should not be mistaken for an oppositional dialectic in which one pole must overcome the other. There are such oppositional dialectics, such as that between good and evil, for which mutuality and reconciliation are false goals.

Cynthia Crysdale pointed out that whatever action is taken to shift habits of meaning and, therefore, concrete practices of denigrating the nonhuman, such action cannot solve the problem of ecological demise in one fell swoop. All that can be accomplished is to shift the conditions of probability that make a new set of (ecologically friendly) schemes of recurrence more likely to emerge.

The upshot of the discussion was to recognize (1) the complexity of the theory (Lonergan) and praxis (eco-feminist) interchange; (2) the complicated nature of trying to shift habits of meaning and concrete ecological practices; and (3) the usefulness of understanding emergent probability as it applies to human interaction and processes of transformation.
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Daly first laid out the problem and challenge of this session: that when one starts from traditional Catholic sacramental theology, it is difficult to do justice to the reality and efficacy of God’s universal salvific will, and that when one starts from the latter, it is difficult to do justice to the former. In an exploratory mode which might eventually lead to a more universally “catholic” theology, it was proposed that sacramental theology should (also) begin from the basic insight that every authentically human act is a graced, salvific act which is more like than unlike the seven major sacraments. This is because all authentic acts of self-giving love are in fact—and however differently this might be understood and thematized in other religions—empowered by the same Spirit that empowered Christ’s theandric acts. After an excursus outlining the disparity between the “ontological” conception of Eucharist favored by the magisterium: Christ-priest-Eucharist-Church, and that favored by most theologians: Christ-Church-Eucharist, Daly applied the basic anthropological insight of this presentation to the “central sacrament,” following Kilmartin’s thesis that if the “Eucharistic Prayer ... is indeed the doing of theology, then the voice of the Church should be heard when
she speaks to her divine partner in that moment of maximum relative tension of which the one and the other are capable.”

Then, continuing with this (basically Rahnerian) anthropological approach, Shiner illustrated the central and universal sacramality of self-giving love by pointing out how, across religions and cultures, the “salvific love of marriage” can be verified in the following aspects of marriage and marital life: (1) free consent; (2) the daily affairs of family life; (3) forgiveness; (4) spiritual-physical communion; and (5) children and community. She then sought to ground the “uniqueness of Christian marriages” (and their irrevocability) in a consciously appropriated Christ-Church relationship of the marriage partners rather than in the (mere) fact of their having been baptized.

Larson-Miller, while agreeing with most of the presentation, had the following comments: (1) the definitions of “sacrament” and “sacramentality” and “salvation” should be more precise; (2) the discussion of marriage might better have preceded rather than followed that of the Eucharist; and (3) it remains very difficult to use the Ephesians marital Christ-Church imagery in a pastorally constructive way.

The open discussion evoked a reservation about the presentation’s apparent inattention to the positive aspects of the medieval distinction between sacramentum and res sacramenti, but for the most part evoked positive and complementary responses, including: the openness of this approach to comparative theological dialogue, the constructive possibilities of basing eucharistic theology on the Eucharistic Prayer, and the helpfulness of remembering Augustine’s concept of Church as “all the just from the time of Abel.” There was also significant discussion of the meaning of “consent” which involves the community as opposed to the more individualized concept increasingly common in modern Western society.

William Loewe

*The Catholic University of America*

Washington, D.C.

---
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The work of Schillebeeckx as a resource for a contemporary and constructive theological anthropology provided the focus for this meeting. Hilkert’s paper