sentiments" contrast with those of Vatican II. Dulles also compares Newman's theology to that of John Paul II (generally consistent), and the book concludes with a sweeping comparison to Vatican II on no less than eleven major topics.

Because all presenters restricted their presentations to under fifteen minutes, there was ample time for lively seminar discussion between presenters and with the audience. Three areas in particular were explored: (1) The focus of Newman's composed prayers on the Incarnation as well as on the Holy Spirit or on God in a more general manner; (2) The reasons why it might be opportune or inopportune to have Newman canonized as a saint; (3) The curious phenomenon among people appealing to Newman for authoritative support that he tends to be quoted by both conservatives and progressives. The seminar, ably moderated by Kevin Godfrey, addressed various factors in these issues and others.

EDWARD JEREMY MILLER
Gwynedd-Mercy College
Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania

* | * | *

YVES CONGAR ECUMENICAL COLLOQUIUM

Topic: Congar on the Vocation of the Theologian
 Convener: Mark E. Ginter, Saint Meinrad School of Theology
 Moderator: Richard K. Eckley, Houghton College
 Presenter: Elizabeth Groppe, Xavier University
 Respondents: Sarah Melcher, Xavier University
 Steven Kostoff, Xavier University

Following the custom of this Colloquium, the first paper, by Elizabeth Groppe, presented a Catholic perspective entitled, "*Unitas and Veritas: The Theological Vocation of Yves Congar, O.P.*" Then, two non-Catholics responded. The Rev. Dr. Sarah Melcher provided a Presbyterian response. Fr. Steven Kostoff provided an Eastern Orthodox response. After these responses, the floor was opened to a discussion among all of the participants.

According to Groppe, Congar's recently published journals testify to a theological vocation lived with a passion for unity and truth. Life experiences set Congar's course on a path towards Christian unity unusual for Catholics of his era. He realized that this ecumenical vocation would require reform of the Catholic Church itself, and over time his work for reform garnered more and more of his theological attention. He lived this theological vocation with a passion for truth. Theological scholarship, he believed, must be assiduous and

open, and carried out with freedom and true human dialogue and exchange. The pursuit of truth, he believed, also requires responsiveness to the intellectual and human needs of one's era, prophetic and evangelical commitment, a life of solitude and communion, obedience to God and honest self-examination of conscience, embrace of the mystery of cross and resurrection, and the practice of theology as doxology.

In Melcher's words, Yves Congar's strong vocational identity was shaped by his deep awareness of the Holy Spirit at work in his life. The strength of his vocational identity and the integrity of his vision were honed upon the steel of denominational conflict, theological dispute, and imposed isolation. This response to Elizabeth Groppe's paper explored how Congar's wisdom, painstakingly recorded in his journals, might inspire a Protestant theologian in her current denominational situation.

According to Kostoff's response, the theological vocation of Unity and Truth by Congar, as presented by Groppe, resonates very clearly for the Orthodox Christian theologian. This begins with his journal entry: "I am not 'conservative,' but I am profoundly 'traditional.'" Respect for the past as alive in the present is essential for the Orthodox. This continues further with his emphasis on liturgy and doxology as basic sources of theology and his passages of an apophatic character when describing the indescribable: communion with the triune God. "Unity," however, remains something of an unrealizable dream; for though the Orthodox claim to be "the Church," their own fragmentation and divisiveness undermines both this claim and their practical participation in the process toward unity.

During the open discussion, questions and comments touched on several areas. Melcher raised the question about whether interreligious dialogue played a part in Congar's vocation; Groppe responded that it substantially did not. Also, Melcher noted some problems with Congar's notion of cruciform suffering: is he aware that this notion has been used to oppress women and the marginalized? In conversation with Kostoff, Groppe asked: do we (that is, Catholics and Orthodox) really want reunion, or are we comfortable just with dialogue?

A question from the floor was: can Congar's works carry the twenty-first century? Congar sees the necessity of human contact to advance human community, replied Groppe. Despite his lack of training in modern philosophies, his "method" of using the historical context, some of his conclusions about the Church, and especially his influence at Vatican II may carry on for some time.

MARK E. GINTER

Saint Meinrad School of Theology

St. Meinrad, Indiana