

WHAT IS THE SPIRIT SAYING TO THE CHURCHES?
TOWARD A CONTEMPORARY ECUMENICAL PNEUMATOLOGY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Eric William Hendry

May 2011

Copyright by
Eric William Hendry

2011

WHAT IS THE SPIRIT SAYING TO THE CHURCHES?
TOWARD A CONTEMPORARY ECUMENICAL PNEUMATOLOGY

By

Eric W. Hendry

Approved 30 March 2011

Radu Bordeianu, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Theology
(Committee Chair)

George S. Worgul, Jr., Ph.D., S.T.D.
Professor of Theology
(Committee Member)

Marinus C. Iwuchukwu, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Theology
(Committee Member)

George S. Worgul, Jr., Ph.D., S.T.D.
Chair, Theology Department
Professor of Theology

Christopher M. Duncan, Ph.D.
Dean, McNulty College and Graduate
School of Liberal Arts

ABSTRACT

WHAT IS THE SPIRIT SAYING TO THE CHURCHES? TOWARD A CONTEMPORARY ECUMENICAL PNEUMATOLOGY

By

Eric William Hendry

May 2011

Dissertation Director: Radu Bordeianu, Ph.D.

There is a clearly articulated body of teachings and similarity of experiences within contemporary ecumenical Pneumatology that has been, to a large degree, neglected within the ongoing renewal of the Roman Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council. In my research, I have come to explore the role of Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens – a key progressive leader at the Council – and his promotion of both charisms and the charismatic dimensions of contemporary ecclesial life. Suenens surrounded himself with some of the most talented periti at the Council, whom he continually called upon in order to articulate a theology of charisms following Vatican II. Hans Küng, the ghostwriter of Suenens' conciliar speech, continued to advocate the charisms of each baptized individual, and the specific calling to use these gifts in ministry within the church. Karl Rahner promoted the charismatic dynamic of ecclesiology, which

he saw as having a democratizing effect upon ministries. Yves Congar, inspired by dialogue with Orthodox theologians, sought to recover the missing connection between Pneumatology, ecclesiology and spiritual anthropology. George Montague and Kilian McDonnell sought to recover the biblical and patristic understandings of charisms, and articulated the *normative* expectation of charismatic experiences within the teachings of Church Fathers such as Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom. I also analyze 119 contemporary ecclesial statements produced by leaders within the Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian-Reformed, Baptist, Pentecostal and Roman Catholic churches, as well as the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogues, and statements by the World Council of Churches – which each advocate wrestling with the charismatic dimensions of Pneumatology through the experiences of the contemporary, world-side Renewal in the Spirit. Finally, by drawing upon overlooked works of Thomas O’Meara, David Power and Leonardo Boff, I have come to articulate a substantiation of all forms of ministry – particularly lay ministries – based upon the charismatic discipleship that is an essential element of a living Pneumatology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	viii
Methodology.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Chapter 1.1 Personal Influences.....	1
Chapter 1.2 The Call for an Ecumenical Council.....	6
Chapter 1.3 The Plan that Suenens Submitted to Pope John XXIII.....	16
Chapter 1.4 Between Sessions.....	19
Chapter 1.5 Suenens' Speech on Charisms.....	23
Chapter 1.6 Charismatic Elements in the Texts of Council Documents.....	30
Chapter 1.6.1 <i>Presbyterorum Ordinis</i>	31
Chapter 1.6.2 <i>Apostolicam Actuositatem</i>	32
Chapter 1.6.3 <i>Ad Gentes</i>	35
Chapter 1.6.4 <i>Lumen Gentium</i>	38
Chapter 1.7 Summarizing the Conciliar Teachings on Charisms.....	47
Chapter 1.8 Duquesne, Notre Dame and Grottaferrata.....	49
Chapter 1.9 Malines.....	54
Chapter 1.10 A New Pentecost?.....	57
Chapter 1.11 Solemnity of Pentecost, Rome, 1975.....	70
Chapter 1.12 The Further Influence of Suenens.....	72
Chapter 1.13 Concluding Thoughts.....	79
CHAPTER TWO.....	84
Chapter 2.1 Introduction.....	84
Chapter 2.2 Anglican Statements.....	86
Chapter 2.3 Lutheran Statements.....	97
Chapter 2.4 Methodist Statements.....	106
Chapter 2.5 Presbyterian – Reformed Statements.....	110
Chapter 2.6 Baptist Statements.....	120
Chapter 2.7 Classical Pentecostal Statements.....	122
Chapter 2.8 Statements by Other Churches.....	124
Chapter 2.9 Statements by the World Council of Churches.....	128

Chapter 2.10 Roman Catholic Statements	130
Chapter 2.10.1 Roman Catholic Episcopal Conferences	131
Chapter 2.10.2 Roman Catholic Church, International	144
Chapter 2.10.3 International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogues	156
Chapter 2.11 Concluding Remarks	164
CHAPTER THREE	168
Chapter 3.1 Introduction	168
Chapter 3.2 Hans Küng	169
Chapter 3.3 Karl Rahner	178
Chapter 3.4 Yves Congar	186
Chapter 3.5 Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague	208
Chapter 3.6 Conclusion	225
CHAPTER FOUR	230
Chapter 4.1 Introduction	230
Chapter 4.2 Background into the Current Status of Lay Ministry	233
Chapter 4.2.1: The Etymology of Klerikos, Laikos and Ordo	234
Chapter 4.2.2: Cleric/Lay Distinctions in Roman Catholic Canon Law	241
Chapter 4.2.3: The Meaning of Discipleship	243
Chapter 4.3 O’Meara, Charisms and Ministry	253
Chapter 4.4: Power on Lay Ministries: Established, Un-established and Re-established	261
Chapter 4.5 Boff and Further Thoughts on Charisms and Lay Ministries	268
Chapter 4.6 Ecclesial Conundrum: Is Paul Confronting Peter Once Again?	271
Chapter 4.7 Concluding Remarks	284
CONCLUSIONS	288
BIBLIOGRAPHY	304

INTRODUCTION

Is there a clearly articulated body of shared beliefs, stemming from ecumenical Pneumatology, that has not informed contemporary practices within the Catholic Church in regard to the Holy Spirit's influence in all persons, especially the laity? In my research, I have come to believe the answer is both “yes” and “no,” and I will confirm this thesis through the following dissertation.

In the early debates during the sessions of Vatican II, Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, made a passionate speech concerning the role of the Holy Spirit in the lives of the lay faithful.¹ Following Pope John XXIII's desire to open the windows of the church to a “new Pentecost,”² Suenens, in turn, called the universal church to both a rediscovery of the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit, and to attend to the charismatic dynamic in relation to the institutional or hierarchical dimensions of ecclesiology. Suenens himself saw this move as a particular step toward ecumenical dialogue and ecclesial unity.³

During the same time period that this call for a renewed *pneumatological* emphasis was taking place in the Catholic Church, a variety of other churches⁴ had been experiencing what would soon be called a “renewal in the Spirit.”⁵ What had been

¹ Léon Joseph Suenens, “The Charismatic Dimension of the Church,” *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Ed. Hans Küng, Yves Congar and Daniel O’Hanlon (Glen Rock, NJ: Deus Books, 1964), 29-34.

² John XXIII, “Give Us a Second Pentecost,” *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989), 1.

³ Léon Joseph Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* English translation by Francis Martin from the original *Une nouvelle Pentecôte?* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 177-195.

⁴ I am aware of the Vatican’s differentiation between churches (Catholic, Orthodox) and ecclesial communions (Protestant), however as this is a dissertation dealing with contemporary ecumenical pneumatology, I prefer to use the terminology of *churches* out of ecumenical sensitivity and respect.

⁵ Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 87-104.

common teaching and practice in Classical Pentecostal churches during the early 1900's – especially concerning the person and charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit – began to penetrate and even integrate into mainline Protestant churches during the 1950's and 1960's.⁶ Slowly and cautiously Christians in the Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist and Reformed churches began adopting certain neo-Pentecostal practices and theologies of the Holy Spirit in their own churches.⁷ As this took place, a variety of their governing structures produced official responses and ecclesial statements on the topic of this renewal at regional, national and international levels.⁸ By 1967, elements of this renewal began to be seen in the Roman Catholic Church, as it had originated at two Catholic universities – Duquesne⁹ and Notre Dame.¹⁰ It rapidly moved across North and Central America and in Europe, and then quickly spread into various churches in third world countries, crossing all Christian ecumenical boundaries.¹¹

As Christian bishops and several Catholic popes wrestled with the pastoral dimensions of this quickly growing ecclesial movement, Roman Catholic theologians began to articulate much attention toward elements of post-conciliar Pneumatology. Hans Küng called for an embrace of the charismatic as a means toward ecumenical progress.¹² Karl Rahner spoke to the lack of a charismatic, dynamic element in church structures.¹³

⁶ Kilian McDonnell, Ed., *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*. Vol. I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), xiv.

⁷ *Ibid.*, xxiv-xxv, xxx-xxxv.

⁸ *Ibid.*, lv-lix.

⁹ Kevin Ranaghan and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (Paramus, NJ: Deus Books, 1969), 6-37.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 38-57.

¹¹ Suenens, *Pentecost?* 74-75.

¹² Hans Küng, "The Charismatic Structure of the Church." English translation by Theodore L. Westow. *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*. Vol. 4. *The Church and Ecumenism* (New York: Paulist Press, 11 May 1965), 41-61.

¹³ Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*. Vol. XII. *Quaestiones Disputatae*. English translation from the original *Das Dynamische in der Kirche* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).

Edward Schillebeeckx had articulated a charismatic dimension to the rites of initiation.¹⁴

Yves Congar, who authored a three-volume study on the Holy Spirit, sought to balance both the charismatic and the institutional dimensions of the church by stressing that a sound Pneumatology produces both a sound anthropology and a sound ecclesiology.¹⁵

More recently, Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague proposed that charismatic experience was a particularly *normative* element of *public* liturgical and sacramental life in the early centuries of the church.¹⁶ Even John Paul II weighed in on the subject, warmly embracing this “renewal of the Spirit” as one of the new ecclesial movements,¹⁷ and spoke about charisms being “lavished” upon the laity,¹⁸ while drawing controversial attention to what he identified as the “ministries, offices, and roles” that are given to the lay faithful through their reception of Baptism and Confirmation.¹⁹

As theological reflection was taking place in the Catholic Church, across the ecumenical spectrum the regional, national and international governing bodies of many churches continued to publish formal ecclesial statements on many aspects of Pneumatology i.e. the charismatic dynamic in ecclesiology, the “renewal in the Holy Spirit,” baptism in the Spirit, charisms, the types of Pentecostal-Charismatic spirituality,

¹⁴ Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Church with a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry*. English translation by John Bowdon (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 34-39, 121-123.

¹⁵ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Milestones in Catholic Theology edition. English translation by David Smith from the original three volume *Je crois en l'Esprit Saint. Les Editions du Cerf, 1979-1980*. (New York: Crossroad Herder, 2001), 2:149-160.

¹⁶ Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, Eds., *Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do With Christian Initiation?* (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1991), 9-30.

¹⁷ Kilian McDonnell, Ed., *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal*. (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989), 24-65.

¹⁸ John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Christifideles Laici*. [On the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World], December 30, 1988. Vatican translation. (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1988), No. 21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 23.

and related ecumenical concerns.²⁰ Following in the trajectory of Vatican II, Catholic ecclesial statements were issued at regional, national and international levels which also dealt with similar concerns to their ecumenical counterparts.²¹

Herein, several specific sets of documents are worth commenting upon. In consultation with some of the best Catholic theologians, noted above, a series of six Roman Catholic ecclesial statements, known as the Malines Documents – all of which were produced under the leadership of Cardinal Suenens as chief protagonist of this renewal – dealt with a variety of these very same issues vis-à-vis a carefully crafted, theologically based articulation of the charismatic dimensions that had been addressed during the Council Sessions of Vatican II.²² Also noteworthy were the interesting joint statements released by the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue,²³ which have, in many respects, modeled positive efforts towards ecumenical sensitivity.²⁴ As a result of all of this activity, I can now begin to ask several questions about these contemporary ecclesial statements and the rich, academic contributions offered by these theologians.

Methodology

In my preliminary research, I examined and analyzed over one hundred nineteen of the aforementioned ecclesial statements that have been issued since the early 1960's.

²⁰ Kilian McDonnell, Ed. *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*. 3-volumes. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980). This collection contains over a hundred ecclesial statements divided as follows: Vol. I - Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974. Vol. II - Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979. Vol. III - International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Léon Joseph Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*. English translation by Elena French. (Dublin: Veritas, 1992), 276-279. Theologians of particular note were Congar, Helder-Câmara, McDonnell, de Monléon, Mühlen, Rahner, Ratzinger and Küng.

²³ Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. "Five Documents from the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue" (1972-1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – Inter-national Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 373-395.

²⁴ Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology*, 99-100.

These regional, national and international documents by both the Roman Catholic Church and by a variety of other churches and ecclesial communities seem to contain many previously hidden perspectives and ideas – pieces or trajectories – of a contemporary ecumenical Pneumatology. Early on, these documents seemed to have begun their theological approaches with an understandably cautious concern – if not hesitancy – toward the personal, human dimension of the experiential; gradually, however, these ecclesial documents began to go beyond the initial pastoral concerns, to ongoing examination concerning these “charismatic dynamics” in contemporary ecclesiologies.

With regard toward ecumenical relations, I strongly believe there is much that the Catholic Church can learn from these non-Catholic ecclesial statements about its own under-standing of Pneumatology. In asking if such elements are also present in contemporary Catholic ecclesial statements on Pneumatology, I believe there are strong similarities and will discuss them. In asking if such elements are impacting the Catholic Church in both its contemporary doctrine and practice, I will present some basic pros and cons. Moreover, in asking if there is any inspiration or energy toward a renewed emphasis on ecumenical dialogue with other churches and ecclesial communions, I believe the answer is clearly shown in several dialogue texts, which I will also demonstrate.

As a point of clarification, and to limit the focus of this dissertation, I am not interested in nor will I be addressing questions of the *filioque* in the dialogue between the eastern and western branches of Christianity as it pertains to my topic. Furthermore, I will not address the particular status or validation of specific groups within the

contemporary Catholic renewal movement. Nor will I be dealing with the characteristic devotional aspects of this contemporary movement.

My interest, as stated above, is simply to investigate the “charismatic dynamic” that was called upon at Vatican II, to uncover ecumenical dimensions and similarities within our own developing Catholic Pneumatology, to observe the contributions of several prolific Catholic theologians in this direction, and to reflect upon the effects of this “charismatic dynamic” upon contemporary practices in Catholic ministerial dimensions. As such, I propose to cover these aspects as follows.

First, in Chapter One, I will begin this dissertation by taking my cue from Cardinal Suenens and the conciliar documents of Vatican II. By examining both the background to the Council and its actual documents, I intend to uncover key elements of Pneumatological interest. I am especially interested in statements about the Holy Spirit and the specific “charismatic element” that was being championed by Suenens. I will then survey the actual conciliar constitutions, decrees and declarations, with particular attention to the Pneumatology that was being articulated within these sixteen documents.

Second, in Chapter Two, I will look at the particular regional, national and international ecclesial statements that have dealt with both this “charismatic element” and its developing Pneumatology. These statements, issued during the last five decades by both the Catholic Church and other churches or ecclesial communities, will be considered in light of their similarities and differences. By comparing and contrasting these statements, I will suggest that the Catholic Church may deepen her own understanding of Pneumatology from these non-Catholic ecclesial statements. Of secondary interest, I will also consider specific International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogues and their ability to

witness to both the “charismatic elements” within their different ecclesiologies and their contributions to a shared sense of spiritual fellowship.

Third, in Chapter Three, I will then trace the specific works of Catholic scholars who have been noted for their interest in Pneumatology since Vatican II. By examining the pertinent writings of three Conciliar periti – Küng, Rahner and especially Congar – before, during, and after the Council, my intention is to discover each of their specific contributions to the development of Catholic Pneumatology, especially in light of Cardinal Suenens’ challenging call during the Council. I will also examine the more recent contributions of Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, here in the United States, in their efforts to promote the normality of this charismatic dimension toward a comprehensive Pneumatology from a contemporary Roman Catholic perspective.

My final section, in Chapter Four, will uncover just how deeply these ecclesial statements and theologians’ contributions have impacted our contemporary Catholic experience. Here, I will attempt to uncover how these Pneumatological and charismatic insights have played out within actual Church praxis, giving attention to their impact – or even lack of impact – upon Roman Catholic teaching on the legitimacy of ministry by the laity.

THE INFLUENCE OF LÉON-JOSEPH CARDINAL SUENENS

CHAPTER ONE

Chapter 1.1 Personal Influences

Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens was a major driving force behind the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). As the confidant of both John XXIII and Paul VI, his influences on the preparatory commissions and his specific contributions during the four sessions of the Council, go far beyond his role as one of four permanent cardinal-moderators. His meteoric rise in the post-war Belgian hierarchy, his influence with Kings and Statesmen, and his travels and lectures well beyond his formal retirement, all speak of his dedication and character to bring renewal to the People of God. In order to adequately understand his profound contributions and his visionary efforts, it is necessary to understand his background and personal influences.

He was born in 1904 in Ixelles, Belgium, and was raised by his mother following his father's sudden death, when he was just four years old. As her only child, he attended the College de Notre-Dame in Boom, the Marist Brothers' Institute in Brussels, and later the Institute Sainte-Marie, from which he graduated at the top of his class. As he was fatherless, the family economics were short, and he was forced to borrow schoolbooks and to do without many comforts. He found solace in reading, and his mother awakened in him an early vocation to the priesthood, which she nurtured by ensuring as much solitude as possible. He spent much of his childhood time in the presbytery of the local

parish church in which his uncle was the priest, daydreaming about how he would one day be ordained.

By the age of fifteen, he had become fascinated with the political debates of the Belgian Parliament, and would frequently attend them in person. By the end of his high school studies, he was fluent in both French and Flemish, and was beginning to study English with his mother's cousin, who had married a prominent American businessman. They offered to pay for a university degree in economics, but by this time he had solidified his decision to seek admission to the seminary in Malines. He quickly established a strong rapport with his archbishop, Cardinal Mercier, whose admiration and paternal friendship would redirect his long preparation for the priesthood; the Cardinal personally decided that Suenens should be sent to the Pontifical Belgian College in Rome. This would have a crucial effect upon his future, as his long years in Rome allowed him to acquire a certain familiarity with the Roman curial system – an advantage that would later prove its usefulness at the time of the Council.

Mercier's influence would also have profound effects upon Suenens' career in several other ways. His immense prestige had been gained by his establishment of the Higher Institute for Philosophy at the Louvain, which had elected to teach courses in the vernacular, instead of Latin; his frequent meetings with Anglican clergy had also made him a pioneer in ecumenical dialogue, which was then in its earliest stages. Suenens was eventually appointed to teach philosophy at the Louvain; he would also further Mercier's ecumenical relationships as he would later rise to become one of the appointed successors of his patron and friend.

At the Gregorian, Suenens took full advantage of the Roman education. Since he had been appointed student-librarian at the College, he continued to nurture his passion and appetite for church history. Finding their class lectures to be “far too bookish and scholastic,” he spent many hours listening to the “free-wheeling discussions” of the Belgian priests and seminary formators, whose “impassioned discussions often lasted for days.”²⁵ This allowed him to acquire a familiarity with a wealth of issues and subjects, and, as he would later describe, receive much theological formation “by osmosis, by infusion” during hundreds of priest-debates and occasional presentations by young, impressive seminarians such as Gerard Philips (the main author and redactor behind *Lumen Gentium*), and Etienne Lamotte (who would later become a leading interpreter of Buddhist thinking).²⁶

Between 1922 and 1924, Suenens struck up a relationship with Dom Lambert Beauduin, OSB,²⁷ who was enthusiastic for the Greek Fathers and their teachings on both the Trinity and the Holy Spirit. Suenens wrote,

At the time, our spiritual climate was still deistic in its approach; the Trinity had very little to do with life, and, in God, the Holy Spirit disappeared into a sort of anonymity as a result of the theological explanations that were current at the time. According to the theory of appropriation, the role of each person within the Trinity – as regards external action – was defined by ‘the conventional attributes.’ Thus the

²⁵ Léon-Joseph Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*. English translation by Elena French (Dublin: Veritas, 1992), 23.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 24.

²⁷ According to Suenens, Beauduin was exiled by his own hierarchy for initiating early ecumenical dialogues and for his paper *Église unie, non absorbée*, which Mercier had read during the Malines Conversations with the Anglicans. He later founded a form of monastic ecumenism at Chevetogne, cf. 28.

role of the Holy Spirit became interchangeable, and lost any truly personal meaning.”²⁸

Against this “impoverishment,” Beauduin recommended that Suenens read the four-volume work by Petau, Waffelaert, and de Regnon, entitled, *Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité*, which described a type of pluralism in the divine persons, which could be seen in their unity and in their interpersonal relationships. As Suenens studied this work, he also spent considerable time immersing himself in the deep spiritual writings of Elizabeth of the Trinity. This methodical study and growing awareness of the Holy Spirit led Suenens to choose the motto, “*in Spiritu Sancto*,” when he would later be made a bishop in 1945.²⁹

Suenens was ordained to the priesthood on September 4, 1927, but continued in studies for another two years at the Gregorian; there he earned doctorates in both philosophy and theology, with a baccalaureate in canon law.³⁰ From 1930 to 1940, he was appointed to the minor seminary in Malines, as a professor of philosophy, epistemology and pedagogy, and, over the next decade, he would come to teach nearly a thousand seminarians under the threat of an approaching world war. In August 1940, the bishops of Belgium appointed him vice-rector of the University of Louvain. Then, during the Nazi occupation, his rector was imprisoned for refusing to cooperate with the military authorities, and Suenens became interim rector³¹ until the end of the war. The Allied

²⁸ Ibid, 28.

²⁹ Ibid, 28-29.

³⁰ Léon-Joseph Suenens, “A Plan for the Whole Council,” in *Vatican II Revisited, By Those Who Were There*, Alberic Stacpoole, ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1986), 88.

³¹ One of the major accomplishments of Suenens, as interim rector of the University of Louvain, was the foundation of the Institut des Sciences Religieuses.

liberation of Belgium would actually save his life, as he had been listed as one of thirty leaders that the Germans intended to capture and execute.³²

It was in his position as Rector, that Suenens began inviting the leading Belgian theologians to his home for regular theological discussions. As a result of these meetings, it was easy for the Belgians to work together again during the Second Vatican Council; several would go on to assist in the drafting of Council documents, and Suenens himself would entrust the drafting of *Lumen Gentium* to his old school friend, Msgr. Gerard Philips.³³

At the end of the war, Cardinal Van Roey (who had replaced Mercier upon his death) appointed Suenens vicar general and auxiliary bishop of Malines-Brussels. Over the next fifteen years, one of his shared responsibilities was the celebration of sacramental Confirmation for nearly 250,000 children. Suenens' lived experiences of this ministry began to challenge and affect his theology; he slowly realized that the vast majority of these children saw Confirmation as the end of their religious practice, and lamented that many of them would no longer take part in the life of the church. This situation deeply troubled him; he began to search for some type of authentic pastoral solution. He saw the need for a more penetrating evangelization and catechesis of these children, who were now becoming adult members of the Catholic faith.³⁴

In his desire to educate adult Christians, he began writing articles and full length books dealing with aspects of faith and practice. One early book, *The Gospel to Every Creature*, was his personal appeal for each Christian to understand that one is not fully a mature Christian until he or she embraces a missionary outlook, and begins to personally

³² Walter M. Abbott, *Twelve Council Fathers*. (New York: MacMillan, 1963), 33

³³ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 38.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 43-44.

and directly share the Gospel with others; he personally felt that this was an urgent necessity placed upon each Christian, following the devastation of World War II. The archbishop of Milan, Cardinal Montini (the future Pope Paul VI), widely praised his appeal, began a correspondence with him, and wrote the preface to the Italian edition of this work. The two would correspond on a variety of issues for many years to come.³⁵

Chapter 1.2 The Call for an Ecumenical Council

On Christmas Day, 1959, the newly elected Pope John XXIII stunned both the Roman Curia and the entire world when he announced that an Ecumenical³⁶ Council would be held at the Vatican, beginning in 1962. It was Pope John's explicit intention that the Council would be a "new Pentecost" for the Church; he asked Christians to pray that this gathering of the world's bishops could be "a flash of sublime illumination." Suenens noted,

The Church needed to face the necessity of a profound renewal, so that it could present itself to the world and communicate the message of the gospel to humanity with the same power and immediacy as the first Pentecost. The reference to Pentecost, moreover, brought to the forefront

³⁵ Ibid, 51-52, 83-87, 316-322.

³⁶ The title "Ecumenical" used here is common in the Roman Catholic references designating the status of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Since Pope John's announcement, Vatican II has been acknowledged as ranking among the twenty-one general councils of the (Roman) Catholic Church, although the title "ecumenical" is more commonly reserved for the councils of the undivided Church of the first millennium. Many Christian Churches, most notably the various Eastern Orthodox Churches, have objected to this designation for Vatican II.

the action of the Holy Spirit, rather than that of the Pope, the Church, or even the Council assembly itself.³⁷

When the Holy Father sent out notice that he was asking each of the bishops for their suggestions, Suenens personally wrote him a ten-page response that he assumed would be kept confidential by the Pope.³⁸ He was soon invited to participate with other auxiliary bishops in the initial launching of the various preparatory commissions, presumably because it was thought that auxiliary bishops were more available than the Ordinaries. He was assigned to the Commission for Bishops, which would eventually outline the draft text *De episcopis*, and raise many pastoral issues for the Council. This appointment also allowed him to make frequent visits to Rome before the actual opening of the Council.

During this time, Suenens began writing a series of memos to his own and other commissions concerning multiple items that he felt were in need of reform, such as,

- the specific role of the episcopate
- a revision of the breviary
- the role of women religious in joint apostolic pastoral ministry
- the role of the bishop and the role of the director of diocesan works
- the establishment of a permanent diaconate
- collaboration with the laity, and the suggestion of lay councils at various levels
- the future role of bishops' conferences

³⁷ Giuseppe Alberigo, *A Brief History of Vatican II*, Matthew Sherry, transl. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006), 119.

³⁸ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 66. Note: The Pope would later publish all the responses of the bishops, collected in seventeen volumes, so he could personally ensure that the Roman Curia would know “what the rest of the world was thinking.” Suenens later commented, in glancing through these volumes, that the majority of the bishops’ responses centered “essentially on canonical and liturgical reforms.”

- the gradual integration of apostolic initiation in seminaries
- age limits for the retirement of bishops
- better preparation of Christians for marriage
- the adoption of simple clerical dress
- changes in religious orders
- relations between bishops and major religious superiors
- the complete revision of the rules of the Index
- a reform of the Roman Curia³⁹

This quickly became a valuable experience for Suenens and would prove useful during the Council itself. It also drew the attention of Pope John XXIII, who immediately recognized a “communion of vision and hopes” in the proactive auxiliary from Malines.⁴⁰

When Cardinal Van Roey died in August 1961, Bishop Suenens was immediately asked to take on the role of apostolic administrator of Malines-Brussels. On November 24, 1961 he was appointed as its new Archbishop by Pope John XXIII, and contrary to the established custom, he was named a Cardinal only a few weeks later.⁴¹ In a private audience with the Pope, Suenens was informed that being elevated would give him, “a chance to be more effective at the Council, where Cardinals would be given the privilege of speaking first.”⁴² His accelerated elevation would also allow him to become a member of the Central Preparatory Commission, which had overall responsibility for planning the Council.⁴³ Suenens noted,

³⁹ Ibid, compiled from memos listed on 57-58.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 109.

⁴¹ Ibid, 59.

⁴² Ibid, 109.

⁴³ Ibid, 60.

At the time of my appointment, this Commission was half-way through its work. Much to my surprise, I discovered that the texts and drafts to be submitted to the Council in no way reflected the hopes that had been awakened by the announcement of this Council – they lacked life and vision.

Several European cardinals, who were already on the commission before I was appointed, shared this feeling. Separately, we had all had the same reactions. Cardinals Döpfner, Koenig and Alfrink had already expressed their objections, but to no avail. Six of us then sent a joint letter to Pope John, telling him that the schemata prepared by the Curia were inadequate, and that the Council would certainly reject them.⁴⁴

Immediately, Suenens began to be noticed as a clear voice among the Commission members, which included fifty cardinals, twenty archbishops and ten major religious superiors.⁴⁵ Cardinal Tisserand, who presided over this Commission, gave regular reports to Pope John, and would frequently mention Suenens' creative contributions.⁴⁶

The Second Vatican Council opened on October 11, 1962. Nearly 2,400 bishops had assembled in St. Peter's Basilica in Vatican City. Pope John XXIII had personally composed a prayer for the occasion:

Holy Spirit,

Sent to us by the Father in the name of Jesus,

⁴⁴ Ibid, 60.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 60.

⁴⁶ Suenens would be asked by Pope John XXIII, privately, to be ready to play the part of his personal legate to the Council, as noted in Alberto Melloni, "The Beginning of the Second Period: The Great Debate on the Church," in *The History of Vatican II*, vol. III. Giuseppe Alberigo, ed. Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000), 5.

You help the Church by your presence
And you guide it infallibly.
Renew your wonders in our time
As for a new Pentecost.
Grant to the Holy Church,
United in prayer, insistent and perseverant,
With Mary, the Mother of Jesus,
That the Kingdom of the Divine Savior may spread –
A Kingdom of truth and of justice,
Of love and of peace.⁴⁷

He had asked the assembling body of bishops to make this prayer their own, in unison with his own specific intention for the Council to be a “grace of Pentecost” for the Church.

At the Council’s very first working session, the assembled bishops demanded the right to freely determine the membership on each of the commissions. When the assembly had realized that they were being presented with ready-made lists by the Roman Curia, Cardinals Liénart and Frings quickly protested at this Curial presumption. To the pleasure of John XXIII, their bold action received a thunderous ovation, signaling the prevailing will of the gathered assembly, and to a great extent, the entire future direction of the Council was decided by this spontaneous ovation.⁴⁸

Pope John then invited Suenens to be on his ministerial cabinet, the Secretariat for Extraordinary Ecclesial Affairs. This centralized steering committee eventually became

⁴⁷ As cited by Suenens himself in Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 67.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 68.

known as the Coordinating Council, and it was here that cardinals Döpfner, Liénart and Suenens began their very significant working relationship. At this cabinet's very first meeting with the Pope, he distributed a memo by Cardinal Bea, which argued for ecumenical sensitivity in the production of final Council documents, something that was also dear to the heart of Suenens. Near the end of the meeting, the Pope distributed another document to them that he thought would be "useful" in guiding their work. Suenens was stunned when each member received a copy of his original ten-page response to the Pope – the same response that Suenens had thought was only a private letter to him – along with a handwritten note from Cardinal Cicognani summarizing Suenens' entire plan for the Council. In effect, Pope John had endorsed Suenens' entire response.⁴⁹

As the Council itself progressed, Suenens began to observe two different approaches that became clearly defined in regular daily sessions – a *centralizing* approach (backed by the Curia, especially Cardinal Ottaviani, who was then head of the Holy Office) and a *collegial* approach (increasingly backed by diocesan bishops). Suenens' knew that the Belgian theologians and bishops had cooperated in an atmosphere of collegiality and mutual respect for many years. He then began inviting other theologians into his weekly discussion circle. Along with Msgr. Gerard Philips (Louvain), he invited Msgr. Colombo (the Pope's personal theologian), Msgrs. Dondeyne and Delhay, as well as Frs. Tucci, SJ (Italy), Rahner, SJ (Germany), and Congar, OP (France).⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Ibid, 71.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 74.

Suenens knew his growing circle could place him in direct confrontation with Cardinal Ottaviani, head of both the Doctrinal Commission and the Holy Office, who saw himself as “the one and only authentic interpreter of Catholic Orthodoxy.”⁵¹ Nevertheless, Ottaviani, who was already known to be in a quiet dispute with Pope John, would eventually see a great majority of the Council fathers dissociate themselves from his views. Suenens noted,

It had become necessary to free ourselves from a theology that limited and restricted the mystery of the Church. What we were about to experience was not a “theology of liberation,” but rather “liberation from a particular theology.”⁵²

While, in essence, Suenens held for a strong continuity with the articulated tradition, he also welcomed new perspectives that would bring forth a fresh vision of the Church; that vision, itself, would be enriched by a return to the sources. He actually anticipated that theologians such as Rahner, Congar, de Lubac, and Daniélou would be the kind of experts that could help him articulate this new vision.⁵³ Such thinking, however, antagonized Ottaviani, and when he spoke out against it on the Council floor, he was interrupted mid-speech by Cardinal Alfrink, who was presiding over that day’s session. Suenens later commented that Ottaviani never recovered from the psychological shock of having had Council regulations applied to himself.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Ibid, 75.

⁵² Ibid, 75.

⁵³ Ibid, 76.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 76.

In retrospect, Ottaviani may not have known of Suenens' frequent meetings with the Pope, which had gone back to the Spring of 1962.⁵⁵ In those meetings, Suenens had expressed frustration with the sheer number of draft texts that had been prepared by the Holy Office, and intended for discussion at the Council. When he informed the Pope that seventy such texts had been prepared by Ottaviani and his officials, John XXIII asked Suenens to make sure his *alternate plan* pared down the number of texts. This new plan, he believed, allowed for a pastoral approach that was much more in line with the Pope's intentions i.e. those he had expressed in his original call for the Council.⁵⁶ Suenens' alternative plan had been accompanied by a personal note addressed to Pope John:

It seems to me necessary to prune mercilessly all that is secondary, minor, of local interest, or purely canonical or administrative in nature. In practice – if I may be allowed to speak with filial honesty – this means, in my opinion, that eighty percent of the schemata, in their present form, are not “Council material.” It is enough to read the documents to see that they deal largely with secondary issues.⁵⁷

Suenens had echoed the initial hopes of the Holy Father, and carefully expressed his own ideas for the Council, in words he thought might resonate with Pope John:

If I may be permitted, in conclusion, to express a wish – it is that the Council may be, above all, a pastoral council, that is to say an apostolic council. How greatly it would benefit the Church if the Council were to

⁵⁵ See Joseph A. Komonchak, “The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962),” in *History of Vatican II*, vol. I. Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 338-344.

⁵⁶ See Klaus Wittstadt, “On the Eve of the Second Vatican Council (July 1 – October 10, 1962),” in *History of Vatican II*, vol. I, 440-442. A major effect of their collaboration was that Suenens became a close confidant of Pope John XXIII, from this point forward.

⁵⁷ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 79-80.

define, in broad lines, the manner in which the entire Church could become *a Church in mission*, at all levels – laity, religious, clergy, bishops... and Roman Congregations! It would indeed be a magnificent Pentecostal grace for the Church, one that the beloved head of our Church has wished for with all his heart and his Christian hope!⁵⁸

The personal note and the alternate plan were intended to be private documents to Pope John, although Suenens eventually began sharing them with a few trusted cardinals, like Montini and Liénart.

In May 1962, the Pope had quietly distributed copies of Suenens' alternate plan to certain number of influential cardinals with the intention to rally secret support for it. In July, he gave Suenens the names of the cardinals and acknowledged those whom he believed would be helpful in presenting his plan under joint sponsorship. Cardinals Döpfner, Siri, Lecaro, Montini, and Liénart then had two meetings with Suenens at the Belgian College, and vigorously supported his proposed plan. Each believed that the central theological framework should begin under the heading *De Ecclesiae Christi mysterio*, dealing directly with the Church in her essence. Suenens wrote to Pope John, on behalf of these cardinals, to ask the Pope where he felt the final schemata could be introduced, at appropriate points, in the existing structure of the Council. By this time, Pope John had already adopted the main points of the alternative plan and made them his own.⁵⁹

On September 12, 1962, Pope John XXIII had delivered a radio message to introduce the Council, just a few weeks before its actual solemn opening. In this address,

⁵⁸ Ibid, 83.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 83-85.

the Holy Father had summarized what he believed were the main themes of the upcoming Council, making reference to a distinction between the Church *ad intra* and the Church *ad extra* – the main distinction on which Suenens’ entire plan hinged.⁶⁰

During the very first week of the Council, Suenens had a private audience with Pope John, who, by then, had been lying sick in bed with exhaustion. The Pope told Suenens,

The plan is here, in this drawer (which he opened, as if to confirm his words). I will let you know when the time comes. For now, the Pope’s duty is to listen with open ears (and he placed both hands behind his ears) and be attentive to what the Holy Spirit is saying to the bishops.⁶¹

Suenens complied with this request to patiently wait, out of his immense respect for Pope John. But as the Council had progressed, it increasingly seemed unable to find its sense of direction.

In noting the Council’s irresolute climate, Cardinal Montini had independently written to Pope John (October 18, 1962), and requested his specific guidance in establishing a greater sense of structure to Council Sessions. In his letter, he alluded to Suenens’ alternative plan, concerned about its precise timing, and, by then, the Pope’s declining health. In Montini’s estimation, Pope John had become too ill to choose the most appropriate moment for making the plan public.

Within a few weeks, however, the concerned cardinals had felt that a critical point had been reached. Suenens had attempted to contact the Pope, and had even sent the Pope’s personal secretary a copy which outlined the alternative plan that he intended to

⁶⁰ Ibid, 85-86.

⁶¹ Ibid, 101.

introduce on the Council floor, only two days later. Early the next morning, Suenens was summoned to the Vatican and told that Pope John had fully approved his text, and had even added a few remarks in the margin for his consideration. On December 4, 1962, Suenens delivered his speech – proposing the alternative plan and its central theme – which the Council fathers immediately approved. Their near unanimous endorsement was enthusiastically reinforced the next day, in speeches that were delivered by both Cardinals Montini and Lecaro.⁶²

Chapter 1.3 The Plan that Suenens Submitted to Pope John XXIII

Suenens' overall purpose in submitting his alternative plan was to offer the Council a *coherent pastoral direction*. It included a basic introduction, a number of major themes, and a final message to the Council itself. He felt that its structure would allow for the best use of the limited, prepared schemata, conceding that a great amount of work had already been undertaken; his plan did, however, call the various commissions to task for presentations that were lifeless, legalistic, overly canonical and even repressive.⁶³ His major thrust was in introducing the two key concepts that would allow the Council Fathers to examine the chief problems of their time. He called for a reassessment of the Church, both *ad intra*, within the Church itself, and *ad extra*, in the way the Church related with the world. Suenens envisioned this corporate examination of conscience in a

⁶² Ibid, 86-87; see also Suenens, "A Plan for the Whole Council," 91; and also Komonchak, "The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," vol. I, 347.

⁶³ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 88.

positive and constructive manner, without resorting to the kind of anathemas and condemnations that had been frequently used in past councils.⁶⁴

In Suenens' mind, by beginning with *De Ecclesiae Christi mysterio*, the Council Fathers would establish a strong continuity between Vatican I and Vatican II. In having promulgated its own schema, *De Ecclesia*, Vatican I had already defined papal primacy and infallibility, but he also felt that there had not been equal treatment given to the role of the bishops or laity before that council's premature close. Suenens believed that by attending to these two missing dimensions, his own approach would allow for a corrective balance in ecclesiology, especially since the Church would now be presented in true fullness.⁶⁵ In fact, he could foresee that this needed balance might be welcomed by many Eastern Orthodox Churches, who had criticized the Roman Church for "minimizing" and "suppressing" the role of the bishops.⁶⁶ He also argued for some type of declaration on the role of the laity in the Church, recognizing that an early schema, *De laicis*, needed to be completely rewritten.

Our separated brethren accuse the Church of being far too clerical and of stifling the laity. They believe in the "priesthood of the faithful," to whom they assign an important role. Quite frequently, Catholics who leave the faith to join a sect will claim to have found a religion where they are respected, and in which they can actively participate.

Taking all of this into account, an important statement should be drafted, in a loving and paternal tone, recognizing the rights and obligations of lay

⁶⁴ Ibid, 88-89.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 89.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 89.

people by virtue of the baptism which they have received and through which they have been incorporated into the Church.⁶⁷

Here, Suenens effectively declares himself an advocate and champion the lay faithful, a role to which he would return to repeatedly in his later years of ministry.

On December 1, 1962, Cardinal Ottaviani officially introduced a similar, Curia-backed draft, which his own Theological Commission had prepared prior to the start of the Council; the assembled Council Fathers quickly realized that Ottaviani simply wanted them to endorse his own text, which clearly reflected the status quo that had developed following Vatican I. Three days later, Suenens took the floor in favor of a complete redraft of Ottaviani's text – one that would allow the Church to become the “light of nations.”⁶⁸ His intervention met with such sustained applause, that the entire assembly was sharply rebuked for its “boisterous response.” Cardinal Bea, however, publically agreed with Suenens, fully backing his intervention. The following morning, Cardinal Montini, who had rarely spoken on the Council floor, generously praised Suenens' speech, and clearly identified that Suenens “was speaking the mind and heart of the pope himself.” “It is necessary,” he told them, “to send this schema back to its commission for redrafting.”⁶⁹ Several months later, Suenens' friend from Milan would be elected as successor to John XXIII.

In asking how the Church of the twentieth century could respond to Christ's challenge to “make disciples of all nations,” Suenens' plan placed the entire Church in “a state of mission.” He had in mind that the Church itself shared the “joys and hopes” of the men and women around the globe; he urged that the Church should stand alongside

⁶⁷ Ibid, 95.

⁶⁸ Bill Huebsch, *Vatican II in Plain English: The Council*, vol. I. (Allen, TX: Thomas More, 1997), 112.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 113.

humanity and offer its support by addressing the major issues facing the contemporary world. In particular, Suenens felt that four specific problems needed to be addressed by the Church:

- The Church and its relationship to the family and married couples
- The Church and economics, with special attention to the poor
- The Church and social issues, such as religious freedom
- The Church and international issues, such as war⁷⁰

Suenens also intended for the Council to address the Eastern Orthodox, the Protestants, those who believed in God, and those that did not. His vision proposed that men and women everywhere had the same basic aspirations – aspirations he identified as daily bread, love in their homes, and peace in the world. He pressed the assembled Council Fathers, and asked them to consider what the Church could contribute to humanity. He challenged them to articulate how Christianity could offer contemporary society the kind of answers that gave men and women everywhere, “a reason for the hope that is in them.”⁷¹

Chapter 1.4 Between Sessions

As the first session of the Council adjourned, and all the bishops began to return to their respective dioceses, Pope John wished to communicate a message of hope to the world, knowing that his own time on earth was limited. His encyclical, *Pacem in terris*, was intended not just for the Church, but for all men and women of good will. The

⁷⁰ Suenens, 98-99.

⁷¹ Ibid, 97-100.

encyclical was well received across the entire globe, and much to his surprise, he was invited to introduce his encyclical in a presentation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Since John XXIII was in poor health and unable to accept this invitation, he selected Cardinal Suenens as his personal representative, and asked him to deliver his presentation to the General Assembly, in his stead.

Suenens presented *Pacem in terris* in English to the General Assembly, at the United Nations headquarters in New York. The main point of his summary was to emphasize the universal aspects of Pope John's encyclical. He compared its contents to "a symphony of peace, with various components," and highlighted its themes of human rights, social justice and world peace. He likened Pope John's encyclical as his farewell message to the world, and became aware of the profound respect this assembly had for the earthy pontiff. A question-answer time followed, and Suenens engaged in more than a dozen issues with these leaders, who were representing every major ethnic group, race, economic status and religion. The immensity of the occasion introduced Suenens to the world-stage in an impressive, dramatic way – one that was both similar and distinct from his platform in the Council.

For Suenens, this moment was a kind of epiphany. Before him had stood representatives of the entire globe – a microcosm of the universal audience he hoped the Council would address in its draft on the Church *ad extra*. It was his deep desire that the Church would speak to all men and women in a spirit of brotherly love. His answers reflected this compassion, and would bring him the admiration of the both the General

Assembly, and various Christian leaders in North America – a continent he would return to, often, in years to come.⁷²

As Suenens returned to Europe, he immediately began meeting with the cardinals who had been asked by the Pope to advise him on the preparatory work taking place between Council sessions. Pope John then personally assigned the oversight for each specific draft to each specific cardinal; Suenens, however, was entrusted with oversight for two drafts – the Church *ad intra* (the future *Lumen Gentium*) and the Church *ad extra* (the future *Gaudium et Spes*).⁷³ In being deliberately assigned the responsibility for two key drafts, Suenens resolved to integrate each of the elements he had suggested in his alternate plan, and which Pope John strongly endorsed.

He imagined that the schema on the Church *ad intra* would be fairly easy to complete, since it had been the Belgian theologians who had drafted much of the original text. He assigned responsibility for this final draft to the Louvain theologian Msgr. Gerard Philips.⁷⁴ As it would turn out, more time would be spent in Council debates on this particular schema than on any other at Vatican II.⁷⁵ The final text, *Lumen Gentium*, would eventually be approved during the third session of the Council on November 21, 1964, by a vote of 2,151 to 5.⁷⁶

Then, in considering the draft on the Church *ad extra* – which was commonly referred to as “*schema XVII*” (then later changed to schema XIII) – Suenens knew it would be a formidable task to create a text with such universal scope. He had envisioned

⁷² Ibid, 104-106.

⁷³ Ibid, 106.

⁷⁴ Ibid, 106.

⁷⁵ Edward P. Hahnenberg, *A Concise Guide to the Documents of Vatican II*. (Cincinnati, OH: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2007), 40.

⁷⁶ Bill Huebsch, *Vatican II in Plain English: The Decrees and Declarations*, vol. III. (Allen, TX: Thomas More, 1997), 213.

the first half as a theological statement on the Church's presence in the world; the second half would deal with issues such as the family, human rights, culture, nuclear arms and world peace.

For this task, he invited a group of theologians to meet with him in Malines for one week. The insights and contributions of Msgrs. Philips, Delhayne and Dondeyne, as well as those by Frs. Rahner, SJ, Tucci, SJ, and Congar, OP were also, initially, drafted together by Msgr. Philips. By the conclusion of the fourth session, this schema had then gone through more editorial revisions than any other document during the Council. A series of working plans were each adopted and included editorial contributions of the moral theologian, Fr. Bernard Häring, CSSR; the special drafting committee's final version fell to the priest-sociologist Msgr. Pierre Hauptmann.⁷⁷ The final version of this text, *Gaudium et Spes*, would eventually be approved during the fourth session of the Council on December 7, 1965, by a vote of 2,309 to 75.⁷⁸

When Pope John XXIII died, on 3 June 1963, Suenens received a letter from Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, on behalf of the newly elected Pope Paul VI (formerly Cardinal Montini of Milan, and close confidant of Suenens), asking him to give a eulogy in Pope John's memory at the opening of the second session of the Council. Part of this letter noted,

His Holiness [Paul VI] feels that no one could evoke, better than your Eminence, the person of Pope John XXIII... It was Pope John who, having entrusted to you the Episcopal seat of Malines-Brussels, elevated you to the position of cardinal and immediately associated you closely

⁷⁷ Suenens, 107.

⁷⁸ Huebsch, vol. III, 217.

with the work of the ecumenical Vatican Council, first in its preparatory stages, then in its actual unfolding...⁷⁹

Suenens spoke at the Council in solemn commemoration of John XXIII, on October 28, 1963, marking the actual day of John's elevation to the papacy.

Prior to the beginning the Council's second session, Pope Paul VI had informed Suenens that he would be making some structural changes in order to make the Council sessions run more effectively. Pope John had originally appointed ten honorary cardinal-presidents to chair sessions on a rotating basis, but Pope Paul considered this impractical and had decided that Cardinals Döpfner (Munich), Lecaro (Bologna), Agagianian (the Armenian Patriarch of Lebanon) and Suenens would serve as four permanent "legates" or "moderators," charged with unparalleled oversight and direction of the Council itself. This effectively created what Suenens saw as a progressive "brain-trust," who could ensure the inner cohesion of the Council. It would also give the four moderators weekly access to the new Pope, with a regular exchange of insights, ideas opinions and direction.⁸⁰

Chapter 1.5 Suenens' Speech on Charisms

During a Council debate on the draft of *Lumen Gentium*, the mention of "charisms" had triggered a negative reaction from Cardinal Ruffini, who, at that time, had been a popular Italian theologian and author. He had called for a complete suppression of this kind of terminology, and promoted the idea that charisms should be consigned

⁷⁹ Suenens, 122-123.

⁸⁰ Ibid, 131.

exclusively to the experience of the early church. In his opinion, charisms were not relevant for the contemporary Church, and could easily lead to abuses if they were promoted or even allowed in Christian life and practice.⁸¹

Recalling his deep friendship with Dom Beauduin, and their mutual theological interest and devotion to the Holy Spirit, Suenens felt compelled to object. He prepared what he believed to be a thorough response for the following day. He opened the debate by stressing how the sheer *absence of charisms* in the contemporary Catholic theological teachings had actually been a *distortion* of the true Gospel message.

The remarks made about the charisms of the Christian people are so few that one could get the impression that charisms are nothing more than a peripheral and unessential phenomenon in the life of the Church. Now the vital importance of these charisms for building up the Mystical Body must be presented with greater clarity and consequently at greater length. What is to be completely avoided is the appearance that the hierarchical structure of the Church appears as an administrative apparatus with no intimate connection with the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit, which are spread throughout the life of the Church.⁸²

Suenens went on to describe the gifts of the Spirit as something he saw as particularly relevant for the Church's contemporary understanding and practice.

In baptism, the sacrament of faith, all Christians receive the Holy Spirit.

All Christians, "living stones," as they are called, are to be built into a

⁸¹ Ibid, 140.

⁸² Léon Joseph Suenens, "The Charismatic Dimension of the Church," in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, Hans Küng, Yves Congar, OP, and Daniel O'Hanlon, SJ, eds. (Glen Rock, NJ: Deus Books/Paulist Press, 1964), 29.

“spiritual dwelling” *oikos pneumatikos* (2 Pet. 2:5). Therefore the whole Church is essentially a truly “pneumatic” or spiritual reality, built on the foundation not only of the Apostles, but – as Ephesus 2:20 says – also of prophets...⁸³

He then went on to contrast extraordinary charisms with the more ordinary ones.

The Holy Spirit shows himself in the Church in the great number and richness of his spiritual gifts, gifts which Scripture calls *pneumatika* (1 Cor. 12:1; 14:1) or charisms (Rom. 12:6; 1 Cor. 12:4, 9, 28, 30f; 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6; 1 Pet. 4:10). Certainly in the time of St. Paul even very extraordinary and marvelous charisms such as “ecstatic utterance” (1 Cor. 12:10, 28, 30; 14:18, 26; Acts 19:6) or charisms of healings (1 Cor. 12:9, 28, 30; see 1 Cor. 12:10, 12, 28f; Gal. 3:5), were shown forth in the Church. But we should not think that charisms of the Spirit consist exclusively or even principally in these phenomena which are more extraordinary and marvelous. St. Paul speaks, for example, of the charism of wise speech and knowledge (1 Cor. 12:8), of the charism of faith (1 Cor. 12:9), of the charism of teaching (Rom. 12:7; 1 Cor. 12:28f; 14:26), of stirring or comforting speech (Rom. 12:8), and administration (Rom. 12:7), of the charism of distinguishing true spirits from false (1 Cor. 12:10), of the charism of helping others and guiding them (1 Cor. 12:28) and so on.⁸⁴

⁸³ Ibid, 30.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 30-31.

Each and every Christian, according to Suenens' understanding of St. Paul, had charisms to offer one another in daily life, with the specific purpose of building up the whole Body of Christ.

Thus to St. Paul the Church of the living Christ does not appear as some kind of administrative organization, but as a living web of gifts, of charisms, of ministries. The Spirit is given to every individual Christian, the Spirit who gives his gifts, his charisms to each and every one "different as they are allotted to us by God's grace" (Rom. 12:6). "In each of us the Spirit is manifested in one particular way, for some useful purpose" (1 Cor. 12:7)... Each and every Christian, whether lettered or unlettered, has his charism in his daily life, but – as St. Paul says – "All of these must aim at one thing: to build up the Church" (1 Cor. 12:26, 14:3-5).⁸⁵

Suenens' speech then went on to remind the Council Fathers that the Church had a historical wealth of charismatic men and women in the role of its saints, martyrs and mystics. He gave the assembly references to charisms in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, and those that exemplified in the life of St. Francis of Assisi – two saintly models whom, he argued, understood their own particular charisms, and who were willing to share their unique spiritual gifts with the entire People of God.

⁸⁵ Ibid, 31. Note: Cardinal Suenens typically used the colloquial masculine language of his era, particularly when he was addressing the male hierarchy. I have elected not to render his statements in a gender inclusive idiom, but would note that I did find some occasions in his statements in which he did express his thoughts in a more sensitive and gender inclusive manner, especially when addressing mixed audiences.

Suenens challenged the Council Fathers to consider their own dioceses, and, in particular, the lay men and women who gave clear evidence of their own spirituality, and who willingly shared their own gifts or charisms in the normal life of the Church.

Do we not all know laymen and laywomen in each of our own dioceses who we might say are in a way called by the Lord and endowed with various charisms of the Spirit? Whether in catechetical work, in spreading the Gospel, in every area of Catholic activity in social and charitable works? Do we not know and see in our daily experience that the action of the Holy Spirit has not died out in the Church?⁸⁶

He then reminded them,

It is the duty of pastors, both those in charge of local and individual Churches and those in charge of the universal Church, through a kind of spiritual instinct, to discover the charisms of the Spirit in the Church, to foster them and to help them grow.⁸⁷

He continued to preach, with a fervent conviction, that they should become open, listen to their lay people, and avoid quenching the Spirit,

It is the duty of pastors to listen carefully and with an open heart to laymen, and repeatedly to engage in a living dialogue with them. For each and every layman has been given his own gifts and charisms, and more often than not has greater experience than the clergy in daily life in the world... It is clear that all the faithful, even those endowed with the greatest gifts, give reverence and obedience to their pastors. But it is also

⁸⁶ Ibid, 32.

⁸⁷ Ibid, 33.

true from the other side that similar attention and reverence is due to those charisms and impulses of the Holy Spirit, who frequently breathes through Christian laymen who have no position of authority. Consequently, St. Paul warns all Christians, pastors included, “Do not quench the Spirit, and do not despise prophetic utterances, but bring them all to the test and then keep what is good” (1 Thess. 5:19-21). This complex of gifts, charisms and ministries can be brought into play and serve to build up the Church only through that freedom of the sons of God which, following St. Paul’s example, all pastors must protect and foster.⁸⁸

Near the end of his speech, Cardinal Suenens began to suggest that specific doctrinal statements in the drafts text of *Lumen Gentium* could be expanded upon or improved to reflect the charismatic dimensions of the Christian spiritual heritage, particularly as it applied to forms of service and ministry in the chapter on *the People of God*. To this end he offered the following five points for suggestion – each of which was to be incorporated in the draft text:

1. Along with the structure of ministry, the charismatic dimension of the Church should be developed in the whole chapter
2. The importance of charisms in the people of God should be given positive emphasis by more extended and concrete treatment
3. In particular, the importance of prophets and teachers in the Church should be given attention
4. The relation of pastors to charisms of the faithful should be described in more positive and constructive terms

⁸⁸ Ibid, 33.

5. The teaching of St. Paul about the freedom of the sons of God in the Church should not be forgotten.⁸⁹

It is in this speech that I find a major turning point for Cardinal Suenens. While it was clear that Suenens considered the full integration of charismatic dynamics a necessity in the life of the contemporary Church, he made it quite clear that these charismatic dynamics should be articulated in Council documents, and actively encouraged in lay men and women at the local level. He concluded his speech by recommending a concrete expression of the Council's faith in these baptismal graces; he formally recommended that the Council increase the number of lay auditors, invite women to be auditors, and include religious brothers and sisters in their overall makeup of auditors. Then he asked the assembled Council Fathers to explicitly demonstrate their belief that the Holy Spirit was still giving charismatic gifts and graces to all Christians.

Suenens wanted nothing less than a clear statement that charisms were active in the contemporary Church.⁹⁰ This speech became the exact moment that would define what I see as his greatest impact upon the Council. For Cardinal Suenens, the vision of Pope John XXIII – for this new Council to be “a new Pentecost” – was now a grace that could be actualized in a unique, concrete form; in his mind, the Holy Spirit was beginning to “breathe” a new life into their Council debates, and gradually the nearly 2,800 assembled cardinals and bishops began to open up to both the possibility and recovery of charismatic expressions by all the baptized faithful – each and every person who had been sacramentally initiated into the life of the Spirit. Suenens articulated a new direction for the Council that was both faithful to the vision of Pope John, and a dramatic

⁸⁹ Ibid, 34.

⁹⁰ Ibid, 34.

and bold departure from the kind of vision that had been suggested by Ottaviani, and laid out in the eighty documents that had been prepared by the Holy Office. This speech, this moment, was a clear microcosm of the theological openness that had come to define Suenens in the greater macrocosm of his life, his training, his unique experience, and his meteoric rise in the Church. His vision and his ability to carve out a bold, dramatic new direction were precisely the kind of characteristics that drew him to the attention of Pope John, and that allowed him to be given such an unprecedented public leadership role, and continued private access to the mind of Pope John for the Council.

This unexpected departure tapped into the hopes and expectations of all the assembled Council Fathers, and would come to mark Suenens' impact upon the Council and the Conciliar documents that would be produced over the next three sessions. With this in mind, I will now pause and look at the impact of Suenens' speech upon the developing Vatican documents.

Chapter 1.6 Charismatic Elements in the Texts of Council Documents

Suenens' speech on the reawakening of the charismatic dynamics in the Church would come to bear a direct impact on the overall pneumatology of the Council. His own personal vision and theology of the Holy Spirit and, more importantly, the specific bold departure on charismatic gifts and graces that he had championed would come to impact the documents themselves in a direct way.

Of the sixteen final drafts promulgated by the Second Vatican Council, there are 306 references to the term "spirit," as seen most prevalently in references to "the Holy

Spirit,” “the spirit of God,” “the spirit of Christ,” “spirituality,” “spiritual,” and “spirit,” etc. At the same time, I would note that there are twelve specific references to charismatic dynamics or activity, as seen in the use of terminology such as “charismata” or “charismatic” or “charisms,” found in four specific conciliar documents. These twelve particular charismatic references are found in *Presbyterorum Ordinis* 9; in *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 3 and 30; in *Ad Gentes* 4, 23 and 28; and in *Lumen Gentium* 4, 7, 12, 25, 30 and 50. To understand Suenens’ contribution to the Council, then, it is important to see how his speech on the charismatic dynamics may have impacted the theology in these documents.

Chapter 1.6.1 *Presbyterorum Ordinis*

The *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (Presbyterorum Ordinis)* was approved during the fourth session of the Council on December 7, 1965, by a vote of 2,390 to 4.⁹¹ Its sole reference (no. 9) to the charismatic dimension of Christian life and practice comes in a section dealing with the relationship between priests and the lay faithful.

Priests must sincerely acknowledge and promote the dignity of the laity and the part proper to them in the mission of the Church ... While trying the spirits to see if they be of God, priests should uncover with a sense of faith, acknowledge with joy and foster with diligence the various humble and exalted charisms of the laity. Among the other gifts of God, which are found in abundance among the laity, those are worthy of special mention by which not a few of the laity are attracted to a higher spiritual life.

⁹¹ Huebsch, vol. III, 223.

Likewise, they should confidently entrust to the laity duties in the service of the Church, allowing them freedom and room for action; in fact, they should invite them on suitable occasions to undertake works on their own initiative.⁹²

There are several principles here that bear reflection.

First, priests are called to promote the proper roles of the laity in the mission of the Church. As lay faithful, they are incorporated into the mission of the Church by virtue of the fact that they are baptized – initiated into the life of the Spirit. Second, priests are called upon to uncover, acknowledge and foster the charisms of the laity; this text seems to affirm that all who have received baptism have also received charisms. Some are humble and others are exalted – but they are all meant to be fostered by the clergy. Third, the charisms may attract people to a higher spiritual life. And finally, priests are instructed to entrust the laity with duties, and invite both their creativity and initiative in giving birth to apostolic works. For *Presbyterorum Ordinis* then, the charisms are clearly gifts of the Spirit that are to be welcomed and fostered into the life and for the service of the Church.

Chapter 1.6.2 *Apostolicam Actuositatem*

The *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (Apostolicam Actuositatem)* was approved during the fourth session of the Council on November 18, 1965, by a vote of 2,305 to 2.⁹³ Its two references on charismatic dynamics come in a section devoted to

⁹² Second Vatican Council: *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (December 12, 1965), no. 9, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html

⁹³ Huebsch, vol. III, 222.

their use and benefit (no. 3) and in a section on proper formation for the lay apostolate (no.30).

For the exercise of this apostolate, the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies the people of God through ministry and the sacraments gives the faithful special gifts also (cf. 1 Cor. 12:7), "allotting them to everyone according as He wills" (1 Cor. 12:11) ... From the acceptance of these charisms, including those which are more elementary, there arise for each believer the right and duty to use them in the Church and in the world for the good of men and the building up of the Church, in the freedom of the Holy Spirit who "breathes where He wills" (John 3:8). This should be done by the laity in communion with their brothers in Christ, especially with their pastors who must make a judgment about the true nature and proper use of these gifts not to extinguish the Spirit but to test all things and hold for what is good (cf. 1 Thess. 5:12,19,21).⁹⁴

This reference to charisms offers several points for reflection.

First, the origin of this sanctification process is the Holy Spirit himself; it is he who sanctifies believers through ministries, sacraments and, it seems, these special gifts. Here, it is inferred that the use of these special gifts actually helps to sanctify its recipient. Second, the Spirit allots them according to his will; the recipient is a passive participant in that they are not merited by any actions on our own part. They are graces that are freely given. Third, their application and practice are for building up the Church; they are gifts of service. Fourth, they are to be shared in communion with other disciples of

⁹⁴ Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*. (November 18, 1965), no. 3, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html

Christ, including their pastors in the faith. Fifth, their true nature and proper use is to be watched over by pastors; the pastors, in turn, are to weigh the fruit of such manifestations in order to preserve the good of the Church. And sixth, pastors are cautioned not to extinguish the vitality of these manifestations, and therein become counterproductive toward the expression and full benefit of these spiritual graces.

In section 30 of this same decree, the Council encourages proper formation for those lay men and lay women who undertake any kind of apostolic work – particularly those who commit themselves and their gifts for the long term.

Indeed, everyone should diligently prepare himself for the apostolate, this preparation being the more urgent in adulthood. For the advance of age brings with it a more open mind, enabling each person to detect more readily the talents with which God has enriched his soul, and to exercise more effectively those charisms which the Holy Spirit has bestowed on him for the good of his brethren.⁹⁵

Here too, several points should be clarified.

First, preparation is necessary in order to exercise one's particular charism or spiritual gift; that preparation is specifically for an apostolate that is primarily open to lay participants. Second, if formation is overlooked, it becomes more problematic in the lives of adults. Third, the advance of age brings more openness, and an improved awareness of one's talents; if self-discovery precedes the use of charisms, then the exercise of charisms will be truly helpful and build the common good of the community. Finally, the locus of charisms seems – at least initially – aimed toward brothers and sisters in the household of

⁹⁵ Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*. (November 18, 1965), no. 30, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html

faith; this locus is undoubtedly to ensure the spiritual vitality of the community itself, and to build a communion of persons that together witness outward to the rest of humanity.

Chapter 1.6.3 *Ad Gentes*

The *Decree on the Mission Activity of the Church (Ad Gentes)* was approved during the fourth session of the Council on December 7, 1965, by a vote of 2,394 to 5.⁹⁶ Three particular passages, in sections 4, 23 and 28, stand out for their focus on the charismatic nature of the Church.

Throughout all ages, the Holy Spirit makes the entire Church "one in communion and in ministering; He equips her with various gifts of a hierarchical and charismatic nature," giving life, soul - like, to ecclesiastical institutions and instilling into the hearts of the faithful the same mission spirit which impelled Christ Himself. Sometimes He even visibly anticipates the Apostles' acting, just as He unceasingly accompanies and directs it in different ways.⁹⁷

Here, we find several points of reference.

First, according to this passage, the Council Fathers teach that the Holy Spirit brings the entire membership of the Church into communion with each other; if the person of the Holy Spirit actively resides in a baptized person through his or her initiation in the Spirit, then a kind of spiritual unity is actualized between each individual in whom the Spirit resides. And it follows that individuals in whom the Spirit resides are also one in the ministering of the other individuals in the community. Second, the Holy Spirit

⁹⁶ Huebsch, vol. III, 224.

⁹⁷ Second Vatican Council: *Ad Gentes*. (December 7, 1965), no. 4, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html

equips the church with hierarchical gifts; it is clear that the hierarchical leadership is a grace of the Holy Spirit i.e. that the administrative functions are “gifts,” that leadership is a “gift,” that structures are a “gift.” Other “gifts” are charismatic in nature, more spontaneous, free, and unstructured. Here the Holy Spirit is able to give a variety of gifts. Third, the Holy Spirit instills in the faithful the same mission spirit that propelled Christ himself, as well as the Apostles, the Martyrs, and the Saints; we are each being given a share of the Spirit for mission.

In section 23, we find this concept revisited and strengthened:

Although every disciple of Christ, as far in him lies [sic], has the duty of spread-ing the Faith, Christ the Lord always calls whomever He will from among the number of His disciples, to be with Him and to be sent by Him to preach to the nations (cf. Mark 3:13). Therefore, by the Holy Spirit, who distributes the charismata as He wills for the common good (1 Cor. 12:11), He inspires the missionary vocation in the hearts of individuals, and at the same time He raises up in the Church certain institutes which take as their own special task the duty of preaching the Gospel, a duty belonging to the whole Church.⁹⁸

Here we find a few more reference points,

First, the Council fathers make it clear that each and every Christian has the duty to spread the faith; it is not just the domain of priests or religious, but of every baptized person. Second, Christ can call anyone to a specific missionary activity; but each baptized Christian has a missionary spirit – a spirit that could be tapped for specific

⁹⁸ Second Vatican Council: *Ad Gentes*. (December 7, 1965), no. 23, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html

missionary functions at any time. Third, the Council reaffirms that the Holy Spirit distributes charismata as he wills, for the common good; in the same manner, he inspires missionary vocations and certain missionary institutes – as he wills, for the common good.

In section 28, we find an affirmation of harmony:

The Christian faithful, having different gifts (cf. Rom. 12:6), according to each one's opportunity, ability, charisms and ministry (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10) must all cooperate in the Gospel. Hence all alike, those who sow and those who reap (cf. John 4:37), those who plant and those who irrigate, must be one (cf. 1 Cor. 3:8), so that "in a free and orderly fashion cooperating toward the same end," they may spend their forces harmoniously for the building up of the Church.⁹⁹

Several references here can be commented upon.

First, the text specifically identifies the Christian faithful as those who possess gifts; every baptized individual benefits and serves to build the church. Second, gifts seem to be given according to each individual's opportunities, their abilities, and their ministries, but each individual is required to cooperate together, for the sake of the Gospel. Third, all persons must be unified together so that they can freely cooperate toward the same end; by cooperating with that goal in mind, all can build the Church in harmony. If the intention to be one with each other is not present, then harmony will quickly fade; thus cooperation and harmony are intimately linked with the successful ability to build the Church.

⁹⁹ Second Vatican Council: *Ad Gentes*. (December 7, 1965), no. 28, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html

Chapter 1.6.4 *Lumen Gentium*

The *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)* was formally approved during the third session of the Council on November 21, 1964, by a vote of 2,151 to 5.¹⁰⁰ Of the sixteen documents that were promulgated, it clearly contains the most important and profound texts on the charismatic dimensions of the Church. Part of this may be due to its central, prominent place within the corpus of conciliar texts; its centrality is seen in how so many of the decrees and declarations found their origin in a few lines or even a small paragraph of *Lumen Gentium*. The texts that speak about charisms and the pneumatic elements can be seen in sections 4, 7, 12, 25, 30 and 50.

A strong Trinitarian statement introduces the very first section do deal with charisms in paragraph no. 4:

When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that He might continually sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father. He is the Spirit of Life, a fountain of water springing up to life eternal. To men, dead in sin, the Father gives life through Him, until, in Christ, He brings to life their mortal bodies. The Spirit dwells in the Church and in the hearts of the faithful, as in a temple. In them He prays on their behalf and bears witness to the fact that they are adopted sons. The Church, which the Spirit guides in way of all truth and which He unified in communion and in works of ministry, He both equips and directs with hierarchical and

¹⁰⁰ Huebsch, vol. III, 213.

charismatic gifts and adorns with His fruits. By the power of the Gospel He makes the Church keep the freshness of youth. Uninterruptedly He renews it and leads it to perfect union with its Spouse. The Spirit and the Bride both say to Jesus, the Lord, "Come!"¹⁰¹

Several reference points may be commented upon.

First, the initial reference to the Holy Spirit, here, recounts the Pentecost event; in this passage the Spirit is said to continually sanctify the Church. Second, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Life, and is likened to a fountain springing up to life; to those who are already dead in sin, he is the life-giving Spirit, who brings tangible life. Third, the Spirit actively dwells in the faithful, prays in them, through them, and on their behalf, as adopted sons and daughters of God. Fourth, the Spirit guides the Church into all truth and unifies others in sacrament and in ministries; he is the Spirit of revelation, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Living God. Fifth, he equips and directs individuals with gifts, charisms, graces; he orders the charismatic manifestations and the hierarchical ministries, both to the same end, the building up of the Church. Sixth, he vivifies the Church, and draws forth fruits as a sign of his sanctifying presence. He draws us deeper, closer, more intimately in union with Christ.

In section 7, we see the following additional attributes:

As all the members of the human body, though they are many, form one body, so also are the faithful in Christ. Also, in the building up of Christ's Body various members and functions have their part to play. There is only one Spirit who,

¹⁰¹ Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*. (December 7, 1965), no. 4, at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html

according to His own richness and the needs of the ministries, gives His different gifts for the welfare of the Church. What has a special place among these gifts is the grace of the apostles to whose authority the Spirit Himself subjected even those who were endowed with charisms. Giving the body unity through Himself and through His power and inner joining of the members, this same Spirit produces and urges love among the believers. From all this it follows that if one member endures anything, all the members co-endure it, and if one member is honored, all the members together rejoice.¹⁰²

Here the Council fathers are recalling the texts from 1 Corinthians 12, alluding to body imagery as a metaphor for all of their members having their share. They then elaborate how the one Spirit gives different gifts to different people for the good of the Church. Then turning their attention toward the Apostles, they describe how the Spirit subjected those with charisms to defer to the authority of the Apostles. This same Spirit then produces love among the believers, the ability to share one another's suffering, and the ability to rejoice in a mutual honor of each other.

Then, in section 12 of *Lumen Gentium*, we read the following text on charisms:

It is not only through the sacraments and the ministries of the Church that the Holy Spirit sanctifies and leads the people of God and enriches it with virtues, but, "allotting his gifts to everyone according as He wills, He distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts He makes them fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices which contribute toward the renewal and building up of the Church,

¹⁰² Ibid, no. 7.

according to the words of the Apostle: “The manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit.” These charisms, whether they be the more outstanding or the more simple and widely diffused, are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation for they are perfectly suited to and useful for the needs of the Church.¹⁰³

First, the Holy Spirit is understood to *sanctify* and enrich people by allotting each person gifts and by distributing these special graces – and not just simply through their regular participation in the sacraments and ministries of the Church; the implication is again given that the gifts contribute to the actual sanctification of the People of God. Second, the Holy Spirit allots these gifts to everyone, and distributes these graces among every rank, clarifying that they are given universally to the People of God. Third, in giving persons these charismatic gifts, he qualifies the recipients and makes them fit to undertake roles and offices in the Church. Fourth, the use of these gifts actually contributes to the renewal and building up of the Church itself. Fifth, these charisms, whether simple or outstanding, are to be received by the baptized faithful with thanksgiving, as the charisms themselves are seen as “perfectly suited” for the various needs of the Church community.

This same paragraph of text in *Lumen Gentium* then continues on, Extraordinary gifts are not to be sought after [rashly], nor are the fruits of apostolic labor to be presumptuously expected from their use; but judgment as to their genuinity and proper use belongs to those who are appointed leaders in the Church, to whose special competence it belongs,

¹⁰³ Ibid, no. 12.

not indeed to extinguish the Spirit, but to test all things and hold fast to that which is good.¹⁰⁴

First, we must deal with a rather remarkable mistranslation in the actual text of *Lumen Gentium*. A stunning correction to this paragraph is noted in the bracketed inclusion, which is not shown in the document's official English translation, hosted on the Vatican website.¹⁰⁵ In the official Latin text, this section of the paragraph reads,

Dona autem extraordinaria non sunt temere expetenda, neque praesumptuose ab eis sperandi sunt fructus operarum apostolicarum: sed iudicium de eorum genuinitate et ordinato exercitio ad eos pertinet, qui in Ecclesia praesunt, et quibus speciatim competit, non Spiritum extinguere, sed omnia probare et quod bonum est tenere (cf. 1Thess 5:12, 19-21).¹⁰⁶

The remarkable omission concerns the Latin word *temere*, which is commonly translated as *rashly* or *blindly*.¹⁰⁷ This omission, in effect, renders the intended phrase, “extraordinary gifts are not to be sought after rashly,” into “extraordinary gifts are not to be sought after,” (i.e. at all) implying a finality and directive to this instruction that is not in the Latin original, nor in the intention of the Council Fathers who had authored and approved of the text. The exclusion of the properly translated term *temere* nuances our

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, no. 12.

¹⁰⁵ Note: While the official Vatican online English version does not include a specific translation of the term *temere*, it is interesting to note that *temere* is translated as *rashly* in three widely-referenced English translations, those by Abbott, Flannery and Tanner; see in *The Documents of Vatican II*, Walter M. Abbott, ed., Joseph Gallagher, transl. (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 30; and in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, new revised ed., Austin Flannery, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1992, 1775), 363; and in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Norman P. Tanner, ed. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 1990), 858. The term *temere* is not translated or included in the early NCWC translation which was published by the Daughters of St. Paul in *The Sixteen Documents of Vatican II*, NCWC transl. (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1966), 122.

¹⁰⁶ Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*. (December 7, 1965), no. 12, at hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html

¹⁰⁷ University of Notre Dame Latin Dictionary and Grammar Aid, as found online June 3, 2008 at the hyperlink: <http://www.archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/lookit.pl?latin=temere>

understanding of charisms and charismatic graces in a strikingly negative manner. Nevertheless, when translated correctly, the text instructs and actually encourages that extraordinary charisms are to be *expetenda* i.e. *expected, desired, sought after* – even *eagerly sought after*¹⁰⁸ as long as they are not sought after *temere* i.e. *rashly* or *blindly*. Corrected, the text gives a profoundly positive directive to the People of God.

Several other observations can be noted in this same paragraph. First, the fruits of charismatic activity cannot be expected in a presumptuous manner; apostolic works may result from their use, but cannot be assumed unconditionally. Second, the text validates that appointed Church leaders have the competency to judge the genuineness and proper use of charisms; the leaders are to test the charisms, affirm the good, and never extinguish the manifestations or the activity that can be legitimately attributed to the Holy Spirit. This seems to suggest that it is the right and duty of the ordained hierarchy to judge the legitimacy of charismatic activity; it may also suggest that their “special competence” to judge these charisms may, in fact, be a charismatic grace itself – a grace which the Holy Spirit has given to appointed leaders.

In section 25 of *Lumen Gentium*, we see a specific reference that appointed leaders have been given particular charisms by the Holy Spirit in regard to their leadership of and within the Church. In considering how the definition of faith and morals must be taught and guarded, the document affirms the Roman Catholic Church’s teaching on the charism of infallibility that the supreme shepherd and bishops hold when proclaiming a doctrine of faith or morals:

¹⁰⁸ University of Notre Dame Latin Dictionary and Grammar Aid, as found online June 3, 2008 at the hyperlink: <http://www.archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/lookit.pl?latin=expetenda>

For then the Roman Pontiff is not pronouncing judgment as a private person, but as the supreme teacher of the universal Church, in whom the charism of infallibility of the Church itself is individually present, he is expounding or defending a doctrine of Catholic faith. The infallibility promised to the Church resides also in the body of Bishops, when that body exercises the supreme magisterium with the successor of Peter. To these definitions the assent of the Church can never be wanting, on account of the activity of that same Holy Spirit, by which the whole flock of Christ is preserved and progresses in unity of faith.¹⁰⁹

I note that this paper is not intended as a treatise on or defense of the Catholic understanding of infallibility. There are, however, some interesting observations I could offer toward the Catholic approach and interpretation of infallibility *as a particular charism*.

First, this document clearly articulates that infallibility is a charism of the Holy Spirit. It is a charism that is shared by the Pope and the body of Bishops and the Church in its totality; the document articulates that this charism is individually present in the Roman Pontiff when he expounds upon or defends a doctrine in his role as the supreme teacher of the universal Church; the document also articulates that this charism is shared by the body of Bishops when they exercise the supreme magisterium in cooperation with the Pope. In short, the document suggests what kinds of parameters exist in the *exercise* of this particular charism. Second, the document suggests that there is a connection between the exercise of the charism of infallibility, and the reception or *assent* of the faithful to those infallible definitions; it articulates that this connection is a result of the

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, no. 25.

Holy Spirit, whose activity preserves the flock and allows them to make progress in the unity of faith. As such, *Lumen Gentium* 25 clearly suggests that the Holy Spirit is operative with a *charism* of infallibility, that is 1) individually present in the teaching of the Pope, 2) shared in the magisterium of the Bishops with the Pope, and 3) assented to by the faithful of the Church. One might suggest that further theological reflection upon the concept of infallibility *as both an individual and a shared charism of the Holy Spirit* could prove to be of some benefit in the ecumenical dialogues between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches, and between the Catholic Church and various Protestant ecclesial communities.

Having focused on one particular charismatic function of ordained pastoral leadership, the Council Fathers then begin to recognize a general distinction concerning the charisms that are proper to the laity, as seen in the text of *Lumen Gentium* 30:

[The pastors] know that they were not ordained by Christ to take upon themselves alone the entire salvific mission of the Church toward the world. On the contrary they understand that it is their noble duty to shepherd the faithful and to recognize their ministries and charisms, so that all according to their proper roles may cooperate in this common undertaking with one mind.¹¹⁰

First, I would note the document's clear admission that bishops and their clergy have no monopoly on the mission of the Church to the world; each baptized man and woman is seen to have a share in the Church's mission. Second, it is the *duty* of every bishop and priest to recognize the ministries and charisms of the lay men and women; it is part of their *noble duty* as shepherds to acknowledge the ministries and charisms of the laity.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, no. 30.

Third, laypersons clearly have *ministries* and *charisms* of their own; these ministries and charisms are not identified as a participation in the ministries or charisms that are allotted to their ordained pastors. In fact, they seem to be independent of ministries and charisms that are proper to the role of pastors. It would follow, therefore, that this is why they need to be recognized and acknowledged by pastors in the first place. Fourth, each of these lay ministries and charisms are part of the greater collective; according to their proper roles, each baptized person – man or woman, clergy or lay - is to cooperate in this one common undertaking with one mind. Each of these ministries and charisms cooperate in one common mission – the mission of the Church to build the kingdom of God.

In *Lumen Gentium* 50, the Council Fathers call us to identify the charismatic graces that have been clearly evidenced in the lives of the various saints throughout the long history of the Church, who, along with apostles and early martyrs, have been recommended to us as models and intercessors.

To these were soon added also those who had more closely imitated Christ's virginity and poverty, and finally others whom the outstanding practice of the Christian virtues and the divine charisms recommended to the pious devotion and imitation of the faithful.¹¹¹

First, according to this text, men and women were considered saintly models, when they closely imitated virginity and poverty, and they practiced the Christian virtues and the divine charisms; here, charisms are one of four characteristics or conditions that were seen to qualify persons to be considered saintly. Second, charismatic activity is depicted as positive evidence that one could be recommended to others for both intercession and imitation; in suggesting that charisms are potential evidence of saintly activity, the

¹¹¹ Ibid, no. 50.

Council Fathers may have been implying that charismatic activity could be significant evidence of holiness in contemporary men and women. This element will be studied further in my final chapter.

Chapter 1.7 Summarizing the Conciliar Teachings on Charisms

During the Second Vatican Council, it is quite clear that both charisms and charismatic activity were given a positive endorsement, first by Cardinal Suenens, and then by the great assembly of Council Fathers, who clearly spoke of them with high regard in each of the four previously mentioned conciliar documents. Within these teaching documents themselves, I would argue that the Council Fathers clearly articulated a bold new departure.

First, the attention given to legitimizing the charismatic gifts and the charismatic nature of the Church is the first thing that strikes me as being a bold departure. A thorough read of these four particular documents presents the charisms as being clearly given to each and every baptized Christian. The documents clearly articulate that these charisms are given by the Holy Spirit freely, according to his will, and intimately connected with sacramental initiation. The documents clearly articulate that each lay man and woman is given charisms and is expected to use them, generously, in their own unique contributions to the good of the Church; in fact, their use of individual charisms is seen as both a right and a duty placed upon all the baptized. While their use may be preceded by preparation and self-discovery, charisms tend to be spontaneous in their nature. Through their generous application, charisms are seen to vivify and bring tangible

life to the Church, and are seen to assist individuals – along with sacraments and ministries – in the continuing sanctification of their lives. Charisms, in the end, are seen as being perfectly suited to the needs of the Church, and should be received with thanksgiving and joy.

Second, the role of pastors in lending credence to and supporting the charismatic gifts is another bold departure. Pastors are not given any option here; they are charged and called to promote charisms and the various roles of the laity in the mission of the Church. They are to entrust the laity with duties and encourage laypeople to show creativity and initiative in apostolic works. To this end, pastors are called to uncover, acknowledge and foster all the charisms of the laity. Since charisms are intended for the building up of the Church, pastors are given chief responsibility to watch over them and weigh their usefulness and the fruit that is produced by their exercise. To insure their rightful use, pastors are given clear guidelines: they may never extinguish the charisms, but must assure that they are used in cooperation with the common mission of the kingdom of God.

Finally, the clarification that the Holy Spirit actually sanctifies people through the use of charisms is one of the bold departures that the Council Fathers elaborate upon further. Since charisms are graces that are freely given, they are seen, in effect, to sanctify the individual. In being given according to each individual's ability, they help to actualize the spiritual unity of the Church, and are linked to ecclesial harmony and cooperation. To this end, they assist in the overall sanctification of the Church itself. Whether they are outstanding and extraordinary or ordinary and widely diffused, charisms are distributed among every rank of people and contribute to the ongoing

renewal of the Church. While they are given independently of the hierarchical gifts and ministries, they make their individual recipients qualified and fit for a variety of other ministries, roles and offices in the Church. Church history attests that charisms have often been viewed as one of several conditions or characteristics for sainthood, and their use has been evidenced throughout history in the lives of the individuals who have been held up as canonized Saints. As such, I would argue that charisms and charismatic activity can easily be extrapolated to signify evidence of saintly activity and holiness in contemporary men and women in the Church.

To this end, I will now turn to investigate some significant developments that have taken place in the Catholic Church since the articulation of charismatic dynamics were introduced in these Conciliar documents. It is my intention then to show a direct relationship between the charismatic activities that both Suenens and then the Council Fathers articulated, and some contemporary evidence of spontaneous charismatic dynamics within the greater Church.

Chapter 1.8 Duquesne, Notre Dame and Grottaferrata

Following the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council, Cardinal Suenens possessed an immense popularity with the Orthodox and Protestant Observers. His strong statements in support of advancing ecumenical relationships, brought him a good number of invitations for speaking engagements across the world, and, in particular, to a variety of Lutheran, Episcopalian and Pentecostal events that were being held in the United States. As a result of a friendship with Archbishop Hallinan of Atlanta, and equally due

to the admiration of American bishops who had admired his popular stances in the Council, Suenens became an extremely popular speaker at US Catholic clergy events during this time period. His many visits would give him a direct experience and understanding of the Catholic Church in the United States.¹¹²

During these speaking visits, Suenens had begun writing a book on the Holy Spirit, but this was interrupted when Veronica O'Brien, a leader in the Legion of Mary, phoned Suenens to alert him to a group in New York that described itself as a "Catholic Pentecostal" group, which was then meeting at Fordham University, a Jesuit institution. Suenens noted,

I gave up writing the book; I thought it was a matter of the most basic courtesy to pay attention to the possible action of the Holy Spirit, however surprising it might be. I was especially interested in the talk of the awakening of charisms; at the Council, I had pleaded the cause of such an awakening.¹¹³

Within weeks, Suenens had established contact with several charismatic groups and a Catholic priest, Fr. Jim Ferry, who had been a spiritual director for the Legion of Mary, and was now known to be directly involved with a very dynamic group of "charismatic" women religious. Suenens arranged to meet up with Ferry at their Convent Station prayer meeting. He would later remark of these meetings,

Suddenly, St. Paul and the Acts of the Apostles seems to come alive and become part of the present; what was authentically true in the past seems

¹¹² Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 169ff. Suenens himself noted that his speaking engagements in the USA would eventually grow to encompass more than forty trips over the next two decades. During the vast majority of these trips, he would speak to both Catholic and Protestant audiences, i.e. in priestly gatherings, in various ecumenical conferences, and in seminaries and universities.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, 267.

to be happening once again before our very eyes. It is a discovery of the true action of the Holy Spirit, who is always at work, as Jesus himself promised. He kept and keeps his “word.” It is once more an explosion of the Spirit of Pentecost, a jubilation that had become foreign to the Church, for the sky is dark over the Church today. “Happy are those who know joy,” says the Psalm.¹¹⁴

Suenens decided to visit and meet with some of those who appeared to be the main initiators of this movement, and flew to Ann Arbor, MI. There he met with several graduate students and their leaders,¹¹⁵ who were able to trace the brief history of the movement for him.

The beginnings of this contemporary Catholic charismatic movement had first come into being at Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA) in 1967. A group of students there had been studying the *Acts of the Apostles*, and decided to go away on a retreat for a weekend of prayer and fasting. They intended to ask the Holy Spirit for the graces that were evidenced in *Acts*. Many had read David Wilkerson’s *The Cross and the Switchblade*,¹¹⁶ and a good number of them had been reciting the *Pentecost Sequence*, every day for the preceding year. In February, at a retreat center known as *The Ark and the Dove*, the students who had gathered there claimed to have had actual Pentecost-like experiences. They spoke of being “baptized in the Holy Spirit” and recounted how they had each been given charisms, similar to those that were operative in the early church.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 267.

¹¹⁵ Suenens would eventually ask one of those leaders, Ralph Martin, to head up the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service offices, first located in Belgium, and then later in Rome.

¹¹⁶ David R. Wilkerson with John Sherrill and Elizabeth Sherrill, *The Cross and the Switchblade* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1963). This book recounts the personal story of a young minister who places his faith in the Holy Spirit, as he attempts to evangelize gang members in the slums of New York City. It speaks of physical healings that resulted from prayers to the Holy Spirit.

These young students began sharing their experiences with friends who were attending other universities; students at the University of Notre Dame (South Bend, IN) soon began speaking of similar experiences to those at Duquesne. From there, student groups at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI), at Loyola University (New Orleans, LA), and several Los Angeles, CA area universities began speaking of similar experiences in prayer.¹¹⁷

Charismatic groups soon began forming in parishes, convents and monasteries near each of the original university locations. Within months, this movement had travelled from the United States to five different continents. The first national charismatic conference was held in 1967. In June 1973, the University of Notre Dame hosted the first international charismatic conference, which was attended by adherents from thirty-five countries, with nearly twenty-two thousand participants, including six hundred priests, ten bishops, and Cardinal Suenens himself.¹¹⁸

As these Catholic charismatic groups spread across the globe, some began forming houses of prayer. Others chose to incorporate into structures known as “covenant communities,” where members could seek and experience deeper forms of commitment and types of communal living. Distinct styles of worship would lead to the creation of charismatic styles of music¹¹⁹ and the integration of certain charismatic dynamics into

¹¹⁷ Léon Joseph Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* Francis Martin, transl. (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 72-74.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 74-75.

¹¹⁹ The Ann Arbor charismatic group would gather together and publish original music and lyrics in its *Songs of Praise* series (eventually four volumes) which was primarily guitar-driven, charismatic praise and worship music.

liturgical practices, with many experimental adaptations¹²⁰ being employed in the post-conciliar atmosphere.

In his book, *A New Pentecost?* Suenens describes the kind of information that was revealed from a 1973 questionnaire that had been given to Jesuit priests;¹²¹ forty highly-educated Jesuit intellectuals, who had each experienced charismatic activity in their lives, were asked to speak of their experiences. Suenens summarized,

Briefly, what seems to be common to all is an experience of a presence and of a power coming from the Holy Spirit... prayer is less intellectual now, simpler, more from the heart and much more filled with praise. Several gave testimony to the spiritual fruits they experienced by praying in tongues. Others spoke of a change which made them more deeply and constantly aware of the presence of God in their apostolic activity... They spoke of the spiritual support they found in prayer groups, and of a new boldness in sharing... deeper, inner experiences... a change in their attitude toward the sacrament of penance which they now see as a sacrament of healing. In general, these men testified that this experience had strengthened them in their Jesuit vocation, and ... priesthood, and that it had led them to see in a new light... the exercises of St. Ignatius.¹²²

¹²⁰ The author visited a charismatic liturgy at St. Patrick Catholic Church, Dallas, TX (November 3, 2007), which had incorporated periods of “prayer in tongues,” interspersed at different points throughout the liturgy.

¹²¹ As cited in Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* 76-79. The questionnaire by Fr. John Haughey, SJ was published as “The Pentecostal Thing and the Jesuits,” in *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, vol. 5 (June, 1973), 113-120. Suenens notes that this article was not sold to the public, but was primarily an internal publication of the Society of Jesus.

¹²² Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* 78.

Suenens notes that a great many priests, religious and lay people had told him personally of similar experiences, often in the same terms as these highly educated Jesuit priests.¹²³

Shortly after receiving these results, Suenens wrote to Pope Paul VI, to inform him that the next international gathering of charismatic Catholics was set to take place in Grottaferrata, Italy – the foothills of Rome – in October 1974. By this point, it had become necessary for Rome to give this “renewal movement” its blessing, in order to avoid the potential that it might develop in isolation from the heart of the Church.¹²⁴ Suenens noted that after an initial hesitancy, the Pope’s reaction was favorable to the location. The unexpected fruit of the international meeting in Grottaferrata was a private audience with the Pope for fifteen of the movement’s international leaders, who were genuinely welcomed by the Pontiff.¹²⁵ A second fruit of the international meeting was an initiative to establish a theological and pastoral commission to study necessary clarifications on this growing movement, precisely from a Catholic point of view. That initiative was adopted in May 1974, and would be implemented by a team that would then meet with the Cardinal at his residence in Malines, Belgium. For this enterprise, Suenens would also call upon many of his most important collaborators during the Council – the theologians or *periti* who had helped to draft some of the most important documents at Vatican II.

Chapter 1.9 Malines

¹²³ Ibid, 78.

¹²⁴ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 268.

¹²⁵ Ibid, 268-272.

In response to the initiative made at the Grottaferrata conference, Suenens set up a team composed of international theologians, whose task it was to provide a theological and pastoral evaluation of this Catholic “charismatic renewal.” Suenens believed this was also necessary to clarify the credibility of charismatic experiences for those who had met with serious opposition from individual bishops, from various episcopal conferences and, most importantly, from the highly skeptical critics in the Roman Curia.¹²⁶

Suenens invited the theological and pastoral experts to meet at his palatial Archbishop’s residence in Malines from May 21 - 26, 1974. Initially, the preparatory team included Fr. Kilian McDonnell, OSB (who composed the initial draft), Fr. Paul Lebeau, SJ and Sr. Marie André Houdard, OSB (the working group secretaries), Fr. Carlos Aldunate, SJ (Chile), Fr. Salvador Carillo Alday, MSpS (Mexico), Ralph Martin (USA), Fr. Albert de Monléon, OP (France), Fr. Heribert Mühlen (Germany), Veronica O’Brien (Ireland), and Kevin Ranaghan (USA). Their preparatory draft was then reviewed by several *periti* who served as theological consultants, including Fr. Yves Congar, OP (France), Fr. Avery Dulles, SJ (USA), Fr. Michael Hurley, SJ (Ireland), Fr. Walter Kasper (Germany), Fr. Hans Küng (Germany), Fr. René Laurentin (France), Fr. Karl Rahner, SJ (Germany), and Fr. Joseph Ratzinger (Germany). Cardinal Suenens chaired each of these meetings, and assumed the full responsibility and consequences of either acceptance or rejection from Rome.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Ibid, 276.

¹²⁷ Ibid, 277. Suenens lists both Rahner and Küng as two of the theological consultants; he does not list Martin and Houdard in the preparatory team, or Dulles, Hurley, Kasper and Laurentin, as consultants. An alternate list by McDonnell can be compared in his introductory essay to “Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I,” *Presence Power and Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, vol. III. Kilian McDonnell, ed. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1980), 15. In McDonnell we note the absence of Rahner and Küng, but the inclusion of Dulles, Hurley, Kasper and Laurentin, as well as Martin and Houdard. This is an interesting conflict, considering that Suenens and McDonnell worked together on this first Malines Document.

Their final document, entitled, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I*,¹²⁸ was warmly welcomed by Paul

VI. According to Suenens,

Sometime later, he showed it to me, lying on his desk, and commented,

“This is precisely the sort of study that is needed. Please continue to provide us with similar reports, which serve the Renewal.”¹²⁹

Suenens and his team of collaborators would go on to produce a total of six *Malines Documents* over the next decade.¹³⁰ For Suenens, these six pastoral and theological statements were a serious attempt to develop an understanding of charisms, as found in the conciliar documents.

Pope Paul, as Cardinal Montini, had been known to be a deeply spiritual man. His keen interest in spirituality allowed him to be both open to and interested in the ongoing reports he received from Suenens. Despite the growing opposition of his immediate Curial entourage (with the exception Cardinal Benelli), the Pope gave Suenens

¹²⁸ “Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I,” *Presence Power and Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, vol. III. Kilian McDonnell, ed. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1980), 13-69. This was the first of the six documents commonly referred to as *Malines Documents* that would be produced under the explicit direction of Suenens. They are part of the quasi-official corpus of Roman Catholic ecclesial statements in support of the charismatic renewal.

¹²⁹ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 277.

¹³⁰ Each of the six *Malines Documents* will be analyzed in a later chapter of this dissertation. In addition to “Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I,” they include: Léon Joseph Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations: Malines Document II*. (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978); Léon Joseph Suenens and Helder Camara, *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue: Malines Document III*. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1979); Léon Joseph Suenens, *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness: Malines Document IV*. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983), with a Forward written by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger; Léon Joseph Suenens, *Nature and Grace: A Vital Unity: Malines Document V*. Olga Prendergast, transl. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986); and Léon Joseph Suenens, *A Controversial Phenomenon: Resting in the Spirit: Malines Document VI*. (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1987).

unparalleled support and encouragement of his work with contemporary charismatic manifestations and activities around the globe.¹³¹

Chapter 1.10 A New Pentecost?

Suenens believed his immediate task was to document his own investigation of these experiences and to make them known to a much wider public audience. He took up his pen and dedicated the next few months to a book that he came to entitle, *A New Pentecost?* Fr. René Laurentin, who wrote a positive review in the French journal *Le Figaro*, noted, “The author wants to show us that the breath of the Holy Spirit is active today in very broadly-based groups, creating and offering a ‘democracy of holiness.’”¹³² Suenens himself noted that his main thesis centered on the actual *question mark* that had been used in the title of the book.

I felt that the Renewal ran the risk of not being recognized for what it was: an act of the Holy Spirit, available to all movements, and capable of renewing many aspects of the Church. It was an anguished call to those in power within the Church to accept this challenge, rather than reducing the Renewal to one movement among many others.¹³³

What completely surprised Suenens, however, was the response from Pope Paul VI, who actually began endorsing his book during the 1975 Synod of Bishops. In a historically unprecedented move during his Wednesday public audience, the Pope set aside his prepared text, lifted Suenens’ book high, and spoke of signs of hope and the importance

¹³¹ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 319-320.

¹³² *Ibid*, 279. Reference information was not noted by Suenens.

¹³³ *Ibid*, 280.

of charisms for all in the Church. “I am alluding to a book recently written by Cardinal Suenens – *A New Pentecost?*” the Pope told all those who had assembled. “The abundant outpouring of those supernatural graces which we call charisms can indeed be the sign of a providential hour in the history of the Church.”¹³⁴

The book itself is an interesting treatment of the role of the Holy Spirit in what Suenens saw as a critical turning point in the history of the Church.

Now is the time to listen, in silence, with all our heart to ‘what the Spirit is saying to the Churches’ (Rev. 2:29). He is telling us, it seems, to carry out the ever necessary reform of structures. But beyond this institutional ‘overhaul’ at every level – indeed, to assure its realization – he is inaugurating a spiritual renewal of exceptional richness.¹³⁵

Suenens suggested that the “pneumatic” dimensions of the Church must be understood in light of a “communion in the Holy Spirit,”¹³⁶ He noted, “the Holy Spirit is the bond of unity,” and the “creator of communion,” and that the Spirit “animates the entire Church from within.”¹³⁷

As to the charismatic nature of the Church, Suenens clearly makes an impassioned plea:

We must never forget that the Church cannot exist without its charismatic dimension; to be deprived of this dimension would not be merely an impoverishment, it would be a negation of the Church’s very being. The Church without charisms would not only be a Church missing a part of

¹³⁴ Ibid, 284.

¹³⁵ Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* xii.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 3.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 4.

itself – like a man deprived of hands – it simply would not be a Church at all: its very essence would be affected.¹³⁸

He struck a critical note in affirming that charismatic manifestations could be “surprising” and even “disconcerting,” but argued that “the Spirit reveals himself by means of such graces and marvelous gifts” in order to empower his followers to do great works in the name of Christ.¹³⁹ By drawing attention to the charismatic nature of the Church, he reminded us that the Council Fathers called the People of God to be more aware of the abiding, active presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church.¹⁴⁰ He also anticipated potential critics of charismatic spiritual experiences, maintained that Jesus never excluded any religious experience from the Christian life, and argued that authentic experiences of God should be the normal reality in the life of every Christian. He reasoned that, for God, there was no line of demarcation between “ordinary experiences” and “extraordinary experiences.”¹⁴¹

The Spirit is inseparable from his gifts. When I receive him, I receive the fullness of all that is his. And this fullness is not something static, but dynamic... The visibility of the gifts, the manner in which they are exercised, will differ, not only from person to person, but also, in each person the action of the Spirit modifies the use to which the gifts are put... [I] am possessed by the Spirit who moves me and leads me according to

¹³⁸ Ibid, 8.

¹³⁹ Ibid, 22-25.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 32.

¹⁴¹ Ibid, 64. The concept of charisms vis-à-vis normal reality of the Christian life will be further explored in a later chapter of this dissertation.

the good pleasure of his boundless love, and in accordance with the degree of faith, hope and love he finds in me.¹⁴²

Suenens drew upon the theological understanding that the Holy Spirit is initially present in a baptized Christian; he recalled that a newly baptized infant had already received the fullness of the Holy Spirit, even if the awareness of this reality was not present until much later when the child became an adult, and ratified the meaning and consequences of his or her baptism.¹⁴³ For Suenens, baptism becomes the primal source of all the other sacraments. In the course of the normal Christian life, each sacrament extends the rays of the Spirit's action, which began at baptism.¹⁴⁴

At baptism we all receive the fullness of the Holy Spirit, the layman as well as the priest, bishop or pope. The Holy Spirit cannot be received more or less, any more than a [Eucharistic] host is more or less consecrated. Each of us receives the Spirit of God with the charisms which are necessary for the fulfillment of our individual mission.¹⁴⁵

Suenens, in fact, goes on to speak of the sacrament of Confirmation as a ratification of Baptism. He notes that, "Confirmation is not some supplement to baptism; it confirms baptism." He does not differentiate further between the Catholic sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, nor does he speak to the traditional Catholic understanding of *sacramental character* that is received in the three sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation

¹⁴² Ibid, 82.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 83.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 84.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 86.

or Ordination. This is a striking departure from traditional Catholic sacramental theology.¹⁴⁶

Suenens also speaks to the work of the Spirit as an abiding power.

This power of the Holy Spirit is not reserved only for the apostles; it is an integral part of the heritage given to all of us. If we would dare believe in it, we would find our discouragement in the service of the Lord swept away, and we would cease looking upon the spiritual life as a prolonged ascetic effort which we must endure by our own force of will. We would see it, rather for what it is: the work of the Spirit in and with us, supporting us with his unfailing presence and power.¹⁴⁷

Suenens then begins to articulate several concerns about the traditional western understanding of spiritual growth. He notes how many Christians report years of fruitless effort in their quest for a personal spiritual life; many of them, he believes, incorrectly decide to double their *human efforts*, increase their ascetical practices and fight to maintain the energy they need in the daily struggle at prayer. For those caught in a barren waste, he recommends that they begin opening themselves to experiences of the charismatic nature of the Holy Spirit.

An asceticism based on our own will power cannot take us far. Faith in the present, active power of the Spirit does not dispense us from asceticism, but it sets it in true perspective – in a secondary place. Such a faith can show us that holiness is primarily an "assumption" rather than an

¹⁴⁶ I will revisit this departure in my final chapter of this dissertation.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 87.

"ascension." That is to say, it is God who reaches out to us and bears us aloft. This is a truth that we must learn and learn again.¹⁴⁸

Suenens then attempts to locate the greater meaning and relevance of charismatic experiences. He argues that the Holy Spirit had been perceived in early Catholic Church tradition as a lived experience, who revealed himself through various manifestations.¹⁴⁹ He reminds us that it was normal for these early Christians to live out their faith in an ongoing experience of the Holy Spirit, and that their everyday experiences would only later be crafted into actual dogmatic teachings on the Holy Spirit. For early Christians, to receive the Spirit and to experience the Spirit were one and the same thing.¹⁵⁰ In light of this, he calls our contemporary Churches to accountability for minimizing the role of religious experience; in his mind, religious experience is at the very heart of authentic Christianity.¹⁵¹

In Suenens' understanding, any fear of subjectivity must be examined with the fore-knowledge that faith is a living encounter with a living God; objective truths of the faith are formulated by the Church within the context of experience. Doctrine is the expression of that lived experience of God, the Holy Spirit, which is articulated by the apostles and the Christian communities and then passed down to us. The actual doctrines of the Holy Spirit only began to be defined three centuries after the initial experience of Pentecost.¹⁵² Suenens reminds us that this experience-expression pattern came down to us from the Hebrew Scriptures. In the biblical world view, there is only one path to knowledge of God, and that path is experience. For the Israelites, to know God was to

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, 88.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, 50.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, 57.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, 58.

¹⁵² Ibid, 56-57.

first experience God. For Suenens, to know the Holy Spirit, we must clearly experience the Holy Spirit – and that experience must come first.¹⁵³

In his book, Suenens also notes some of the more striking and widespread effects of this developing charismatic movement. First, the spirituality of participants quickly becomes more oriented toward Christ; participants encounter a living, intimate, experiential relationship with Christ, which leads to a fullness of life in the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁴ Second, the outflow of this deeper relationship gives rise to a new understanding of prayer, both on the individual and communal levels; prayer becomes more spontaneous, natural, and seems dominated by praise.¹⁵⁵ Third, the participants find a passion for reading and studying the Holy Scriptures; whether in private or in communal celebrations, the rediscovery of the Bible, a deeper grasp of biblical narratives, and an appreciation for meditation on Scripture passages (*Lectio Divina*), are common characteristics found among people who have experienced the charisms of the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁶ Fourth, an openness toward the gift of tongues (Greek: *glossolalia* or speaking in tongues); praying in tongues, both individually and corporately, is a striking, characteristic phenomenon of many persons who identify themselves as having received charisms from the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁷ Fifth, a greater love for both the institutional and sacramental dimensions of the Church; there is often a unity found among those who have had charismatic experiences that aims to overcome polarizations and factions within the local Church. In fact, one notes that many of those who have experienced charismatic

¹⁵³ Ibid, 58.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, 95-96.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, 96-97.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, 98.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid, 99-104. Here, Suenens mentions several studies by teams of psychiatrists and medical professionals that have examined self-identified individuals with a charism or gift of tongues. The findings of this research are discussed in several of the documents that are analyzed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

manifestations are marked by a common intention to build up the Church with a notably strong, Christocentric focus.¹⁵⁸

Suenens then turns to examine these charismatic manifestations in light of our own contemporary Christian identity and our basic ability to cooperate with grace:

For me, the most striking aspect of the experience that I have analyzed here is the fact that it compels me to look with new eyes at texts in the New Testament that I thought I knew. As I suddenly see manifestations of the Holy Spirit, especially in *Acts*, I have to ask myself: Were those Christians of the early Church exceptional, inimitable beings, living lives of perfection, who have ceased to exist, or is it that we Christians of today with our weakened faith are really “sub-normal?” I find I have to question myself as to the norms of true Christian fidelity and to look at the quality of my personal adherence to Jesus Christ... This question then obliges us to look afresh at Christianity and within it, at what is most ancient and fundamental: fidelity to the life of Christ in the Holy Spirit with all the visible and invisible consequences that this implies... I must take the measure of the vitality and breadth of my twentieth-century Christian faith as compared with that of the Christians of the first century.¹⁵⁹

Suenens suggests that the only difference between early Christians and contemporary Christians can be seen in terms of *expectation* and *receptivity* to the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁰

Previous to the Second Vatican Council, as far as a majority of contemporary Catholic believers had been concerned, the vast majority had seen charisms as belonging only to

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 105.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, 106-107.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 109.

the domain of exceptionally rare persons; they might have readily admitted that an entire spectrum of charisms was fully present in the early Church, but no longer expected to find charisms operative among Christians in the present day. But with the implementation of Vatican II and the sudden, unexpected advent of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, perspectives throughout the Church began to change.¹⁶¹

Suenens describes both the nature and characteristics of “normal” Christianity in terms of ordinary sanctity. Charisms and charismatic manifestations should be seen in Christians of every walk of life; those who simply live their faith possess the kind of openness to the Holy Spirit that is common among those who have experienced such manifestations. He is clear that charisms are not the monopoly of canonized saints or of vowed contemplatives cloistered in monasteries. In fact, the teachings of the Second Vatican Council articulate that holiness is a universal call to every Christian – a universal vocation to those in the most diverse walks of life, who are gifted with the stirrings of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶² Suenens then makes a bold clarification:

We should not see in this Renewal just one more movement to be set alongside many others in the Church today, or worse still, as in competition with them. Rather than a movement, Charismatic Renewal is a moving of the Holy Spirit which can reach all Christians, lay or cleric. It is comparable to a high voltage current of grace which is coursing through the Church. Every Christian is charismatic by definition; the difference lies in our degree of faith, our awareness of this fundamental and necessarily common reality... To benefit by this current, there is no need

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 109.

¹⁶² Ibid, 107-108.

even to join a formal prayer group... The Spirit blows how and where he will; he does not need the help of an organization to penetrate all classes of society: lay persons in every walk of life, members of religious congregations and orders, all are within his reach... He will... find his way into bishops' residences, episcopal conferences, and Roman synods!¹⁶³

He argues that any Church renewal is inconceivable when the vast majority of the faithful are unable to identify what it means to be a normal Christian. Suenens defines this as the ability of every Christian to grasp what it truly means to be baptized.

Peter's address provides us with the first definition of Christian identity, the unique quality inherent in being a Christian... "Repent" he said "and each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and then you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). Conversion. Baptism. Personal surrender to Christ. Receiving the Holy Spirit. All of Christianity is contained in these words.¹⁶⁴

Suenens here notes the indissoluble relationship between Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, particularly in that the designation "Christ" signifies being "anointed with the Holy Spirit." He recalls that Christ sent us the "life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45), and that he continues to direct the Church in, through and with the Holy Spirit, just as promised. He reminds us that Christians are baptized into the mystery of Christ – his death, resurrection, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. When the individual is "baptized in water," Suenens writes, he is "baptized in the Holy Spirit," the giver of life;

¹⁶³ Ibid, 111-112.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid, 117.

in fact, conversion, baptism, and receiving the Holy Spirit are each parts of a unique whole which the Sacred Tradition calls “Christian Initiation,” “enlightenment,” and “entrance into a new life.”¹⁶⁵ He laments that centuries of Christians were “sacramentalized” without being sufficiently “evangelized,” and that the version of Christianity that we have now inherited must “mature into a Christianity of choice, based on a personal decision and embraced with full consciousness.”¹⁶⁶

No matter what the future may bring, the Christian of today must live his faith with courage and conviction. Now more than ever he must draw his inspiration from those words which Peter spoke on the first Pentecost: he must experience conversion... he must meet Jesus... he must accept the guidance of the Holy Spirit... In brief, he must be open to the future in a faith refilled with hope, because it is founded on the promise and the power of God.¹⁶⁷

Suenens, here, clearly articulates that without a Christianity that is filled with the hope that is founded on this power of God, the believers of tomorrow may not be able to retain any sense of Christian identity. He challenges the Church to pass on a form of Christianity which is “strong and exhilarating: grafted on the power of the Holy Spirit... performing ‘signs and wonders’ which attest that we too live in that burgeoning of new life which is Pentecost.”¹⁶⁸ He exhorts the Church to present a very different picture of

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, 120-121.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, 125.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, 127.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, 134.

the “normal” Christian life – one that “exorcises” fears of charismatic manifestations that might appear to others as “exaggerations” of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁹

He also acknowledges a striking theological assessment of Fr. Yves Congar, OP, who wrote a widely circulated article, “I believe in the Holy Spirit in the Church,” in March 1972:

Almost without exception, the Christians who are not in full communion with us, whether Orthodox or Protestant, reproach us for our deficient “pneumatology.” They understand by this that we do not attribute to the Holy Spirit a real personal role... This personal role of the Spirit seems to them to be implied in the liberty and personalization of grace... We might think that the reproach is exaggerated and therefore unjust. Nevertheless, we ought to admit that it has some foundation. We have spoken about the Holy Spirit in connection with the spiritual life, but except for his role in assuring the reality of the sacramental or hierarchical acts, we have not said much of the Spirit in our ecclesiology, at least until recently. The situation is improving with our deeper appreciation of the meaning of local communities, of the charisms, as well as with the renewal movement rich in initiatives.¹⁷⁰

Suenens noted that the pneumatological advances made by the Second Vatican Council had inspired Pope Paul VI, who called for ongoing development of pneumatology; he had discerned that this would be “an indispensable complement to the teaching of the

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, 135.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, 187-188. Suenens quotes Yves Congar, “I Believe in the Holy Spirit in the Church,” *La Croix* (March 4, 1972). This article was published during initial research for his three volume study, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (1979-1980).

Council.”¹⁷¹ In light of Congar’s words, Suenens had clearly recognized that any development of pneumatology would, in its very nature, make significant contributions to the direction of new ecumenical initiatives, the progress of official bilateral dialogues, and the eventual unity of all Christian Churches. Suenens realized that in giving a new priority to the role of the Holy Spirit, Christians would create a common point of reference – a new focal point – that would allow them to speak in a language that was familiar to all Christians.¹⁷²

In addition, Suenens echoes that possibility for “a new springtime of the Church,” in recalling the mutual hope of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI, who had each prayed for “a new Pentecost” in relation to the Second Vatican Council. “It is here before our eyes,” he recognizes, “like the first rays of dawn.”¹⁷³

This Spirit remains at the heart of the Church, directing us towards the future. We would like to have a glimpse of that future, so as to read better the signs of the time. But this is not essential: our hope for the future is not based on statistics and charts. It derives entirely from faith in the Spirit, who is... the living breath of the Church, leading it on its pilgrimage, as long ago the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, led the people of Israel in the desert. He is at once continuity and freshness: “things new and old” (Mt. 13:52); tradition and progress.¹⁷⁴

For Suenens, this ready openness toward the future is an integral part of Christianity. It allows the Christian Church, through the power of the Holy Spirit, to carry the mission of

¹⁷¹ Ibid, 188. Suenens quotes from a speech given in the general audience of Pope Paul VI, June 6, 1973.

¹⁷² Ibid, 188-189.

¹⁷³ Ibid, 224.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, 229.

hope into the future. Here he also argues that the Church has been thrust forward by the Spirit, at certain moments throughout its two-thousand year history, and that, in its own mysterious way, the Spirit offers special graces to those who are open and attentive to his movements. He then acknowledges that the Catholic Church was going through such a moment during the Second Vatican Council and in the wake of the Renewal in the Spirit. In response to these two graced movements, Suenens offers his readers deep encouragement: “We must not fear the unknown ways of God, nor the renewals needed if the Church is to keep young.” In just such an open atmosphere, he concludes, “Pentecost continues.”¹⁷⁵

Chapter 1.11 Solemnity of Pentecost, Rome, 1975

Immediately following Pope Paul’s stunning public endorsement of *A New Pentecost?* the very next international Catholic charismatic conference was scheduled to be held in the city of Rome, during the Spring of 1975. This was an explicit move by the leaders to symbolically indicate their desire to be integrated into the wider Catholic Church. The conference took place during the week preceding the solemnity of Pentecost. Cardinal Willebrands, a keynote speaker, then President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, captivated the audience with his speech on *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, which gave great encouragement to all those gathered. The following Sunday, ten thousand of these charismatic pilgrims joined the massive crowds that had gathered in the piazza of St. Peter’s Basilica, to attend the Pontifical Liturgy of Pentecost. Suenens characterized this event as “unforgettable moments of fraternal

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, 230.

communion,” with a memorable and moving “musical joust” that took place between the Sistine Chapel Choir and the spontaneous chants of the charismatic pilgrims.¹⁷⁶

The very next morning, Suenens was given the rare privilege to be the principal celebrant in a special Eucharistic Liturgy at the papal altar of St. Peter’s Basilica. Here he was surrounded by a flood of charismatic pilgrims that included eight hundred priests and a dozen bishops. He describes how this unprecedented celebration proceeded in “a climate of extraordinary symbiosis between traditional liturgy and spontaneous prayer.” Then, with the announcement that Pope Paul VI would join these pilgrims in a special audience, the crowds greeted his arrival with “waves of alleluias.” Following his official greeting, Pope Paul VI began improvising in relaxed Italian, noting, “The Church welcomes the Charismatic Renewal!” He called it “an opportunity that the Church must seize.” At the foot of the papal altar, Pope Paul VI embraced Cardinal Suenens with visible emotion, designated him as his personal representative to the movement, and thanked him, “for all that you have done, and all that you will still do, to bring the Charismatic Renewal into the heart of the Church.”¹⁷⁷

“On the official level,” Suenens later noted, “the Monday after Pentecost 1975 will be remembered as the date on which the Church fully welcome the Renewal.” On another level, it was the same day that Suenens invited several of the American charismatic leaders to move to Brussels,¹⁷⁸ where they would begin the foundations of an organizing body that would eventually be known as the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services (ICCRS). Eventually the ICCRS offices moved to Rome, and then relocated into the Vatican City State. The ICCRS was given juridical personality

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, 290.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, 291.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, 292.

on 14 September 1993 as a private association of the faithful.¹⁷⁹ Popes Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II and Benedict XVI have each cultivated a positive relationship with the “Charismatic Renewal” or “Renewal in the Spirit,” and have frequently referred to it as one of the “new ecclesial movements” that give hope and courage to the rest of the Church.¹⁸⁰

Chapter 1.12 The Further Influence of Suenens

In April 1976 Cardinal Suenens was awarded the *Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion*,¹⁸¹ which was presented by HRH Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh, along with Sir John and Irene Templeton, and Margaret Thatcher, then British Secretary for Education, who gave the official address honoring Suenens at Guild Hall in London. He received this award in light of his “pioneering research and discourse of the Charismatic Renewal,” which had been previously seen as a cause for concern to many leaders in western Christianity. The inscription to the prize noted that, “the Cardinal’s enlightened discourse on the movement provided guidance and reassurance, eliminating misunderstanding and offering thoughtful insight to followers and observers alike.”¹⁸² Suenens considered this prize a very unique honor, as it is awarded by a panel jury composed of various Christians, Jews, Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists.

¹⁷⁹ Copies of the actual canonical decrees, amendments, statutes, etc. can be viewed on the website of the ICCRS as found online June 20, 2008 at the hyperlink:

http://www.iccrs.org/about_iccrs/recognition/statutes.htm

¹⁸⁰ The developing relationship between these four popes and the growing Charismatic Renewal will be analyzed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

¹⁸¹ Since 2001 it has been known as the *Templeton Prize for Progress Toward Research or Discoveries about Spiritual Realities*. Suenens was only the second Catholic (after Mother Teresa, 1973) to receive this award.

¹⁸² See the Templeton Prize website at the hyperlink: http://www.templetonprize.org/bios_recent.html

In 1977, Suenens was given the unexpected invitation to preach a mission for Oxford University students. This mission, which was brought to fame under William Temple in 1931, had been abolished in 1968 for fear of popular student uprisings. For the first time since the Reformation, Suenens, a Catholic cardinal and archbishop, had been invited to preach there. On each of the four evenings, he gave lectures to 1,500 students and faculty on the theme of God. Suenens wrote, “This mission was one of the most important moments of my life... but what made it even more special was the ecumenical communion in which I lived during those days.”¹⁸³ In a review that appeared in *The Tablet*,¹⁸⁴ it was noted that Suenens unprecedented invitation had met without any opposition. The audience listened to his thoughts on the widespread lack of traditional Christian upbringing, God the Father’s intense love for humanity, and the need to make a personal decision to follow Christ. Suenens then turned to the topic of the Holy Spirit and the ecumenical efforts to reunite the Church, noting, “first there must be a personal renewal, alone, and then, inevitably, in community with others.”¹⁸⁵ The article’s author noted, “One had the feeling that the Holy Spirit, through the speaker and the listeners, was breathing new life into our university’s ancient motto, *Dominus Illuminatio Mea*.”¹⁸⁶

In April 1978, Suenens wrote to Pope Paul VI in an effort to keep him up to date with the growth and progress of his charismatic research and guidance of the movement. In May, Suenens received his final letter from Pope Paul VI, whose health had been quickly declining.

¹⁸³ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 307.

¹⁸⁴ Ronald Jenkinson, “Cardinal Suenens Preaches the Mission at Oxford University.” *The Tablet* (Feb. 26, 1977), as quoted by Suenens in *Memories and Hopes*, 309-313.

¹⁸⁵ Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 311-312.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 312.

We have read with great care your letter of April 15, concerning the Charismatic Renewal Movement. We were unable to respond as promptly as we would have liked, to express our satisfaction with the caring attention with which you are attempting to ensure the full integration of this movement into the life of the Catholic Church; we are happy to do so now, and to tell you how very much we appreciate these efforts. We ask the Lord to fill you with his grace in this ecclesial service, and we renew from the depths of our heart our affectionate apostolic benediction.¹⁸⁷

Pope Paul VI died several weeks later, on August 6, 1978, having repeatedly endorsed and supported Suenens and his work with the Renewal of the Spirit. This set a positive tone for Suenens' work with each of the Popes who would succeed him.

When Cardinal Luciani became Pope John Paul I, Suenens was one the first Cardinals to be received in a private audience. When the new Pontiff greeted Suenens, he stated aloud, "Here is the Cardinal of the Holy Spirit, who writes so magnificently about him." Suenens had first met Luciani between two sessions of a previous synod in Rome; after their long discussion about contemporary charisms, Suenens had sent Luciani a copy of *A New Pentecost?* Luciani, in turn, sent a response thanking him for the book, and admitting, "As I went along, I often felt the need to go back, with new eyes to certain passages in St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles – passages which I thought I knew well. For me, your book has been, and will continue to be, a precious guide to the Acts."¹⁸⁸ At Luciani's papal inaugural ceremony, Suenens made the typical act of

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, 320.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 328.

obedience, but then the Pope embraced him, and began asking Suenens to pray that he too would experience, “an encounter with the Holy Spirit.”¹⁸⁹

When Luciani died after just a month in office, Cardinal Wojtyla was elected to serve as Pope, and took the name John Paul II. Suenens had heard him speak during the Council, but had never met him. As Suenens offered his act of obedience, John Paul II stunned him, saying, “Thank you, Eminence, for all that we owe you... It will now be possible to bring about what you had hoped for. And now, let us have some affective and effective collegiality.”¹⁹⁰ Suenens was unsure if Wojtyla was alluding to his work during the Council, or his recent, well-known initiatives with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. But when Suenens joined the new pope on his pilgrimage to Czestochowa, he was met at the Warsaw airport by a large group of Polish Catholic charismatics, who had waited in festive anticipation for the charismatic Cardinal from Belgium. Suenens was overwhelmed by their embrace of him.¹⁹¹ Months later, Suenens took part in a special Synod (Fall 1980), and was invited to bring a small group of Charismatic Catholics to the private chapel of Pope John Paul II for a Eucharistic Liturgy. Following Communion, the group broke out in chanted tongues; when Suenens later asked the Pope if this had disturbed his meditation, the Pope replied, “On the contrary; it helped me to pray more deeply.”¹⁹²

As Suenens approached the age of seventy-five, he sought to be released from the active burden and administration of the Belgian Church. He willingly offered his *nunc dimittis* to Pope John Paul II on July 14, 1979; his resignation became effective on

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, 326.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, 330.

¹⁹¹ Ibid, 331. Suenens had not asked for royalties from the Polish editions of his books. As a result, publishers had been able to saturate the Polish market with inexpensive editions of *A New Pentecost?*

¹⁹² Ibid, 343.

January 4, 1980.¹⁹³ Suenens was overjoyed to learn that Godfried Danneels, his protégé and Bishop of Antwerp,¹⁹⁴ was to succeed him as primate of Belgium. At a farewell gathering for Suenens, Danneels made public the remarks that Pope John Paul II had shared with him in confidence: “Cardinal Suenens played a crucial role during Vatican II, and the universal Church owes much to him.”¹⁹⁵

Even upon retirement, the Belgian Cardinal still continued to play a very active role in European Catholicism.¹⁹⁶ In early 1987, Pope John Paul II invited Suenens – the only surviving member of the four Council moderators¹⁹⁷ – to the Commemorative Synod for Vatican II, where he was to give a special address to the gathered assembly.¹⁹⁸ His brief message echoed the thoughts of John Paul II for a “new evangelization:”

Scripture tells us that “the young have visions and the old have dreams.”

This gives me the right – at my advanced age – to share with you the dreams I have for your work and the upcoming Synod on the Laity... I would like to see the Synod insistently stress the need for Christians of future generations to relive the experience of Pentecost – in other words, to receive that “Baptism in the Holy Spirit” which created the Church and gave it its vital breath... They must live the experience of the Cenacle – and I do mean experience – which is an experience of profound conversion; of recognition of the resurrected Christ; of openness and

¹⁹³ Ibid, 336-337. Suenens intended to be consistent with his own suggestions at the Council, where he openly called for the establishment of a mandatory retirement age for diocesan bishops.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, 335. Suenens had been the principal consecrator of Danneels at his episcopal ordination, according to the information found at the hyperlink: <http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bdanneels.html>

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, 338.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, 350. By 1981, Suenens had decided to discontinue his regular speaking engagements in the United States, and limited his role to ecumenical and charismatic events in continental Europe.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, 354. Suenens notes that Cardinals Agagianian, Lecaro and Döpfner had already passed into eternity.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, 368-369.

availability to the Holy Spirit, to his gifts and charisms, in the fire of Pentecost.¹⁹⁹

Later that year, Suenens was interviewed in connection with the twentieth anniversary of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.²⁰⁰ When asked about the movement's progress, he suggested, "We are far from having fully discovered the Holy Spirit, whether in theology, in spirituality, or in our pastoral applications." He then praised Pope John Paul II for his release of the encyclical, *Dominum et vivificantem*, noting that it was an invitation for all to emphasize the Spirit's life-giving role.²⁰¹ As the interview continued, Suenens clarified that "baptism in the Spirit" is an experience of the grace that is rooted in the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation.²⁰² He may have surprised many of his critics when he suggested, "The Renewal should no longer be viewed as a "movement" alongside other "movements," but... as a breath of the Spirit, an act of the Spirit." He then encouraged, "We should rediscover the secret of Pentecost, which is a mystery of conversion (ad intra) and of apostolate (ad extra)."²⁰³

In January 1990, while suffering minor heart problems, Suenens was forced to face his finitude. Fifteen days in a hospital, "completely lacking in humanity," helped him to see "that Christianity has barely touched the surface of people's souls," and that "the world is in need, more than ever, of a new evangelization."²⁰⁴ That same year he published a prayer for the new millennium, part of which reads,

Lord, if I turn my eyes to the Church

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, 369-370.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, 371-377.

²⁰¹ Ibid, 372.

²⁰² Ibid, 375.

²⁰³ Ibid, 377.

²⁰⁴ Ibid, 380.

Who received from your Son the promise of Eternal Life,
I see all the poverty and weakness there is in us, your disciples,
So poor and so unchristian!
And I hear, on every side,
The pressing call of our Pastors
To a new and second Evangelization
To make us true Christians,
Conscious of the imperatives of our Baptism.

Help us to find again the fervor of the early Christians
And the power of the first evangelization,
Which began that morning of Pentecost,
In the Cenacle of Jerusalem,
Where your disciples, gathered in prayer with Mary,
Awaited the fulfillment of their Father's promise.

Give us the grace to be renewed
“in the Spirit and in fire.”
Teach us to speak to the world in tongues of fire,
And let there be an end to this time of timid, silent Christians
Who anxiously debate the problems of today
As Christians did long ago
On the road that led from Jerusalem to Emmaus

Unaware that the Master is Risen and Alive.²⁰⁵

Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, 91, died from a thrombosis, on May 6, 1996, in Brussels.

He was buried in the Cathedral of St. Rumbold, in Malines.

Chapter 1.13 Concluding Thoughts

What are we to make of the life and teachings of Cardinal Suenens? What is the real significance of his impulse for the “charismatic dynamic” at the Second Vatican Council? What kind of insights can be gained by the Catholic Church, how will they impact our practices, and how will this, in turn, impact the way we relate to the other churches?

It is clear that Suenens was no ordinary man of the Church. Consider his background and his influence: He was raised by a single mother, in the poverty of a rectory where his uncle was a priest. He was attracted to the priesthood, languages and parliamentary procedure at an early age. He was sponsored by the primate of Belgium, who took an active interest in his education; sent to Rome, he studied canon law, and obtained dual doctorates in theology and philosophy. There, he learned the art of debate from some of the finest theologians of his day. He also learned how to maneuver about in the inner sanctums of the Roman Curial system.

He was a seminary professor, and a university rector that was marked for death by the Nazi regime. As an auxiliary bishop, he attracted the patronage of the supreme pontiff, rose to leadership as an archbishop, and was created a cardinal with unprecedented speed. He was positioned as one of ten presidents of the largest

²⁰⁵ Ibid, 385. The prayer cited is just a small portion of a much larger one, composed by Suenens.

Ecumenical²⁰⁶ Council in Church history. As a papal advisor, he was the secret author of a massive *alternative plan* that was unanimously adopted by the Council Fathers. He preceded any Roman Pontiff in presenting a papal encyclical to a General Assembly of the United Nations, and found courage in that audience to address the universal Church. He was hand-picked over more senior hierarchs to eulogize a pope and had unprecedented access to the next pontiff, who appointed him one of four permanent moderators of the Council. He championed the Conciliar teachings on Church *ad intra* and *ad extra*, and was charged to oversee the completion of two constitutions. In Council, he defended the grace of charisms, and convinced nearly 2,800 bishops of the contemporary, dynamic power of the Holy Spirit.

After the Council, Suenens was named papal representative to the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and co-founded the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services. With the help of a dozen Council *periti*, he published six theological and pastoral studies on charismatic dynamics known as the *Malines Documents*. In order to strengthen many Catholic charismatics who had experienced criticism and misunderstanding, he wrote *A New Pentecost?* – just one of twenty-two books he authored during his career. In 1976, he was awarded the *Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion*, for his specific advancement and guidance of the Charismatic Renewal. Even upon his retirement as Primate of Belgium, he continued to publish his thoughts and present lectures to Catholic and Protestant groups for another sixteen years.

For many who have taken an initial, cursory glance at his work and life, Cardinal Suenens was, perhaps, one of nearly two dozen leaders who seemed to draw the attention, admiration and praise of many during the Second Vatican Council. Looking deeper,

²⁰⁶ Again, I employ this designation “Ecumenical” in keeping with the earlier footnote in section 1.2.

however, it becomes clear that this Belgian cleric was the principal, driving force behind many of the most proactive decisions and positive fruits of the Council. For example, the papal endorsement and unanimous adoption of his *alternative plan* was, in my opinion, the major turning point in the overall direction of the Council. Then, with his insight to approach ecclesiology *ad intra* and *ad extra*, I would argue that Suenens provided the theological framework to capture and balance the dynamic, influential forces of *aggiornamento* and *resourcement* that became a conceptual backdrop to the sixteen conciliar documents. In his dual responsibility and oversight for *Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes*, Suenens exercised unparalleled influence over the most debated and most rewritten texts, both behind the scenes, and during each of the four autumn sessions of the Council.

Most importantly, Suenens introduced the concept that charismatic gifts were still being freely given, by the Holy Spirit, to all the baptized faithful. Each baptized Christian has received charisms in order to contribute his or her role in the universal mission to build up the kingdom of God. It was no accident, then, that *Lumen Gentium* – a constitution that was the responsibility of Suenens – would contain six of the twelve references to charisms that are found in the corpus of Vatican II documents. Or that eleven of the twelve references speak of charisms being exercised by lay persons i.e. “the laity” (1), “the lay faithful” (1), “the faithful” (3), “the entire church” (1), “the church” (1), “each person” (1), “every disciple” (1), “all the people of God” (1), and “those who were endowed” and subjected to the authority of the apostles (1). In fact, only one of these twelve references mentions charisms being exercised by the hierarchy – “the charism of infallibility,” which is actually given to “roman pontiffs,” to “the body of

bishops,” and to the Church in its entirety. In light of this, the documents of the Second Vatican Council clearly identify the majority of charisms in relation to how they are exercised by lay men and women; no other Vatican II document speaks of charisms in direct relation to pastors, bishops or popes.

Vatican II taught that all baptized laypersons – male and female – are given charisms by the will of the Holy Spirit, in order to participate in the communion and overall mission of the Church. Each lay person has both the right and the duty to use their charisms in the Church. Pastors are called to uncover, acknowledge and foster all the charisms of the laity, encourage them to show their initiative, and weigh the fruit of lay charisms without extinguishing them. Charisms are seen to sanctify the Church in addition to sacraments and ministries; they can be extraordinary or simple and widely diffused, but they are to be received with thanksgiving; they may be desired and even eagerly sought, but never rashly sought after or presumptuously expected to bear fruit. They are spontaneous and independent from ordained ministerial gifts; they are not a shared participation in gifts proper to the hierarchy, but they are seen to qualify their recipients and make them fit for roles and offices in the Church. Charisms, as they were then acknowledged, may even signify evidence of holiness in contemporary men and women.

Suenens collaborated with theologians and Council *periti* like Philips, Küng, Rahner, Congar, Häring, Ratzinger, Hauptmann, Colombo, Tucci, Camara, McDonnell, Mühlen, Dulles and Kasper. Six *Malines Documents* were produced that articulate and develop a theology of charisms, and which soon became the backbone of Rome’s official position on the Charismatic Renewal. Suenens and his collaborators continued to study,

write and articulate a fresh understanding of the Holy Spirit and his role in the Church, in missionary activity, in the role of the laity, and in the ministerial and sacramental practices of the Church.

To further explore this “charismatic dynamic,” I will first examine the rich ecclesial statements published by the various churches and ecclesial communions that have encountered this contemporary charismatic renewal. It is my intention to uncover any ecumenical similarities to the Catholic Pneumatology that has developed since the Council. To this end, I will also examine a cross section of contributions by several Catholic theologians to discover what they have articulated regarding the Holy Spirit and charismatic gifts. I am particularly interested in locating any previously lost or hidden perspectives and ideas – pieces or trajectories – that could help form and articulate a contemporary ecumenical Pneumatology. I will then attempt to identify some applications of these developments and how these pneumatic influences contribute to our contemporary Catholic practices and theology of the laity, of ministry by lay persons, of sacramental and liturgical renewal, and of ecumenical relations with all our brothers and sisters in Christ.

SIGNIFICANT ECCLESIAL STATEMENTS ON THE CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

CHAPTER TWO

Chapter 2.1 Introduction

As I presented in chapter one, Cardinal Suenens had been a major driving force behind both the Second Vatican Council and the nascent Catholic Charismatic Renewal. As a confidant of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI, his contributions to the wider understanding and appreciation of charismatic gifts and ministries in the church were unsurpassed. His global recognition was undoubtedly aided by his appearance to the United Nations as a papal substitute, and his far reaching influence clearly surpassed his official ecclesial roles within Belgium.

His Council speech on reawakening the charismatic dynamics of the Church directly shaped the overall pneumatology of the Council itself; his personal interest and dedication led to the inclusion of twelve specific references to either charisms or charismatic activity in four of the Council's sixteen documents, including six references in its pivotal Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* (no. 4, 7, 12, 25, 30 and 50). He showed a particular genius in tapping the theological advice of several top Council *periti* – e.g. Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, Yves Congar, Heribert Mühlen, Avery Dulles, Walter Kasper, René Laurentin and Joseph Ratzinger – for some of the earliest Catholic theological discussions on the actual charismatic dynamics of the Church,

asking Kilian McDonnell, to begin coordinating these early Catholic theological responses into the first *Malines Document*, which then became the backbone of Rome's official position on the Charismatic Renewal.

Following the Council, and well beyond his official retirement as the Belgian Primate and Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, Suenens never ceased travelling the world, and promoting research and discourse on the Charismatic renewal. His travels and lectures brought him into direct contact with a variety of people touched by the Charismatic movements both in and outside of the Catholic Church. Whether speaking in various Catholic dioceses, to bishops' conferences, or to gatherings of various Catholic or Christian groups involved in the renewal itself, Suenens was able to address audiences throughout all of Europe and North America.

At the formal request of the Council's many official Protestant observers, Suenens had accepted many invitations to meet with individuals from other Christian churches around the world – Christians that the Vatican had begun referring to as “separated brothers and sisters”²⁰⁷ in Council documents. During these travels he also met with Charismatic leaders who represented the renewal movements within the Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist and many other Protestant churches; they were particularly interested in meeting a Roman Catholic Cardinal, known to be open to the charismatic gifts, to gain his perspective on how the renewal was seen in the eyes of Rome. In these encounters he began to hear of the ecclesial statements that had been published by these other churches, a summary of which will now appear in the rest of this chapter.

²⁰⁷ The specific terminology used during and following the Second Vatican Council was “separated brethren.”

Chapter 2.2 Anglican Statements

In April 1960, the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles issued a formal ecclesial statement, *The Speaking in Tongues and the Church*,²⁰⁸ following preliminary reports that a rector²⁰⁹ and seventy members of his parish had received what they identified as a “Pentecostal experience.”²¹⁰

The rector was immediately forced to resign and the local diocese issued a formal ban against speaking in tongues on church property; at the same time, a commission was appointed with the primary task to study the pertinent biblical texts, church history, and any contemporary examples of these manifestations. Their official statement expressed serious doubts about the *normality* of these experiences, and the commission had quickly adopted the view that speaking in tongues had been strictly limited to early church experience and not to continuing ecclesial history. They had discovered isolated examples of speaking in tongues throughout Church history,²¹¹ sometimes associated

²⁰⁸ “The Speaking in Tongues and the Church” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1-9.

²⁰⁹ Rev. Dennis Bennett, rector of St. Mark Episcopal Church, Van Nuys, CA, who later co-authored with his wife, Dennis Bennett and Rita Bennett, *The Holy Spirit and You*. (Gainesville, FL: Bridge-Logos Publishers, 1971).

²¹⁰ *Op cit.*, 1-2.

²¹¹ *Ibid*, 4-5. In their historical section they indicated that speaking in tongues or “glossolalia” had not been commonly considered an “inspiration” until the late seventeenth century, and was even seen by some as a “symbol of alleged diabolical possession.” Stories of St. Vincent Ferrer claim that while travelling throughout Europe he had understood and spoken in languages that he had never studied; similar experiences of St. Francis Xavier in his mission to the Orient, were considered to be manifestations of glossolalia. Within Eastern Orthodoxy, they found reported cases of glossolalia as phases in the mystic’s private “ladder of ascent” to heaven, often stemming out of the repetition of the Jesus Prayer. They located similar accounts among French Huguenots, Camisards, Quakers, Methodists, and Zinzendorfian Moravians. The study also documented the origin of Pentecostal Churches, which date back to early movements that began in 1900 at a bible school in Topeka, KS; here, speaking in tongues was seen as the key evidence of having received the baptism of the Spirit. The study goes on to identify three overall approaches to glossolalia, which they articulate as the Catholic, Protestant and Enthusiast views. Catholics

with heretical groups, but more frequently associated with enthusiastic movements.

Despite the research and historical evidence, this first official statement of the Episcopal Church, USA concluded that, with the normal, historical growth of the Church, these kinds of charismatic manifestations were eventually discarded as “marks of ecclesial infancy.”²¹²

Then, in December 1960, the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago issued a similar statement, *Report of the Special Commission on Glossolalia*,²¹³ upon learning that a local Chicago parish had grown into a center of charismatic activity.²¹⁴ Written by an appointed commission, it cautioned against the formation of a “spiritual elite,” who showed “an unfortunate schismatic tendency,” and warned of the “real danger” that glossolalia²¹⁵ could actually be “delusional” activity or even a form of “diabolical deception.”²¹⁶ The report placed a clear emphasis on the role of proper discernment, to strike a preemptive move against any further growth of this phenomenon. In retrospect, its cautionary tone is quite interesting, in light of the fact that the document’s own biblical appendix suggested that tongues “ordinarily accompanied the gift of the Holy

(as well as Orthodox and Anglicans) were understood to view the Holy Spirit as the “soul” of the Church, who bestows gifts as the “animating and unifying principle of the Church.” The Protestant point of view, as they understood it, had not yet recognized “the imminence of indwelling of the Spirit.” Enthusiasts (such as Schwaermerei and Pentecostalism) had held on to a view that was made popular by the Anabaptists, which exalted the freedom of the Spirit over and against the view that the Spirit was channeled through an institutional means of grace; they also tended to ignore the fruit of the Spirit as a primary sign of the indwelling presence of the Spirit.

²¹² Ibid, 9.

²¹³ “Report on the Special Commission on Glossolalia” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 10-20.

²¹⁴ Ibid, 10. The parish is here identified as Trinity Episcopal Church, Wheaton, IL.

²¹⁵ The Greek term *γλωσσολαλία* derives from *γλῶσσα* "tongue, language" and *λαλεῖν* "to talk."

²¹⁶ Ibid, 13; see also Appendix B, Section C, which notes, “But – and this is never to be forgotten – speaking in a tongue is not self-authenticating, and indeed may be the work of demons.”

Spirit at baptism,” were a “manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the Church,” and operated “for the common good” of the entire Church.²¹⁷

By 1962, this cautionary tone had spread across the United State; the House of Bishops then collectively published *New Movements in the Church*,²¹⁸ following their annual national convention.²¹⁹ In emphasizing how this new Charismatic Renewal should relate itself to the historic Episcopal Church, the national body of bishops issued a stark warning:

We observe that the danger of all new movements is self-righteousness, divisiveness, one-sidedness, and exaggeration. We call, therefore, upon all new movements to remain in the full, rich, balanced life of the historic Church, and thereby protect themselves against these dangers; and we remind all clergy of their solemn vow to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Church. The Church... is by its nature more comprehensive than any special groups within it; and the Church, therefore, is both enriched by and balances the insights of all particular movements.²²⁰

The bishops’ collective caution and hesitation seemed to indicate that certain elements of the Charismatic Renewal had been perceived as some kind of threat to their hierarchical authority. It also clearly identified that the legitimacy of any Charismatic movement would be judged by its ability to *conform* to the established, institutional structure.

²¹⁷ Ibid, 17-18.

²¹⁸ “New Movements in the Church” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 20-21.

²¹⁹ Ibid, 20.

²²⁰ Ibid, 21.

By May 1963, a report entitled *Study Commission on Glossolalia*²²¹ was published by the Episcopal Diocese of California (San Francisco). This commission was made up of theologians and psychiatrists, a parapsychologist, and a charismatic Episcopal priest. They noted the clear “absence” of any previous systematic treatment of glossolalia in the Episcopal Church, and suggested that Charismatic adherents might turn to “Pentecostal vocabulary and literature” for spiritual help. They described three types of glossolalia found in scripture: 1) the “sign tongue,” an evidence of surrender to the Spirit and having been filled by God; 2) “Prayer in the Spirit,” the continual use of tongues as a type of private prayer language; and 3) the “gift of tongues,” a public, prophetic message of God, that often necessitated the “charism of interpretation.”²²²

In the study’s psychological section, it drew a comparison between the psychological “surrender” of an individual to his or her inner life – i.e. a surrendering of the rational and the conscious to the irrational and unconscious – and the “surrender” in this charismatic experience to the person of God, the Holy Spirit. In fact, the study clarified that, psychologically speaking, this “surrender” to the charismatic dimension brought a sense of release and freedom; it noted that praying or speaking in tongues could be seen as “a healthy outlet” that freed and enlarged religious life.²²³ The report concluded that praying in tongues during private devotions “should not be denied,” and that local pastors, with discretion, might allow the public use of charismatic prayer “in place of” lauds or

²²¹ “Study Commission on Glossolalia,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 70-95.

²²² *Ibid*, 75-77.

²²³ *Ibid*, 85.

vespers; it could also be allowed in cathedrals or parish churches “when authorized by the bishop, and . . . when the edification of the congregation so requires.”²²⁴

The same day that this nuanced, positive statement was issued, the Episcopal bishop of California, who had actually sponsored this study, issued his own, more negative response, in a *Pastoral Letter*,²²⁵ dated May 2, 1963. He first reminded his flock that the normal “vehicles” for the action of the Holy Spirit were the reading and preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments.²²⁶ He then evoked a 1962 statement by the House of Bishops, implied that the Charismatic movement had ignored their specific cautions, and accused the movement of having “borrowed” much of its theology and practices from Pentecostal churches, whose “imbalances and overemphasis,” he judged, had presented the Church with “heresy in embryo.”²²⁷ While he tolerated the private, devotional use of tongues, he advised that his Churches should not take part in charismatic activity, and that clergy should not promote or place any emphasis on this gift.²²⁸ He issued directives forbidding the charismatic practice of the “laying on of hands,” particularly by lay persons, reserving this to clergy administering the sacramental Unction of the Sick.²²⁹ Despite his negative assessment, he pointed out, “The very rise of this movement within major Churches in this country is a sign of a real need and hunger for a more vital, Spirit-filled Christian experience in life.”²³⁰ This appeared confusing, in light of his own commission’s statement on the positive aspects of

²²⁴ Ibid, 94.

²²⁵ James A. Pike, “Pastoral Letter,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 96-104.

²²⁶ Ibid, 98.

²²⁷ Ibid, 100.

²²⁸ Ibid, 101-102.

²²⁹ Ibid, 102.

²³⁰ Ibid, 103.

the renewal and gift of tongues. But as I will show, this kind of confusing and even conflicting statement would be issued by other church denominations.

As early documents by Episcopal bishops and dioceses were circulated around the country, and greater clarity became necessary, the Episcopal Church, USA, issued its second formal statement in its *1971 Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops*,²³¹ published shortly after its Special Meeting in late October. In this statement, the bishops note a growing awareness of the Holy Spirit, whom they recognized as having continued to move in these “new ways,” in both the lives of individuals and in the life of the Church itself.

We see a growing awareness of the Pentecostal power of the Holy Spirit to transform men and women. He is working in the devotional lives of His people, and in their experience of His charismatic gifts of prayer, praise, and healing, and in their joy in the sacramental life.²³²

While brief and to the point, the House of Bishops had clarified that, on a national scale, both the charismatic gifts and movement were to be recognized for their positive fruit within the Church. This was a significant growth from their earlier, more cautionary response in their first joint document; it was clear that the bishops had been satisfied with the ability of the early renewal to *conform* to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the larger Episcopal Church, USA.

As the 1971 House of Bishops statement began to circulate globally, the Session in Synod of the Anglican Church, Australia, passed a resolution to make its own

²³¹ “1971 Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 282-285.

²³² *Ibid*, 283.

theological and exegetical study of the Charismatic Renewal. The committee that was then appointed to study the movement published *Both Sides to the Question*,²³³ in October 1973. Composed by both Anglicans who had enthusiastically supported the renewal and Anglicans who were generally opposed to it, the document traced the historical phenomenon of 20th-century Pentecostalism,²³⁴ and investigated the historic use of the specific terminology “baptism in the Holy Spirit.”²³⁵ The committee noted that the phrase had gradually shifted in meaning from one of “sanctification and holiness” to one of “empowering for service.” Various Pentecostal teachings had popularized the idea of a “second work” of the Holy Spirit following the moment of Christian conversion, and neo-Pentecostal Anglicans had been teaching that Christian experience involved two separate and distinct moments: the first moment was the experience of being “born

²³³ “Both Sides to the Question” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 374-441.

²³⁴ *Ibid*, 383-385. This document traced the origins of the contemporary Pentecostal movement that had begun in the United States in 1900, at Bethel College in Kansas. A young student had asked the school head to “lay hands” on her head, and she began speaking in a strange language. By 1906 a church was opened on Azusa Street in Los Angeles, which began to draw skeptics and admirers from many parts of the United States. By 1960, a similar movement had begun to integrate itself directly into the major Protestant denominations, and by 1967, it had spread to the Catholic Church. Initially known as neo-Pentecostalism in many mainline churches, it later became known as the Charismatic movement, as it crossed more and more ecclesial boundaries and its adherents sought separation from the historic ties to the Pentecostal denominations. Charismatic theology itself was built upon the doctrine of the “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” that had been articulated by Finney at the Oberlin School of Theology, New York, in 1946. His teachings had largely focused upon the necessity of a second “post-conversion” grace, which empowered Christians for service and witness, and was typically accompanied by the gift of tongues. For Finney, the doctrine of “baptism in the Holy Spirit” was identical to John Wesley’s doctrine of “entire sanctification.”

²³⁵ In dealing with the “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” the committee had chosen to investigate the use of the term in Sacred Scripture. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit had been referred to in Matthew 3:11, by John the Baptist, who proclaimed, “He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire;” in Acts 1:5, by Jesus himself, who encouraged the Apostles, “in a few days you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit;” and then again by Peter in Acts 11:16, where the Apostle recalls the promise of Jesus, “John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit.” The committee also listed other phrases or related terminology, including, “the Holy Spirit came upon you” (Acts 1:8, 19:6); “filled with the Holy Spirit” (Acts 2:4, 9:17); “the Spirit poured out upon you” (Acts 2:17, 33); “to receive the Holy Spirit” (Acts 8:15, 10:47); “to be given the Holy Spirit” (Acts 8:18, 11:17); and “the Spirit falling upon you” (Acts 10:44, 11:15). Acknowledging that they could not find the exact phrase, “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” in the Scriptures, the committee concluded that it was not significantly different from the biblical phrase “baptized in [or with] the Holy Spirit.”

again” and baptized into the body of Christ; the second moment was the experience of being “baptized in the Spirit.” Here, the Holy Spirit was given in a distinct second experience, where Christians were freshly endowed with a spiritual power, and quickened in the experience of the spiritual gifts (Acts 1:8; 1 Cor. 2:4-11).”²³⁶

As to the gifts themselves, the committee specifically recognized only those mentioned in Scripture.²³⁷ It noted that while most classic Pentecostal theology viewed tongues as a “necessary sign of baptism in the Holy Spirit,” traditional Anglicans simply recognized tongues as a sign of the Holy Spirit’s presence.²³⁸ Aware of the great balance that St. Paul brought to the subject of tongues, the committee ruled, “tongues are not to be forbidden in the congregation,” that the “proper exercise of tongues [was] not divisive in the congregation,” and that any offense at the exercise of tongues was “a failure in love, or perhaps in understanding the gifts of the Spirit.”²³⁹ This ruling, within the committee’s much wider document, was a dramatic development in the Anglican Charismatic movement, and advanced both the understanding of and appreciation for tongues throughout the Anglican Communion.

In its final section on healing, this diverse committee agreed that divine healing, with its accompanying signs and wonders, was to be understood as, “a transfer of the

²³⁶ Ibid, 384-385.

²³⁷ Ibid, 392-393. The committee listed the following charismatic gifts together with their appropriate scriptural references: Rom 12:3-8 – prophecy, ministry, teaching, exhortation, giving money, giving aid, showing mercy.

1 Cor. 1:5 – every kind of speech, every kind of knowledge. 1 Cor. 7:7 – marriage, continence. 1 Cor. 12:8-10 – speaking wisdom, speaking knowledge, faith, healings, works of power, prophecy, distinguishing between spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues. 1 Cor. 12:28-30 – apostles, prophets, teachers, works of powers, healers, helpers, administrators, tongues. Ephesians 4:7-12 – apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. 1 Peter 4:10-11 – preaching and serving.

²³⁸ Ibid, 397.

²³⁹ Ibid, 398.

authority of Christ to the Church of New Testament times,²⁴⁰ intimately related to spreading the Kingdom of God. They identified twenty-six gospel accounts of individual healings performed by Jesus, and an additional ten accounts of multiple healings, ranging from several people to great multitudes.²⁴¹ They also identified five separate times that Jesus committed this ministry to his followers,²⁴² giving them “authority” over unclean or evil spirits and the “power” to “heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease” (Matt 10:1). To the members of the committee, this meant that all followers of Jesus had been instructed to act in the same way as the Lord himself;²⁴³ this meant that healing the sick was something that each follower had a personal responsibility to discharge in the name of Christ.

In December 1975, the Anglican Church in New Zealand issued its own *Report of the Commission on the Charismatic Movement*,²⁴⁴ in light of estimates that forty to fifty percent of the Anglican clergy in the Auckland diocese were either participants in the Charismatic renewal or open to charismatic experiences.²⁴⁵ Many major New Zealand cities had significant numbers of Anglicans who attended either their own parish prayer

²⁴⁰ Ibid, 407.

²⁴¹ Ibid, 409.

²⁴² Cf.: Matthew 10:7-8; Mark 6:7, 16:17-18; Luke 9:1-2, 10:8-9.

²⁴³ Ibid, 413. The New Testament records nine cases of individual healings by his followers (Acts 3:1-16, 9:10-19, 9:32-35, 9:36-42, 14:8-10, 16:16-18, 20:7-12, 28:3-6, 28:8), and as many as seven cases of multiple healings (Acts 2:43, 5:12-16, 6:8, 8:5-8, 14:3, 19:8-12, 28:9).

²⁴⁴ “Report of the Commission on the Charismatic Movement,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1-13.

²⁴⁵ Ibid, 3-4. Several factors were seen to have contributed to the widespread interest in the Holy Spirit, including the crusades by Billy Graham (1959), and by classical Pentecostal or Charismatic ministers, such as David du Plessis (1966), Dennis Bennett (1966), Derek Prince (1968), Graham Pulkingham (1972, 1975), and Kevin Ranaghan (1973); other factors included the rise of new, interdenominational ministries such as the Full Gospel Businessman’s Fellowship International, the 1972 Jesus Marches, and the *Life in the Spirit Seminars*, developed by Charismatics in the United States.

groups or interdenominational prayer groups.²⁴⁶ The judgment of the commission was that the charismatic renewal within the Anglican Church did not pass beyond the boundaries of theological orthodoxy, as boundaries had been traditionally defined and understood by Anglicans.²⁴⁷ After addressing some of the more common negative concerns – elitism, fundamentalism, escapism, separatism, neglect of social concerns, a depreciation of reason, exaggerated supernaturalism, etc. – the commission praised the benefits that the Charismatic renewal offered Anglican parish life, including the clear transcending of denominational barriers, the growth of the ministry of the laity, and a richer sense of community among Christians.²⁴⁸ They also urged that the renewal should take place within the Church, and not separated from it.²⁴⁹

In 1977, the Church of England published *Gospel and Spirit: A Joint Statement*,²⁵⁰ which was prepared by its Evangelical Council and the Anglican Charismatic service group known as Fountain Trust.²⁵¹ The document of this joint-committee criticized the common use of the phrase “baptism in the Spirit,” as they believed it had some problematic features to it:

²⁴⁶ Ibid, 5. Apparently, in its initial stages, the Anglicans involved in the movement were seen to have adopted the practices and attitudes of classical Pentecostalism, including a fundamentalist approach to the Bible, and an anti-institutional stance toward Churches – all as part of their charismatic experiences. During the late sixties, a general confusion developed among many Anglican charismatics: many left established churches and gave up on Christianity altogether, some repudiated Pentecostal ties and opted for traditional Anglicanism, others moved into classical Pentecostal churches, and a great majority tried to find ways to integrate their new experiences into existing Anglican ecclesiology; the growth of the movement was hindered by fear of a schism and by alienation from other Anglican leaders and clergy. But by 1973, the influence of *Life in the Spirit Seminars* had made a profound impact and proved to anchor the charismatic movement in the wider Anglican identity.

²⁴⁷ Ibid, 9.

²⁴⁸ Ibid, 10.

²⁴⁹ Ibid, 10-12.

²⁵⁰ “Gospel and Spirit: A Joint Statement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 291-307.

²⁵¹ A Charismatic project of its former Anglican Canon Michael Harper, who later became an Antiochian Orthodox priest. He died in January 2010.

The use of this term to describe an experience separated, often by a long period of time, from the person's initial conversion to Christ... suggests that what is sub-normal in the New Testament should be regarded as normal, today: namely, that a long interval should elapse between the new birth and any conscious realization or reception of the Spirit's power.²⁵²

The joint-committee articulated its understanding that, "the whole church is a charismatic community in which all are endowed with spiritual gifts."²⁵³ It argued that the Charismatic movement had been one of the chief forces to correct excessive individualism, and bring about an emphasis on the body of Christ.²⁵⁴ It called to mind that every Christian had a responsibility to manifest his or her gifts, and encouraged them to "ministry," where a healthy functioning of the body of Christ is was dependent upon each one contributing in this way.²⁵⁵ The goal of the Charismatic renewal was not just the renewal of the individual but of the entire Church.²⁵⁶

In 1978, the Lambeth Conference passed a resolution that placed the question of charisms before the entire world-wide Anglican Communion. While the *Resolution on the Holy Spirit and the Church*²⁵⁷ does not explicitly mention the Charismatic Renewal by name, it encouraged the entire Anglican Communion toward a new openness to the power of the Holy Spirit. It called all Anglicans to a full participation in the "balanced corporate and sacramental life" of their local parish churches, where informal styles of

²⁵² Ibid, 296-297.

²⁵³ Ibid, 299.

²⁵⁴ Ibid, 300.

²⁵⁵ Ibid, 302-303.

²⁵⁶ Ibid, 306.

²⁵⁷ "Resolution on the Holy Spirit and the Church" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 77-78.

praise and worship could help corporate sacramental life, just as corporate sacramental life could help to balance the various styles of praise and worship. It also issued a caution about the need to avoid excessive presumptions concerning the “power of the Holy Spirit;” it suggested that the Holy Spirit was to be found in the shadow of the Cross, where Christians must pray, “Come Holy Spirit!” When used together, as the Conference proposed, these points of guidance offered to help to ensure that Spirit-filled activities were best understood and best represented within the regular, active life of a parish church community.²⁵⁸

Chapter 2.3 Lutheran Statements

In 1962, the Lutheran Church in America,²⁵⁹ issued *Anointing and Healing*,²⁶⁰ a study document on the forms of charismatic healing. From a medical standpoint, the physicians on the committee unanimously agreed that sickness was not the result of a loss of faith;²⁶¹ they also agreed that the pastoral care of persons in various health crises was one of the great historic ministries of the Church.²⁶² Nevertheless, the committee identified that the injunctions by Christ to his disciples to perform healings and miracles were “specific commissions for that time and circumstance,” and were not to be

²⁵⁸ Ibid, 78.

²⁵⁹ This church actually originated under the auspices of the United Lutheran Church in America. In 1962 it merged together with the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (Suomi Synod) and the American Evangelical Lutheran Church to form what would then be known as the Lutheran Church of America until 1987. On January 1, 1988, the combined Lutheran Church in America ceased to exist, when it joined together with the American Lutheran Church and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches to form what would then be known as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), and is now the largest Lutheran denomination in the US.

²⁶⁰ “Anointing and Healing,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 21-55.

²⁶¹ Ibid, 26.

²⁶² Ibid, 28.

considered a specific “assignment for the ongoing church.”²⁶³ Ultimately, the committee argued that contemporary stresses on charismatic healing actually forced “the penultimate of bodily health to be treated as an ultimate,” and essentially misused the Gospel.²⁶⁴ They saw a fundamental error in focusing on contemporary healing ministries, and subsequently warned Lutherans not to participate in the activities of popular “faith healers,” who confused “the power of suggestion and mass hypnosis” with the “work of the Holy Spirit.”²⁶⁵ The committee saw a potential value in the “laying on of hands” as a sign of concern or blessing within a particular fellowship, but actually discouraged implications that it conveyed special graces of “healing power.”²⁶⁶

The smaller American Lutheran Church had made a pair of preliminary studies on the Charismatic renewal, and then designated its Commission on Evangelization to publish an official position. That statement, *A Report on Glossolalia*,²⁶⁷ issued in 1963, placed responsibility for unity and peace upon any person who would introduce a new element into the congregation; while not forbidding the private practice of speaking in tongues, the statement clearly suggested that promoting tongues was “to be avoided,” and strongly recommended that “the public practice should not be initiated” in congregations where it had not previously appeared.²⁶⁸

In December 1963, the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church of the Rhineland and Evangelical (Lutheran) Church of Westphalia met in Mühlheim on the Ruhr, to discuss the role of the lay person. A major topic at that conference was the theme of charisms;

²⁶³ Ibid, 41.

²⁶⁴ Ibid, 48.

²⁶⁵ Ibid, 49.

²⁶⁶ Ibid, 52.

²⁶⁷ “A Report on Glossolalia” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 55-63

²⁶⁸ Ibid, 62.

these two Lutheran bodies then immediately issued a report known as the *Mühlheim Theses on Community and Charism*.²⁶⁹ The intent of this statement was to situate the charisms in the center of the church's life, so that a fully functioning community would no longer depend exclusively on the efforts of one person, the pastor. The document described charisms as "gifts of grace," and provided a specific explanation of twenty separate charisms, complete with biblical references and their Greek names. To be Christian, it recognized, meant to be filled with the Holy Spirit and his visible charisms; thus, they reasoned, with the fullness of gifts present in the church, the one-man system would vanish and the mature community would emerge anew.²⁷⁰

In 1964, the American Lutheran Church published *A Statement with Regard to Speaking in Tongues*,²⁷¹ its second document on the Charismatic Renewal. Following the publication of their first report, some Lutheran pastors had actually begun teaching their congregations that the fullness of the Holy Spirit was attested to by speaking in tongues; this created considerable confusion and the national leadership felt there was room for additional clarification on the matter. This new document clarified that Lutheran Churches believed and taught that the Holy Spirit was given in baptism to believers. It then specifically mandated that there be no further instruction in the technique or the practice of speaking in tongues.²⁷² The following year, the American Lutheran Church published its third statement on the renewal, choosing the charism of healing as its particular focus. Written by a team of eight Lutheran theologians, *Christian Faith and the*

²⁶⁹ "Mühlheim Theses on Community and Charism" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 104-108.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 108.

²⁷¹ "A Statement with Regard to Speaking in Tongues" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 108-111.

²⁷² *Ibid*, 110-111.

*Ministry of Healing*²⁷³ was highly critical of the healing ministries that were going on “outside of the ongoing life of the congregation.”

In 1972, the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, issued its very first study on the Charismatic Renewal, as nearly four dozen of its pastors had admitted to personal involvement with the movement. Essentially a negative statement, *The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology*,²⁷⁴ was issued by its Commission on Theology and Church Relations in 1972. The work of two anthropologists, Luther P. Gerlach and Virginia H. Hine, was cited for their early study on the development of the renewal movement. Older scholarship had related glossolalia with schizophrenia, hysteria and a high degree of susceptibility to suggestion, but Gerlach and Hine found that in seven studies done by psychologists or psychiatrists, glossolalia or the gift of tongues could not be identified with mental illness, and was not considered an indicator of either psychosis or neurosis.²⁷⁵ This report soon circulated throughout many denominations.

In 1973, the Council of Presidents within the American Lutheran Church, was presented with a previously commissioned theological study, entitled *Guidelines*.²⁷⁶ It contained specific recommendations for pastors and congregations who had been dealing with “neo-Pentecostal” phenomenon. In its final section, the statement concentrated on the conscious pursuit of working relationships between neo-Pentecostal Lutherans and the more traditional Lutherans. It advised that there should be a mutual allowance for

²⁷³ “Christian Faith and the Ministry of Healing” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 121-131.

²⁷⁴ “The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 321-363.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 326-327.

²⁷⁶ “Guidelines” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 369-374.

diversity, with a preeminence of love that brought focus to the Christian essentials and not to the peripherals (i.e. praying or speaking in tongues).

The following year, in 1974, the Lutheran Church in America issued its second statement on the renewal entitled, *The Charismatic Movement in the Lutheran Church in America: A Pastoral Perspective*.²⁷⁷ The document traced the history of both the Pentecostal and neo-Pentecostal movements, noting that participating Lutherans preferred to designate them-selves as “charismatic,” to avoid certain Pentecostal associations and stereotyping. The text spoke of glossolalia or tongues as “essentially a prayer gift” that allowed its practitioners to pray at deep levels. In response to the critiques that suggested there was something “unstable” about individuals with this gift, the statement highlighted the work of John P. Kildahl, a Lutheran psychologist, who had published an extensive analysis on the charism of tongues. Kildahl and his research team discovered that “glossolalists represented a cross section of all personality types,” and that they had “employed the full range of personality mechanisms and character defenses;” Kildahl, in fact, noted that this came to his team as “a complete surprise.”²⁷⁸ His report went on to argue that tongues were beneficial and should not be condemned.²⁷⁹

In early 1975, the president of Concordia Theological Seminary had issued a new policy statement to all seminary students of the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod; it had been issued in response to the increasing difficulty of placing their graduates who were favorable to the Charismatic Renewal. This *Policy Statement Regarding the Neo-*

²⁷⁷ “The Charismatic Movement in the Lutheran Church in America: A Pastoral Perspective,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 547-567.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 556. Kildahl’s work was known and respected among Lutherans. See John P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 49.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 567.

Pentecostal Movement,²⁸⁰ with its accompanying questionnaire, was sent to all their prospective students that summer in order to ascertain their positions; the seminary required them to answer and provide comments upon their personal beliefs and spiritual practices with regard to the Renewal. They also instituted a policy to repeat this “assurance” prior to certification for ministry in the Synod, when every candidate for the *ministerium* had to confirm that they had not received the baptism in the Spirit, and did not claim special charismatic gifts.²⁸¹ Students who responded in the affirmative could only be admitted as general students in their Masters of Divinity program, but were declared ineligible for certification or placement in a congregation or agency of the Missouri Synod.²⁸²

In 1976, the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church in Germany issued a document entitled, *Theological Guidelines for the Charismatic Congregational Renewal in Protestant Churches*.²⁸³ Commonly referred to as the “Würzburg Theses,” it came out of a meeting of representatives from the German Protestant churches that coordinated Charismatic renewal in local parishes. In them, they identified all communities as having a missionary, charismatic and ecumenical dimension. As such, they argued that the Charismatic renewal put into question a “church to which people belong as a matter of custom,” and that was characterized by the “passivity and indifference” of its members.

²⁸⁰ “Policy Statement Regarding the Neo-Pentecostal Movement,” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 15-22.

²⁸¹ *Ibid*, 15-16,

²⁸² *Ibid*, 16.

²⁸³ “Theological Guidelines for the Charismatic Congregational Renewal in Protestant Churches” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 147-150.

They then identified that the actual goal was for them to become a charismatically-renewed Church that rendered the actual movement superfluous.²⁸⁴

That same year, the combined Lutheran missions of Mekane Yesus in Ethiopia²⁸⁵ issued an ecclesial statement known as *The Work of the Holy Spirit*.²⁸⁶ The Charismatic movement in Ethiopia had provided an ongoing evangelization for several decades there. At the same time the renewal had helped to elevate great numbers of young people into increasing responsibility and leadership within these Christian communities; problems had arisen because of the enthusiastic worship that challenged the established ways of worship in this traditional, conservative region. The document presented an analysis of the biblical texts dealing with the Holy Spirit as well as some examples of the renewal's struggles in several other countries; this allowed it to become a highly practical teaching tool throughout the missions of this Ethiopian Church.²⁸⁷

In May 1976, the bishops of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany held a working retreat in Schwanberg, where they were able to observe the charismatic communities of Casteller Ring and the Brotherhood of Christ (Selbitz), and learn about the unique charismatic structures to these two communities. As a result of this experience, the gathered bishops were able to slowly introduce their Lutheran

²⁸⁴ Ibid, 150.

²⁸⁵ These missions were Swedish, Icelandic, Danish, German, and American in their combined ethnic origins.

²⁸⁶ "The Work of the Holy Spirit" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 158-182.

²⁸⁷ Ibid, 181.

communities to various elements of the renewal, and they issued an ecclesial statement, *Renewal in the Holy Spirit*²⁸⁸ to that end. Their text noted,

In our contacts with these communities they recognize that they make every effort to give first place to worship, prayer, and quite in the midst of their daily tasks; in this kind of community life, filled with such a spirit, we see a power for church renewal. Together with proven forms of traditional Congregational and fellowship life they can bring new life to the church.²⁸⁹

In 1977, the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod decided to supplement its earlier 1972 statement with some detailed guidelines for dealing with pastors and laypersons sympathetic to the charismatic or neo-Pentecostal movements. This 1977 report, drawn up by its Commission on Theology and Church Relations, was entitled, *The Lutheran Church and the Charismatic Movement: Guidelines for Congregations and Pastors*.²⁹⁰ It noted that the Lutheran Confessions frequently emphasized that the Holy Spirit built the Church through the means of grace, i.e. the Word and Sacraments, that the charismatic spiritual gifts were not a means of grace, and that they should not be employed as though they were. It also clearly questioned the tendency of the renewal's adherents to claim direct spiritual illumination apart from the Word, which it suggested was the most serious doctrinal error of the movement.²⁹¹

²⁸⁸ "Renewal in the Holy Spirit" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 268-270.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 268-269.

²⁹⁰ "The Lutheran Church and the Charismatic Movement: Guidelines for Congregations and Pastors" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 307-324.

²⁹¹ *Ibid*, 309.

In 1978, the *Report of the Lutheran Council in the United States*²⁹² was issued following a series of four study conferences convened by the Lutheran Council, USA,²⁹³ and its Division of Theological Studies (1974-1976). The study had begun as a biblical, historical and systematic re-examination of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; it was also an account of their dialogue on the Charismatic movement, which had taken place during all four of its sessions. It spoke about the church as a "pneumatological reality," and confirmed that the Charismatic movement was among the events that the church must respond to when considering the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.²⁹⁴

That year, the Lutheran Churches in East Germany published their own ecclesial text, entitled *The Charismatic Movement in the German Democratic Republic*.²⁹⁵ Several charismatic influences from West Germany²⁹⁶ had contributed to the excitement over the appearance of the renewal in East Germany. Charismatic groups were primarily oriented to the local community, with the consequent leading role of the pastor in many places; and in the majority of groups the Lord's Supper and Eucharist enjoyed a very high place among its members. This document provided a history of the renewal in East Germany, and insight into the various cultural and ecclesial events that fermented its growth; it also provided a basic Pneumatology and orientation, as there was an almost universal

²⁹² "Report of the Lutheran Council in the United States" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 429-453.

²⁹³ Ibid, 429. The LCUSA is a cooperative agency of four national churches: the American Lutheran Church, USA, the Association of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches, the Lutheran Church in America, USA, and the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, USA.

²⁹⁴ Ibid, 448.

²⁹⁵ "The Charismatic Movement in the German Democratic Republic" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 453-483.

²⁹⁶ The western influences included groups such as the Brothers of the Common life, the Evangelical Sisters of Mary (Darmstadt), the Brotherhood of Christ (Selbitz), and the Brotherhood of Jesus (Gnadenthal), as well as individuals such as Larry Christenson and Steve Lightle from the United States, and R.F. Edel of West Germany.

emphasis on its developing ecclesiastical nature (*Kirchlichkeit*) in the gatherings and celebrations of the Charismatic movement across the country.²⁹⁷

Finally, in 1979 the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church in Germany published its third ecclesial statement touching on the Charismatic renewal, *Evangelical Spirituality*.²⁹⁸ While not a primary text on the renewal itself, it promoted several charismatic ideas that had been contained in both the 1963 *Mühlheim Theses* and 1976 *Würzburg Theses*; it attempted to integrate patterns of Christian life and the charismatic elements of a person's "experience of God" as being vital to the growth of a congregation. Because of this, it identified the Charismatic Renewal as a strong unifying force within congregational life.²⁹⁹

Chapter 2.4 Methodist Statements

In 1973, the bishops of the Methodist Church, Australia issued an ecclesial text entitled, *The Report on the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church*,³⁰⁰ which unanimously ruled that the church had nothing to fear from the charismatic movement, and had much to gain from its renewal of the Church. They agreed that glossolalia was a meaningful experience in the lives of participants, although they reasoned that some individuals might have attached too much importance to it. For them, it seemed alien to

²⁹⁷ Ibid, 478.

²⁹⁸ "Evangelical Spirituality" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 486-489.

²⁹⁹ Ibid, 489.

³⁰⁰ "The Report on the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 443-449.

the catholic spirit advocated by Wesley to question the validity of anyone's experience, if, in fact, loyalty to Christ remained visible in their lives.³⁰¹

This was echoed by *The Charismatic Movement and Methodism*,³⁰² issued by the Methodist Church, Great Britain, that recognized similarities between the renewal and the tradition inherited from the 19th-century holiness movement. In asking if the early Methodists had exercised charismatic gifts, it argued that a careful study of Wesley's writings and the lives the early Methodist preachers revealed evidence that the majority of the charisms listed in 1 Cor. 12:8-10 had been exercised.³⁰³ It argued that the revivalist Charles G. Finney had been a "bridge-builder between primitive Wesleyanism and modern Pentecostalism,"³⁰⁴ and identified the roots of Classical Pentecostalism in the teachings of both Charles Parham, an American Methodist minister, and his student William J. Seymour, whose ministry was based in a Methodist chapel on Azusa Street, in Los Angeles.³⁰⁵ Wesley, in fact, had used the term "second blessing" for the experience of "Christian Perfection;" Methodist doctrine had taught that this work of the Spirit was subsequent to conversion, which may have explained why Methodists had so easily come to associate the "second blessing" with the Pentecostal understanding of the "baptism in the Spirit."³⁰⁶

The following year, the Methodist Church, Great Britain, issued its *Report on the Charismatic Movement by the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist*

³⁰¹ Ibid, 448.

³⁰² "The Charismatic Movement and Methodism" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 449-494.

³⁰³ Ibid, 455.

³⁰⁴ Ibid, 456.

³⁰⁵ Ibid, 457. The Azusa Street revivals had become a center of nascent Pentecostalism by 1906.

³⁰⁶ Ibid, 468.

Conference.³⁰⁷ It questioned the appropriateness of the phrase "baptism in the Spirit," which some had seen as the "second blessing" and others had seen as an "assurance" of the Spirit in sacramental activity.³⁰⁸ It called upon all Methodists, whatever their experience of the Spirit, to show tolerance toward the experiences of others. Recognizing that the Spirit "blows where He wills," the statement expressed the hope that no one movement would claim a monopoly on the Spirit's presence.³⁰⁹

This call for tolerance was then echoed in a second statement by the Methodist Church, Australia in its 1975 text, *The "Pentecostal Ministry" Report*,³¹⁰ and followed in 1976 by its third text on *The Place of the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church*,³¹¹ which understood charisms to be "the regular, unspectacular things necessary to the structure of the church's daily life." By the publication of this third ecclesial statement, there was clearly plenty of room for the Charismatic renewal to fully function throughout the Methodist Church in Australia.³¹²

In October 1976, a council of the Evangelical-Methodist Central Conference had met in Arnoldsheim, West Germany, and had issued *Charism and Renewal of the Church*,³¹³ with the specific intent to stimulate discussion on the charisms within local

³⁰⁷ "Report on the Charismatic Movement by the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Conference" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 567-573.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid*, 569.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 573.

³¹⁰ "The 'Pentecostal Ministry' Report" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 22-37.

³¹¹ "The Place of the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 182-199.

³¹² *Ibid*, 185, 197.

³¹³ "Charism and Renewal of the Church" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 199-215.

communities; the leadership had aimed to discover whether the Charismatic Renewal could effectively “deliver” its member churches from the “heavy weight of inflexible patters” in its ecclesial life. They determined that neither the Reformation or Methodist traditions had required their churches to “anxiously guard against spiritual experiences;” in fact, these leaders had come to view the Charismatic Renewal as an opportunity to re-open theological discussion on the question of holiness. They argued that their own church order “left sufficient freedom of movement” for charismatic talents to operate for the common good; they also recognized that charismatic activities would, in turn, call the church to a deeper and more nuanced understanding of its own ecclesiology.³¹⁴

A few months later, the Methodist Church, Great Britain, issued their third document on the renewal, entitled *The Impact of Charismatic Renewal on Methodism*.³¹⁵ It estimated that there were then more than 250 Methodist ministers who involved in the Charismatic movement across Great Britain, with at least one hundred Methodist communities that offered Charismatic gatherings and prayer meetings. Citing its Commission on Evangelism in the Home Mission Division, it documented that the vast majority of Methodists who were involved in the renewal had remained loyal to their denomination, and that the rapid growth of Charismatic groups had closely paralleled the rapid growth of Methodist groups, seen in their early days.³¹⁶

In 1976, the Board of Discipleship of the United Methodist Church, USA, had issued its own position statement on the renewal, entitled *Guidelines: The United*

³¹⁴ Ibid, 205, 211-212 and 214-215.

³¹⁵ “The Impact of Charismatic Renewal on Methodism” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 215-221.

³¹⁶ Ibid, 217-219. It noted, for example, how one Charismatic group in a northwestern city had given birth to sixteen similar groups over a 20 mile radius.

Methodist Church and the Charismatic Movement.³¹⁷ Its goal was to provide Methodists with a clear understanding of their theological heritage, in order to rightly frame and interpret contemporary Charismatic gifts and experiences.³¹⁸ It documented how, with the historic decline of the Methodist emphases on “holiness” and “perfection,” Parham, had actually attempted to fuse Wesley’s doctrine of “subsequent instantaneous sanctification” with Finney’s doctrine of “baptism in the Spirit.”³¹⁹ This fusion, however, blurred Methodist ecclesiology, substituted experience for doctrine, and allowed a slow attrition of members who were “no longer rooted in the traditions that could sustain them.”³²⁰ In referencing Albert Outler,³²¹ however, a respected Methodist theologian and philosopher, the authors recognized that the Charismatic renewal had developed a clear potential to catalyze what Outler identified as “a third great awakening.”³²²

Chapter 2.5 Presbyterian – Reformed Statements

In 1965, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States issued their first ecclesial statement on the Charismatic renewal, entitled *Glossolalia*.³²³

The drafting committee had been primarily concerned with the issue of speaking in

³¹⁷ “Guidelines: The United Methodist Church and the Charismatic Movement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 270-291.

³¹⁸ *Ibid*, 271 cf.: McDonnell’s introductory remarks.

³¹⁹ *Ibid*, 279-2. Charles F. Parham, a Methodist minister

³²⁰ *Ibid*, 283.

³²¹ Outler had been the dean of the Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX, was one of three Methodist observers invited to the Second Vatican Council, and served on the Faith and Order board of the World Council of Churches. Outler was widely noted for his recognition and understanding of John Wesley’s basis for doing theology i.e. the *quadrilateral* of Scripture, Church Tradition, Reason, and Personal Experience.

³²² *Ibid*, 285.

³²³ “Glossolalia” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 131-139.

tongues, and had referred to section XXIII.3 of their *Confession of Faith*; they determined that “prayer, if vocal, should be made in a known tongue,” and interpreted the section as an implicit condemnation of glossolalia or speaking in tongues.”³²⁴ They seriously questioned the *a priori* validity of the experience that was widespread among Charismatic Presbyterians; they believed it was immature to identify or name the contemporary phenomenon with the New Testament terminology of “glossolalia,” and emphasized that the committee could not declare the experiences of contemporary Christians “to be either valid or invalid reproductions of New Testament glossolalia.”³²⁵

Two years later, an *ad hoc committee* reported its initial findings to a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, New Zealand, in a statement entitled, *Pentecostalism*.³²⁶ The committee’s evaluation was that the Charismatic renewal had only recently begun to appear in New Zealand, and had attracted only a few members in its northern districts; it determined to observe its growth despite suggestions that the movement had spread “naïve sentimentalism” among its early adherents.³²⁷ Its preliminary conclusions identified that many Charismatic phenomena were already part of the “normal experience of every Christian,” and clearly saw Charismatic elements existing in the Christian life and experience of those who were not necessarily identified with any renewal or movement.³²⁸

³²⁴ Ibid, 134. The statement actually notes that this particular section of the *Confession of Faith*, a 1903 adaptation of the *Westminster Confession*, was originally directed against the Roman Catholic Church and its liturgical practice of prayers in Latin. They extrapolated from this text what they believed to be an implicit condemnation of glossolalia.

³²⁵ Ibid, 135-137.

³²⁶ “Pentecostalism” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 139-146.

³²⁷ Ibid, 146.

³²⁸ Ibid, 143.

In Holland, a variety of classical Pentecostal Churches had been in dialogue for many years with the two major branches of the Reformed churches, and had greatly contributed to the growth of the Charismatic renewal within the Gereformeerde Kerken, or Re-reformed Church, Holland. By 1967, this Re-reformed Church had produced a major ecclesial statement on the renewal entitled *The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Community*.³²⁹ Here, the authors evaluated three charisms in particular (the gifts of “tongues,” “prophecy,” and “healing”); they had also provided a retrospective history of the Charismatic renewal in Holland. As a result, they took an official stance that the New Testament provided no distinction between office and charism,³³⁰ they also raised the danger of the Church’s “over-officing,” so that the great variety of charismatic gifts was entirely subsumed into one office of leadership.³³¹

Three years later, a Special Committee on the Work of the Spirit submitted its formal evaluative report to the United Presbyterian Church, USA. Its text, entitled *The Work of the Holy Spirit*,³³² was then adopted and published by the 182nd General Assembly, in 1970. Its two year study on the Charismatic movement and its particular practice of glossolalia included the results of a subcommittee composed of professionals competent in the behavioral sciences that “found no evidence of pathology in the movement,”³³³ and affirmed that those involved in Pentecostal or Charismatic activities

³²⁹ “The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Community” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 147-207.

³³⁰ *Ibid*, 179

³³¹ *Ibid*, 180.

³³² “The Work of the Holy Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 221-282.

³³³ *Ibid*, 281. The study noted: “The subcommittee found the movement to be dynamic, growing, and involving persons from practically every denomination, walk and situation in life. Varied educational backgrounds and personality patterns were present and the socio-economic status ranged from the

were “essentially well-adjusted and productive members of society.” Their research indicated that there was no justification to generalize participants as “maladjusted individuals, emotionally unstable, or emotionally deprived.” In fact, their data indicated that participants were “emotionally and psychologically quite similar” to both the normal church population and occupational identity groupings.³³⁴ The report included a set of recommendations for various individuals both within and outside of the Charismatic renewal, and concluded with an appendix of substantial and detailed biblical exegesis on the relevant “charismatic” texts in the Scriptures,³³⁵ as well as a more technical appendix on the professional psychological literature that focused on specific manifestations of the Charismatic renewal.³³⁶

In 1971, a more extensive ecclesial statement was published by the Presbyterian Church in the United States. As their second document on the renewal, *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, with Special Reference to “The Baptism in the Holy Spirit”*³³⁷ was focused on the much broader subject of the “infilling” or “baptism” of (with, in) the Spirit, especially since their 1965 text had focused sole attention on glossolalia. The document noted the relationship of the bestowal of the Spirit to the singular event of water baptism. While attentive to the *Westminster Confession’s* doctrine that baptism is a channel of God’s grace, it put forth the understanding that the efficacy of baptism was not

uneducated through those in high executive positions carrying great responsibility in major corporations, in federal government and in the space effort. Physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, scientists, professors of every description, clergy of every denomination including the hierarchy, and professors of religion and philosophy are to be found in the movement.”

³³⁴ Ibid, 235.

³³⁵ Ibid, 252ff. The exegetical appendix was prepared by two theologians, David E. Dilworth and Bruce M. Metzger.

³³⁶ Ibid, 272ff. The psychological appendix was prepared by Thomas Foster, M.D. and Charles H. Meisgeier, Ed.D.

³³⁷ “The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, with Special Reference to ‘The Baptism in the Holy Spirit’” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 287-317.

tioned to the moment of administration; thus the grace of baptism was not automatically efficacious, but could become so at a later time.³³⁸ In fact, they identified that their *Standards* recognized a differentiation and possibility of chronological separation between water baptism and the baptism with the Spirit.³³⁹ They noted,

The “baptism of the Holy Spirit” may be signified by certain pneumatic phenomena, such as speaking in tongues and prophecy (Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6)... With the New Testament dispensation the Spirit is now available to all who believe in Jesus Christ. Hence, such signs of this invading power as ecstatic language and prophecy could occur with anyone who has experienced this visitation... However, that such extraordinary manifestations *may* occur – and in so doing give evidence of the Spirit’s working – is quite in accord with the witness of the New Testament.³⁴⁰

With such a “Biblical and Reformed witness,” the Presbyterian Church in the United States acknowledged that the gifts of the Charismatic renewal could be received with gratitude as the benefits of God’s free grace.³⁴¹

In 1972, the Panel on Doctrine of the Church of Scotland formally elected to establish a working party to examine contemporary charismatic phenomena in light of its own established doctrines, and then produced the 1973 report *The Work and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*,³⁴² which recognized the legitimacy of the renewal and stressed the *ecclesial nature* of the charisms. It also warned participants to guard against the idea that

³³⁸ Ibid, 309.

³³⁹ Ibid, 311.

³⁴⁰ Ibid, 315.

³⁴¹ Ibid, 316.

³⁴² “The Work and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 442-443.

they were living in “the age of the Spirit” – an age somehow superior to everything that had preceded it; they encouraged all members of the Church of Scotland and all Presbyterians everywhere to avoid disharmony and schism, and cautioned adherents not to require or even expect the Church to make the Charismatic gifts normative for all.³⁴³

Upon hearing of this development in the Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church, New Zealand, charged both its Doctrine Committee and its Life and Work Committee to begin further research on the Charismatic movement. In 1973, the Life and Work Committee published *The Church and Pentecostalism*,³⁴⁴ which tackled the growing pastoral problem of alienation that Charismatics encountered in their local congregations; it urged the Church to move beyond its initial defensiveness, and urged the movement’s adherents against “charismatising” others with suggestions that Charismatic experiences were *essential* for the whole Church.³⁴⁵ That same year, its Doctrine Committee published *The Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal of the Church*,³⁴⁶ which encouraged the whole Church to have an open mind regarding the claims of the movement’s participants. It clarified that the term “baptism in the Spirit” signified the *initial outpouring* of the Spirit during the process of initiation into the community; it also portrayed later bestowals of the Spirit as *renewed activity* better

³⁴³ Ibid, 443.

³⁴⁴ “The Church and Pentecostalism” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 494-509.

³⁴⁵ Ibid, 501.

³⁴⁶ “The Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal of the Church” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 510-517.

designated as an “infillings,”³⁴⁷ especially in light of the biblical witness, citing that “the disciples themselves experienced more than one filling, but only one baptism.”³⁴⁸

By 1974, the Church of Scotland, which by then had been influenced by the published statements of the two Presbyterian bodies in the United States, issued its second major ecclesial statement on the renewal, entitled *The Charismatic Movement within the Church of Scotland*.³⁴⁹ It too questioned the use of the phrase “baptism in (of, with) the Holy Spirit,” and considered that the Renewal’s widespread use and emphasis of this terminology inherently conveyed the problematic understanding of a *Church within a Church*.³⁵⁰ They reasoned that the practice of Charismatic forms of worship “should neither be forbidden nor encouraged,” but advised that the practices themselves were not to be expected as part of the rubrics of public worship on the Lord’s Day.³⁵¹ In the end, they ruled that the Charismatic gifts deserved a legitimate place in the Church of Scotland, as long as they were exercised for the benefit of the entire Church.³⁵²

During the 100th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Canada, an interim text known as the *Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement*³⁵³ was reviewed and published. This brief 1974 statement was an initial response to questions that had been raised by young people, and held the position that every Christian should experience the presence of the Holy Spirit, although it also clearly stipulated that

³⁴⁷ Ibid, 513.

³⁴⁸ Ibid, 516.

³⁴⁹ “The Charismatic Movement within the Church of Scotland” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 519-547.

³⁵⁰ Ibid, 523. It went so far to suggest the idea, accordingly, of *a ministry within a ministry*.

³⁵¹ Ibid, 543.

³⁵² Ibid, 545.

³⁵³ “Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 573-579.

“the manifestations of that presence need not be in the same form for everyone.”³⁵⁴ They identified the gifts of the Holy Spirit as a “bestowal of supernatural abilities for worship, witness and ministry” (1 Cor. 12), defined glossolalia as talking to God in a “language of ecstasy” (1 Cor. 14:2), and validated contemporary forms of the healing ministry of Christ.³⁵⁵ The following year, a second, modified version of the *Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement*³⁵⁶ was published. It attempted to situate the success of the renewal within the broad context of the unease and emptiness generally felt within all aspects of church life; its authors noted that the contemporary hunger for God had remained “unsatisfied.”³⁵⁷ In contrast to this, the authors recognized that those in the neo-Pentecostal and Charismatic movements were filled with the love of Christ, and wished to help the Church “embody, more visibly, the gospel of Jesus Christ in its fullness.”³⁵⁸ They urged ministers and sessions to create opportunities for neo-Pentecostals and Charismatics within the Church itself, and asked that the movement’s adherents refrain from isolation apart from the rest of Church life; it formally called the Church to be open to the full spectrum of the gifts of the Spirit, to recognize the freedom of the Spirit to bestow his gifts according to his will, and not to restrict the use of the “charismata” to the apostolic age alone.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁴ Ibid, 575.

³⁵⁵ Ibid, 575-579.

³⁵⁶ “Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 53-68

³⁵⁷ Ibid, 57-58.

³⁵⁸ Ibid, 61.

³⁵⁹ Ibid, 67.

In 1975, the Presbyterian Church, Australia, issued the text *Renewal by the Spirit*,³⁶⁰ which linked baptism in the Spirit with the initiation rites in water, and offered an exegetical study that encouraged the use of different terminology for post-conversion experiences, such as “being filled with the Holy Spirit” and “full of the Holy Spirit.” Remarkably, it was the first ecclesial statement on the renewal that spoke positively of the Charismatic influence upon church music, and noted its real contribution to the overall “sense of praise” within Presbyterian congregations.³⁶¹

That same year, the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America had asked its Theological Commission to prepare a report on the impact of the Charismatic renewal within its member churches. Its text, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit*,³⁶² never questioned the validity or authenticity of the experience of its members, but restricted itself to the nature and meaning of such experiences. The Commission argued that there was no clear warrant for two baptisms in the New Testament.³⁶³ The Pentecostal theology of a “second blessing” implicitly rejected the role of ordained leaders who had not undergone a “second blessing” experience,³⁶⁴ and set a dangerous precedent for a “bi-level” or two-class Christianity,³⁶⁵ which had led to a “spiritual apartheid” within the greater Church community.³⁶⁶ It also ruled that there was no need for extra-congregational charismatic

³⁶⁰ “Renewal by the Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 37-52.

³⁶¹ *Ibid*, 48.

³⁶² “The Baptism in the Holy Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 68-82.

³⁶³ *Ibid*, 73.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 79.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 74, 78.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 79.

groups within Church life, since every Reformed congregation was, in fact, “essentially charismatic.”³⁶⁷

The Presbyterian Church, Canada, published its third and final ecclesial statement on the Charismatic renewal in 1976, entitled *The Work of the Spirit*.³⁶⁸ This extensive report studied the rapid growth of the movement in Canada, analyzed its features and claims in relation to basic Reformed theology, and offered a series of counsels for the Church. It reminded Presbyterians that the Protestant Reformation had been a battle on two fronts: against the Church of Rome and against “enthusiasts” and “spiritualists” who had claimed experiences of being caught up into “ecstatic degrees of union with the Spirit.”³⁶⁹ It made the distinction, however, that unlike the 16th century “enthusiasts” and “spiritualists,” the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements did not elevate *private revelations* over the public revelation contained in Sacred Scripture,³⁷⁰ as such, it actually encouraged open hospitality toward the Charismatic renewal, and even found it to be evidence that God was at work in His Church.³⁷¹

A similar encouragement was found in an ecclesial statement issued by the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, Republic of South Africa, in 1978. Entitled *Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement and the Charismatic Gifts*,³⁷² and written by its Commission on Doctrine and Current Affairs, the text situated both the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements within the vein of the Holiness and Wesleyan

³⁶⁷ Ibid, 80.

³⁶⁸ “The Work of the Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 221-255.

³⁶⁹ Ibid, 242.

³⁷⁰ Ibid, 245.

³⁷¹ Ibid, 246.

³⁷² “Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement and the Charismatic Gifts” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 391-429.

traditions. In recalling how the Dutch Reformed Church had historically dissociated itself from the doctrine of the “second blessing,”³⁷³ the text clearly promoted the understanding of repeated “infillings” that must be continuously sought through prayer and commitment.³⁷⁴ It too identified many of the charisms as particular “gifts of grace,” and identified contemporary suspicion of Charismatic experiences as an indicator that the Church had grown cold and passive.³⁷⁵ While the statement noted the movement’s ability to cross existing denominational boundaries, it questioned the helpfulness of any new unity founded upon *shared experience*, rather than agreement in doctrinal truths; the text predicted that this could have “grotesque consequences” for the larger ecumenical movement, and might inevitably lead to the disenfranchising of Christians from their congregations.³⁷⁶ To this end, it suggested that the Church give more attention to specific catechesis on the nature of the Triune God, and provide more opportunities to accommodate and integrate the experience of all truly Spirit-filled people into the confession and liturgy of the Dutch Reformed Church.³⁷⁷

Chapter 2.6 Baptist Statements

In 1970, the Baptist Union, New Zealand, issued *The Effects of Neo-Pentecostalism on New Zealand Baptist Churches*,³⁷⁸ which held that the “baptism in the Spirit” was part of the initial act of God in regeneration or conversion, and that

³⁷³ Ibid, 398.

³⁷⁴ Ibid, 403.

³⁷⁵ Ibid, 419.

³⁷⁶ Ibid, 424.

³⁷⁷ Ibid, 428.

³⁷⁸ “The Effects of neo-Pentecostalism on New Zealand Baptist Churches” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 211-219.

Pentecostal terminology was to be rejected as "misleading teaching." It held that the private exercise of gifts was a matter between the individual believer and the Lord, but that the public exercise of such gifts was unwarranted; it rejected the theology of a "second blessing," but identified the "filling with the Spirit" as an experience to be repeated throughout the life of the believer. The authors recommended that individuals who differed in convictions "must seek a fellowship of Christians of like mind," but held that there was no ground for the church to excommunicate a member whose convictions on charismatic beliefs differed from those of the local assembly.³⁷⁹

In 1974, the document *Biblical Charisma and the Contemporary New Testament Church*³⁸⁰ was issued by the Baptist General Conference, USA. It clarified that there was no separate experience subsequent to the new birth, and that no single group or movement had the right to be called charismatic, since the church by its very nature was charismatic.³⁸¹ The following year, the Southern Baptist Convention issued the statement *Resolution of the Dallas Baptist Association*.³⁸² It accused two member parishes of openly practicing glossolalia, made the formal resolution not to seat its delegates in their Convention meetings, and declared that both parishes were no longer considered part of the association of the Southern Baptist Convention.³⁸³

³⁷⁹ Ibid, 218.

³⁸⁰ "Biblical Charisma and the Contemporary New Testament Church" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 517-519.

³⁸¹ Ibid, 518.

³⁸² "Resolution of the Dallas Baptist Association" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 114-116.

³⁸³ Ibid, 116.

The Baptist Union, Great Britain and Ireland, issued the report *Working Group on the Charismatic Movement*³⁸⁴ in 1978. It stressed that "baptism in the Spirit" was a significant challenge to the Baptist belief and theology, and found the Charismatic style of leadership to be a particular departure from their *congregational* principle and polity.³⁸⁵ A similar understanding was found in *Summary Statement and Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement*,³⁸⁶ published by the Baptized World Alliance during that same year. Its official decision was that the two-stage account of Christian initiation (water baptism, then the baptism in the Holy Spirit) was a popular but "unbiblical" position of the Charismatic renewal.³⁸⁷

Chapter 2.7 Classical Pentecostal Statements

The first of the classical Pentecostal churches to deal with these mainline contemporary Charismatic movements was the Assemblies of God, USA, based in Springfield, Missouri. In 1972, its *Charismatic Study Report*³⁸⁸ was issued by its Executive Presbytery, which, by then, had recognized that a variety of neo-Pentecostal experiences had saturated both the mainline Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches.³⁸⁹

It expressed its wish "to identify" with what God was bringing about, recognized the

³⁸⁴ "Working Group on the Charismatic Movement" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 379-390.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 870.

³⁸⁶ "Summary Statement and Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 79-81.

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 81.

³⁸⁸ "Charismatic Study Report" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 318-320.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 320.

“essential unity” which transcended ecclesial boundaries, and called for an avoidance of any false ecumenism that “compromises scriptural principles.”³⁹⁰

In the Republic of South Africa, the Apostolic Faith Mission approved the publication of a 1978 document, *The Charismatic Movement*,³⁹¹ written by its own Council for Doctrine, Ethics and Liturgy.³⁹² It was noteworthy for encouraging Charismatics to remain in their established Churches, where they could convey the blessings of Pentecost to their respective congregations in the practices of divine worship. The text also urged fellow Pentecostals not to adopt a negative attitude towards the Charismatic movement, but to regard its development in a positive light.³⁹³

In 1979, the Department of Executives of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), USA, proposed a radical change from its previously negative stance toward the Charismatic renewal. This change was then adopted by its General Executive Council, and published as a *Statement on Charismatic Renewal*.³⁹⁴ It welcomed “fellowship with the vast body of the Spirit-filled,” and accepted the “responsibility of brotherhood” to share its life-shaping experiences with those who were “new in the Holy Spirit baptism and blessings.”³⁹⁵ It rejoiced in the promise presented by the Charismatic renewal’s emphasis on the Spirit-filled life, and pledged the full resources of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) to the “protection and preservation” of those experiences,

³⁹⁰ Ibid, 320.

³⁹¹ “The Charismatic Movement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 377-378

³⁹² Ibid, 378. The General Secretary of this Council for Doctrine, Ethics and Liturgy was Justus T. du Plessis, the youngest brother of David du Plessis. Both brothers served as Pentecostal moderators, in separate sessions, on the ecumenical teams that composed the *International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue*.

³⁹³ Ibid, 378.

³⁹⁴ “Statement on Charismatic Renewal” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 484-486.

³⁹⁵ Ibid, 485.

teachings, and patterns of life that were appropriate for all those who considered themselves Spirit-filled believers.³⁹⁶

Chapter 2.8 Statements by Other Churches

There are several other churches that have issued statements on the Charismatic renewal. In 1963, the Christian Missionary Alliance, USA, issued a statement which summarized its own doctrinal position, entitled *Seek Not – Forbid Not!*³⁹⁷ Written by its Board of Managers, it echoed a 1907 statement by its founder, A. B. Simpson, and reaffirmed his position that the gift of tongues “may be present in the normal Christian assembly as a sovereign bestowal of the Holy Spirit,” although they clarified that this charism was not to be considered an “evidence” of having been filled with the Holy Spirit.³⁹⁸ It also drew attention to the alarming but popular practice of some individuals who sought out the guidance of prophetic ministers who actually claimed a certain *authority* over the lives and consciences of these men and women – even in daily practical matters and the mundane private duties of life; the text chastised these individuals for following men in such a slavish and superstitious manner, and strongly advised them to seek the full council of God, instead.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁶ Ibid, 486.

³⁹⁷ “Seek Not – Forbid Not!” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 63-69.

³⁹⁸ Ibid, 67.

³⁹⁹ Ibid, 69.

The Church of the Nazarene, USA,⁴⁰⁰ which had emerged out of the nineteenth century Holiness movement, issued a formal, one-sentence resolution against contemporary Charismatic movements during its General Assembly in 1970. Its text, *Resolution of the Board of General Superintendents*,⁴⁰¹ interpreted the contemporary practice of speaking in tongues, whether as the evidence of the baptism in the Spirit or as an ecstatic neo-Pentecostal prayer language, and ruled that it had been “inveighing against the doctrines and practices of the Church.”⁴⁰²

In 1971, the Lancaster Conference of the Mennonite Church, USA, took an open position on the Charismatic renewal in its statement *The Holy Spirit*.⁴⁰³ In challenging that many Christians had been “living on a low spiritual plane,” it encouraged a general acceptance of the gifts of the Spirit, based on the clear example and evidence that it found in the New Testament. At the same time, it argued that the presence or absence of certain gifts was not an indication of whether a particular individual had been filled with the Spirit.⁴⁰⁴ The Conference further ruled that Mennonite congregations should allow opportunities for the “unhindered manifestation of the Spirit’s presence,” and encouraged intercession that the Spirit would “bring new life in all its fullness to every Christian.”⁴⁰⁵

Then in 1977, the delegates to the Mennonite General Assembly revised and approved a 1975 *Study Report* that was to be published as a formal *Summary Statement*,

⁴⁰⁰ This church had originally been called The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene for the first two decades of its existence. It had been created by the merger of the three largest Holiness churches in the Wesleyan tradition, and clearly held belief in the doctrine of sanctification as “a second work of grace,” subsequent to regeneration of Christian believers.

⁴⁰¹ “Resolution of the Board of General Superintendents” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 219-221.

⁴⁰² *Ibid*, 221.

⁴⁰³ “The Holy Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 285-287.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 286.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 287.

and designated as *The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church*.⁴⁰⁶ It provided some biblical background in support of the renewal, the baptism of the Spirit, the Pauline ideal of being “filled with the Spirit,” and the many references to various individuals who had been described as being “full of the Spirit” in the *Acts of the Apostles*.⁴⁰⁷ It included a section on what the authors saw as the biblical evidence of various Charismatic gifts, which they then identified as the gifts of tongues, prophecy, healing, deliverance and exorcism.⁴⁰⁸ While recognizing some of the weaknesses of the contemporary Charismatic movement, it provided a convincingly positive evaluation of the renewal and identified some of what were considered the obvious benefits: “the counteraction of tendencies toward secularization; the reutilization of worship; hierarchical power; spiritual coldness and lethargy,” as well as the “authentic hand of God... quickening, inspiring, encouraging, forgiving, and strengthening His people.”⁴⁰⁹ The statement closed by offering several counsels, calling Charismatic individuals to use their gifts “to fulfill their respective ministries,” calling other Christians to affirm these gifts and ministries in their Charismatic brothers and sisters, and calling all Christians to encourage one another to be continuously filled with the Spirit.⁴¹⁰

That same year, an Ecumenical Conference of European Charismatic Leaders was held at Schloss Craheim, Germany. From June 23-28, 1975, three brief theses were issued that were seen as central to the Ecumenical movement, especially from their perspective as practicing Charismatics. Published together under one title, *Charismatic*

⁴⁰⁶ “The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 325-344.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid*, 330-333.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid*, 335-338.

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 341.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid*, 343-344.

Renewal and the Unity of the Church,⁴¹¹ it called for self discovery, openness, and awareness of what ministries it could help take over from other struggling Churches. It argued that every Church had particular spiritual traditions which did not allow for a full realization of the gifts of the Spirit; it called each Church to discover its own “inalienable vocation.” Despite the great ecclesial divisions, it called for open recognition of the gifts of grace in other churches, as well as the openness to be enriched by these other graces. It also asked each Church, in light of its particular vocation, what ministries it could assist with, and, if necessary, even take over from another Church. Together, with the readiness of what was possible, each Church could contribute to the common good.⁴¹²

An undated ecclesial statement, known simply as *The Charismatic Movement*,⁴¹³ was also published by the Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren, Czechoslovakia.⁴¹⁴ Shortly before rising out of its Soviet domination, the Czech Brethren had endured so many sociological changes that it clearly recognized a profound negative impact to its fellowship and pattern of life; at the same time, however, it began to rediscover what it identified as a Charismatic nature, an aspect that its evangelical ecclesial life had once considered suspect and even violently rejected. As its Church began to strengthen under a weakening military regime, it began to rethink its ecclesiology and redefine its confession; its Christological and pneumatological developments allowed it to

⁴¹¹ “Charismatic Renewal and the Unity of the Church” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 13-14.

⁴¹² *Ibid*, 14.

⁴¹³ “The Charismatic Movement” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 521-530.

⁴¹⁴ The national reference appears to indicate a date prior to the eventual split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The Church originated after the fall of the Hapsburg monarchy, when a union of Protestant Churches, previously based upon the Helvetic and Augsburg Confessions, brought about the realization of the Bohemian Reformation.

incorporate Charismatic gifts into the life of the local congregation.⁴¹⁵ This meant that the “one-man style of leadership” was brought into direct conflict with the charismatically renewed congregation and its many gifted members; the Charismatic renewal brought about a decentralization of the preaching and teaching ministries as it institutionalized the full use of the Charismatic gifts. The Czech Brethren welcomed this “badly needed corrective to the one-sided narrowness which restricted the life of faith, and impeded upon the creative variety which the life of faith could take.”⁴¹⁶ It identified that the Church based its hope and certainty on the presence of the Holy Spirit in all his gifts and manifestations, and fully agreed with those who expected to be enabled, empowered and strengthened for a more effective ministry through the charismatic gifts, given to and exercised in the local congregations.⁴¹⁷

Chapter 2.9 Statements by the World Council of Churches

During the Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, held in Nairobi, Kenya, 1975, a draft was circulated, entitled *A Statement of Concerns*; it proposed what the role of the WCC should be with regard to the ecumenical potential of the Charismatic renewal. By March 1976, a staff report to the Executive Committee set up an International Charismatic Theological Consultation; following their meeting at Schloss Schwanberg, Germany, 1978, a draft of a theological statement, *Towards a Church Renewed and United in the Spirit*, was also developed. These two drafts were joined

⁴¹⁵ Ibid, 524.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid, 529.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid, 530.

together and became the first published statement⁴¹⁸ of the WCC on the Charismatic renewal.

First, the statement identified the role of the WCC as one that discerns the ecumenical significance of grass-roots movements, and then assists in the realization of their ecumenical potential. It suggested that the interrelations between the WCC and the Charismatic movement needed to be two-way i.e. the renewal would benefit from its continued contact with other movements and dimensions of the WCC, and the Member Churches of the WCC would benefit from its charismatic inspiration and style in all aspects of Christian life.⁴¹⁹ Second, it identified two great promises of the renewal: its ecclesial potential – to help people once again experience the presence of God within their communities; and its sacramental potential – to help rekindle the graces of conversion in baptism, confirmation and even ordination.⁴²⁰

Following the Fifth Assembly in Nairobi, the WCC formed a subunit on *Renewal and Congregational Life*, which organized an international consultation, set in Bossey, Switzerland, in March 1980.⁴²¹ Since the renewal had crossed denominational boundaries, it had been seen as particularly hopeful for ecumenists; the WCC considered the pneumatological dimensions of its developing ecclesiology an important focus in these consultations, although the *meaning* of the renewal seemed to dominate their formal discussions. In 1980, the Renewal and Congregational Life committee issued its findings

⁴¹⁸ “‘A Statement of Concerns’ and ‘Towards a Church Renewed and United in the Spirit’” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 280-291.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 283-284.

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*, 288-290.

⁴²¹ According to p. 358 of Kilian McDonnell’s introduction, the Bossey consultation had included fifty participants and four observers, and involved representatives from the mainline Protestant Churches, as well as those from the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches, Egyptian Copts, Roman Catholics, classical Pentecostal Churches from England, Chile, Kenya and Zaire, as well as representatives from a variety of Charismatic backgrounds.

in a ten page statement, entitled *Report of the Consultation on the Significance of the Charismatic Renewal for the Churches*,⁴²² which greatly adapted a preliminary report from the subunit's discussions that had taken place during a 1978 meeting in Stony Point, New York.

It began by describing several common characteristics seen in all forms of genuine renewal,⁴²³ and then addressed the *particular meaning* of the contemporary Charismatic renewal: for Member Churches – the tensions and strains accompanying this movement were the birth-pangs of the Church being renewed; for the Ecumenical Movement – the sense of community in the renewal bound together people of various denominations and historic divisions; and for the greater World – the renewal had led to a deeper commitment for socio-political action.⁴²⁴ The document closed by calling for future consultations, especially located in and with the adequate representation of third world countries; it also recommended further investigation by the WCC Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, to be held in Melbourne, that same year.

Chapter 2.10 Roman Catholic Statements

In surveying the pertinent ecclesial statements of the Roman Catholic Church, I will begin by first examining ecclesial documents published independently by various national Episcopal Conferences that have dealt in any specific way with the Charismatic

⁴²² “Report of the Consultation on the Significance of the Charismatic Renewal for the Churches” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 358-369.

⁴²³ *Ibid*, 360-361. It describes five specific features of genuine renewal: an attitude of expectation, an attitude of creative faithfulness toward authentic tradition, engaging in a struggle with the lived reality (i.e. personal, social, political and economic), a loving dynamism that radiates outward, and the centrality of worship.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid*, 362-365.

renewal; I will then analyze ecclesial statements having an international character; finally, I will take a brief look at the statements issued as a result of the first and fifth phases of the ecumenical dialogue that have taken place between the Roman Catholic Church and Classical Pentecostalism for the past 35 years.

Chapter 2.10.1 Roman Catholic Episcopal Conferences

The first national Episcopal Conference to publish an ecclesial document dealing with the Charismatic movement within the Roman Catholic Church was a 2-page statement issued in the United States. The *Report of the Committee on Doctrine*⁴²⁵ was issued by the NCCB-USCC in 1969. While the Charismatic renewal had been a source of internal dissension when it was introduced in the historic Protestant churches, it received a warmer reception in the Catholic Church, largely as a result of having Catholic theologians involved from its very beginning; these theologians, at that time almost all Catholic priests, were able to quickly reflect upon the theological meaning of the renewal, and its place within the greater Catholic experience and tradition. While the Committee had initially sought to focus on the phenomenon of tongues, they gradually expanded their perspective on other issues, which resulted in a more positive conclusion. In comparison to the initial statements of other churches, this report appears to be a bold, positive evaluation of the renewal; while seen as somewhat of a *Gamaliel statement*, the Committee concluded that the renewal should “not be inhibited, but allowed to develop.”⁴²⁶ It provided only two cautions: that the members should avoid the mistakes of

⁴²⁵ "Report of the Committee on Doctrine" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 207-210.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid*, 210.

Classical Pente-costalism, and that bishops should allow their clergy to be associated.⁴²⁷

Both cautions appear to be attempts to insure that the groups remained Catholic in practice. Ultimately, however, it stands as a very positive initial statement of support and encouragement.

In Puerto Rico, the Episcopal Conference was slightly more cautious, and issued its own *Declaration on the Pentecostal Movement*⁴²⁸ in 1972. While seeing the movement chiefly as an import from the United States, they were not inclined to accept the US hierarchy's report in its totality; they were especially concerned as a strong Pentecostal presence in their country elicited worries of potential defections. They echoed popular condemnations of "certain abuses," such as "pretended cures," and expressed disapproval of the way Catholicism was allegedly ridiculed.⁴²⁹

In November 1974, the *Message of the Bishops of the Western Province of Quebec on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*⁴³⁰ was published by six Canadian bishops of that ecclesial province. The statement itself recalled the positive assessment of the charismatic gifts found in *Lumen Gentium*, as well as the responsibility for bishops to discern the genuineness and proper use of gifts; while assessing the benefits and dangers of the movement, they identified the particular "harvest of vocations" as being one of the strongest fruits of renewal.⁴³¹

⁴²⁷ Ibid, 210.

⁴²⁸ "Declaration on the Pentecostal Movement" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 364-368.

⁴²⁹ Ibid, 367-368.

⁴³⁰ "Message of the Bishops of the Western Province of Quebec on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 580-584.

⁴³¹ Ibid, 584.

The Australian Episcopal Conference issued its report, *Charismatic Renewal*⁴³² in 1975, after several years of stability that had followed much earlier reports of the presence of Catholics attending interdenominational Pentecostal churches.⁴³³ By the time of this Australian study, however, the movement had been assessed by the country's bishops to be "firmly Catholic in character."⁴³⁴ It gave a cautious approval of the movement.

That same year, 1975, the entire Episcopal Conference in Canada adopted a formal statement that originally had been drawn up by some of its own bishops who were actually involved in the renewal. Unlike the statement prepared by the bishops of Western Quebec, this one carried the weight of the entire body of Catholic bishops in Canada. *Charismatic Renewal: Message of the Canadian Bishops Addressed to All Canadian Catholics*,⁴³⁵ dispensed with the normal reserve and pastoral cautions that are standard in ecclesial documents and wholeheartedly endorsed the Catholic Charismatic renewal.⁴³⁶ Recognizing the "Trinitarian structure" of the Catholic faith in the renewal, the bishops praised the "manifest joy" of charismatic individuals as the renewal's most striking characteristic.⁴³⁷ They also clarified much of the confusion regarding the "baptism of the Spirit;" rather than joining the chorus of Pentecostal voices that identified this act as "a second baptism," the Canadian bishops were clear to articulate it as "a

⁴³² "Charismatic Renewal" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 82-83.

⁴³³ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁴³⁵ "Charismatic Renewal: Message of the Canadian Bishops Addressed to All Canadian Catholics" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 84-98.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, 84. The document's footnotes indicate that it had heavily relied upon *Malines Document I*.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, 89.

symbolic act signifying a new openness in the believer to the Spirit received at baptism.”⁴³⁸ In speaking of the purpose of the charismatic gifts, they identify it as “service,” and saw in them a “ministerial function.”⁴³⁹

Their presence in the Church is neither unusual nor secondary. It is one of its essential characteristic, for the Church community is, by its very nature, charismatic... Their role is to help the Church exercise its “diaconate” of love, that is to say, the ministerial function of dispensing to all men the love that the Father manifested to them in Jesus Christ... While acknowledging that certain of them stand out more clearly, the Renewal is well aware that most of them abound in ordinary ways in the life of the Church.⁴⁴⁰

The year 1975 saw two brief ecclesial statements, those by the Episcopal Conferences of Mexico and of Panama. The Mexican, *Christian Renewal in the Holy Spirit*⁴⁴¹ emphasized the need for openness and submissiveness to the Spirit as a means of entering into a more effective relationship with Church authorities;⁴⁴² the document exhorted Mexican Catholics “to proceed always and in everything in accord with the bishop, center, root, and foundation of the life of faith and grace within the community.”⁴⁴³ The Panamanian episcopate issued its verbosely titled, *Collective Letter from the Episcopacy of Panama Concerning the Movement of Renewal in the Spirit*,

⁴³⁸ Ibid, 89.

⁴³⁹ Ibid, 90.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid, 91.

⁴⁴¹ “Christian Renewal in the Holy Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 98-100.

⁴⁴² Ibid, 99.

⁴⁴³ Ibid, 100.

Directed to Priests, Religious, and Lay People Who Work in Apostolic Movements.⁴⁴⁴ In their statement, the bishops clarified that these “gifts and charismas” were already received in the sacraments of Christian initiation, although “in spite of their intrinsic strength... remain lethargic in some as a consequence of sin;”⁴⁴⁵ they also mandated that Catholics should only assemble together in charismatic prayer that was “authorized by the hierarchy.”⁴⁴⁶

In 1975, the Episcopal Conference in the United States authorized its second ecclesial document on the movement, written on this occasion by its Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices, entitled, *Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal*.⁴⁴⁷ It was much more cautionary than their 1969 *Gamaliel statement*, although, when released to the press, it had been presented in a positive, supportive tone.⁴⁴⁸ The renewal had greatly expanded in the USA, and several large national conferences had been held at the University of Notre Dame; many priests and even bishops had since joined the renewal.⁴⁴⁹ As in their 1969 *Gamaliel statement*, the bishops enumerated several positive fruits of the renewal, but encouraged growth in significant areas, such as lay leadership:

A key element in the future success of the charismatic movement is the formation of leaders who are well grounded in the teaching of the Church and in understanding of Scripture, leaders who are open to one another

⁴⁴⁴ “Collective Letter from the Episcopacy of Panama Concerning the Movement of Renewal in the Spirit, Directed to Priests, Religious, and Lay People Who Work in Apostolic Movements” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 100-103

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 101.

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 102.

⁴⁴⁷ “Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 104-114.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 105.

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 104.

and mature enough to share responsibility. In many places the benefits derived from such leadership are already markedly visible.⁴⁵⁰

While the document also encouraged growth in ecumenical sensitivity, it also warned that Catholic charismatic individuals who had been involved with other Christian traditions ran the risk of a “diluting” their sense of Catholic identity; it cautioned these individuals to be “mature in their faith,” and to closely follow the Church’s guidelines for ecumenical activities.⁴⁵¹

In the West Indies, the Antilles Episcopal Conference willingly promoted the renewal while also addressing some problems in their *Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*,⁴⁵² issued at its 1976 meeting in Belize. They formally recognized that the renewal had contributed to breaking down racial, social and territorial barriers that had negatively impacted the growth of the Christianity in these islands; in particular, they noted how the renewal brought a sense of sharing, unity and transcendence of their differences.⁴⁵³ The bishops also charged all their priests to get actively acquainted with the renewal and to seek cooperation with its lay leadership, so that its full potential would benefit every diocese and parish within the conference.⁴⁵⁴

The statement, *Orientation of the Episcopal Theological Team to the Local Ordinaries Concerning the Movements of Spiritual Renewal*⁴⁵⁵ was issued by the

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid, 110.

⁴⁵¹ Ibid, 110.

⁴⁵² “Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 256-267.

⁴⁵³ Ibid, 259.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid, 261.

⁴⁵⁵ “Orientation of the Episcopal Theological Team to the Local Ordinaries Concerning the Movements of Spiritual Renewal” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 345-348.

Permanent Theological Commission of the Argentinian Episcopal Conference at its thirty-fifth Plenary Assembly in 1977. While the Commission issued warnings over the renewal's potential for "illuminism and subjectivism,"⁴⁵⁶ it appears that their overriding concern was with the actual participation of Charismatic individuals in *authentic* liturgical celebrations:

Serious participation in the liturgy must hold first place in the spiritual life of those who participate in these groups. Mass and other liturgical ceremonies that may have a place in their reunions must be celebrated faithfully and without adding *extraneous elements* to the celebration according to the guidelines dictated by ecclesial authority... Particular manifestations in gesture, attitude and styles of prayer at these reunions should be moderated within the limits of decorum and prudence at the discretion of the Ordinary.⁴⁵⁷

The Commission, here, seems somewhat concerned with fidelity to the *rubrical norms* in the celebration of the Catholic Liturgy. It appears that Charismatic worship and prayer were clearly encouraged in personal devotions or even their particular gatherings and "reunions," but were clearly not permitted to be integrated with Eucharistic celebrations, and thus were considered "extraneous elements." One could extrapolate that something unique may have been happening, at one point, in the Catholic liturgical life of Argentina – unique enough to warrant a *corrective* by its Episcopal Conference.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid, 347.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid, 347-348.

That same year, the Brazilian Episcopal Conference issued *Charismatic Renewal in Brazil*.⁴⁵⁸ The Catholic hierarchy there had seen a gradual loss of interest in their own national pastoral priorities when the Charismatic renewal was introduced to its Catholic parishes; its adherents were seen as being overly preoccupied with the “extraordinary gifts.”⁴⁵⁹ Leaders in the renewal had attempted to reduce this tension by issuing a *recommendation letter* to prayer groups which stipulated that prayer in tongues should no longer be practiced either in public or in prayer groups.⁴⁶⁰ The Conference’s statement, which contained the results of a national survey of the hierarchy, made explicit several dozen recommendations of the individual bishops surveyed, both the *pros* and *cons*; while no one recommendation gained a majority approval of the bishops, the Conference called for continued discussion and the creation of a study panel that would be made up by bishops and theologians, especially those who were active members of the renewal.⁴⁶¹

In 1977, the Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano (CELAM), the organization of Latin American Catholic bishops based in Bogotá, Colombia, issued *Renewal in the Spirit*.⁴⁶² Written by Alfonso Lopes Trujillo,⁴⁶³ coadjutor archbishop of Medellín and CELAM’s general secretary, it was originally the final section of his prologue to CELAM’s symposium on the Charismatic renewal, held earlier that year. Adopted by the bishops, the document identifies the unitive elements of the renewal, what Trujillo

⁴⁵⁸ “Charismatic Renewal in Brazil” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 348-357.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 348.

⁴⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 349.

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 357.

⁴⁶² “Renewal in the Spirit” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 358-364.

⁴⁶³ Trujillo would later be named a Cardinal and President of the Vatican’s Pontifical Council for the Family.

identified as a “unity in variety,” a “fundamental charism” given for “the service of the community.”⁴⁶⁴ He identified the Charismatic “baptism in the Spirit” as a renewal of the Sacrament of Baptism, a “deepening of the commitments which derive from baptism;” he saw it as a “special innovation” of the Spirit’s presence, an “outpouring that comes, not from outside, but from within,” and agreed with Suenens that a better expression was needed to clarify the experience.⁴⁶⁵ Moreover, Trujillo saw within this individual and personal Charismatic experience a clear synthesis between the *transcendence* and *immanence* of God that was clearly visible in the contemporary Church.⁴⁶⁶

In Puerto Rico that year, the bishops’ Episcopal Conference issued a second ecclesial document, *Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*,⁴⁶⁷ as a more extensive statement than its predecessor, *Declaration on the Pentecostal Movement*, issued five years before. In this new document, the bishops take note of the eagerness shown by contemporary men and women who were “seeking their own personal experiences of reality,” and how this manifested itself in the rapid growth of the renewal.⁴⁶⁸ They also reflected on the wisdom of encouraging the life of grace as the authenticator of exterior phenomenon; if the fruit of the Spirit were produced in the person’s life, then the charisms they exhibited were judged to be authentic.⁴⁶⁹ At the same time, the bishops remained cautious toward the propagation of non-Catholic ideas that

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid, 359.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid, 363.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid, 364.

⁴⁶⁷ “Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 365-376.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid, 369.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid, 372.

were seen to *endanger* those less educated or lacking a solid grounding in the Catholic faith.⁴⁷⁰

By 1979, Cardinal Suenens had reached the age of mandatory retirement, and submitted his resignation as the archbishop of Malines-Brussels and primate of Belgium; his immediate successor, Archbishop Godfried Danneels, had been known as a particularly strong proponent of the Charismatic renewal. Danneels, in fact, played a large part in the content and formulation of the ecclesial statement, *The Charismatic Renewal: A Pastoral Evaluation*,⁴⁷¹ issued by the Belgian Episcopal Conference that same year. No other ecclesial statement on the renewal had spoken so strongly about the dimension of community life, since the Antilles document in 1976; it identified a particular outgrowth of the Charismatic movement as the new communities of evangelical life – “*covenant communities*” – which it commended as authentic models of contemporary holiness and Christian asceticism.⁴⁷² It was also remarkable in that noted that the renewal would cease to exist, asserting that once the Church had been completely renewed, the distinct Charismatic renewal movement would no longer be needed:

The Spirit breathes where he wills. He is not restricted by human limitations. Still, there are moments in the history of the church when he acts with particular power. The renewal, which claims no monopoly on the Spirit, is a grace which is passing. As with every grace, it leaves us free. It

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid, 376.

⁴⁷¹ “The Charismatic Renewal: A Pastoral Evaluation” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 490-503.

⁴⁷² Ibid, 497-498.

calls for our collaboration if it is to bring forth fruits of renewal for our personal, communal, and ecclesial life.⁴⁷³

It was also in 1979 that the Episcopal Conference of Costa Rica issued its *Circular Letter of the Costa Rican Bishops*,⁴⁷⁴ which clearly identified the Charismatic renewal as “a living expression of our Church.” However, because of the broad catechetical ignorance of Costa Rican Catholics and the continuing efforts of Protestant recruitment, the bishops were concerned about the “apostasy of many of the faithful.”⁴⁷⁵ To remedy this, they recommended the organization of adult formation courses, Catholic Bible studies, the spread of Catholic literature, and the heightened involvement of priests who could alert the faithful to Protestant influences and curb their aggressive proselytizing activities.⁴⁷⁶

In Germany, the Charismatic renewal had been warmly welcomed in the Roman Catholic Church, as members of the movement had made themselves generously available for service to their local parishes, many of which became known as Charismatic parishes (charismatische Gemeinde-Erneuerung). As a result of the popularity of this restructuring, the German Episcopal Conference issued the statement, *Temporary Ordering of Procedures for the Charismatic Parish Renewal in the Catholic Church in the Geographical Area in which the German Bishops’ Conference is Competent*.⁴⁷⁷ The document praised the ongoing efforts of the diocesan and inter-diocesan leadership

⁴⁷³ Ibid, 502.

⁴⁷⁴ “Circular Letter of the Costa Rican Bishops” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 503-506.

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid, 505.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid, 506.

⁴⁷⁷ “Temporary Ordering of Procedures for the Charismatic Parish Renewal in the Catholic Church in the Geographical Area in which the German Bishops’ Conference is Competent” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 507-511.

teams, and mandated the appointment of dual diocesan representatives (one priest and one layperson) that would serve for three years in every diocese having Charismatic activities.⁴⁷⁸ They asked that a national coordination team composed of diocesan representatives that were also elected for three year terms, have the primary responsibility to convoke national meetings, to maintain a relationship to the Conference of bishops, to establish contacts at the international level and concern themselves with ongoing public relations.⁴⁷⁹ This propensity for organization and order was set firmly in place by the Episcopal Conference, which established in consensus that these procedures and norms could only be changed in the future by a two-thirds majority of the Catholic bishops.⁴⁸⁰ Their commitment to the renewal was concrete.

The next meeting of the Latin American Episcopal Conference, held in Puebla, Mexico, in 1979, followed the historic precedence of the 1968 Medellin Conference. While the issue of *liberation theology* had been a major underpinning theme of the two conferences, the visit of Pope John Paul II to the Puebla Conference elicited a conservative reassessment of priorities; the Pope eventually condemned the concept of “base ecclesial communities,” that had been strongly supported by CELAM. A second topic of considerable interest at the Puebla Conference was the status of the Charismatic renewal within Latin American countries; Bishop Alfonso Uribe Jaramillo of Sonsón-Rionegro, Colombia was the driving force and primary proponent of the renewal’s potential for the local communities. His influence was seen in two brief sections of the CELAM ecclesial statement, *Puebla: Evangelization in the Present and in the Future of*

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid,

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid, 510.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid, 511.

Latin America,⁴⁸¹ which dealt specifically with the Charismatic movement. First, the bishops recognized that the Holy Spirit unified the community and provided the ministries of its hierarchical and charismatic gifts; these hierarchical and charismatic gifts gave life to Catholic institutions in the same way that it gave life to the human soul.⁴⁸² Second, they recognized that the Spirit of Jesus inspired individuals to be servants who transformed the world with the gifts that God had given them; they vocalized their wish to possess the both the creativity and the dynamism of the Spirit, as a means of bearing new hope to their Latin American brothers and sisters.⁴⁸³ In effect, the bishops saw the Charismatic renewal as a particular grace toward the evangelization of all Latin America.

As a result of the support shown at both the Medellin and Puebla Conferences, the leaders of the Latin American Catholic Charismatic Renewal (Encuentro Carismático Católico Latino-americano) or ECCLA met in Lima, Peru, in May 1979. Ninety-nine delegates from twenty-nine Latin American countries sought to integrate the goals of the renewal with the Puebla document; they placed the Charismatic renewal at the very center of the evangelization program envisioned by Puebla in their own response, *The Charismatic Renewal and Puebla*.⁴⁸⁴ They identified the Charismatic renewal as the “current grace” by which the Spirit causes individuals to live out “Christianity to the limits of its consequences.”⁴⁸⁵ The delegates also listed seventeen “priorities” for the renewal, reflecting many of the recommendations that had been listed in the previously

⁴⁸¹ “Puebla: Evangelization in the Present and in the Future of Latin America” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 511-515.

⁴⁸² *Ibid*, 514.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid*, 515.

⁴⁸⁴ “The Charismatic Renewal and Puebla” *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 516-521.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 519.

published Catholic ecclesial statements; their eleventh priority, however, immediately stands out among the rest:

11. To discover and assimilate the spirit and wisdom of the church present in the liturgy in order to participate in it in a full, creative, free, and respectful manner, being open to the manifestations of the Spirit.⁴⁸⁶

Unlike the Argentinian bishops' warning to Charismatics about their *extraneous elements* being unwelcome during liturgical celebrations, the ECCLA actually promoted the open integration of Charismatic manifestations within the Catholic Liturgy itself.⁴⁸⁷

Chapter 2.10.2 Roman Catholic Church, International

On an international level, the Roman Catholic Church had begun to see rapid growth of the Charismatic movement affecting its members across the entire world. Even scattered throughout the city of Rome, several Catholic charismatic prayer groups had begun meeting in bell towers and church basements. As the movement had now penetrated into the very heart of the Roman Church, an official response had been deemed necessary by various hierarchs within the Roman Curia. By October 1973, the movement held its first major *International Leaders Conference*⁴⁸⁸ in Grottaferrata, Italy. Cardinal Suenens, who had been advising Paul VI of the movement's continuing developments, then took the initiative and organized a direct response to the concerns of

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid, 521.

⁴⁸⁷ This integration of the charismatic and the liturgical can actually been seen at the highest levels of the Roman Catholic Church, during the 1975 Pentecost celebrations in St. Peter's Basilica, when Pope Paul VI had been greeted with applause and waves of alleluias by the ten thousand Charismatic pilgrims in attendance. Cardinal Suenens records how this liturgical celebration was interspersed with dramatic, extended moments of Charismatic praise, and massive crowds spontaneously singing aloud with the gift of tongues. Cf.: Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 290.

⁴⁸⁸ This was the first major *international* conference of the Roman Catholic Charismatic movement. It met in proximity to Vatican City to highlight its global dimension and suggest that the movement held an attitude of respectful submission toward the Pope.

the various Roman congregations. He hand-picked Fr. Kilian McDonnell, OSB, to be the principle architect of a *quasi-official* ecclesial document, and appointed a small group of theologians to collaborate with him and recommend appropriate revisions.⁴⁸⁹ The resulting *Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*⁴⁹⁰ clearly identifies that the Spirit and the charisms belong to the *constitutive nature* of the church, and are not simply "additions" to the existing body of Christ; it also clarifies that charisms belong to the essential nature of the Christian life, in both its corporate and individual expression.⁴⁹¹ It stipulates that during the earliest Christian forms of initiation (i.e. Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist), those initiated not only received the Spirit, but expected that the Spirit would manifest himself across the full spectrum of charisms within the community.⁴⁹² It notes,

The charisms of the Spirit are without number and they constitute the means by which each member of the Church ministers to the whole body.

Charisms are essentially ministerial functions directed outward for the building up of the body at the service of the world rather than exclusively inward toward the edification of the individual. The Spirit manifests himself in a ministerial function in each

Christian. No Christian is without a ministry in and for the Church and the world... The contemporary church is not aware of some of the charisms of

⁴⁸⁹ This statement was prepared under the direction of Cardinal Suenens, and presented at the Grottaferrata Conference. The small group of theologians and co-signatories were: Salvador Carrillo Alday, MSPS (Mexico); Albert de Monléon, OP (France); Francis Martin (Canada); Donatien Mollat, SJ (Italy); Heribert Mühlen (Germany); and Francis Sullivan, SJ (Italy).

⁴⁹⁰ "Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid*, 4.

⁴⁹² *Ibid*, 5.

the Spirit as real possibilities for its life. The contemporary church has more limited expectations as to how the Spirit manifests himself. One of the reasons for the restricted expectations is the tendency to describe the assistance of the Holy Spirit primarily in terms of the hierarchical ministry.⁴⁹³

Here, it is particularly important to note that this quasi-official ecclesial document of the Roman Catholic Church identifies this tendency toward "restricted expectations" as stemming from the overshadowing ministries of the ordained hierarchy. This is a tendency that will be more fully explored in chapter 4.

As the Grottaferrata Conference was taking place, Pope Paul VI decided to hold a private audience with some of its leaders and participants, and subsequently issued a formal address⁴⁹⁴ containing his remarks to them. His careful avoidance of the term "charismatic" was obvious and seemed to indicate that the Pope was unwilling to make a statement which could be interpreted as an approval, at such an early date. As a result, the Pope's statement was cautious and makes an ambiguous reference to "this renewal" which is manifested "in different forms and in various environments."⁴⁹⁵

In response to these initiatives in Grottaferrata and Rome, Cardinal Suenens called together a second team of international experts,⁴⁹⁶ whose task was to provide a more detailed theological and pastoral evaluation of the renewal. He invited these experts to meet at his residence in Malines, Belgium from May 21 - 26, 1974. The fact that the

⁴⁹³ Ibid, 5.

⁴⁹⁴ "Address of Pope Paul VI (October 12, 1973)" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 11-12.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid, 12.

⁴⁹⁶ See Chapter 1, page 61 and footnote 126, for the composition of this team of international experts.

principle ghost writer of this new document was McDonnell meant that many of the major themes seen in the earlier Grottaferrata document would reappear in this ecclesial statement. Their preparatory draft was then reviewed by several theological consultants who had served as *periti* at the Second Vatican Council.⁴⁹⁷ Cardinal Suenens chaired each of these meetings, and assumed the full responsibility for the document's acceptance or rejection by the Pope. The final text, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*,⁴⁹⁸ published in 1974, is the first of the six *Malines documents*. It has come to represent one of the main streams of thought on the Catholic's Charismatic movement.

In its ecclesial and sacramental nature, the Charismatic renewal is identified here as a renewal of Christian initiation (Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist). Charisms are understood to be gifts or aptitudes empowered by the Spirit of God for the *ministry* of building up the Church. As the sacrament of Christ, the Church extends Christ's anointing to each of its members. As such, it is presupposed that every Christian manifests one or more charisms, and that they belong in such an essential way to the life of the Church that without them she is actually a non-Church.⁴⁹⁹

One does not place the institutional Church over against a charismatic Church. Irenaeus said: "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church." The Spirit and his gifts are constitutive of the Church and each person as a Christian. Even though the

⁴⁹⁷ See Chapter 1, page 61 and footnote 126, for the composition of this team of theological consultants and *periti*.

⁴⁹⁸ "Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal – Malines Document I" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 13-70.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 18.

manifestation of the Spirit is not the same in function or kind in priest and lay person, each has his gift. The ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop is itself a charism. Charism is a principle of order in the Church in such a way that there is no distinction between the institutional Church and the charismatic Church.⁵⁰⁰

In this sense, every Christian is a charismatic and, therefore, has a ministry to the Church and to the world. Here, the plurality of charisms in the Church is essential to its nature; it means that there is no Christian without a charism – and no Christian without a ministry.⁵⁰¹

By the following Spring, Suenens had convinced Pope Paul VI to address the assembled participants of the third *International Catholic Charismatic Conference*, being held in Rome that year. On Monday, May 19, 1975, Pope Paul received more than 10,000 participants at St. Peter's Basilica. Designating the assembled crowd as representatives of a new "spiritual renewal," he read a prepared address in both French and English,⁵⁰² applauding their attachment and devotion to the See of Peter. Then, uncharacteristically, he began speaking to them in Italian, extempo-raneously, of their great "charismatic pilgrimage." He encouraged all Christians who were not involved in the Charismatic movement to unite themselves with its members celebrating the feast of Pentecost, so that they might also "nourish themselves on the enthusiasm and the spiritual energy with which we must live our religion."⁵⁰³ At the close of this Papal Audience, Pope Paul

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid, 25.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid, 24.

⁵⁰² "Address of Pope Paul VI (May 19, 1975)" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 70-76.

⁵⁰³ Ibid, 76.

embraced Suenens with visible emotion, designated him as his papal representative to the movement, and thanked him, “for all that you have done, and all that you will still do, to bring the Charismatic Renewal into the heart of the [Roman] Church.”⁵⁰⁴

Cardinal Suenens had already come to enjoy a kind of *de facto* authority within the Catholic Charismatic renewal that was only strengthened after this Papal appointment. While taking on the role of shepherding this growing movement, in 1978 he himself authored a second Malines document, entitled *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations*.⁵⁰⁵ In this document, Suenens establishes a connection between the Charismatic renewal, with its antecedents in classical Pentecostalism, and the burgeoning Ecumenical movement within the mainline churches.

At present we are perceiving a double summons, as it were, a double current of graces. They are so many challenges of the Spirit. The first, there is the ecumenical current, which reminds Christians of all persuasions that the Church must be one in order to be faithful to its very being... Parallel to this, another more recent current is flowing through the Churches: the charismatic current. It reminds Christians that the Spirit is the vital breath of his Church, that his active and mighty presence is always operative to the extent that we have faith, hope, and the courage to let him take over.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰⁴ Suenens, *A New Pentecost*,

⁵⁰⁵ *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations – Malines Document II" Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 82-174.

⁵⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 87.

While acknowledging that Catholic ecumenical openness had grown slowly, it credits the Charismatic renewal as having first originated outside the Catholic Church; it calls Catholics to acknowledge and esteem the common heritage "found among our separated brethren." It then identifies a clear "ecumenical vocation" within the renewal itself, and encourages ecumenism to find its complement and corrective within the Charismatic movement.⁵⁰⁷ It describes the lived experience of the renewal as a *fulfillment* of the bold ecumenical hope of the Council; it quotes Johannes Cardinal Willebrands,⁵⁰⁸ (then) President of the Vatican Secretariat for Unity, who identified the Charismatic renewal as "a call to spiritual ecumenism."⁵⁰⁹ It also identifies a *symbiotic* relationship between charism and institution; it makes reference to a speech given by Metropolitan Ignatios of Latakia, in his address to the World Council of Churches, where he suggests, "Without the Holy Spirit, God is far away... the Church is simply an organization... But in the Holy Spirit... the Church shows forth the life of the Trinity... mission is a Pentecost... human action is deified."⁵¹⁰

Later the same year, a complementary text, *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*,⁵¹¹ drafted by McDonnell, was circulated on an international level, following a widespread consul-tation with theologians and pastoral leaders who were personally

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid, 89.

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid, 104. Cardinal Willebrands gave the featured keynote address at the *International Congress on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* that was held in Rome, Italy during the Solemnity of Pentecost (1975).

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid, 104, 163. The term "spiritual ecumenism" was used in the Second Vatican Council *Decree on Ecumenism*.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid, 114. Metropolitan Ignatios is quoted here from his Opening Address to the *World Council of Churches* at their Fourth Assembly in Uppsala, Sweden (1968).

⁵¹¹ "The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 175-279.

involved in the Charismatic renewal.⁵¹² Suggestions by these experts were incorporated into five consecutive preliminary drafts then refined by a second group of Catholic theologians,⁵¹³ as well as a third group of international theologians that were not personally identified with the renewal.⁵¹⁴ Noting that the Catholic Charismatic renewal had followed both the Classical Pentecostal and Protestant Charismatic movements, the document maintains that Catholics were able to learn from their strengths and weaknesses; it also suggests that its strong tendency to retain its Catholic identity was due, in large part, to the presence and participation of Catholic theologians, who were able to reflect upon the meaning of their charismatic experiences.⁵¹⁵

The document suggested that many Catholic parishes were filled with "baptized non-Christians" – members who were sacramentally initiated but "never evangelized," who "never made a true Christian commitment."⁵¹⁶ The Protestant-Catholic polemic that had developed after the Council of Trent served to reinforce a kind of Catholic objectivism which stressed God's act in the sacrament without a corresponding living faith in the recipients; because of the Catholic belief in the efficacy of the sacraments,

⁵¹² Ibid, 177. According to McDonnell's introductory remarks, the international team of theologians and pastoral leaders consulted included: Oscar Abayaratne (Sri Lanka), Salvador Carrillo Alday (Mexico), Carlos Aldunate (Chile), Simon N. Dikuba (Cameroon), Doris Donnelly (USA), Jean Miguel Garrigues (France), Dominico Grasso (Italy), Pierre Goursat (France), Benedict Heron (UK), Inocencio Iacobellis (Argentina, Puerto Rico), Francis Martin (Canada), Bishop Joseph McKinney (USA), Elina Nalletamby (Kenya), Andrew Ngcobo (South Africa), José Luis Pardos (Spain), Rufus Pereira (India), Michael Scanlon, TOR (USA), Piet Schoonenberg (Holland), Brian Smith (Australia), Francis Sullivan, SJ (USA), John Wood (Malaysia), and Gabriele Winkler (Germany).

⁵¹³ Ibid, 177. McDonnell lists the following six Catholic theological consultants: Yves Congar, OP (France), Avery Dulles, SJ (USA), Bishop Gerard L. Frey (USA), Bernard Häring, CSSR (Germany), Gotthold Hassenhüttel (Germany), and Thomas Marsh (Ireland).

⁵¹⁴ Ibid, 177. According to McDonnell, the following Protestant theologians and lay leaders were consulted: Arnold Bittlinger, Lutheran (Germany), Larry Christenson, Lutheran (USA), Rex Davis, Anglican (Australia, Switzerland), David du Plessis, Classical Pentecostal (USA), Michael Harper, Anglican (UK), Bishop Robert McAlister, Classical Pentecostal (Brazil), Thomas Smail, United Reformed (UK), J. Rodman Williams, Presbyterian (USA).

⁵¹⁵ Ibid, 181.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid, 191.

they were increasingly administered without any emphasis on personal evangelization.⁵¹⁷ And, as McDonnell clearly notes, this contradicts the widely held supposition that frequent reception of the sacraments (i.e. even without any real evangelization of the individual) would always result in a vibrant Christianity.⁵¹⁸ The document, in fact, stresses that no full evangelization has taken place until there is engagement of the person and an experience of God's presence.⁵¹⁹ The Holy Spirit is this *presence* and *power* for the Christian; he is the immediate nearness of God, the presence-power who changes and transforms the committed, believing individual.⁵²⁰ The point of contact with humankind is the Holy Spirit; he is the proximity itself of God,⁵²¹ and the personal presence of Jesus in the world.⁵²² The Charismatic renewal, then, is a manifestation of the newness of the Spirit in the total life of the Church.⁵²³

In the New Testament community there was first of all an experience of the Spirit before there was a developed doctrine of the Spirit. The theology of the Spirit was subsequent to the experience and was developed in light of the experience. At this point one should say that the charismatic renewal has a special unitive, ecumenical contribution to make.⁵²⁴

The document points out that Roman Catholics have recovered an understanding of personal evangelism and appreciate ministry in a much broader sense due to its relationship with Classical Pentecostalism and the Charismatic renewal. Here the charismatic renewal is identified as the single most potent force of the Ecumenical

⁵¹⁷ Ibid, 191.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid, 192.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid, 193.

⁵²⁰ Ibid, 211.

⁵²¹ Ibid, 217

⁵²² Ibid, 218.

⁵²³ Ibid, 227.

⁵²⁴ Ibid, 257-258.

movement; the renewal and its ecumenical significance are viewed as permanent elements in the life of the Roman Catholic Church.⁵²⁵

At the next *International Charismatic Conference* in Dublin (1978), Suenens called for the integration of spiritual commitment and social involvement by all participants in the Charismatic renewal. With the aid of his old friend, Dom Helder Camara, the Catholic archbishop of Olinda and Recife, Brazil, preparations were made to co-author a third Malines document entitled, *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue*.⁵²⁶ Suenens recalled that he had been haunted throughout the proceedings of the Second Vatican Council by images of Latin America – the home of one third of the world's Catholics – and the developing potential of socio-political and religious liberation. Camara and Suenens identified the vocation of the Charismatic renewal as a total transformation of human life and culture according to the demands of the gospel.⁵²⁷

The charismatic renewal, which draws its inspiration from the essence of the gospel message, the interrelated charisms of the Spirit, and mutual service, is already, on the strength of all this, contributing to the transformation of social life. But lived faith will also lead men quite naturally to undertake social initiatives as many and as varied as the human sufferings they encounter.⁵²⁸

The authors propose that the Christian's involvement in the temporal and historical is an integral part of an individual's relationship to God; they conclude that polarizing tensions

⁵²⁵ Ibid, 271.

⁵²⁶ ""Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue – Malines Document III" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 291-357.

⁵²⁷ Ibid, 292.

⁵²⁸ Ibid, 312.

between "charismatic" and "social" Christians would be greatly eased if a theology of charisms were to progress beyond restrictive exegetical interpretations.⁵²⁹

The scope of the next Malines document proved to be somewhat controversial as it dealt with the phenomenon of evil, the belief in demonic spirits and the ministries of deliverance and exorcism. Cardinal Suenens was particularly concerned that these topics were being raised in every region where the renewal had made a significant impact. Upon careful reflection with Catholic theologians involved in the renewal, and in particular dialogue with Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger,⁵³⁰ Suenens issued the fourth Malines document, *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness* in 1983.⁵³¹ Ratzinger, in his *Forward* to the document, noted that while rationalistic skepticism and reductionist theologies had demythologized the existence of the devil, a new awareness of evil had grown in the context of the Charismatic renewal; that awareness gave rise to the practice of "prayers for deliverance," which closely resembled the formal Catholic ritual of exorcism.⁵³² While this excess had concerned Ratzinger, Suenens contributed several practical directives that he hoped would balance two polarizing forces within the renewal: a tendency to underestimate the presence of evil in the world, and the tendency to fight that evil without a healthy sense of discernment that grounded its members in the traditions and practices of the Catholic faith.

⁵²⁹ Ibid, 317. The authors clearly believed that a theology of charisms had been insufficiently developed within the Roman Catholic Church. I will argue, in chapter 3 of this paper, that a small number of Catholic theologians have developed their own theologies of charisms, although these works have been largely ignored by or are unknown to the majority within the Roman Catholic community.

⁵³⁰ Suenens had first encountered the 35-year-old Ratzinger in his role as a *peritus* and theological advisor to Cardinal Frings, archbishop of Cologne, during all four sessions of the Second Vatican Council. Ratzinger had then served as a member of Suenens' original theological consultation for the first *Malines Document*, and agreed to write the *Forward* to the fourth *Malines Document*, shortly after he was named as the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

⁵³¹ Léon-Joseph Suenens, *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness - Malines Document IV*. English translation by Olga Prendergast. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983).

⁵³² Ibid, ix.

In 1985, Suenens authored a fifth Malines document, *Nature and Grace: A Vital Unity*.⁵³³ In it, he attempted to curb the overemphasis that had been placed on the supernatural in contrast to human nature. To correct this, his text underscored how grace and nature worked together in a vital unity. Suenens warned renewal leaders not to exaggerate any attention on exorcisms or prophetic messages; he was equally critical of views that described human nature as being driven by base ego-satisfaction.⁵³⁴ For Suenens, the key to the unity of grace and nature was the *koinonia* or *fellowship* that took place in the local community of faith; in fact, he suggested that living in shared fellowship with other Catholics was the foundation for any form of Christian renewal.⁵³⁵ In community, individual human development and the glory of God had the potential to meet together in a dynamic way.⁵³⁶

The sixth and final Malines document, entitled, *A Controversial Phenomenon: Resting in the Spirit*,⁵³⁷ was published in 1987. It dealt with the divisive issue of "resting in the Spirit," a phenomenon that provoked divergent reactions and controversy on an international level. It came about after a year-long analysis of the positive and negative reactions that were compiled from questionnaires and surveys of renewal groups in every continent. It describes the phenomenon itself, offers a critical examination and attempts to present an essential pastoral attitude and approach toward this "unprecedented grace."⁵³⁸

⁵³³ Léon-Joseph Suenens, *Nature and Grace: A Vital Unity – Malines Document V*. English translation by Olga Prendergast. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986).

⁵³⁴ *Ibid*, 2.

⁵³⁵ *Ibid*, 75.

⁵³⁶ *Ibid*, 83.

⁵³⁷ Léon-Joseph Suenens, *A Controversial Phenomenon: Resting in the Spirit – Malines Document VI*. (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1987).

⁵³⁸ *Ibid*, 7.

The term itself designates the phenomenon of falling – usually backwards – and was frequently associated with Charismatic prayer or healing services.⁵³⁹ In varying degrees, the phenomenon is found among charismatics in the Roman Catholic Church, as well as those from Anglican, Lutheran and other mainline denominations; it was especially prevalent in churches awakened by "revivals," and was most often associated with Classical Pentecostalism.⁵⁴⁰ Those who have experienced this phenomenon frequently describe encountering sensations such as, "a special presence of God," "a feeling of euphoria," and "a deep peace," etc.; some have felt they were unable to get up; some have reported being aware of a "sweet smelling fragrance;" others report having received "visions," heard "voices" or "choirs singing," etc.; in some cases, people have burst into tears, wept deeply, cried out, or even laughed uncontrollably.⁵⁴¹ While the average observer might express that they felt unsettled by such phenomenon, the actual participants come away from these phenomenon frequently reporting that they felt spiritually, emotionally and physically refreshed; many describe having felt a sense of peace and joy that lasted for several hours or days, accompanied by the desire to vocally praise God.⁵⁴²

Chapter 2.10.3 International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogues

Beginning in 1972, the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity of the Roman Catholic Church and leaders of some of the Classical Pentecostal Churches entered into

⁵³⁹ Ibid, 17. The phenomenon is typically described by verbs such as: "falling," "swaying," "collapsing," "letting go," etc. Other terms were inherited from Classical Pentecostalism, such as: "Being slain in the Spirit," "Overpowering of the Spirit," "Resting in the Spirit," and "The Blessing."

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid, 18.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid, 21

⁵⁴² Ibid, 22.

an international dialogue.⁵⁴³ As a result of what began as a simple "dialogue on spirituality," five documents were issued in its first phase, between 1972 and 1976.⁵⁴⁴ The members of the international dialogue⁵⁴⁵ clarified that their conclusions did not necessarily represent the *official position* of either the Roman Catholic Church or the Classical Pentecostal Churches that they represented; their discussions did not formally commit either side to the theological positions that were expressed, but the reports were submitted to their churches for suitable use and reaction.⁵⁴⁶

The first statement, *Report of the Meeting at Zürich-Horgen, June 20-24, 1972*, identified that the Pentecostal movements laid particular stress on full participation in the reality of being "baptized in the Spirit." They agreed that the fundamental attitude of Christians should be one of openness to what the Holy Spirit worked in them. They agreed that life in the Spirit could be manifested in signs and accompanying charisms that went beyond the individual's natural abilities. They also agreed that charisms were subject to the discernment of the spiritual authority within the community.⁵⁴⁷

⁵⁴³ This first phase also included participants of the charismatic movement in both the Anglican and Protestant churches. To the astonishment of many within the membership of the World Council of Churches, this official dialogue was initiated between the two largest ecclesial traditions of the day, which also shared the peculiar distinction of being outside the full membership of the WCC at that time. Cf.: Jelle Creemers, "Time Will Teach Us... Reflections on Thirty-five years of Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue" *Ecclesiology*, vol. 5 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2009), 325.

⁵⁴⁴ "Five Documents from the Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), 373-395.

⁵⁴⁵ Two notable member of the international dialogue were Fr. Kilian McDonnell, OSB, director of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research in Collegeville, MN and longtime collaborator of Cardinal Suenens, and the Rev. David du Plessis, a well-known leader within Pentecostal Churches and the only Pentecostal minister invited to be an *observer* during the Second Vatican Council. His continued participation in the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue cost him the loss of his ministerial accreditation within the Assemblies of God (for eighteen years), mainly due to the AOG's suspicion towards ecumenical dialogue, and the outspoken role du Plessis had within the World Council of Churches.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 375-376,

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 376-378

The Second Statement, *Report of the Meeting at Rome, June 18-22, 1973*, identified the background of the Pentecostal movements and experiences in the history of the Church. They agreed that in the early centuries of the Church, the celebration of Christian initiation was accompanied by signs of the Holy Spirit. They agreed that religious experiences differ with regard to certain charismatic gifts, and that individuals who did not have the same manifestations were not to be considered inferior Christians. They also agreed to study the relationship between the charismatic and the sacramental dimensions of ecclesial life.⁵⁴⁸

The third statement, *Report of the Meeting at Schloss Craheim, June 10-14, 1974*, centered on further discussion of Christian initiation as well as infant and adult baptism. While it was agreed that the Holy Spirit is the agent in regeneration, there was inconclusive argument about Confirmation with regard to whether it was a release of the Spirit already given, or whether it was a further impartation of the Spirit toward charismatic ministry; the meeting participants were unclear whether it was simply initiation, or a kind of ordination. On the subject of "the laying on of hands," Pentecostals and Catholics agreed it was part of the received practices of both churches. On the question of infant baptism, the members made progress toward mutual understanding, but full agreement was not reached; the participants did agree that grace operates in advance of our conscious awareness. There was inconclusive discussion on the pastoral situation of people baptized in infancy but seeking a new experience of baptism later in life; Pentecostals suggested that re-baptism in the strict sense was unacceptable to all.⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid, 378-380.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid, 380-382.

The fourth statement, *Report of the Meeting at Venice, May 21-26, 1975*, noted that the revisions to the post-Conciliar liturgy allowed more opportunities for the type of individual spontaneous prayer and singing that Charismatics were accustomed to practice; at the same time Pentecostal tradition had come to accept the development of a certain structure in its worship that had been moving in the direction of liturgical types of prayer. Agreement was reached that all genuinely charismatic phenomena had both a divine and human aspect; this meant that the diverse manifestations could be subject to psychological, linguistic, sociological and anthropo-logical limitations of the human person – allowing for errors of judgment. Both sides agreed that the gift of discernment was essential to authentic ministry; whether speaking of the charism of the discernment of spirits (*diakriseis pneumátōn* – 1 Cor. 12:10) or the kind of discernment that came through the testing of spirits (*dokimázete tà pneúmata* – 1 John 4:1), each exercised in the power of the Spirit acted to safeguard the development of the Christian community and its diversity of ministries.⁵⁵⁰

The fifth and final statement of the first phase of the international dialogue was entitled, *Report of the Meeting at Rome, May 23-29, 1976*. The document included a historical account of the origins of the international dialogue, as well as the frank explanation that, unlike the bilateral dialogues with the Anglicans or Lutherans, the dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and some of the Classical Pentecostal Churches was not primarily aimed at securing a permanent structural union, but a simple unity of prayer, spirituality, and theological reflection. It clearly identified that for Pentecostal Christians “being baptized in the Spirit” was understood as a decisive and

⁵⁵⁰ Ibid, 382-385.

distinct moment apart from the individual's conversion to Christ.⁵⁵¹ The largest portion of the statement was a summary review of the first four statements, along with a brief but positive assessment of Charismatic prayer and praise.

The next three phases of their international dialogues focused on a variety of topics, including: the confessional identities and traditions of both churches (1977 – 1982); their various perspectives on *koinonia* (1985 – 1989); and their concepts of evangelization, proselytism, and common witness (1990 – 1997). But it was during the fifth phase of the international dialogues (1998 to 2006) that the two teams agreed to discuss both the biblical and patristic understandings of “Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Spirit.” The annual meetings of this fifth phase of the Dialogues had focused on six specific subtopics: the process of becoming a Christian (Bolton, Ontario, Canada – June 1998); faith and Christian initiation (Venice, Italy – July 1999); conversion and Christian initiation (Vienna, Austria – July 2000); Christian experience in community (Celje, Slovenia – June/July 2001); Christian formation and discipleship (Sierra Madre, California, USA – July 2002); and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit (Rottenburg, Germany – July 2003). Plenary drafting sessions were also begun in Rottenburg, and then continued in Torhout, Belgium (2004), Prague, Czech Republic (2005), and Bose, Italy (2006).

These final working sessions produced the text, *On Becoming a Christian: Insights from Scripture and the Patristic Writings, with some Contemporary Reflections*,⁵⁵² published in 2006 as a Final Report of the Fifth Phase.⁵⁵³ This document

⁵⁵¹ Ibid, 385-386.

⁵⁵² *On Becoming a Christian: Insights from Scripture and the Patristic Writings, with some Contemporary Reflections (1998-2006) – Report of the Fifth Phase of the International Dialogue Between Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders and the Catholic Church*, taken from the Pontifical Council for

initially began as an unofficial working response to an early draft of *Christian Initiation and Baptism of the Spirit*,⁵⁵⁴ a textbook that was co-authored by Kilian McDonnell.⁵⁵⁵ McDonnell had maintained that baptism in the Spirit had a direct relationship to the earliest understandings of Christian initiation and was actually regarded as “constitutive of the church.”⁵⁵⁶ By undertaking a complete review of this book and other related texts, the Dialogue team stated that they could not determine whether the baptism in the Spirit provided a “bridge” between their two communities.⁵⁵⁷ While they both respected the Bible as “normative” for the faith and life of the church, the Pentecostals, in particular, thought that a study of the Church Fathers might enrich their own understanding. Despite the different authority that each tradition had given to the Fathers, it was agreed that “the patristic writings *may* be seen as having a privileged place in the post-biblical church.”⁵⁵⁸

In the central section of the document, the Dialogue team found themselves in agreement on the centrality of *experience* in the role of the Christian life. They noted that when the grace of the Spirit touched the heart of an individual, “a person consciously encountered the Lord,” and “an authentic experience of God” took place.⁵⁵⁹ Experience, here, was seen to give a dimension of actuality and firmness to faith; they agreed that a conversion had “a strong experiential quality which sometimes occurred more as an event

Promoting Christian Unity pages of the Vatican website, at the hypertext:
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/eccl-comm-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20060101_becoming-a-christian_en.html

⁵⁵³ The document is considered a *study report* by the Vatican’s PCPCU.

⁵⁵⁴ Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, 2nd Rev. Ed. (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994).

⁵⁵⁵ McDonnell had served as the Dialogue’s first Catholic co-moderator from 1972 through 2000, and as one of the participants thereafter. John A. Radano (Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity) served as the Catholic co-moderator from 2001 to 2006. David du Plessis had been the original Pentecostal co-moderator, and was then replaced by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr. (Assemblies of God).

⁵⁵⁶ *On Becoming a Christian*, no. 7.

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid*, no. 7.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid*, no. 7 and 8.

⁵⁵⁹ *Ibid*, no. 140

and at other times more as a process.”⁵⁶⁰ Because of this, they then turned their focus to the actual experience of the baptism of the Spirit. Here, both traditions affirmed the grace present in the Charismatic renewal; so, in documenting the biblical, patristic and contemporary understandings of this grace, they attempted to provide the best and most current research on the subject. Of particular interest, was the patristic section that dealt with the teachings of Hilary of Poitiers (c. 314-367), Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386), Basil of Caesarea (c. 330-379), and John Chrysostom (c. 354-407).

For Hilary, those reborn through the sacrament of baptism “begin to have insight into the mysteries of faith, to prophesy and to speak with wisdom, become steadfast in hope and receive the gifts of healing and domination over demons” (*Tract on the Psalms 64:15*); when filled with “the power of divine grace,” charisms were seen as “profitable gifts” (*On the Trinity 8:30*). For Cyril, his pre-Easter instructions to catechumens related the Spirit to the gifts poured out upon the newly initiated: “Great indeed, and all-powerful in gifts, and wonderful, is the Holy Spirit” (*Catechetical Lectures 16:22*); he also noted that, “just as one who plunges into the waters and is baptized is encompassed on all sides by the waters, so were they also baptized completely by the Holy Spirit” (*Catechetical Lectures 17:14*). For Basil, the Spirit held the church together with the charisms: “[W]e are all members one of another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is given us;” these charisms functioned “as need requires, in prophecies, or in healings, or in some other actual carrying into effect of His potential action” (*On the Holy Spirit, 26:61*). For John Chrysostom, who wrote in contrast to Basil’s earlier text, his particular concern was that the charisms had already become “obscure” by his time, due to the “ignorance of the facts” and the gradual cessation of those charisms “that used to occur but now no longer

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid, no. 141.

take place” (*On 1 Corinthians, 29*); Chrysostom also seemed to indicate that some of the charisms in the early community had continued in a new hierarchical or “institutionalized form” (*On Romans, 14*).⁵⁶¹

The weight given to the teachings of Hilary, Cyril, Basil and Chrysostom can be seen in their almost universal acceptance by Christians. They have been recognized as four authoritative witnesses who identified the faith of the early church, and who clearly demonstrated that the baptism of the Spirit and accompanying charisms were *integral* to Christian initiation. For these fourth-century giants, then, the experience of the baptism of the Spirit was both “constitutive” and “normative” for the life of the universal church.⁵⁶²

After considering the biblical, patristic and contemporary understandings of both the baptism of the Spirit and the charismatic gifts, the Pentecostal and Catholic members identified a substantial diversity between both communities, as well as within each community itself. The two communities also recognized a fascinating parallel in the ways that each had experienced the Holy Spirit in the twentieth century: On January 1, 1901, Pope Leo XIII had entrusted the new century to the Holy Spirit, during an audience in Vatican City; this followed several “prophetic requests” from within the Catholic Church itself, in response to his Apostolic Exhortation (1895) and his Encyclical (1897), in which he had called for an increased devotion to the Holy Spirit, as well as a new *Novena to the Holy Spirit* during the nine days leading up to Pentecost – all aimed at the renewal of church and society. On that very same day, in Topeka, Kansas, a young student received the baptism in the Spirit and began praying in tongues; Pentecostals point to this day as

⁵⁶¹ Ibid, no. 212 to 215.

⁵⁶² Ibid, no. 7, 231 and 234.

the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement in the United States.⁵⁶³ While this parallel may not be widely known, the Dialogue participants felt that it was a remarkable coincidence that spoke to the activity and presence of the Holy Spirit within both communities. It is striking to imagine the congruence between a Catholic pope, chanting in Latin the *Veni Sancti Spiritus*, and a young female student, in the heartland of the United States and separated by a vast ocean, who was experiencing a deep outpouring of the Spirit that inspired her to speak out in a spontaneous and unfamiliar charismatic tongue.

While these five phases and their respective documents established a longstanding and positive ecumenical dialogue between Catholics and Pentecostals, we are reminded that the purpose of these dialogues was to establish a unity of prayer, spirituality, and theological reflection. While certain *doctrinal agreements* were clearly established, the primary purpose of these discussions remained the *elimination of mutual misunderstandings* between Catholics and Pentecostals. To that end, these international dialogues can be considered quite successful.

Chapter 2.11 Concluding Remarks

While it is clear that the ecclesial statements reviewed in this chapter were diverse and represented a variety of approaches to the Charismatic renewal, several patterns can be deduced from the entire body of texts. First, the Charismatic renewal penetrated directly into the heart of the major Churches between the 1960's and the 1980's; it surfaced in Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian-Reformed, and other

⁵⁶³ Ibid, no. 271.

Protestant Churches, as well as in the Catholic Church in Europe, North and South America, Africa, Australia and various island nations. Second, the vast majority of *initial* ecclesial statements attempted to understand the external manifestations of glossolalia or speaking in tongues; a second issue in order of importance was the biblical and historical theologies of the “baptism in (of, with) the Spirit,” as well as a question as to the interrelationship between water baptism and Spirit baptism; there was no universal consensus on whether this experience constituted a revivification of the Spirit previously received in conversion-water baptism, or whether this experience actually constituted a “second blessing,” a traditional doctrine of some Classical Pentecostal Churches.

Third, while the vast majority of early documents called for some level of caution towards the Charismatic renewal, they gradually opened to the movement over additional time, as this was frequently documented within the historical statements they produced; a very common caution was voiced toward the unwarranted proselytism of practicing Christians toward membership in classical Pentecostal churches. Fourth, with mounting internal pressures to recognize the individual and ecclesial benefits of the renewal, a variety of churches and communions produced a second distinct level of *international* ecclesial documentation, mostly supportive, yet with appropriate recommendations to ensure the internal ecclesial peace and harmony; these included the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Communion, the World Council of Churches, etc.

Fifth, many of the later ecclesial statements recognized the ecumenical benefits of the Charismatic renewal, as one defining element was its ability to transcend ecclesial boundaries; a high percentage of Charismatics had occasionally, some even frequently, joined together with members of other churches for Charismatic prayer and worship,

enough to warrant hierarchical interest and even warnings against a loss of “faith identity” and the adoption of incompatible doctrines. Sixth, the international levels of Catholic participation in the renewal led to the appointment of a Papal Representative, an international coordinating office based in Rome, the establishment of regular meetings of representatives with the Pope and Vatican Curia, as well as the pontifical and canonical recognition of “private associations of the faithful” for various Charismatic groups within the Catholic Church itself.

With the creation of the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue, the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and roughly 95 representatives from some Classical Pentecostal Churches established a longstanding ecumenical relationship with each other. This dialogue allowed theologians from the Catholic and Pentecostal churches to explore similarities and differences in their approaches toward speaking in tongues, prophesy, healing, the rites of Christian initiation, and how Christians understood their membership within the community. As a result of what originally began as a simple "dialogue on spirituality," five phases of ecumenical dialogue took place over a period of thirty-five years.

The most important ecumenical text produced from this international dialogue came in the publication of *On Becoming a Christian: Insights from Scripture and the Patristic Writings*, published in 2006 as the Final Report of the Fifth Phase. The nucleus of this document is clearly the patristic contributions of Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom on the relationship of the charismatic gifts and the baptism in the Spirit to the Sacramental rites in the earliest accounts of Christian initiation. The weight and authority of these four Church Fathers allowed the

Catholics and classical Pentecostals to find deeper meaning and even agreement on various points in their discussions, and set a clear tone for the coming future of their joint discussions on the Holy Spirit and his charismatic graces.

With this in mind, I will now turn to some significant contributions made by Catholic theologians on the charismatic dimensions of Pneumatology over the last fifty years. I will analyze some particular writings of Küng, Rahner, Congar, McDonnell and Montague and their contributions to the subject.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS TO A PNEUMATOLOGY OF CHARISMS

CHAPTER THREE

Chapter 3.1 Introduction

Having analyzed the ecclesial statements of various churches who have dealt in some way with the spontaneous integration of the Charismatic renewal into their own communities, I would suggest that it is just as critically important to understand the insights and contributions of respected Catholic theologians who have examined and even promoted a variety of charismatic elements within their own pneumatological approaches in their specific service to the Roman Catholic Church. Suenens, the protagonist and papal-appointed shepherd over the Charismatic movements within the Roman Catholic Church, had himself approached, listened to, and relied upon, the expertise of leading Catholic theologians who made up his private inner circle, especially those who had distinction of being appointed by John XXIII as *periti* to the Second Vatican Council. The magnitude of the combined contributions by five theologians will be better understood from within their immediate historical context; to this end, I will analyze the work of three key Catholic theologians who served as *periti* during the Second Vatican Council, as well as two contemporary Catholic theologians who have

worked jointly to elaborate some further aspects of a pneumatology of charisms in our own time.

In this present chapter, I will argue that the pneumatological contributions of these three *periti* – Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, SJ and Yves Congar, OP – together with the joint work of two contemporary theologians – George T. Montague, SM and Kilian McDonnell, OSB – constitutes a highly significant, but still unappreciated response to the symbolic call of Pope John XXIII to “open the windows of the Church to a new Pentecost! “

Chapter 3.2 Hans Küng

Hans Küng, the (then) 35-year-old Swiss Catholic priest and professor of Dogmatics and Ecumenical Theology at Eberhard Karls University in Tübingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany, was appointed as one of the youngest *periti*⁵⁶⁴ during the Second Vatican Council. In his recent memoirs,⁵⁶⁵ he revealed that he was the ghost writer behind the speech delivered by Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens on “The Charismatic Dimensions of the Church.”⁵⁶⁶ Suenens, who had met Küng prior to the Council, had sought his advice on redirecting the Council’s momentum, and, in particular, had asked

⁵⁶⁴ As a Catholic priest and professor of theology, Küng initially served as an individual *peritus* for Bishop Carl-Joseph Leiprecht of Rottenburg, Germany, who dismissed him toward the end of the first Session of the Council. Pope John XXIII immediately appointed Küng as a *general peritus* of the Council, which gave Küng the freedom to engage in building consensus through behind-the-scenes discussions with various groups of German and English speaking bishops for the rest of the Council’s remaining three Sessions.

⁵⁶⁵ Cf.: Hans Küng, *My Struggle for Freedom: Memoirs*. English translation by John Bowden. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2003), and Hans Küng, *Disputed Truth: Memoirs II*, English translation by John Bowden. (New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing, 2008).

⁵⁶⁶ The text of this speech can be found in Léon-Joseph Suenens, “The Charismatic Dimension of the Church,” in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, Hans Küng, Yves Congar, OP, and Daniel O’Hanlon, SJ, eds. (Glen Rock, NJ: Deus Books/Paulist Press, 1964), 29f.

him to draft some theological notes on several potential topics for debate by the assembled bishops. Küng knew of Suenens' mutual interest in the charismatic dimensions of the church and his specific recognition of and appreciation for lay charisms, and had agreed to provide Suenens with a biblically-based sketch of charisms, based upon Paul's ecclesiology. Suenens was thrilled with the depth of the notes and the clear theological articulation presented by the young Swiss professor, and actually read Küng's notes *verbatim* in his speech on the Council floor, delivered in October of 1963. Küng's memoirs note several things about Suenens' speech to the Council fathers:

Presented in his clear sonorous voice with a slight French accent, the speech makes a strong impression. Alongside the hierarchical structure of the church there is a charismatic dimension. Not only the pastors but all Christians have their own charisma, their spiritual gift, their personal calling. Alongside the charisms of the apostles, the charisms of the prophets and the teachers are particularly to be valued in the church. Indeed, in pastoral praxis, the inconspicuous charisms of the laity, say in catechesis, proclamation, social and charitable action, are to be taken particularly seriously.⁵⁶⁷

Here, Küng has recalled a major trajectory of the presentation on charisms: specific attention to each person's individual "charisma" as both 1) a spiritual gift and 2) their personal calling. In fact, his prepared notes had placed specific emphasis on the potentiality that the "charisms" of lay individuals were, in fact, to be taken seriously by the assembled hierarchy. As I argued in Chapter 1, the most direct result of this particular speech – and thus Küng's specific contribution here – was the explicit inclusion of

⁵⁶⁷ Küng, *My Struggle for Freedom: Memoirs*, 361.

multiple charismatic emphases in the conciliar documents, particularly the six specific references to charismatic elements in *Lumen Gentium*.

Küng had first written about these charismatic elements of Catholic ecclesiology in his *Structures of the Church*, published the previous year (1962), just prior to the assembling of the world's Catholic bishops at the Council. In responding to the ecumenical theology of Edmund Schlink⁵⁶⁸ and the progressive exegetical contributions of Ernst Käsemann,⁵⁶⁹ Küng had begun formulating a biblical critique of traditional Catholic ecclesiology, which, he argued, had been heavily influenced by the theology of the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. By balancing the traditional Catholic emphasis on the hierarchical, governing structures with a renewed emphasis to integrate the elements of Pauline ecclesiology, Küng had intentionally hoped to encourage the assembled Council Fathers to recover the missing charismatic elements of Church life. In speaking of the ecclesiology within the authentic Pauline epistles, he boldly suggested, "The congregation itself is presumed to be a community of manifold charismatic ministries, a cosmos of different spiritual gifts and ministries, and it is addressed as such."⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁸ Schlink was a Lutheran theologian who completed a doctorate in psychiatry at Marburg, and a second doctorate in theology at Münster under Karl Barth. Schlink was in the Protestant Faculty of Theology at Heidelberg from 1946 to 1971, established the first ecumenical institute in a German university, was an invited Lutheran observer at the Second Vatican Council, and was a founding delegate at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches.

⁵⁶⁹ Käsemann was a Lutheran theologian who wrote a dissertation on Pauline ecclesiology under Rudolf Bultmann, and taught in the Protestant Faculty of Theology at Tübingen from 1959 to 1971. He argued for a reinvestment in Pauline ecclesiology as a means to support efforts for church renewal.

⁵⁷⁰ Hans Küng. *Structures of the Church*. English translation by Thomas Nelson and Sons. (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1982), 174.

To advance his theological position further, Küng then published a more detailed essay entitled, “The Charismatic Structure of the Church,”⁵⁷¹ during the busy nine-month break between the third and fourth sessions of the Council. He had quickly grasped that section 12 of *Lumen Gentium* – on the charismatic elements of the church – provided fertile ground for the entrance of the Catholic Church into the ongoing global ecumenical discussions; he had also witnessed firsthand that certain traditionalist groups of Catholic bishops had attempted to curtail or even oppose the importance of charismatic gifts during the Council debates.⁵⁷² As such, Küng sought to provide a deeper theological validation and background for the assembled Council Fathers, as well as the Catholic Church as a whole. He began by noting that *Lumen Gentium* had simply built upon the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*⁵⁷³ before it, but that the constitution’s final edition⁵⁷⁴ had “explicitly and repeatedly acknowledged the existence of charismata in the Church.”⁵⁷⁵

Küng noted the dogmatic constitution’s Christocentric focus and its emphasis in which the *whole people of God* shares in the prophetic “witness” and “office;” from this text, he zeroed in on the principle that all baptized Christians were both communally and individually “anointed, filled and moved by the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁷⁶ Still, he went on to critique the dogmatic constitution by insisting that the Church is built upon the apostles

⁵⁷¹ Küng’s article (as well as each of the articles in volume 4, and many *Concilium* volumes thereafter) was granted an *imprimatur* by my own bishop, the Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan, DD (Worcester, MA). Flanagan had met Küng during the Second Vatican Council, had chaired the US Bishops’ subcommittee on Catholic-Orthodox relations, and was a longstanding supporter of *Concilium*, even granting his *imprimatur* to the series’ volumes for many years.

⁵⁷² Hans Küng. “The Charismatic Structure of the Church.” *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*, vol. 4: *The Church and Ecumenism*. (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1965), 41.

⁵⁷³ Cf.: Pope Pius XII. *Mystici Corporis*, 17. Taken from the Vatican website hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi_en.html

⁵⁷⁴ Cf.: Chapter 1, page 36. *Lumen Gentium*, had been formally approved by the Council Fathers during its third session on November 21, 1964, by a final vote of 2,151 to 5.

⁵⁷⁵ Hans Küng. “The Charismatic Structures of the Church,” 41.

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 42.

“and prophets” (Eph. 2:20), and that the text “clearly affirms that *every* Christian is *directly* enlightened by the Spirit” (emphases his).⁵⁷⁷ He concluded that the whole Church existed as a *pneumatic reality*. For Küng, *Lumen Gentium* distinguished a *pneumatic character* in both the *sensus fidei* and the *various charismata*.⁵⁷⁸

Küng suggested that the charismatic dimensions of the church had been misunderstood for many centuries; he saw this as the combined result of widespread clericalism⁵⁷⁹ and legalism⁵⁸⁰ within the ranks of the hierarchy, as well as longstanding ecclesiologies that had emphasized the texts and the teachings of the *Pastoral Epistles* and the *Acts of the Apostles*, to the exclusion of the ecclesiologies present within the Pauline epistles.⁵⁸¹ He reasoned that the much earlier and undisputed authorship of certain Pauline epistles (i.e. *I & II Thessalonians* and *I Corinthians*⁵⁸²) actually gave them “a priority of origin,” that must directly impact and foundationally ground all future Catholic ecclesiologies.⁵⁸³ Küng went on to argue that the *derived witness* of both *Acts* and the *Pastoral Epistles* had placed their ecclesial emphasis on hierarchical structures (i.e. *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi* and *diakonoi*) and a theology of *office* that “fitted” the Spirit into the ordination rites. The early Pauline epistles, however, presupposed the existence of more charismatic structures, repeatedly mentioned the terms *charismata* and

⁵⁷⁷ Ibid, 43.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid, 43. Küng suggested that this *sensus fidei* is operative when the entire body of the faithful manifests a supernatural discernment in matters of faith and morals. He also stipulates that this *sensus fidei* is operative when there is clearly a *universal agreement* in matters of faith and morals. As a direct result of this *universal agreement*, the entire body of the faithful cannot err.

⁵⁷⁹ Küng identifies clericalism as the prerogative of the clergy alone to determine all real and decisive activity and initiative within the Church; such determination is not open to the other ranks of the people of God.

⁵⁸⁰ Küng identifies legalism as the mistrust of the free operation of God’s Spirit in the Church, especially since “the Spirit blows where he will and does not wait for official permission.” He saw the legalism of the hierarchy as an issue of arrogance and narcissistic control.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid, 47.

⁵⁸² Küng adopted the exegetical view that the earliest epistles of undoubted Pauline authorship were *I & II Thessalonians* and *I Corinthians*.

⁵⁸³ Ibid, 48.

pneumatika, and completely contrasted the more traditional Catholic ecclesiologies with what he identified as the *true evangelium* of both Jesus and Paul during their earthly lives. Küng went on to assert that this longstanding tradition had developed an almost exclusive ecclesiology of hierarchical structures, at the tragic expense of the earlier Pauline charismatic and pneumatic structures; this led to a specific ecclesial neglect of the *charismata* and *pneumatika* as *prerogatives* of each and every individual within the *whole people of God*. For Küng, then, the importance of Catholic and ecumenical issues that arise from this neglected aspect of ecclesiology cannot be overrated; the rediscovery of the *charismata* is the rediscovery of the real ecclesiology of Paul.⁵⁸⁴

Küng had also sought to explore and settle three related issues: First, he questioned whether the *charismata* are actually *extraordinary* or *common* phenomena. He noted that *Lumen Gentium* had explicitly distinguished “the more outstanding” phenomena from those that seemed to be “more simple and widely diffused,” suggesting that there were both extraordinary and ordinary types of *charismata* manifested among the baptized Christians; Küng inferred from this that those charged with composing the dogmatic constitution had concluded that it was a clear misunderstanding to think of *charismata* as mainly *extraordinary*, *miraculous* and *sensational* phenomena. He clarified that Paul had “accepted all the gifts of the Spirit gladly,” but had later promoted the *relative significance* of some of the more sensational gifts, such as tongues;⁵⁸⁵ Paul himself had been critical of certain *pneumatika* unleashed in Hellenistic ecstasies and

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid, 49.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid, 50.

miracles;⁵⁸⁶ yet he also explicitly encouraged the types of charismata that attracted *less attention*, such as exhortation, consolation, service, help and administration.⁵⁸⁷ Küng reasoned from all this that the charismata are certainly not limited to the realm of extraordinary phenomena; at the same time, he suggested that all the charismata were to be seen as “*ordinary phenomena*” in the life of the Church.⁵⁸⁸ And while noting that Paul commended the Corinthians to “strive after the greater gifts,” and the “still more excellent way” of love, Küng suggested that *the ordinary character of the charismata* became especially clear when one saw their real variety.⁵⁸⁹

Second, Küng attacked the misunderstanding that there is only one kind or class of charismata, such as those linked with preaching. He made reference to Paul’s clear implication in I Corinthians 12:4-5 that there are “different kinds of gifts” and “different kinds of service” that are needed in each Christian community; he also concluded from *Lumen Gentium* 12 that each and every member is made “fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices which contribute to the renewal and building up of the church.” He noted that the dogmatic constitution clearly distinguished between sacraments and charismata, and that the Pauline epistles refrained from institutionalizing the charismata in any way. Küng drew attention to various lists of charismata drawn up by Paul (Cf.: I Corinthians 12:4-11, 28-31; Romans 12:6-8; etc.), and categorized them into three major groups, i.e. charismata that are connected with: 1) preaching, 2) practical aid, or 3) leadership in the various communities.⁵⁹⁰ Küng determined from this that every calling

⁵⁸⁶ Küng noted that after his critique of the sensationalism of the Hellenistic pneumatika, Paul preferred to use the term “charisma” from that point forward in his writings to the various churches of the Mediterranean.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid, 51.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid, 51.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid, 52.

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid, 53-54.

implied a sharing in charisma, and that every charisma was a call to service; he suggested that every spiritual gift and every calling was, in fact, a charisma – one that was taken into service within the specific community, and simultaneously gave each distinct individual in that community a purpose. Küng understood that an infinite variety of charismata exist, and that there was an unlimited distribution of them throughout the Church.⁵⁹¹

Third, Küng underscored that it was a serious misunderstanding to limit the charismata to *small groups, special classes* or *certain ranks* of those endowed with spiritual gifts. To suggest that charismatic gifts were concentrated in only a few persons, such as in the appointed leaders of the communities (*episkopoi, presbyteroi* and *diakonoi*), was completely erroneous. In Küng's opinion, the New Testament showed that it was "wholly impossible to limit the charismata to officeholders;"⁵⁹² *Lumen Gentium*, in fact, also carefully insisted that these *special graces* were given "to faithful of every rank." Küng followed this, by insisting that no one individual could possess all of the charismata – including those who were directly in charge of administration in the church.

The administrative gifts do in no way lead to a kind of 'leading class' that stands apart from the community and rises above it to dominate it. The whole New Testament deliberately avoids the secular terms of office (*archê, time, and telos*) where the Christian community is concerned, because all these terms express a *dominating* attitude. On the contrary, the New Testament uses instead of these the term 'service' (*diakonia*). But Paul prefers the more comprehensive idea of *charisma* (Rom. 12:6-8),

⁵⁹¹ Ibid, 54.

⁵⁹² Ibid, 55.

which exactly describes the essence of all ecclesial services and offices...

The *charisma* does not fall under the heading ‘ecclesial office,’ but the ecclesial office does fall under the heading ‘*charisma*’.⁵⁹³

The charismata, according to Küng, are not the privilege of a few elect individuals, but belong to the entire community of the faithful. He emphatically argues, “Where a Church or a community thrives only on officeholders and not on all the members, one may well wonder in all seriousness whether the Spirit has not been thrown out with the charismata.”

Küng concludes his article by proposing that each and every *charisma* or *charismatic gift* is to be understood as “God’s call to the individual person in view of a specific service within the community, including the ability to perform this service.”⁵⁹⁴ Each *charisma* is actually understood to be a concrete expression of God’s own *charis* or “grace-giving power” – a *charis* that seizes and inspires each individual to share his or her gifts, in the service of Christ, with one another. For Küng, then, *charisma*, *call* and *service* interconnect and overlap in meaning.⁵⁹⁵ The resulting *energēmata* or “powerful workings” of each and every *charisma* are the manifestations of the Holy Spirit’s presence within the community⁵⁹⁶ – one that is actually edifies and unifies by the very fact that each Christian has his or her own *charisma* to share, in order to build the eschatological community that waits in hope between the *already* and the *not yet*.⁵⁹⁷

⁵⁹³ Ibid, 57.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid, 59.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid, 59.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid, 60.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid, 61.

Chapter 3.3 Karl Rahner

Karl Rahner, the German Jesuit and one of the most influential 20th century theologians, served as *peritus* to Franz Cardinal König of Vienna during the Second Vatican Council. He studied philosophy in Freiburg under Martin Heidegger, taught on the university faculties of Innsbruck, Vienna, Munich and Münster, was one of the first appointees to the inaugural term of the *International Theological Commission* (1969-1974), and later received the honored status of *professor emeritus* at both Munich and Innsbruck. He had a great amount of influence on many of the conciliar documents, and was one of the seven primary theologians to collaborate in the creative vision of *Lumen Gentium*. Because of his direct involvement here, his particular insights on the *charismatic dynamic* of the church are quite valuable.

One of Rahner's most significant contributions toward this *charismatic dynamic* in pneumatology appeared in his *Quaestiones disputatae 32, The Dynamic Element in the Church*, published in 1964, during the months between the second and third sessions of the Council. This collection republished an earlier essay (c. 1957), "The Charismatic Element in the Church." He had begun his investigation by reasserting the charisma of office, and emphasizing that the Spirit was specifically "promised and given to the ecclesiastical ministry." Rahner qualified this statement by reaffirming the traditional Catholic understanding that the *official Church* and its ecclesiastical office must be assured by this promise of the Spirit. He then drew the distinction that this ecclesiastical office and ministry were actually "charismatic in character," and transcended the institutional order "in contradistinction to what is purely institutional, administered by

men, subject to calculation, expressible in laws and rules.” Rahner perceived that every single form of ecclesiastical office and ministry must *necessarily* be charismatic; he further argued that the ecclesiastical office itself – not simply the individual who holds office – must be characterized by charismatic gifts, especially if a hierarchically-constituted Church is to remain a living reality, abiding in the Spirit.⁵⁹⁸

Rahner categorizes a second dimension of the Spirit’s activity in the Church, which he identifies as those *charismata* that are “in addition to *and* outside her official ministry.”⁵⁹⁹ He took his lead from Pius XII’s encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, articulating that it is possible to say that there are Christians endowed with the charismatic gifts of the Spirit “outside of the *sacred ministry*,” who are “not merely recipients of orders from the hierarchy,” but are themselves “men and women of outstanding sanctity” through whom Christ “directly” guides his Church – apart from the hierarchy – through various *charismata* that are not linked to *sacred office* and that do not belong to her *official ministry*.⁶⁰⁰

Here, as did Küng, Rahner touches upon St. Paul’s concept of *charismata* as found in the epistles 1 Corinthians 12-14 and Romans 12:1-8; 16:1.⁶⁰¹ He first establishes that all ecclesiastical ministries are gifts of the Spirit, both as *office* and as a *pneumatic enablement* to fulfill the office. Second, he recognizes what he terms the *non-institutional* spiritual gifts, and acknowledges these as equally important for building up the body of Christ. Third, in addressing traditional Catholic categorizations of grace, he demonstrates

⁵⁹⁸ Karl Rahner, “The Charismatic Element in the Church,” in *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, from the original *Quaestiones disputatae* 32, transl. by W. J. O’Hara. (New York, NY: Herder & Herder, 1964), 42-47.

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid, 49.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid, 50-52

⁶⁰¹ Rahner had summarized the basic teachings on the *charismata* as found in 1 Corinthians 12-14, and Romans 12: 1-8; 16:1, and included a summary of the teachings in Ephesians 4:1-6, as well.

that Paul does not make clear distinctions between a charismatic grace as a *gratia gratum faciens* and one as a *gratia gratis data*. Rahner understood that St. Paul had envisioned each charismatic grace as one that sanctifies the recipient and that also benefits the Body of Christ, simultaneously and reciprocally. Rahner sees that this particular point is vital:

It is a very evangelical way of looking at it. For how else could one truly sanctify oneself except by unselfish service to others in the one Body of Christ by the power of the Spirit? And how could one fail to be sanctified if one faithfully takes up and fulfills one's real and true function in the Body of Christ? If both are done... that for Paul is a charisma of the Spirit of the Church, and it belongs just as essentially to the body and life of the Church as the official ministries.⁶⁰²

Fourth, through St. Paul, Rahner sees that this *charismatic dynamic* belongs to the *essence* of the Church, and has *always existed* in the Church. He notes that while some have attributed a certain visible charismatic endowment solely to the early Church, there is no point in the history of the Church where the *charismatic dynamic* has not existed; to miss identifying this fundamental element in the Church is, for Rahner, to completely misunderstand Church history. Finally, the *charismata* are not only properties of the essence of the Church, but they are also *criteria* that convince and lead to faith; the charismatic elements, here, in their temporal and spatial unity and totality, can be a motive of faith, since, more than any other historical development, the church proves herself, again and again, to be “the Church of the great charismata.”⁶⁰³

⁶⁰² Ibid, 55.

⁶⁰³ Ibid, 68-69.

Rahner then observes five important *consequences* that arise from a renewed awareness of this charismatic dynamic in the Church. First, he urges a generous *toleration* by office-holders toward what he identifies as the charismatic stirrings that arise outside official ministries and that have not yet been positively approved by ecclesial authorities; for Rahner, executive authority in the Church must always cultivate the awareness that it is neither self-sufficient nor a system of totalitarian control. Church authorities must be conscious of their clear responsibility to accept the existence of charismatic wisdom “from below,” without any condescension. Second, in this divinely-inspired dualism of charisma and office, Rahner recognizes a *democratic* aspect to the nature of the Church; he sees a plurality in the nature of this charismatic dynamic that originates from the people of God, and that is directly guided by God. Here, the whole people of God can together discern the Spirit in the Church, along with the ecclesiastical authority.⁶⁰⁴

A third consequence of this dynamic, according to Rahner, is that the multiplicity of charismatic impulses brings inevitable *disagreements*. Coexisting efforts within the church require a charity that allows the other to be different; the principle of Christian charity implies that each Christian follows the Spirit in a way that is not contrary to the Spirit. Rahner argues that charity allows orthodoxy, freedom and goodwill to flourish; without charity, disagreements descend into unavoidable divisions. Fourth, Rahner sees the inevitable consequence of *suffering* associated with the charismata. He suggests that to fulfill the call and task of any charismatic gift, one may endure opposition from within the Church itself. He then makes two observations: 1) opposition is not a proof against the authenticity of the charismatic gift or mission; opposition can be a burden or a cross

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid, 69-73.

that is patiently endured in the case of an authentic gift or mission from God; 2) the link between charismatic gifts and suffering requires understanding on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities; indifference and hardness of heart can extinguish the Spirit and cause the gift to be without effect for the Church. Anyone who studies the history of the church, Rahner advocates, will find the “inescapable necessity” of suffering in the individual lives of the recognized saints and holy men and women of the Church.⁶⁰⁵

Rahner recognizes a fifth and final consequence of this charismatic dynamic: Christians must intentionally cultivate a great amount of *courage* to discern these charismatic gifts, so that they are not choked by human tendencies toward incomprehension and intellectual laziness:

The charismatic feature, when it is new, and one might almost say it is only charismatic if it is so, has something shocking about it. It can be mistaken for facile enthusiasm, a hankering after change, attempted subversion, lack of feeling for tradition and the well-tried experience of the past. And precisely those who are firmly rooted in the old, who have preserved a living Christianity as a sacred inheritance from the past, are tempted to extinguish the new spirit, which does not always fix on what is most tried and tested, and yet may be a holy spirit for all that, and to oppose it in the name of the Church’s Holy Spirit, although it is a spiritual gift of that Spirit.⁶⁰⁶

Courage, for Rahner, is a vital necessity for those in ecclesiastical authority, who are called to discern the genuineness of charismatic gifts, as well as for each individual in the

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid, 73-82.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid, 83.

community of the faithful – the *whole* people of God – who often need *courage* in the face of rejection by those whose responsibility is to discern the role each charismatic gift has within the larger community itself.

Rahner's second major contribution to this *charismatic dynamic* within pneumatology and ecclesiology is found in his essay "Experiencing the Spirit," written twelve years after the close of the Council (c. 1977), and then republished in his collection of similarly-themed essays entitled *The Spirit in the Church*. While more directly a treatise on mystical theology and the transcendental experience of the Divine, it gives ample evidence of his matured understanding of the *charismatic dynamic* that exists within the Church itself. Here, Rahner fully appreciates the subjectivity of the individual and very personal experience of the Spirit; however, he grounds his essay by calling upon the testimony of those recognized as Christian mystics, who bear witness to the experience of the Spirit, and who have spoken of the charismatic elements, often referred to as *extraordinary mystical phenomena*.⁶⁰⁷

Rahner clearly notes that the majority of traditional Catholic mystical theology has inherently focused on the individual's progression in the life of sanctity, and that extraordinary mystical phenomena have often been relegated as peripheral and unimportant to progression in the mystical life – one's "ultimate union with God in grace in the *unio mystica* itself." At the same time, he notes that an objective and rational theology does not have to reject all charismatic or enthusiastic experiences with doubt

⁶⁰⁷ Karl Rahner, "Experiencing the Spirit" in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original *Erfahrung des Geistes*, transl. by John Griffiths. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979), 9.

and skepticism; he even imagines the possibility of a theology of the hierarchy of enthusiastic or charismatic experiences.⁶⁰⁸

Rahner actually speaks to his awareness of a “number of American charismatic efforts” wherein members look for and experience “the power of the Spirit,” in “charismatically-inspired prayer meetings,” in which they experience “ecstatic glossolalia... and miraculous healing;” he notes that they gather in charismatic services where “the operation of the Spirit is given to the community” in which they find “impressive, humanly affective, liberating experiences of grace,” and receive “what they think of as baptism in the Spirit: an ultimate fullness of the Spirit.”⁶⁰⁹ He even suggests that the baptism of the Spirit and the accompanying charismatic experiences may, indeed, be necessary in the lives of all Christians:

We accept, and even confess as Christians supported by the testimony of Scripture, that we can have such an experience of the Spirit, and *must* have it as something offered to us in our essential freedom. That experience *is* given to us, even though we usually overlook it in the pursuit of our everyday lives, and perhaps repress it and do not take it seriously enough (*italics his*).⁶¹⁰

Rahner notes that the people of God, are the *people of the Spirit*, and that they live in the “borderline between God and the world, time and eternity.”⁶¹¹

A more nuanced view of St. Paul and his teaching on these spiritual gifts is also seen here, in Rahner’s stress on the importance of charismata for the construction of

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid, 10.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid, 10-11.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid, 11.

⁶¹¹ Ibid, 24-25.

community. In fact, he sees an implicit Pauline *commission* to construct the Christian community through these charismatic capacities, since, by their very nature, they are meant to be shared with one another. Thus, when a Christian acts in the freedom that he or she has found in the discerned will of God, then he or she will act not only rationally and morally but charismatically. According to Rahner, then our “spiritual life” is truly found in a “real experience of the Holy Spirit.”⁶¹²

Two additional brief essays complete Rahner’s understanding of the *charismatic dynamic* in his pneumatology. The first, “Some Criteria for Genuine Visions,” supplies several criteria to be adopted when confronted with visions or revelations which purport to be of God. Here Rahner suggests that piety and personal honesty are the primary requisite criteria, of recognized saints throughout Church history, to determine the authenticity of a genuine vision. Ultimately, however, Rahner reasons that if a vision contains nothing offensive to faith and morals, the principle always remains that supernatural agency is never presupposed but must be proven i.e. the vision must be accompanied by either the gift of infused contemplation, or an external miracle. Without either criterion as evidence, a vision can lay no claim to the assent of Christians.⁶¹³

The second article, entitled “Prophecies,” provides a description of the varieties of prophetic impulses and distinguishes what constitutes a genuine communication from the Divine, usually pertaining to information that could not have been made known by ordinary human means. Rahner lists five different types of prophecies: 1) the phenomena of soothsaying or divination, which must always be rejected as superstition; 2)

⁶¹² Ibid, 30-31.

⁶¹³ Karl Rahner, “Some Criteria for Genuine Visions” in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original 1962 *Visionen und Prophezeiungen*, transl. by Charles Henkey and Richard Strachan. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979), 77-82.

parapsychological phenomena such as dreams, clairvoyance and foreknowledge, which simply derive from natural human faculties; 3) the anticipation of future consequences in light of history, which is highly prone to misinterpretation; 4) the fabrication of prophecies, which tends to propagate civil or religious ideals; and 5) the genuine, supernatural revelations in which God is the immediate cause, and confirms messages given by apostles and prophets. Here, Rahner's sole criterion of authenticity is a miracle connected with the prophecy, and seen as a divine confirmation of the prophecy itself. Finally, he reminds us that all authentic prophecies tell us nothing essentially new beyond public revelation; they are concrete and timely imperatives for our day that fill us with confidence in God and strengthen our faith that nothing will separate us from the love of Christ.⁶¹⁴

Chapter 3.4 Yves Congar

Yves Congar, the French Dominican priest, was a professor of theology and apologetics at Le Saulchoir, in Étioilles, France. He was a major proponent of the *Nouvelle Théologie* and is widely recognized as the most important Catholic ecclesiologist of the twentieth century.⁶¹⁵ An early Catholic advocate for ecumenism, his books and articles were censored (1947–1956), and he himself was banned from teaching in France (1954–1960) and exiled – to the École Biblique in Jerusalem and then to

⁶¹⁴ Karl Rahner, "Prophecies" in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original 1962 *Visionen und Prophezeiungen*, transl. by Charles Henkey and Richard Strachan. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979), 90-104.

⁶¹⁵ Elizabeth T. Gropp, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 4.

Dominican institutes in Cambridge and Strasbourg.⁶¹⁶ In 1960, Congar was rehabilitated when Pope John XXIII named him as a *peritus* to the Second Vatican Council. With his Trinitarian emphasis in ecclesiology – he defined the Church as the people of God, the body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit – he exercised an unparalleled influence in the theology of the Council’s documents.⁶¹⁷ A prolific author, from 1924 to 1987 Congar published fifty-two books and eighteen-hundred articles, despite the painful and debilitating effects of multiple sclerosis. He was elected to *L’Académie française*, appointed as a *Chevalier (knight) de la Légion d’honneur*, and elevated by Pope John Paul II as a (non-voting) Cardinal-deacon at the age of ninety – just seven months prior to his death on 22 June 1995 in Paris.⁶¹⁸

Initially, Congar was a reluctant appointee to the *Theological Commission* that drafted the original *de Ecclesia* schema under the leadership of Cardinal Ottaviani. Hesitant to work alongside the very same individuals who had earlier censored and exiled him, as soon as the assembled bishops had publically rejected the Ottaviani schemas, he quickly began collaborating with Suenens and his drafting team on a *replacement* to the *de Ecclesia* schema.⁶¹⁹ It was during this creative period, that Congar discussed his potential ideas for this new draft over lunch with Nikos Nissiotis and Alexander

⁶¹⁶ Ibid, 22-23. Note: Congar had been exiled, largely due to his support of the *worker-priest movement*, along with MD Chenu and two Dominican provincials, despite much protest from the *papal nuncio* in Paris, Archbishop Angelo Roncalli, who would be elected Pope John XXIII, only four years later.

⁶¹⁷ Ibid, 24-25. Note: According to Groppe, John XXIII initially appointed Congar as a *consultor* to the Preparatory Commission, then as a *peritus* to the Theological Commission. He also served as *peritus* on the drafting committees for eight of the Council’s final documents: *Lumen Gentium*, *Ad Gentes*, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, *Nostra Aetate*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, *Dignitatis Humanae*, *Dei Verbum* and *Gaudium et Spes*.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid, 26-27.

⁶¹⁹ Ibid, 24-25. Note: Suenens and his drafting team would replace Ottaviani’s *de Ecclesia* schema with the draft that would eventually come to be known as the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)*.

Schmemmann, two Orthodox observers invited to the Council.⁶²⁰ They offered Congar a suggestion: “If we were to prepare a treatise *de Ecclesia*, we would draft a chapter on the Holy Spirit, to which we would add a second chapter on Christian anthropology, and that would be all.”⁶²¹ Congar realized that his Orthodox friends were offering an illuminating critique of the Western Church; he began to understand that a separation had occurred between *une anthropologie pneumatologique* and *une ecclésiologie pneumatologique*. Congar’s distinct contribution to contemporary Roman Catholic pneumatology can be seen in his vocation to reunite pneumatological anthropology and pneumatological ecclesiology.⁶²²

Congar’s development of pneumatology became inseparable from his primary work in ecclesiology. His systematic approach to the Holy Spirit is based upon a *ressourcement* of those ancient traditions that had been *missing* from Catholic theology since the Protestant Reformation. Beginning with the New Testament texts, he found no evidence supporting a separation between the personal indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit – and the active ministry of the Holy Spirit in the Church; in a similar manner, he found no evidence of separation in the works of the ancient Church Fathers. As a Dominican, Congar had also studied the *Summa Theologica*, and knew that the pneumatology of Aquinas had closely mirrored the pneumatology of the biblical and patristic sources; he understood that Thomistic ecclesiology presumed a certain

⁶²⁰ Nissiotis, a lay Greek Orthodox theologian was a professor (1958-1966) and then director (1966-1974) of the WCC Ecumenical Institute in Bossey, Switzerland. Schmemmann, a Russian Orthodox priest, had been a professor at St. Sergius, in Paris (1946-1951), then a professor (1951-1962) and dean (1962-1983) at St. Vladimir, in New York; he was instrumental in the Orthodox Church in America being granted its *autocephaly* from the Russian Orthodox Church.

⁶²¹ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:66.

⁶²² Groppe, 4.

connection to theological anthropology.⁶²³ Congar had also studied and been heavily influenced by the theological writings of Johann Adam Möhler, whose *Unity in the Church* had mentioned a clear connection between theological anthropology and ecclesiology.⁶²⁴ Nevertheless, the majority of Congar's subsequent research suggests that the Holy Spirit had been *neglected or forgotten* in the Roman Catholic Counter Reformation.⁶²⁵ With ecclesial certitude in a "sacred triad" of God, Christ and *Church*, he began to see the Catholic cults of Papal, Marian and Eucharistic devotion as *substitutes* for the Holy Spirit.⁶²⁶ Congar felt determined to recover those ancient traditions that were over-shadowed during this four-century *lacuna* of pneumatological development in the Roman Catholic Church.

⁶²³ Groppe, 4-7, 35-40. Note: Groppe implies that after Pope Leo XIII published *Aeterni Patris* (1879), elevating the writings of Aquinas as the official theology of Catholic seminaries, that the Thomistic emphasis on the inseparability of pneumatology, ecclesiology and theological anthropology *was never integrated* into the neo-Thomistic seminary manuals in the decades that followed. For Congar, the majority of these neo-Thomistic manuals had spoken about the Holy Spirit as the indwelling, sanctifying presence (pneumatological anthropology) in chapters on the subject of Grace; if there were any references to the activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church (pneumatological ecclesiology) it was only in reference to the Spirit's role as *the guarantor of truth* in the teachings of the official Magisterium.

⁶²⁴ Groppe, 40-43. Note: Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838), one of Germany's greatest Tübingen theologians, wrote *Unity in the Church*, a study on the ecclesiology of the Church Fathers that, according to Congar, had "restored" the primacy of the supernatural over the Church's institutional structures by recovering the pneumatological dimensions of the mystical body and the anthropology of communion; his later book *Symbolism*, offered a Christological ecclesiology of "continued incarnation" that disappointed Congar for its lack of discussion on charisms.

⁶²⁵ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 1:153-157. Note: Congar recognized that the dominant ecclesiology of Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) had not included a highly developed pneumatology; Dionysius Petavius (1587-1652) had placed an emphasis on the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the human soul, but Congar thought that his view lacked an ecclesiological extension; Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) had defined the church as a society of believers united by the Spirit, but Congar found that the nineteenth-century catechisms had replaced this definition with one of a society subjected to its hierarchical authorities; Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835-1888) had formulated a concept of the church as an "incarnation of the Holy Spirit," but Congar found his position sadly unconvincing, even though it appears in some nineteenth century theological manuals; Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892) had written popular books about the Holy Spirit, but in Congar's view he had not addressed the gifts of the Spirit in a pneumatology of charisms. Pope Leo XIII (1810-1903) issued an encyclical defining the Holy Spirit as the *soul* of the Church ("Spiritus Sanctus sit eius Anima"), but Congar recognized that Leo's "ecclesiological monophysitism" was a misinterpretation of Augustine's *functional* comparison between the Holy Spirit and the human soul – not an *ontological* reality.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid*, 1:159-164. Note: Congar borrows Karl Adam's concept of the "sacred triad" of God, Christ, Church," and explores Philip Pare's criticism of exaggerated Papal, Marian and Eucharistic devotionism.

Congar published fifteen different articles on the theology of the Holy Spirit between 1967 and 1985, which then culminated in the highly anticipated *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*,⁶²⁷ his three-volume *magnum opus* on pneumatology. In this text, Congar intentionally used the best methodologies of the *ressourcement* to recover what he saw as *a living Pneumatology* – a task suggested by Nissiotis and Schmemmann. For Congar himself, it would be impossible not to speak of charisms and charismatic activity in a work of Catholic systematic pneumatology. As such, he devotes nearly seventy pages of his second volume to the contemporary charismatic elements of pneumatology, under the heading, “The Renewal in the Spirit: Promises and Questions.”⁶²⁸ Here, he provides introductory remarks and sections on the positive contributions of the Charismatic renewal to the Roman Catholic Church, and on four critical questions, addressed in separate chapters, concerning: 1) whether the title “charismatic” should be used; 2) spectacular charisms; 3) the baptism in the Spirit; and 4) the relationship of the Charismatic renewal to Ecumenism.

In his very first section, Congar seeks to understand the *positive contributions* of the Charismatic renewal for the Roman Catholic Church. From an ecclesiological point of view, he suggests that the Renewal⁶²⁹ is a direct confrontation with the secularization of existing social structures from within and outside of the church; he believes that this secularization inevitably leads to the formation of free and spontaneous groups of

⁶²⁷ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, from the original *Je crois en l'Esprit Saint* transl. by David Smith (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Co., 1979-1980, 1983, 2001).

⁶²⁸ *Ibid*, 2:143-212.

⁶²⁹ Congar prefers the terminology of “the Renewal” or “the Renewal in the Spirit” that was prevalent throughout European Catholicism, over the American preference for “the [Catholic] Charismatic renewal.” His reasons are articulated in his section on “critical questions.”

individuals that can govern themselves and pray in a style that is spontaneous, personal and communal. He notes,

With regard to that Church, the Renewal has been concerned with maintaining the supernatural quality of the people of God at the base, with giving the charisms a stronger profile, without in any way monopolizing them, and with re-introducing into the ordinary life of the Church activities such as prophecy... and healings... The Renewal has, at its own level and in its own way, certainly acted as a response to the pentecostal expectation expressed by John XXIII. Paul VI also declared that ‘the Church needs a perpetual Pentecost.’⁶³⁰

Congar clearly believes that the Renewal introduced a vitality of charisms into the heart of the Roman Catholic Church; he understands these charisms as being affirmed and defined in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, and that the movement itself had been preceded by several decades of liturgical, pastoral and theological advances. While Congar did not view the Renewal as a protest, rejection or criticism against the *institutional* aspects of the church, he does clearly recognize that its aim is to infuse that same institution with new life; to Congar, the mere fact that the Renewal has developed from within the institution itself both affirms and defines the Church’s existence as something other than a *juridical* or even a *sacramental* institution.⁶³¹

Congar believes that the Renewal has encountered two significant problems that were historically linked with great suspicions – personal initiative and personal spiritual experience. He views the ongoing emphasis of the Roman Catholic Church on its

⁶³⁰ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:151.

⁶³¹ *Ibid*, 2:152.

protection and safety as an overreaction to the perceived dangers of schism and heresy; he boldly suggests that the fear of rationalism and revolutionary movements has led the Roman Catholic Church to practice a *pastoral policy of distrust and repression* with regard to personal initiative. For Congar, if every individual person is a source of free initiative, self-expression and invention, then the Renewal offers a positive *communion of persons* at the core of its ecclesiology; it easily provides an alternative of hope in a world of excessive organization and efficient productivity. The Renewal itself can speak to each Christian of freedom, simplicity and child-likeness of heart with a great amount of attraction. Similarly, Congar held that while all personal spiritual experience should be tested for its authenticity with clear discernment, the Renewal provides a context in which the individual can be sustained by a personal experience of God that with faith becomes more real to them in their daily existence. This personal spiritual experience becomes a source of joy and can provide its members with a tangible feeling of freedom; Congar thinks that these personal spiritual experiences allowed the members of the Renewal to find an inner life that had often been neglected in the excessively organized and cerebral religion of Roman Catholicism.⁶³²

Congar thought that the personal experiential characteristics of the Renewal – its distance from intellectualism, its release of power, its level of comfort with the physical body, its over-coming of middle-class ambitions and its simplicity – were all aspects of the movement that contributed towards the evangelization of those who were typically not open to the institutional church. He realized that the Renewal could be valuable in other areas of Christian life:

⁶³² Ibid, 2:154.

This may be of help in our celebration of the sacraments of Christian initiation and especially confirmation, which has been called the ‘seal of the Spirit’. Quite apart from the Renewal movement, there is a certain uneasiness with regard to the practice of these sacraments and even, in the case of confirmation, with regard to its precise status. The experience of the Spirit by Christians who have already been baptized and confirmed, often long since, points to a certain insufficiency in the practice of these two sacraments. Is it really possible to say that the Holy Spirit is given when, apparently at least, nothing happens?⁶³³

Congar, here, was not denying the truth of this sacramental mystery, but he found that it was necessary to make three related points: First, after confirmation, it is painful to acknowledge that it seems as if nothing had happened apart from the formal celebration; he argues that St. Paul would not have accepted this situation. Second, the Roman Catholic celebration of confirmation, at an age when the individual possesses a personal conscience, begs the serious consideration of its pastoral practice. Third, the Roman Catholic practice of infant baptism does not solve the problem of the need for ongoing personal vitalization and conscious reanimation of the graces received in this sacrament. Congar clearly believes that the Renewal can offer a contribution to each situation described above; moreover, if the Renewal in the Spirit becomes a central part of parish formation, he would argue that it can clearly help to reanimate the pastoral dimension of the sacraments of initiation.⁶³⁴ Ultimately, then, Congar welcomes the coming of a Church that promotes the charisms and ministries of sincere Christians who are dedicated

⁶³³ Ibid, 2:155.

⁶³⁴ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:155-156.

to the Lord and animated by his Spirit. He clearly sees in this Renewal “a grace that God has given to the times we are living in.”⁶³⁵

In his section on “critical questions,” Congar first asks whether it is appropriate to use the title “charismatic” when addressing this contemporary movement in the Roman Catholic Church. He begins by noting three crucial points: First, the biblical terms “charisma” (“a spiritual gift”) and “charismata” (“spiritual gifts”) appear primarily and almost exclusively in the Pauline epistles,⁶³⁶ and are derived from the term “charis” (“grace”). For Congar, then, charisms are gifts which result from a grace of God. Second, charisms are often seen as tangible manifestations of the presence of the Spirit; Congar saw this as a fitting definition of “the ‘charismatic’ Renewal” that was operating within the Roman Catholic Church. Third, St. Paul often uses the term “charisms” alongside “pneumatika” (“spiritual gifts”);⁶³⁷ Congar concludes that St. Paul uses the two terms interchangeably.⁶³⁸

Congar himself admits to a clear preference for using the title “the Renewal in the Spirit,” instead of “the Charismatic renewal.” As he understood it, Catholic members of the movement, in France and throughout most of Continental Europe, had chosen this title to avoid placing an undue stress on the extraordinary manifestations of the movement. Furthermore, Congar believed that there was a strong link between an emphasis on charismatic manifestations and a theology of immediacy; any movement that placed too much emphasis on the immediate experience of God had a certain potential for distorting itself into a sensationalistic fundamentalism that was devoid of

⁶³⁵ Ibid, 2:158.

⁶³⁶ Ibid, 2:161. Apart from a single reference in 1 Peter 4:10, there are sixteen separate Pauline references.

⁶³⁷ Pneumatika is more properly translated as “spirituals,” “spiritual-manifestations” or “spiritual-expressions.”

⁶³⁸ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:161-162.

historical context and that promoted a potential for anti-intellectualism. Congar was especially concerned that a possible consequence of this theology of immediacy was the gradual rejection of social and political action by the members of this movement.⁶³⁹

Congar's second critical question focused on the more spectacular charisms. He argues, quite convincingly, that it cannot be established *a priori* that the biblical charism of speaking in tongues (*genē glōssōn*) – which is described in the Acts of the Apostles, and which St. Paul elaborates upon in 1 Corinthians 12-14 – is the very same manifestation or event that has been experienced by the adherents of this contemporary Renewal movement. Congar notes that while St. Paul had valued this particular charism, he had certainly placed its use within a particular ecclesial perspective for the Corinthian community; yet throughout the contemporary Renewal movement, the [apparent] experience of speaking in tongues has been given a privileged place of honor. For Congar, speaking in tongues is not “xenoglossia” (“speaking a foreign language”), but is primarily a *language of communion* with God. Pentecostal Christians, on the other hand, view the charism of tongues as an indispensable sign that *proves* a particular individual has actually received the Holy Spirit – which is clearly not a Roman Catholic position. According to Congar, charity is the supreme charism; St. Paul employed charity as a means to illuminate everything that he had intended to tell his audience about the use of these charismatic gifts of the Spirit.⁶⁴⁰

Both the interpretation of tongues (*hermēneia glōssōn*) and prophecy (*prophēteia*) are seen as spectacular charisms by Congar. Since he had not seen tongues as a form of xenoglossia, it makes sense that he did not consider the interpretation of tongues a

⁶³⁹ Ibid, 2:161-169.

⁶⁴⁰ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:173-176.

charism of translation. Yet, exactly how Congar understood this spectacular charism still remains unclear; there also appears to be no logical way in which to “check” a particular interpretation for its accuracy. The charism of prophecy, on the other hand, is quite active in the contemporary church according to Congar; a contemporary prophet is someone who opens the church to new ways of understanding, who can read the signs of the time, and who goes beyond the boundaries of the establishment. A prophet, in this context, is someone “inbreathed by the Spirit,” who makes others both aware of and open to the truth of God and the truth of one’s self. While its revelatory aspect does not appear to be astonishing, most prophecy “exhorts, warns, comforts and corrects” those open to its message.⁶⁴¹

Congar also sees spectacular charisms in contemporary healings (*charismata iamatōn*) and miracles (*energēmata dymameōn*); he believes that they express the powerful action of the Holy Spirit within the physical realm. While often exaggerated in hagiographies and monastic accounts, in the timeframe of the New Testament they were a sign of the coming Messianic era. Congar sees many examples of both physical and inner (spiritual) healings in the contemporary Renewal movement, typically within the context of a parish prayer meeting, and often where there is the *laying on of hands* and the Holy Spirit is directly invoked, in faith, through prayer. Congar also confirms the existence of miracles (*energēmata dymameōn*)⁶⁴² in the contemporary Renewal movement, recalling the words of the French philosopher Maurice Blondel, who once described miracles as

⁶⁴¹ Ibid, 2:177-178.

⁶⁴² Literally the “workings of powers.”

the manifestations of God's love for humanity and the restoration of its nature to the fullness of life.⁶⁴³

Congar also clearly identifies the discernment of spirits (*diakrīseis pneumatōn*) as one of the spectacular charisms, and distinguishes two aspects of this gift in the teachings of St. Paul, i.e. the charism of discernment and the more general exercise of discernment, practiced most commonly within the community. In one situation, there is the exercise of a *pneumatika*, where Paul invites the brethren to assess (*diakrinein*) what had been delivered in a prophetic statement (1 Corinthians 14:29); it provides a test or check against abuses within the community, and is considered quite rare, according to Congar. In the second case, the community itself tests the validity of something through its common perception of prudence, with the goal of building up the community; in general, this is accomplished by mirroring the authentic doctrinal teachings, assessing inner value-judgments and reaching a community consensus.⁶⁴⁴

One final interesting feature that Congar discusses on this last spectacular charism is the fact that he is speaking about a charism of the *discernment of spirits* (*diakrīseis pneumatōn*), not simply a generic discernment process. Congar believes that this is an important side note, particularly as it regards specific cases of discerning spiritual influences that may not originate from either the Triune God or human nature, and that might possibly include an element of the demonic; here, he recognizes the distinct attraction or fascination by members of the Renewal for the informal practice of *deliverance* prayers or even the formal ritual of *exorcism*, performed by a priest. Congar expresses his deep concern that certain adherents of the Renewal “tend to see the demon

⁶⁴³ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:178-180.

⁶⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 2:180-183.

at work in everything;”⁶⁴⁵ this particular concern was also shared by Cardinal Suenens, who soon after this issued his fourth Malines Document, *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness* (1983), to specifically deal with the obvious pastoral excesses that had slowly surfaced in different pockets of the contemporary Renewal movement in the Roman Catholic Church. I would here note that Congar’s concern was further shared by (then) Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, who actually wrote the *Forward* to the fourth Malines Document, following his appointment as the new prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.⁶⁴⁶

Congar’s third critical question focuses on the baptism in the Spirit, its presence in the Classical Pentecostal Churches, the evidence of its biblical precedents, and its understanding in the Roman Catholic Renewal movement. He begins by noting that the majority of Pentecostals had derived their theological understandings from the Wesleyan Holiness Movement, which clearly distinguishes between a moment of conversion-rebirth (with its subsequent baptism in water) and a moment of sanctification (which they tie to the baptism of the Spirit). This two-stage process still exists in most Classical Pentecostal Churches active today.⁶⁴⁷

As to biblical precedents, Congar begins with the epistles of St. Paul, and clearly notes that individuals are made Christians and members of the body of Christ by a gift of the Spirit of Jesus (Romans 8:9, 14ff; Galatians 3:26-27, 4:6; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Titus 3:5ff.); anyone can enter this Christian life through faith (Galatians 3:2), which is

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid, 2:181.

⁶⁴⁶ In my first chapter (see page 53), I note the roles of both Congar and Ratzinger as two of the theological advisors to Cardinal Suenens in the drafting of the very first *Malines Document* (c. 1974); as *periti*, Congar and Ratzinger had first met and worked together on the team that drafted *Dei Verbum*, during the Second Vatican Council.

⁶⁴⁷ An exception to this would be seen in the teachings of the Assemblies of God, who distinguish between the three separate periods of conversion, baptism in the Spirit, and then a life-long process of sanctification.

expressed and consummated by a water-baptism into the death and resurrection of Christ (Romans 6:3ff; 8:1; Colossians 2:12). Paul tells the Corinthians to eagerly aspire to the gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 14:1). Here, it appears that the decisive elements of being made Christians are faith, on the part of recipients, and the gift of the Spirit, on the part of God. For St. Paul, the crucial point is that the two are combined in one and the same process.⁶⁴⁸

In both Q and the synoptic gospels, Congar observes a significant key to the life in the Spirit: “I have baptized you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” Here, he recognizes the nominative *baptism* in the Spirit is never used by New Testament authors; in its place the verbal *baptize* in the Spirit is always used to indicate the two different baptisms and to draw attention to the one who was actually baptizing. Then, in the Q verses behind the texts of Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16, Congar sees that an eschatological judgment accompanies the Messiah’s action: “he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire;” he notes that in both the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures the last judgment and fire are always closely associated. In John’s gospel, Congar sees a key where Jesus tells Nicodemus, “Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God;” this indicates that the early church understood that two principles – Spirit and water – brought about a single result: rebirth from above; Congar believes that this is exactly what the Roman Catholic Church has practiced and continues to practice in the contemporary situation. For him, the Jesus who baptizes with water – and the Church that continues to baptize with water – is the same Jesus who enables this birth from above and who baptizes with the Spirit.⁶⁴⁹

⁶⁴⁸ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:189-190.

⁶⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 2:190-192.

For Congar, the post-Pentecost text of Acts 2:37-39 is the basic key to understanding Luke's particular theology of the Holy Spirit. St. Peter's sermon presents the essential sequence of events – conversion, water-baptism, and then the gift of the Spirit – which is then repeated in several mini-Pentecost events in Jerusalem (Acts 4:31), in Samaria (Acts 8:14-17) and eventually among the gentiles (Acts 10:44-47; 15:1-7). Congar sees several unique cases – the Samaritans, Cornelius and his family, and the disciples at Ephesus – that separate the water-baptism from the reception of the Spirit: the Samaritans (Acts 8:5-25) receive the preaching of the deacon Philip, who baptizes them in water, but only receive the Spirit when Peter and John lay hands on them; in the unique case of Cornelius, the very first gentile convert (Acts 10:1–11:18), Congar found a radically modified sequence of preaching the word, faith, conversion, the gift of the Spirit, the charism of speaking in tongues, and only then the act of water-baptism – placing all initiative on the Holy Spirit, but clearly emphasizing that the gentiles still needed water-baptism in order to be full members of the Church. A separation also occurs in the pericope of the Ephesians disciples, who, having been instructed by Apollos, received the Spirit, spoke in tongues, and prophesied only after Paul had laid hands on them (Acts 19:5-6). For Congar, the cases of Cornelius, the Samaritans and the Ephesians may present some Classical Pentecostals with an implied basis for their practice of separating water-baptism and the gift of the Spirit; despite this, the connection between water-baptism and the baptism in the Spirit is crucial – it shows that a community's Pneumatology cannot be separated from its Christology or Soteriology.⁶⁵⁰

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid, 2:192-194.

Clearly, Congar appreciates the views of James Dunn,⁶⁵¹ who suggests that the individual is made a Christian by faith in Jesus and the gift of the Holy Spirit, who is received together with water-baptism – thereby consecrating the confession of faith and transforming the event into the sacrament of faith and the sacrament of the gift of the Holy Spirit. While Dunn insists that the Holy Spirit is given *in response* to faith, he views water-baptism as the rite that “points forward and leads up to the Messianic baptism in the Spirit.” Congar sees this Messianic baptism in the Spirit as a *completion* of the reality affected by the Roman Catholic sacrament of Confirmation. He therefore sees himself particularly bound, especially as a Roman Catholic theologian who is “favorably disposed towards the charisms,” to offer a pointed critique of Classical Pentecostals and their use of the Acts of the Apostles as a *norm* or even a *canon within a canon* against which to measure the remaining texts of Scripture. Congar is clear to remind his readers that Luke’s presentation on the Spirit in Acts was, to some degree, a *response to the* Pauline Epistles and their much earlier testimony and foundational theology on the Spirit and charisms.⁶⁵²

Finally, Congar turns back to the place of the baptism of the Spirit in the contemporary Renewal movement of the Roman Catholic Church, and its rapid spread among men and women who long for the fullness of the Spirit to dwell in their own lives. He draws upon the accounts of the lives that have been touched by this movement, and

⁶⁵¹ James D.G. Dunn was Lightfoot Professor of Divinity at the University of Durham (England). A leading Protestant New Testament scholar, he is associated with E.P. Sanders and N.T. Wright in “the new perspective on Paul,” and authored many titles on the Holy Spirit, beginning with his 1968 Cambridge PhD dissertation under C.F.D. Moule, revised and published as *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970) which continues to be influential some four decades since. Some other related titles include: *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975); *The Christ and the Spirit: Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) and *The Christ and the Spirit: Pneumatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). These last two titles contain 47 scholarly essays on Christology and Pneumatology.

⁶⁵² Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:194-196.

relates that whether they have read reports about the Renewal, or been drawn to it by a friend, or visited a prayer meeting –even if they have had their doubts or resisted for a time – eventually many of these men and women come forward and ask for hands to be laid on them and prayers to be said for them:

When the moment has arrived, several members of the group pray over the ‘candidate’ and lay their hands on his head or shoulders. Although the brethren, the community are meditating, it is only God who is acting. Sometimes nothing may seem to be happening to the ‘candidate.’ At other times an experience of peace and joy and a deep feeling of prayer ensues in a few days. At yet other times, he is invaded by the power of God, who seizes hold of his whole being – his heart, his mind and his feelings. He is perhaps conscious of a gentle inner pressure which makes tears flow. A desire to give thanks rises from his heart to his lips, and this may be expressed as praying in tongues. The Spirit is making himself manifest. His coming is powerfully experienced.⁶⁵³

Congar concludes from his ongoing read of many personal testimonies that the members of the Renewal encounter very deep, profound experiences, even though they may, at times, use the term “baptism in the Spirit” without explaining its content or context. To compare or contrast this, however, he points to the observation of Simon Tugwell, OP,⁶⁵⁴ who suggests that the term was even once used of the monastic life – sometimes interpreted as a second baptism – ideally, because it was seen as “a way of experiencing baptism more radically and more fruitfully.” Still, Congar argues, whether

⁶⁵³ Ibid, 2:196. Note: Congar wrote in the masculine or non-inclusive gender throughout much of this text.

⁶⁵⁴ Simon Tugwell, OP, a Dominican of Blackfriars, Oxford, England, was an early advocate of the Renewal in the Spirit and has written several popular books in charismatic spirituality.

members in the contemporary movement use the term “baptism in the Spirit” or “outpouring of the Spirit” or “Renewal in the Spirit” – there is only one “baptism” and this baptism is given and received in faith, in the name of Jesus, and communicated in the Spirit. Whatever the case may be, Congar reasons, it is difficult to doubt this reality when His presence is so clearly revealed by His fruits.⁶⁵⁵

Congar’s final critical question centers on the interrelationship between the Renewal and the Ecumenical movement. He argues that the two are clearly meant to come together, not only because the Spirit offers them as two ways of achieving eventual unity, but precisely because the Renewal has had contact with and even absorbed some of the elements of Pentecostalism, and because Roman Catholics began to pray in union with Protestant Christians. Since, Congar recognizes, the leaders of both movements have thought a great deal about this possibility, he presents here what he believes to be some helpful reflections and proposals.⁶⁵⁶

First, in recalling how Pope Paul VI charged Cardinal Suenens with the ongoing pastoral supervision (*episkopē*) of the Renewal, and that Suenens had issued a *Malines Document* on the connections between the Renewal and Ecumenism in 1978,⁶⁵⁷ Congar agrees with Suenens that the Renewal and Ecumenism are two movements originating out of the same Holy Spirit and directed towards the same end – the unity of all Christ’s disciples in faith and love. To this end, Congar values three directives suggested by Heribert Mühlen⁶⁵⁸ to the leaders of the European Renewal movements: 1) to *evaluate*

⁶⁵⁵ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:197-198.

⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 2:202.

⁶⁵⁷ Léon Joseph Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations: Malines Document II*. (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978). This text was previously discussed in my third chapter.

⁶⁵⁸ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:203. Note: Mühlen had offered these directives at the third Ecumenical Conference of European Charismatic Leaders, held at Schloss Craheim in June 1975.

each church for its own established spiritual heritage and its incomplete realization of the various gifts of grace; 2) to *appreciate* with open gratitude the gifts of grace found in other churches; and 3) to *welcome* and receive the gifts of grace that these other churches can offer to one's own particular church. Congar does, however, criticize this approach for missing elements in its ecclesiology; as a Roman Catholic theologian and ecclesiologist he is critical of Mühlen, who is himself a Roman Catholic theologian, for speaking "as though there were no ecclesiological truth." He suggests that Mühlen is guilty of promoting *a plurality of ecclesiologies* that, historically, have played a significant part in actually *dividing* Christianity. For Congar, then, the Craheim agreement was deficient in promoting an ecumenical approach that lacked a solid ecclesiological foundation.⁶⁵⁹

Congar notes that Oscar Cullman had attempted to apply an ecumenical approach toward charisms and ecclesiology, but that his approach was limited by two tendencies: he believed that Catholics stressed a universalism that tended towards open syncretism, and that Protestants had stressed the centrality of Christ in a way that isolated itself into a subjectivism. Nevertheless, Congar found himself with more questions than answers in each of these approaches.⁶⁶⁰

A major ongoing concern of Congar involved the *danger* of the Renewal being overcome by the language and theology that it had borrowed from Classical Pentecostalism. While leaders in the Roman Catholic Renewal had expressed finding little or no problem with Pentecostal ties, there was a similarity between the early rejection of the global Ecumenical movement by various Classical Pentecostal Churches,

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid, 2:202-204.

⁶⁶⁰ Ibid, 2:204-205.

and the so-called “post-ecumenical” leanings by many of those within Renewal movements, who expressed strong inclinations that they *had already achieved a spiritual unity among Christians* – even without a corresponding unity among the Churches. As a Roman Catholic theologian, Congar criticizes this notion as a false ecumenism, lacking in a true visible unity:

It is clear from a survey of history... that it is possible to for each of these two levels – the spiritual level and that of the visible and tangible means – to develop autonomously. There have been ecclesiologies that have been dominated by a persistent affirmation of the means and have therefore become juridical and clerical in the extreme. There have also been ecclesiologies with an almost exclusive emphasis on the inner life and the immediacy of the spiritual fruit, more or less completely overlooking the visible and tangible means... The Church is not simply communion in and through the Spirit – it is also a sacrament. It is also the word and the confession of faith. It is the celebration of the Eucharist and the other sacraments. It is a community and it is ministries. It is a personal and communal discipline. In all these respects, we are not yet united. We may therefore conclude that, as such, the Renewal is not *the* solution of the monumental ecumenical problem. This problem calls for other attempts as well and, thank God, they are being made today.⁶⁶¹

I should note that while Congar’s opinion here is quite strong, in his final analysis, he does suggest that the *spiritual ecumenism* achieved in the Renewal cannot and will not leave the differences and divisions that exist at the level of the visible

⁶⁶¹ Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:205-207.

Church untouched, but will still contribute towards ecumenical unity.⁶⁶² In this respect, Congar shares what he has learned from his very own personal involvement in the efforts toward Ecumenism. Here, he speaks of four positive contributions and two conditions to this process.

First, he recognizes that the members of the Renewal have gifts of the Spirit that allow them to see other Christians that have the gifts of the Spirit as brothers and sisters; they can begin to see that what unites them is stronger than what separates them. Second, the contemporary emphasis on pneumatology is a factor that allows the importance of charisms to be seen as the gifts given to each Christian for the purpose of building up the body of Christ as a community of disciples; these charisms are, in fact, seen as ministries that literally transform our traditional conception of a Church where the priests carry out tasks with the laity as their clients; in place of this, the Church becomes a community that is built up by the contributions of all its members. Congar does not imply that the Church no longer requires an ordained ministry – but he does mean that the Church and its ministries are being *declericalized*; this, for Congar, specifically commits the Roman Catholic Church to a *fully Trinitarian* view of ministry, in contrast to what he sees as an *inadequate* and *monotheistic, pre-Trinitarian* model of ministry. Third, while it is possible to *transfer* a Pneumatological and Trinitarian theology of the charisms to the various contemporary Churches, a true Ecumenism demands that each church discovers the specific gifts that are present in other churches, without requiring that the other church be absorbed into the first; while Congar admits that he does not accept the theme of a *conciliar community* that has been favored by the World Council of Churches, he does agree with Brother Roger Schütz, the founder of the ecumenical Christian monastic

⁶⁶² Ibid, 2:208.

community of Taizé, who continually spoke of the great *humility* that was the necessary precursor for all true ecumenical dialogue.⁶⁶³

If two people who are separated are trying to be reconciled with each other, they have first of all to discover the specific gifts that are present in the encounter. If each one claims to have all the gifts and believes that he can contribute everything without receiving anything, there will never be any reconciliation. The same applies to reconciliation between the Churches.⁶⁶⁴

Fourth, Congar recognized that the Ecumenical movement was continually addressing the need for each Church to avoid *ecclesiocentrism*, especially when a particular church is prone to consider itself the *absolute* authority on *everything*. Dom Clément Lialine, OSB, the Russian Benedictine ecumenist and Congar's good friend, had gone so far as stating that, potentially, any church could be guilty of *ecclesiolatry* – by elevating their own particular ecclesiology to the level of idolatry. That said, Congar reminds all those involved in the Renewal and Ecumenism to keep the perspective of Irenaeus, who said, “Where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.”⁶⁶⁵

Congar concludes his chapter on Ecumenism and the Renewal with two conditions for their continuing interrelationship: First, those who belong to the Renewal movement should recognize that they have no monopoly on the Spirit and that the Renewal and its activities do not constitute a Church for them; Congar urges the members of the Renewal to be part of the greater Catholic community, in solidarity with all who do

⁶⁶³ Ibid, 2:208-209.

⁶⁶⁴ Ibid, 2:208-209.

⁶⁶⁵ Ibid, 2:209.

not belong to the Renewal and who are, in fact, still animated by the same Holy Spirit dwelling in them. He recommends that they find a place in the “immense, deep and warm love of the Church,” especially since it has clearly been “favorable to a life of prayer and praise.” His second condition requires all Catholics who belong to the Renewal to concern themselves with the soundness of their life in the Spirit, to ensure that their pneumatological beliefs and practices are dependent upon a sound Christology; for Congar, the authenticity of any pneumatology involves the acceptance of this Christological criterion; any fruit attributed to the Spirit must be in complete accord with the incarnate Son of God.⁶⁶⁶

Chapter 3.5 Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague

Kilian McDonnell, the Benedictine monk of St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, MN, and the founder and president of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research, completed his doctorate at the Theological Faculty of Trier, Germany.⁶⁶⁷ He is a specialist in Patristic theology and in the writings of John Calvin, taught in both the graduate school and seminary of St. John’s University and Abbey, and has been Professor Emeritus of Theology since 1992. McDonnell was the founding co-chair of the International Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue,⁶⁶⁸ and has served as a consultant to the

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid, 2:209-211.

⁶⁶⁷ McDonnell completed degrees at St. John’s University, the University of Notre Dame, the Catholic University of America, the University of Ottawa and the Theological Faculty of Trier; in addition to these degrees, he completed graduate ecumenical research at Tübingen, Münster, Heidelberg, Paderborn, Geneva, Paris, Oxford and Edinburgh.

⁶⁶⁸ McDonnell served on each phase of the International Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogues from 1972 to 2001. He was also co-chair of the International Dialogue with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, as well as a consultant or member on the International Dialogues with the Methodist World Alliance, and Disciples of Christ, respectively; on the national level, he was appointed by the US Bishops as secretary of

Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, an invited guest at the World Council of Churches Fourth Assembly (Uppsala, Sweden, 1968), a Catholic observer at the Faith and Order Conference on Ordination (Geneva, Switzerland, 1970), and as a liaison to the Vatican on behalf of the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal. At the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America, McDonnell was honored and presented with its John Courtney Murray Award for his outstanding contributions to the field of Theology.

George T. Montague, a Marianist priest, earned his ecclesial doctorate in Scripture at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, completed post graduate studies at Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem, Israel, assisting in the 1966 archeological excavations of Tel Gezer. He is a past-president of the Catholic Biblical Association of America (1977-1978), as well as a former editor of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1972-1975). He was sent to serve as the Marianist novice director in Kathmandu, Nepal, and has been appointed as a seminary rector in the provinces of both the United States and Canada. Currently Montague is on the theology faculty at St. Mary's University in San Antonio, TX, where he is a professor of New Testament; he teaches courses in Hermeneutics, Johannine Literature, the Synoptic Gospels, the Pauline Epistles and Biblical Pneumatology.

Montague and McDonnell have been widely published throughout their own individual academic careers. Montague wrote his doctoral dissertation on the relationship between Pauline pneumatology and individual growth in the Spirit; he has since

the national Presbyterian-Roman Catholic Consultation, as a member of the national Lutheran-Roman Catholic Consultation, and a participant in the national Southern Baptist-Roman Catholic Dialogue. McDonnell was also invited as a guest consultor in the Uniting Council Dialogues between the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches.

published five books on biblical pneumatology and the charisms.⁶⁶⁹ McDonnell had drafted and was the primary redacting editor of the very first *Malines Document* under the supervision of Cardinal Suenens, and has written seven books that touch on various aspects of pneumatology and the charismatic renewal.⁶⁷⁰ In 1990, the two theologians actually teamed up to coauthor *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, an academic investigation of the biblical and patristic teachings on charisms in the sacraments of initiation.

Prior to the publication of their joint text, Montague and McDonnell had each been active participants in both the global and national Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Because of this, they were invited by the National Service Committee, to participate in a theological consultation that would examine their joint thesis.⁶⁷¹ At this May 1990 “Heart of the Church Consultation,” the two coauthors presented their research for review by thirteen academic theologians and pastoral leaders who were involved in the Charismatic Renewal.⁶⁷² After a full discussion of Montague and McDonnell’s research, the entire

⁶⁶⁹ Montague’s dissertation was later published as *Growth in Christ: A Study on Saint Paul’s Theology of Progress* (Fribourg: Regina Mundi, 1961); his other pneumatological-related texts include: *The Spirit and His Gifts: The Biblical Background of Spirit-Baptism, Tongue-Speaking, and Prophecy* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974); *Riding the Wind: Learning the Ways of the Spirit* (Ann Arbor, MI: Word of Life, 1974); *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976); *Holy Spirit, Make Your Home in Me: Biblical Meditations on Receiving the Gift of the Spirit* (Ijamsville, MD: Word Among Us Press, 2008); and *First Corinthians: Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, forthcoming 2011).

⁶⁷⁰ McDonnell’s books that touch on pneumatology and charisms include: *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, (New York: Doubleday, 1975); *The Charismatic Renewal and the Churches*, (New York: Seabury, 1976); *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*, (New York: Paulist, 1978); *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, 3 vols., (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980); *The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan: The Trinitarian and Cosmic Order of Salvation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996); *The Other Hand of God: The Holy Spirit Along the Trinitarian Highway* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003); *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend: Greenlawn Press, 1989).

⁶⁷¹ The National Service Committee is the national leadership network of the US Catholic Charismatic Renewal.

⁶⁷² The Heart of the Church consultation took place in Techny, IL, from May 6-11, 1990. Along with Montague and McDonnell, the participants had included: Chris Aridas, Robert Bedard, SM, Michael

consultation membership recommended the publication of a thirty-page summary text, *Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do with Christian Initiation?*, that highlighted Montague and McDonnell's main thesis:

Baptism in the Holy Spirit is captive to no camp, whether liberal or conservative. Nor is it identified with any one movement, nor with one style of prayer, worship or community. On the contrary, we believe that this gift of the baptism in the Holy Spirit belongs to the Christian inheritance of all those sacramentally initiated into the church.⁶⁷³

Fanning the Flame had the explicit "confidence and encouragement" of the US Bishops *ad hoc* Committee on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal; as such, their thirty-page summary text was immediately forwarded to all the bishops and pastoral leaders of the Catholic Church in the United States, in order to promote the authors' conclusions on the legitimacy of the Charismatic Renewal and the baptism in the Holy Spirit in each US diocese. In describing the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the text specifically cites the early church's use of this term for Christian initiation; with the coincidental but converging implementation of the Rite of Christian Initiation, the text highlights concern for the newly-initiated to share in a community of personal and ecclesial conversion. Montague and McDonnell framed their argument in the context of a sacramentally- initiated individual's need for deeper personal conversion to Christ, and full sanctification in the life of the Holy Spirit; they argue that an individual's initial conversion to Christ consecrates them to a life of discipleship. Discipleship, in turn, requires the stringent

Eivers, Donald Gelpi, SJ, Boniface Luykx, Walter Matthews, Timothy Nolan, Donna Orsuto, Dorothy Ranaghan, Kevin Ranaghan, and Thomas Scheuring.

⁶⁷³ *Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do with Christian Initiation?* eds. Kilian McDonnell and George Montague (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1991), 10.

demand of a complete trust in God's providence over an individual, the ability to freely share his or her possessions, and a preferential option for the poor; the two authors claim, in fact, that the baptism in the Holy Spirit consecrates the individual recipient to the life of the beatitudes (Matthew 5:3-12).⁶⁷⁴

Fanning the Flame reminds its readers that the *life in the Spirit* exists in this charismatic anointing that endows the church with a full range of spiritual gifts; each *manifestation* or *service* to the church is seen as a personal appropriation of the individual's sacramental initiation. They clearly advocate that this baptism in the Spirit introduces its recipients to a new experience of Christian community – one that empowers the church with a committed, effective and organic form of evangelization. And while acknowledging that the Renewal has encountered its share of problems with fundamentalism, challenges to Episcopal authority and even some attrition from membership in the Catholic Church, it clearly recognizes that these aberrations or distortions are a result of human limitations and individual sinfulness – not from an authentic appropriation of Christian initiation through the baptism in the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷⁵

The consultation agreed with the two authors that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was not *an invention* of Classical Pentecostal Churches; they were in full agreement that it belonged to and was rooted in the witness of the New Testament and early post-biblical teachers. They saw that the gift of the Spirit – which can never be fully appropriated – must be repeatedly sought through prayer (Acts 4:23-31) and even stirred up or rekindled (2 Timothy 1:6-7); and for those Catholics who were baptized during infancy, this

⁶⁷⁴ Ibid, 10-12.

⁶⁷⁵ Ibid, 12-14.

“prayer for the full release of the Holy Spirit” was an appropriation of the charismatic graces *already received* through infant baptism.⁶⁷⁶

The consultation held that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was a New Testament “pattern and mandate” for the life and growth of early ecclesial communities. Early post-biblical writers had confirmed this particular interpretation of the biblical pattern and mandate:

Baptism in the Holy Spirit was a *synonym* for Christian initiation in Justin Martyr, Origin, Didymus the Blind, and Cyril of Jerusalem. Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, John of Apamea, Philoxenus of Mabbug, Severus of Antioch, and Joseph Hazzaya clearly regarded the reception of charisms as integral to Christian initiation.

[Basil, Gregory Nazianzus,] Hilary, Cyril, and Chrysostom have all been named Doctors of the church, recognized as authoritative witnesses identifying the faith of the church. Their testimony demonstrates that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is not a matter of private piety, but of the official liturgy, and of the church’s public life. Historically the baptism in the Holy Spirit is integral to those initiatory sacraments which are constitutive of the church, namely baptism, confirmation, and eucharist. In this sense, the baptism in the Holy Spirit is normative.⁶⁷⁷

The consultation noted that these post-biblical witnesses had represented early Christian communities from Carthage in North Africa, Poitiers in Gaul, Jerusalem in Palestine, Caesarea in Cappadocia, Constantinople, as well as Antioch, Apamea, Mabbug

⁶⁷⁶ Ibid, 15.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid, 15-16.

and Cyrrhus in Syria. Their research revealed that the Latin, Greek and Syriac liturgical traditions had placed the reception of charisms *within* the rite of Christian initiation itself; they also confirmed multiple traditions in Antioch, Apamea, Mabbug and Cyrrhus revealing that even those *baptized in infancy* had later experienced an appropriation of the charismatic graces in their adult Christian lives. According to the testimonies of early Christians, the impartation of charisms within the rite of Christian initiation constitutes a pattern. Embracing the fullness of Christian initiation meant embracing the baptism in the Holy Spirit. The members of the Consultation agreed with the two coauthors that the baptism in the Holy Spirit fully belongs to the *essential nature* of the church.⁶⁷⁸

Montague and McDonnell note that in light of 1) the clear emphasis on the recovery of charisms in the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, 2) their own ongoing investigation of the biblical and patristic rites of Christian initiation, and 3) their personal individual experiences within the contemporary Catholic Charismatic Renewal movement, that the Roman Catholic Church's reappropriation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and charismatic graces requires a great amount of sensitivity, patience and discernment at the level of each local parish:

We believe that the church's reappropriation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit promises to revitalize evangelization, preaching, sacramental worship, the RCIA, youth ministry, preparation for confirmation and forms of community life in the context of the local parish... In our vision, a renewed parish is a community worshipping in vibrant liturgy, bonded together by the Holy Spirit, serving one another, committed to ongoing conversion and growth, reaching out to the inactive, the unchurched and to

⁶⁷⁸ Ibid, 20-21.

the poor. Such parishes confront us with the gospel and evangelize our culture. In these communities, as in the Acts of the Apostles and the early church, the charisms of the Holy Spirit are identified and welcomed.⁶⁷⁹

Thus, for McDonnell, Montague and the members of the Heart of the Church Consultation, the real key was introducing the church's own *rediscovery* of the charisms and the baptism in the Holy Spirit into the life of the contemporary parish. This, they agreed, offers the Church a direct response to the hidden forces of cultural secularization and sectarian proselytizing that had discouraged contemporary Catholics; it recognizes the hunger and thirst of baptized Catholics who long for a more personal relationship with Jesus, an experience of the Spirit's power, a truly vibrant sense of worship, and life in a community marked by its loving, intimate care.⁶⁸⁰

In 1994, a second, revised edition of *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* was issued. Immediately following this new edition, a second "consultation" was scheduled for November 1995, in response to several joint requests by Archbishop Flynn of St. Paul-Minneapolis, Cardinal Law of Boston, the US Bishops *ad hoc* Committee on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and the National Service Committee. This new consultation involved a group of seventy theologians who met in Boston, MA, to discuss the greater impact of both *Fanning the Flame* and *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit* upon the US church; these Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and Pentecostal theologians held personal views that ranged from being positively inclined toward the Charismatic Renewal, to those very hesitant to endorse its significance. Their final joint

⁶⁷⁹ Ibid, 22, 23.

⁶⁸⁰ Ibid, 26.

conclusion, however, was that the Catholic Charismatic Renewal constituted an *essential, significant and positive development* in US Catholic history.⁶⁸¹

Following both the first and second editions, and their respective consultations, some fourteen reviews of *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit* had been published in various theological journals. The overwhelming majority of these reviews spoke positively of Montague and McDonnell's text (e.g.: Robert P. Imbelli, "they have impressively made their case").⁶⁸² One review, by Paul Turner, was somewhat negative toward their overall premise, but following a published response by Montague and McDonnell in the very same journal, Turner apologized in writing and rescinded his review.⁶⁸³

The text of *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit* is divided into two major sections. Montague first investigates the biblical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit in the witness of the New Testament, particularly in passages relating to fire and power in Q and Mark, mercy and righteousness in Matthew, Pentecostal fire in Luke-Acts, the Living water in John, the Spiritual body in the Pauline epistles, and the biblical concept that charisms build community. McDonnell investigates the post-biblical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit in the written works of Tertullian (the North African enthusiast), Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea, John

⁶⁸¹ George T. Montague, "Twenty Years and Counting," *Pentecost Today*, January 2010, 6.

⁶⁸² Robert P. Imbelli, "Review of Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries," *Theological Studies* 53:2 June 1992, 344-345. See also positive reviews by: Theodore Jungkuntz, *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 23:5 October 1996, 372; John C. Haughey *Worship*, 67:1 January 1993, 92-94; Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., *Pneuma*, 14:2 Fall 1992, 209-213; James Dallen, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 29:2 Spring 1992, 270-271; Gerald Bostock, *Expository Times*, 103:2 November 1991, 57; Susan K. Roll, *Louvain Studies*, 16:3 Fall 1991, 280-281; Jean-Daniel Plüss, *EPTA Bulletin*, 10:2 1991, 94-98.

⁶⁸³ The sole negative review is found in: Paul Turner, *Worship*, 70:5 September 1996, 446-452. The response to his critique is found in: Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, "A Response to Paul Turner on Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit," *Worship*, 71:1 January 1997, 51-62. Turner's apology is mentioned in the article by Montague, previously cited, "Twenty Years and Counting," 6.

Chrysostom, the Apostolic Constitutions, etc. For the sake of brevity, since much of their emphasis is seen in works previously mentioned in this dissertation, and since much of the honest criticism of their works focuses on *the repetitive nature of their sources, one building upon another*, I will try to summarize their salient features with an eye toward those texts which will be important foundations for my next chapter.

Montague admits that he is not presenting a survey of the broader role of the Spirit as seen throughout the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, but a specific selection and compilation of texts that are directly related to the subject of the baptism in the Holy Spirit;⁶⁸⁴ in light of this, he presents seven major contributions of biblical pneumatology vis-à-vis the baptism in the Holy Spirit that are summarized in his seventh chapter.

First, he believes that the biblical texts do not allow us to reconstruct with full certainty, a *consistent rite of initiation* in the New Testament era churches; while water-baptism is essential to the rite, other elements (i.e. the laying on of hands, anointing with chrism oil, etc) do not consistently appear in the rite of initiation during this initial stage. Second, the Pauline image of Christ as the spiritual body to which all newly-initiated Christian are joined was lost when the image of “baptism unto death” came to overshadow the Spirit as the *primary effect* of union with Christ; this may also account for the later development of the “rebirth” images seen in both John and Titus. Third, it is assumed in the majority of the texts that there is an *experiential dimension* to receiving the Spirit; Montague argues that the Spirit was experienced in community long before there was a doctrinal teaching, and reminds us that the effects of receiving the Spirit

⁶⁸⁴ I had the opportunity to study under Montague in graduate school, where his Biblical Pneumatology course had presented a broad, sweeping analysis of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, using his then in-process-revision of lecture notes for *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976; revised edition Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).

should somehow be manifested by the person in the community. Fourth, a strong case can be made for an *expectation of charismatic expressions* on the part of the newly-initiated receiver; while he does not accept the Pentecostal teaching that the person must give evidence or proof of the Spirit being received through speaking in tongues, Montague does argue that Christian initiation, modeled on Jesus' own baptism in the Jordan, had anointed him with power to proclaim the kingdom, to heal, to work miracles, etc. To this end, Montague stresses that Ephesians 4:1-6 assumes a charismatic grace is received by every Christian at their baptism. For Montague, all four gospels, Acts, and Paul seem to take for granted that charisms will be among the ordinary manifested gifts of the Christian life; in fact, Montague argues that there is not a single incident where the manifestation of charismatic gifts is even questioned. Paul himself had defended the use of charisms (1 Thessalonians 5:19-20) and clearly promoted the use of charisms (1 Corinthians 14:1) as a normal part of the Christian life.⁶⁸⁵

Fifth, Montague argues that the gift of the Holy Spirit does not remain static, but is meant to be repeatedly sought and received throughout the individual Christian's life. In the passages of Titus 3:5 and 2 Corinthians 3:18 the authors used the Greek term *anakainōsis* ("renewal"), which implies that new outpourings of the Spirit are meant to occur during the typical growth-rhythms in the normal life of a Christian. At times, this growth is gradual, while at other times it can be quite dramatic. Montague suggests that the traditional Pentecostal emphasis on the manifestation of *new outpourings* that is "largely neglected in the mainline sacramental churches," should be considered a *corrective* that challenges us towards growth. Sixth, the normal Christian initiation of

⁶⁸⁵ Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, 2nd rev. ed. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991; 1994), 76-79.

adults should include the expectation for an *experience* of the Holy Spirit and some kind of *charismatic manifestation*; Montague believes that the range of reception is often related to the range of expectations, and that Paul's advice to "seek the gifts" (1 Corinthians 14:1) – even the spectacular gifts – still remains valid today. Seventh, Montague reminds us that charismatic empowerment is destined to build up the local church and evangelize others; as such, charisms are *crucial* to the survival and growth of the church. All the charisms are tools – not optional accessories – and part of the local church's *essential equipment* for its upbuilding. To this end, Montague argues that the primary role of "authority-bearing offices" is "to call forth, facilitate, and coordinate the church-building power present by divine gift *in every baptized Christian*" (Ephesians 4:7-16). For Montague, then, the success of the charismatic renewal of each parish is directly connected to the ability of those "authority-bearing offices" to recognize, discern and cooperate with the Holy Spirit's work here on earth.⁶⁸⁶

In the second part of the text, McDonnell also admits that he is emphasizing a particular interpretation of the post-biblical writers who have provided a corpus of documentation that directly mentions the charisms and the baptism in the Holy Spirit in relation to the liturgical-sacramental issues of their day. By examining these sources in relation to one another, a particular emphasis on the charismatic gifts begins to surface out of these texts.

First, McDonnell begins by describing how a major paradigm shift took place between the era of the biblical authors and our own contemporary era. In the earliest accounts of the post-biblical era, to become an adult Christian, the individual entered a process of Christian initiation into full membership within the local communion.

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid, 79-80.

According to McDonnell, those entering the Church communion were required to first be born of water and Spirit; how that new birth was sacramentally accomplished was directly dependant on the paradigm at work in the liturgical-sacramental actions. The earliest communities focused on the image of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan as their liturgical-sacramental paradigm; that image ordered and structured Christian initiation and baptism itself. But by the end of the fourth century, the paradigm and imagery of death and resurrection began to dominate the liturgical-sacramental process. The result was that the role of the Holy Spirit and charisms were blurred. McDonnell argues that in order to recover the role of the Spirit and charisms, the Church must be faithful to not only the two images of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan and his death and resurrection, but a third separate paradigm: the Pentecost event itself. These three separate paradigms must be integrated.⁶⁸⁷

Second, McDonnell reveals the charismatic elements in early initiation rites. Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, and Cyril of Jerusalem had included an imposition of hands and an anointing; these three and John Chrysostom each had a rite that called upon the Holy Spirit. Whether these leaders and their churches used the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan paradigm or the death and resurrection paradigm, Tertullian, Hilary, Cyril, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzus, John of Apamea, Philoxenus of Mabbug, Theodoret of Cyrrihus, Severus of Antioch, and Joseph Hazzaya all situate the impartation of the Spirit and the reception of charisms within their rite of Christian initiation. By the time of John Chrysostom, however, there was no longer *any expectation* of experiencing the charisms of the Spirit in local Christian communities; Chrysostom, Severus and Philoxenus all recognized that the reception of charisms had clearly been a part of the earlier *apostolic*

⁶⁸⁷ Ibid, 306-308.

community. Chrysostom, in particular, longed for that former period with expressed sadness. It had been the era of: Tertullian, whose liturgical rites included an “insistent prayer for charisms;” and Hilary, whose community had been “inundated with the gifts of the Spirit.” Men like Hilary, Cyril and John of Apamea had all witnessed the charism of prophecy; John and Philoxenus had witnessed healings and miracles; Joseph Hazzaya had been deeply impressed by both tongues and the word of knowledge. Cyril’s famous sixteenth and seventeenth catecheses had spoken of the outpouring of charisms in Acts 2; in his explanation, he had appealed to the experience of the charisms in “all the laity” of his very own diocese in Jerusalem. So, as far as McDonnell is concerned, initiation rites in the first five centuries of the church had a visible endowment of charisms associated with the baptism in the Holy Spirit.⁶⁸⁸

Third, McDonnell attempts to assess the effects of Montanism upon the charismatic gifts and baptism of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁸⁹ It is clear to him that Tertullian had written *On Baptism* while he was still an orthodox Christian; McDonnell concludes that there is no evidence of Montanism in this text. Hilary of Poitiers had been exiled to Phrygia in Asia Minor, where he had come into contact with some existing Montanist churches, but it is clear from his own texts that he was not affected by its system of beliefs; his own Christian initiation had been a vivid experience that later allowed him to write openly about the charisms of prophecy, healing, exorcism, the words of knowledge and wisdom, etc. Cyril of Jerusalem had cautiously mentioned Montanism in his *Catechetical Lectures*, but this certainly had not dissuaded him from an expansive

⁶⁸⁸ Ibid, 308-310.

⁶⁸⁹ Montanism was a heretical charismatic group attributed to the Phrygian priest Montanus (c.156), the leader of a prophetic cult-like movement that departed from the orthodox-catholic faith of the early Christian communities. It had a strong following in the churches of Asia Minor and North Africa, where it was later adopted by Tertullian, who became its most ardent defender.

treatment on charisms; his later *Mystagogical Catecheses* (who some attribute to John of Jerusalem, Cyril's successor) were more conservative in using the phrase "the gift of the Spirit," but McDonnell clearly believes that Cyril desired to keep orthodox control over the celebrations and liturgies at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, which had become a popular pilgrimage site for hordes of pilgrims and bishops from Europe and Asia Minor. Still, Cyril obviously held the charisms in high honor in his instructions to catechumens of Jerusalem, probably in light of the fact that it was the historic location of the Pentecost event. One century later, Philoxenus and the Syrian Churches were adamantly opposed to the banning of charisms, in spite of the Messalians who were condemned by several regional synods.⁶⁹⁰ McDonnell argues that the adherents of Syrian Christianity had invited other churches to reconsider their openness to charisms and to share in their developing pneumatology; they believed that the "reported pneumatic excesses of some" could not force orthodox Churches to "jettison" such a central Christian mystery as the *common empowerment* of all Christians with the charisms of the Spirit.⁶⁹¹

Fourth, McDonnell reveals that Syrians like Philoxenus, Severus of Antioch, John of Apamea, Joseph Hazzaya and even Theodoret of Cyrrhus had developed an interesting theology of baptism. These Syrians had understood the whole reality of *infant baptism* as an impartation of charisms. Paradoxically, the sensation of the divine Spirit within and the actualization of the charisms might not be experienced until one had later observed the discipline of the ascetic life (i.e. prayer, vigils, fasting, silence, etc.). The Syrians believed that those in the rigor of monastic celibacy attained a "second baptism," where

⁶⁹⁰ Messalianism was a heretical Mesopotamian sect (c.360) that denied any grace could come from sacramental baptism; for them grace only originated in being possessed by the Holy Spirit through constant prayer.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid, 311-312.

common charisms were preserved by the ascetical discipline of monks and nuns. McDonnell argues that their exclusive claims to the imparted charisms of infant baptism established their claim to *another level* of Christian experience; what had been common to all Christians was then the preserve of only the few, who built monastic walls around themselves as protection for these charismatic graces.⁶⁹² If McDonnell is correct, this might be an origin of the *common belief* held by many in the Roman Catholic Church, that individuals who have entered monastic orders have attained a *higher level of spirituality* than those in the diocesan clergy – and certainly the average layperson. This question begs further research, well beyond the scope of this project.

Fifth, McDonnell clearly believes that the majority of the post-biblical authors that he examined were not engaged in impulsive or accidental attention to charisms while writing about other themes. He believes that most even intentionally planned to write on the charisms. As his examples, he cites: Tertullian, who was commenting on the long-held liturgical practice of North Africa; Hilary, whose teaching in his *On the Trinity* followed an ancient list of baptismal themes; Chrysostom, who commented on the specific list of charisms in 1 Corinthians 12 with sadness; John of Apamea, whose teaching on the prophetic charisms came out of a Syrian understanding of two baptisms; and Theodoret, who used the charisms to structure his monastic history.⁶⁹³ McDonnell writes,

I have examined Tertullian, representing the Latin tradition of North Africa; Hilary, who embraces both the Latin culture of Poitiers in Gaul and the Greek wisdom of Asia Minor; and the Greek speaking Cyril, who

⁶⁹² Ibid, 312-313.

⁶⁹³ Ibid, 313-314.

has his roots in the pre-Nicene church of Jerusalem, their heir of the Syriac rites of the mother church. Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, representing Greek culture in Cappadocia, and John Chrysostom and Severus in the Greek/Syriac boundary city of Antioch in Syria, in varying ways witness to the baptismal context of the charisms. John of Apamea, Philoxenus of Mabbug, Theodoret of Cyrrhus (the latter writing in Greek but on a Syrian theme), and Joseph Hazzaya near Mount Qardu (in contemporary northern Iraq) speak for the Syriac sources, testifying to a later experiential appropriation of the graces of baptism conferred in infancy. All of them testify that the charisms were sought, or expected, and received within the rites of initiation or in relation to them. The witnesses extend from the end of the second century into the eighth. Geographically they almost ring the Mediter-ranean seaboard. Hilary, Cyril, John Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzus are all Doctors of the Church, a title given to those who are outstanding in identifying the faith and practice of the church.⁶⁹⁴

It is obvious from reading his brief excerpt, that McDonnell is convinced of the *catholicity* of these post-biblical witnesses to the charisms and the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

McDonnell's sixth focus was that while searching through the written corpus of post-biblical authors, he had examined each of the texts for three particular elements in their specific community's experience of Christian initiation: 1) a symbolic gesture during the initiation rite itself, usually an anointing or laying on (imposition) of hands; 2) a specific prayer for the actual descent of the Holy Spirit upon the candidates; and 3) an

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid, 314.

expectation that the charisms would manifest in some observable way in the community. What he discovered was that all three elements appeared to be *integral* to the baptism in the Holy Spirit; in various ways and degrees, each of these elements was associated with the *paradigm* of the Pentecost event itself.⁶⁹⁵

Nevertheless, McDonnell does not ultimately conclude from his examination of each of these post-biblical authors that the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the charismatic gifts belong to the *essential nature* of Christian initiation:

Baptism in the Spirit, as the awakening of the full life of the Spirit with the charisms (including the prophetic), does not belong to the *essence* of Christian initiation. Otherwise there would have been few authentic (valid) baptisms since the early centuries. The essence of Christian initiation has remained intact. Every authentic initiation confers the Holy Spirit. But Christian initiation has been missing a *property*, which flows from its essence, namely, what today is called the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the full flowering of the sacramental grace.⁶⁹⁶

Philosophically, as McDonnell explains it, this missing *property* does not belong to the actual essence, but flows from that essence and belongs to the wholeness of Christian initiation.

Chapter 3.6 Conclusion

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid, 314-315.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid, 315.

In this chapter, I have surveyed and analyzed the writings of five Catholic theologians who worked alongside Cardinal Suenens in the promotion and understanding of the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit. Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, and Yves Congar were each leading theologians at the time of the Second Vatican Council, were each appointed *periti* to the Council itself, and were three of the founders of the international theological journal *Concilium*,⁶⁹⁷ that helped to spread their new views to a wide post-conciliar audience of Catholic men and women across the globe. Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague had both worked alongside Suenens in the implementation of the contemporary Catholic Charismatic Renewal (a.k.a. Renewal in the [Holy] Spirit), that would stretch across the full global reach of the Roman Catholic Church. Several conclusions can be made of the combined efforts of these five theologians.

Küng had been the ghostwriter for the famous October 1963 speech on charisms by Cardinal Suenens that was delivered to the full assembly of bishops at the Second Vatican Council. In attempting to publically defend the charismatic nature of the church, Küng picked up on two major trajectories of the Suenens speech: 1) the charisms as spiritual gifts, and 2) the charisms as personal callings. For Küng, all baptized Christians had been anointed by the Holy Spirit and endowed with their own charisms, which meant that it was actually *normal* to exercise their charisms as contemporary Christians. Then, in seeing that the charisms could be grouped by their similarity of function, he determined that every charism was a call to service, and that every service was a call to a ministry; Küng reasoned that if each baptized Christian had received charisms, then each

⁶⁹⁷ Küng, Rahner and Congar founded the journal in 1965, along with Edward Schillebeeckx, Johann-Baptist Metz, Anton van den Boogaard, and Paul Brand.

baptized Christian was *called to ministry*. Thus, it was absolutely erroneous, according to Küng, to think of the charismatic gifts as the privilege of a few select individuals (i.e. the *episkopoi, presbyteroi* and *diakonoi*). Instead, charismatic ministries belonged to the entire community of the faithful.

Rahner, like Küng, heard the Suenens speech on charisms, and decided to republish some earlier articles, including one that had identified all ordained ecclesial offices and ministries as charismatic in character. But following both *Lumen Gentium* and Küng's supporting article, his own view that the non-hierarchical charismata were "equally important" and "just as essential" as these official ecclesial offices and ministries, took on fresh meaning: the plurality of charismatic gifts clearly had a *democratizing* effect upon the entire people of God. According to Rahner, Paul envisioned each charismatic grace as simultaneously *sanctifying* the recipient and *building up* the Body of Christ; charismatic dynamics belonged to the *essence* of the Church and would always exist as *properties* of the Church. As a trained Jesuit priest, Rahner knew that traditional Catholic mystical theology had focused on the individual's progression in the life of sanctity; by its historical relegation of charisms to the category of *extraordinary mystical phenomena*, they were typically seen as peripheral and unimportant to the mystical life; as a result, charisms had come to be neglected by the majority of Catholic mystical writers. Ultimately, Rahner believed that it was possible to recover a theology of charismatic experiences; with his awareness of the developing "American charismatic efforts," he suggested that the contemporary baptism in the Holy Spirit and charismatic experiences *could be necessary* for the life of each Christian.

Congar's unexpected insight from his conversation with two Orthodox observers

at the Second Vatican Council allowed him to reconsider the inherent connections existing between ecclesiology, pneumatology and theological anthropology. This inspired his efforts over the next quarter century to reunite pneumatological anthropology and pneumatological ecclesiology. He attempted to recover the *living Pneumatology* that had been present in biblical and patristic texts, mirrored by Aquinas, and touched upon by Möhler, but that had largely been forgotten and even replaced after Trent. Following the Second Vatican Council, he clearly identified the experiences of the contemporary Renewal as this *living Pneumatology*, and wrote of the charismatic gifts and the baptism in the Holy Spirit in his magnum opus of Roman Catholic pneumatology. His efforts brought him the attention of the Roman Pontiff, who in great admiration of his theology of the Holy Spirit recognized him as a Cardinal, shortly before his death.

Montague and McDonnell, who had both worked alongside Suenens as participants in this global Catholic Renewal movement, had each contributed to the field of pneumatology, but their joint text propelled them to the current forefront in the pneumatology of charisms. While Montague does not believe that the biblical texts allow us to reconstruct a *completely certain* and *consistent* rite of Christian initiation, water-baptism is clearly an essential element to the rite; the laying on of hands and anointing with chrism oils do not consistently appear in the initial stage, but were adopted as elements by the late fourth century. It is, however, assumed in the majority of biblical texts that there is an *experiential dimension* to Christian initiation, along with a clear *expectation of charismatic manifestations* on the part of the newly-initiated. Montague implies that the Greek term *anakainōsis* (“renewal”) suggests that *new outpourings* of the Spirit were to be continually sought in the life of a believer, especially in light of the fact

that charisms were considered *essential equipment* for building up the local communities.

In the post-biblical texts investigated by McDonnell, he finds that a major paradigm shift had taken place which drew away emphasis from the “new birth” imagery of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and charismatic experiences. Whether in reaction to the feared spread of Montanism or the rise of pilgrimages from Europe and Asia Minor to Jerusalem’s new Constantinian Church of the Holy Sepulcher – with its emphasis on orthodoxy and orthopraxis – the charisms that had been associated with the *common empowerment* of all of believers who had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit during the rite of Christian initiation clearly began to decline; by the end of the fourth century, John Chrysostom laments the loss of the charismatic gifts that clearly had been experienced by Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory Nazianzus. The weight of the fact that the charisms had been a *normal* part of Christian initiation and life in the Holy Spirit is emphasized by McDonnell’s reminder to us that Hilary, Cyril, Basil, Gregory Nazianzus and John Chrysostom were all later named Doctors of the Church, whose teachings were seen as identifying the faith and practice of the Church.

With the Syrian emphasis on the “second baptism” of monastic life, the charisms would eventually come to be associated with the ascetic lifestyle of monastic enclosures, which would, as McDonnell has suggested, eventually come to preserve the charisms from the secularization of the darkening empire. The *essence* of Christian initiation was untouched, the charisms remained sheltered in monasteries, and the once *democratized ministries* were subsumed into the official ecclesial offices and sacred ministries of the hierarchy – but that is the topic for my next chapter.

A CHARISMATIC PNEUMATOLOGICAL PRAXIS: LAY MINISTRIES

CHAPTER FOUR

Chapter 4.1 Introduction

In light of my previous chapter, I would argue that there has been a clear and growing theological emphasis placed on the charismatic nature of the church since the Second Vatican Council; I would also argue that the rediscovery of charisms has impacted the development and understanding of contemporary ministries within the Roman Catholic Church. In my analysis of Küng, Rahner, Congar, McDonnell and Montague, the charisms and thus charismatic ministries are each oriented toward the process of building up the church. In response to the anointing and the action of the Holy Spirit, each individual Christian is baptized into a ministering community of disciples. Each baptized Christian is given charisms and called to charismatic ministry. Each of these charismatic ministries, in Pauline teaching, is aimed at building up the body of Christ – in every age and culture. Thus, if we highlight the charismatic structure of the church, we find a role and function for each individual within the community – a role and a function determined by the specific charisms given to that individual. Through the great variety of charisms that can be shared in mutual benefit to this growing community of disciples, each of the faithful invests their ministries, services and energies in the recreation and reshaping of the church in their own time and place. Each Christian conscientiously cooperates with the Spirit and breathes new life into those parts of the

church that were not alive; each and every sacramentally-baptized, charism-bearing Christian (whether lay or ordained) becomes a spiritual midwife for new life in the church. These charisms, then, have made the baptized faithful fit and ready to undertake a variety of tasks that are advantageous for the ongoing renewal of the Church.⁶⁹⁸

In one sense, the Second Vatican Council may have brought an end to the theological *narrowing* of ministry that had dominated the Roman Catholic Church for centuries, particularly following the elevation of hierarchical ministries and sacramental ordination.⁶⁹⁹ I would suggest that the Council brought an end to this *narrowing* by first recalling the rich, biblical teaching on ministry and service found in the New Testament, especially in the Pauline epistles. Second, as previously stated in Cardinal Suenens' council speech of October 1963, he had emphasized the Pauline teaching that these charisms had been given by the Spirit to *all the baptized*, and not to the ordained ministers alone. Third, during the Council's intense debates on *Lumen Gentium*, the assembled bishops had voted to place the chapter on *the People of God* prior to the chapter on the hierarchy, thereby emphasizing the common baptismal mission that all Christians share. When the Council Fathers then went on to adopt a three-fold emphasis on service, charisms and the one common baptismal mission, they had opened the door to

⁶⁹⁸ William J. Rademacher, *Lay Ministry: A Theological, Spiritual and Pastoral Handbook* (Middlegreen, UK: St Paul Publications, 1991), 112-113.

⁶⁹⁹ Cf.: Edward P. Hahnenberg, *Ministries: A Relational Approach* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2003), 12. Hahnenberg argues that the documents of the Second Vatican Council never use the terminology of "lay ministry," as "ministry" appears to have been reserved as something the clergy does, while laypersons have an "apostolate;" in fact, for all the encouragement of the laity to take up the mission of Christ in the Conciliar texts, the council itself failed to describe precise roles of ministry for the laity. In Hahnenberg's footnote to this section, he references an article by Elissa Rinere, "Conciliar and Canonical Applications of 'Ministry' to the Laity," *The Jurist*, vol. 47 (1987), 204-227. In her study, she notes that of the 200+ uses of "minister" and "ministry" in the Conciliar texts, only nineteen apply to lay activities within the church. While there was a clear shift toward a broader use of the term, it reaffirmed a particular Catholic ecclesial custom of distinguishing between the activity (ministry) of the clergy, and the activity (apostolate) of the laity. "Apostolate," historically, had been a generic term used to designate *the broad mission of the church*, which is an interesting use, understanding and development of this terminology.

reflection on a wide spectrum of ministries that would then emerge within post-conciliar community life i.e. the emergence of ministry from below. In one aspect, those who were baptized no longer needed official mandates from a bishop to share in the mission of the church; baptism itself had once again become the central foundation of Christian vocation, discipleship, service and ministry.⁷⁰⁰

In the Pauline epistles, the Spirit was not only the source of all ministry, but the architect of all its forms. Paul himself used three terms: “charisms” (*charismata*), “services” (*diakonia*), and “energies” (*energêmata*) to describe the Spirit’s activity that was seen as specific forms of ministry (I Cor. 12:4-6). In Peter’s speech in Acts 2:17-18, charism, as a basis for ministry, is not confined to a restricted group within the Christian communities, but is the result of the promised Spirit poured out on the entire People of God, i.e. “upon all flesh,” both “sons and daughters,” “young,” and “old,” “servants and handmaids,” etc. Moreover, for Paul, the life of the Christian community – including all its ministries – was shaped by direct manifestations of the power of the Holy Spirit. The life in the Spirit of all baptized women and men was and is charismatic in its source, and service-oriented in its goal. For Paul, the charisms of the Spirit led all to forms of ministry, and all doing ministries were seen as “God’s co-workers” (I Cor. 3:9).⁷⁰¹

But this begs the real question for me, stated in my original thesis of this dissertation: Is there a clearly articulated body of shared beliefs, from ecumenical Pneumatology, that has not informed contemporary practices within the Catholic Church in regard to the Holy Spirit's influence in all persons, especially the laity? Furthermore, is there a pneumatology of charisms being taught in contemporary schools of theology,

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid, 78.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid, 31-32.

seminaries and institutes for ministry in the Roman Catholic Church? To answer these questions – especially as they relate to the praxis of ministries – I will need to explore several theologies of ministry, which are representative of many contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, and find if there is indeed a contemporary *charismatic element* present in them that is faithful to both the New Testament and the consensus of teachings that are found in the actual texts of the Second Vatican Council. In other words, is this *charismatic element* explicitly and thoroughly taught in contemporary Roman Catholic ministry courses, or has this *charismatic element*, in fact, been neglected, ignored, left out of discussion – or even intentionally attacked – by the contemporary Roman Catholic hierarchy?

Chapter 4.2 Background into the Current Status of Lay Ministry

During the years that have followed the Council, an enormous amount of theological and pastoral literature has been produced on the topic of both the lay persons and lay ministries.⁷⁰² In reviewing the literature, there appears to be three common

⁷⁰² Cf.: R. Aubert, *The Church in a Secularized Society*, (New York: Paulist, 1978); L. Boff, *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1985); B. Bowe, *A Church in Crisis* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988); Y. Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*, transl. by D. Attwater (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957); B. Cooke, *Ministry to Word and Sacraments* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976); J. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1985); L. Doohan, *The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1984); M. Dwyer, ed., *New Woman, New Church, New Priestly Ministry* (Rochester: Women's Ordination Conference, 1980); W.H.C. Frend, *The Layman in Christian History* (London, 1963); E.P. Hahnenberg, *Ministries: A Relational Approach* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2003); B. Kloppenburg, *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1974); R. Latourelle, ed., *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives* (NY: Paulist, 1988); G. Lohfink, *Jesus and Community* (New York: Paulist, 1984); W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale, 1983); R. P. McBrien, *Ministry: A Theological, Pastoral Handbook* (New York: HarperCollins, 1987); K. Osborne, *Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church – Its History and Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993); R. Parent, *Church of the Baptized: Overcoming the Tension Between the Clergy and the Laity*, trans. S. Arndt (New

theological points of departure from which a majority of contemporary Roman Catholic theologians have attempted to articulate their views on lay ministries; Kenan Osborne has argued that a majority of Roman Catholic theologians have placed a primary theological emphasis on: 1) the historical terms of *klerikos*, *laikos* and *ordo*; b) the codified canonical precedents related to these historical terms; or c) the theme of discipleship (which is favored by Osborne).⁷⁰³ I would also suggest that charisms could be a fourth emphasis and departure point for a theology of ministries. Let me first begin with an analysis of the three more common emphases in theologies of lay ministry, and then gradually build an argument for the addition of charisms as a better theological departure point.

Chapter 4.2.1: The Etymology of Klerikos, Laikos and Ordo

Osborne presents the etymologies of *klerikos* and *laikos* as the first and most common point of departure which many Catholic scholars have used in developing their

York: Paulist Press, 1989); W. Rademacher, *Lay Ministry: A Theological, Spiritual and Pastoral Handbook* (Middlegreen, UK: St Paul Pub. 1991); R. Ruether and E. McLaughlin, *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979); E. Schillebeeckx, *The Church with a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry* (New York: Crossroad, 1985); E. Schüssler-Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her* (New York: Cross road, 1983); W.J. Sheils and D. Wood, *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989). Additional articles include: A. Dulles, "Can Laity Properly Be Called 'Ministers'?" *Origins* 35:44 (April 20, 2006), 725-731; J. Dupuis, "Lay People in Church and World: The Contribution of Recent Literature to a Synodal Theme," *Gregorianum* 68(1987), 347-390; R. Gaillardetz, "Shifting Meanings in the Lay-Clergy Distinction," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 64(1999), 115-139; R. Goldie, "Lay, Laity, Laicity: A Bibliographical Survey of Three Decades," *The Laity Today* 26(1979), 107-144; J. Komonchak, "Clergy, Laity and the Church's Mission in the World," *The Jurist*, 41 (1981), 422-447; G. Magnani, "Does the So-Called Theology of the Laity Possess a Theological Status?" *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, vol. 1 (New York: Paulist, 1988), 568-633; T. O'Meara, "Order and Ordination," *The New Dictionary of Theology* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1987); K. Osborne, "The Meaning of Lay, Laity and Lay Ministry in the Christian Theology of Church," *Antonianum*, 53 (1988), 227-258; K. Rahner, "Notes on the Lay Apostolate," *Theological Investigations*, vol. 2 (Baltimore: Helicon, 1963), 319-352; E. Rinere, "Conciliar and Canonical Applications of 'Ministry to the Laity,'" *The Jurist*, vol. 47 (1987), 204-227; G. Williams, "The Role of the Layman in the Ancient Church," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 1 (1958), 9-42.

⁷⁰³ Kenan B. Osborne, *Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church – Its History and Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993). This is a companion text to a text he had published earlier, entitled, *Priesthood: A History of the Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1998).

own theologies of ministry. In asking what legitimate conclusions could be drawn from this body of material, he has concluded that adopting an approach based upon the significance of these two terms within early Christianity could actually prove to be counter-productive. Osborne explained that in the earliest strata of Christian spiritual and apologetic literature, both *klerikos*⁷⁰⁴ and *laikos*⁷⁰⁵ had been used so sparingly that, in his opinion, no generalized conclusions were even possible. At the same time, however, he suggested that *laikos* – in its most basic sense – had gradually grown to convey a very clear and direct connectedness to the people – the *laos*. This connectedness gave a certain

⁷⁰⁴ Osborne, *Ministry*, 10-18. Note: In the Septuagint, *kleros* is used one hundred twenty-nine times. In sixty-two instances, it translates the Hebrew term *goral* or “lot,” as in the case of a stone dice that is cast (throwing lots) or the land (portion or inheritance) that one usually obtains from their use. In another forty-nine instances, the term *kleros* translates the Hebrew *nahala* (possession, property or inheritance); in another eleven places, it also translates words with the root *yarash* (to inherit, to possess). In each of the remaining cases, *kleros* translates four Hebrew terms (*pur*, *helaq*, *hebel* and *qurban*), which all have to do with various aspects of an inheritance. As such, the casting of lots could determine possessions, inheritances and even land disputes. In the New Testament, there are two particular uses: In Mark 15:24 the soldiers *kleron* or cast lots for the clothing of Jesus, and in Acts 1:24-26 it is the Eleven who *kleron* or cast lots to determine who should be an apostle; in this first case, the term is clearly not a reference to either a minister or ministry group, and in the second case, the term is linked to an ecclesial function (*kai elachen ton kleron tes diakonias tautes*) as in his lot (*kleron*) of service (*diakonias*). Osborne does note, however, that in the early Christian community, the *kleron* designated a *lot* or *place* or *assignment* of ministry – and not the ministry itself. The minister was not a *kleros*, and, strictly speaking, from historical perspective, not yet a “cleric” or even considered a “member of the clergy.” Acts simply states that Matthias had been given a *lot* or *place* or *assignment* of service *diakonia* with Jesus; to read anything such as a clerical status or clerical ministry into the meaning of this particular text is simply eisegesis. In fact, the beginning of the ecclesiastical usage of *kleros* does not actually date back to the New Testament, but to the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (c. 215), which has the very first early Christian use of *kleros* for an officially appointed ecclesiastical minister.

⁷⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 10-11, 18-25. Note: Osborne argues that the usage of the term *laikos* (lay person) also never appears in either the Hebrew or Christian Scriptures, and that, in its sense of designating a non-clerical status, the term *laikos* is a much later concept that cannot and should not be superimposed upon the texts of scripture. He also notes that, following the French Revolution, the term *laikos* carried a negative connotation associated with revolution, secularist ideals and the growing anti-clerical rejection of the Roman Catholic Church. For my purpose, there is no doubt that the term *laos* has layers of meaning – a crowd, a people, a population, a nation, Israel, the Jesus community – and that it appears to be a term that is used in the scriptures. Osborne goes on to argue, however, that one cannot see, with historical certainty, a clear use of that similar term *laikos* in the Christian church, until its second-century appearance in Ignatius’ letters and third-century appearance in the Letter of Clement; in fact, Osborne suggests that the appearance of the term *kleros* actually gives rise to the appearance of *laikos* (and its subsequent connection to *laos*) in Christian literature, specifically as terms of contrast. Several third-century Christian authors had then begun to associate the use of *laikos/laos* for all those other than the leaders within the ecclesial communities; further theological distinction between laity and clergy developed later, when the disciples began to be referred to as *laos* specifically within celebrations of the community, i.e. in liturgical celebrations.

weight to *laikos* and suggests that it could not have included others – aliens, foreigners or outsiders – which seems to reinforce an early understanding on the lay person promoted by Congar.⁷⁰⁶ Congar had suggested that the term *laikos* (more precisely the French term *laïc*) was connected to the Jewish and Christian designations for the consecrated people, in opposition to the profane people – a nuance which Congar suggested was present in the Greek during and even beyond the first four centuries of Christian ecclesiology.⁷⁰⁷

Osborne points out, however, that the histories and etymologies of the terms *klerikos* and *laikos* indicate that the two terms had originally developed completely apart from each other, and had been unrelated. He suggests that over time, the qualifying concept of *ordo* had then come to engender the eventual ecclesiastical and canonical meanings these terms would have for nearly two millennia. According to Osborne, the hermeneutical concept of *ordo* had been borrowed from the Greco-Roman socio-political world, where various social *ordines* had been established,⁷⁰⁸ that were considered sacrosanct in the Greco-Roman cultures. Third-century churches had begun to imitate this “ordered” social structure as Christianity began to spread throughout the Empire, especially legally, following the edict of Milan. Greco-Roman *ordines* had been distinguished from the rest of society - the *populus romanus* – and this social *ordo* model gradually became adopted in the structuring of various Christian communities across the Empire. As third-century ecclesiastical literature developed, the concept of *ordo* gradually came to be associated with the charismatic functions of *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi*

⁷⁰⁶ Congar’s conclusions here were not without criticism. Hans Küng had clear reservations about the term “laity” since it carried the pejorative understanding of *idiotae* or “uneducated masses” in the ancient Greek world, and negatively defined an individual as not belonging to the Levitical or Jewish Temple priesthoods. He also argued for an avoidance of the terms “clergy” and “priest” for those who were seen as ecclesiastical office holders in charge of the eschatological salvation. Cf.: Hans Küng, *The Church* (Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1976), 492-494.

⁷⁰⁷ Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 19.

⁷⁰⁸ Osborne identifies examples such as the *ordo senatorius*, *ordo decurionum*, and *ordo equester*.

and *diakonoi*. Historically, one could become a member of these new ecclesial *ordines* by a ritualized ordination; as a result of this association, the community's ecclesiastical orders gradually came to be considered as *klerikos* – the clergy, and those individuals not in such orders were simply considered the *laikos-laos* – lay people.

As Osborne sees it, *ordo* became the over-riding hermeneutic through which *klerikoi* and *laikoi* both received their ecclesiastical meaning and structure; this *ordo* hermeneutic soon gave rise to various theologies of these ecclesiastical *ordines*. As understandings of *klerikos* and *ordo* then slowly developed, they gradually took on shades of meaning connected to 1) the theological descriptions of temple priesthood in the Hebrew Scriptures, and 2) the theologies of *divine order* as described in the cosmologies of both Gregory the Great and Dionysius the Areopagite. So, while the over-riding concept of *ordo* had not appeared in the Christian Scriptures, this understanding would appear in the writings of Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian and Hippolytus – who then each moved the developing theology of orders toward increasingly hierarchical interpretations of church structure. Osborne notes, moreover, that while the basis for this development had not been found in the gospel message of Jesus, in many ways, it was endemic of the repudiated Levitical-Aaronic priesthood that had appears in several New Testament texts; he argues, in fact, that it was precisely the Levitical-Aaronic priesthoods that had been displaced by the priesthood of Jesus (i.e. “You are a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek” – Hebrews 5:6; 7:17). As the historical attempts to theologize these “sacred orders” gave rise to ordination rituals, once they were standardized, it

gradually fixed the interpretations into a structure that appeared to resemble a two-tiered *klerikoi-laikoi* caste system.⁷⁰⁹

Before proceeding any further, I would like to suggest that there have been several Orthodox theologians – Afanassieff, Staniloae and Bordeianu – who have made some interesting observations and contributions that clearly seem to be of particular value for Roman Catholic theologies of lay ministry in regard to the development of these terms. Afanassieff had openly argued that because the church is the new people of God, each of the faithful constitute the *laikos* (Russian *laic*). For Afanassieff, in fact, one could not be in the church and not be a *laic* – since each baptized Christian is a member of the new people of God. He then argued that each *laic* has been called, as a royal priest of God, to offer spiritual sacrifices (*pneumatikai thusiai*) to God through Jesus Christ; as such, each member of the Church, then, is set apart for ministry as the royal priesthood – ministering as priests to God the Father, in the one common priesthood of the *laikoi*. Afanassieff even boldly asserted that the *laikoi* all serve God together as *klêrikoi*, and as *klêrikoi* they are all *laikoi*.⁷¹⁰ I consider this to be highly significant, especially in light of the fact that Afanassieff had been quoted by Roman Catholic bishops within the official

⁷⁰⁹ Osborne, *Ministry*, 25-30.

⁷¹⁰ Nicolas Afanassieff, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, transl. by Vitaly Permiakov (South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2007), 10-12, 14. Note: The translator’s footnote to this section clarifies that Afanassieff had actually coined the Russian term *laic* – for the Greek *laikos* – to create an analogy to the term “cleric.” For Afanassieff, the *laik* is part of a “sacred rank” and not simply a “non-cleric” in our modern English sense of ordained clergy. The *laik* is any individual who has been sacramentally initiated into the sacred clerical order that is actually the *basileion hierateuma* which he understands as a “kingdom of priests” or “royal priesthood” or “priesthood proper to a king.” Afanassieff suggests that both the kingship and the priesthood belong “in Christ” to the Church and through her to each and every one of her initiated members.

debates during the Second Vatican Council, and that his own understanding had been an influence upon *Lumen Gentium*, in its sections on lay people and on local churches.⁷¹¹

Staniloae's particular contribution of value to Roman Catholic theologies of lay ministry stems directly out of his understanding of communion ecclesiology. This particular approach had allowed him to identify three separate concepts of priesthood – a natural priesthood, a universal priesthood, and the ordained priesthood – which the entire church together shares in by virtue of its participation in Christ's very own priesthood.⁷¹² Within the vision of Staniloae, the ultimate expression of the communion between the clergy and laypeople is the locus of Divine Liturgy, where a "prayerful dialogue" of communion and complementarities works together, since all sacerdotal acts can only be accomplished by the entire people of God. Bordeianu suggests that Staniloae's considerations about the mutual interdependence of the ordained and people, or what was identified as the hierarchical and communal characteristics of priesthood, had been a much needed perspective within Orthodox ecclesiology. According to Bordeianu, Staniloae had built on the work of other Orthodox theologians (e.g. Afanassieff, Schmemmann, Florovsky, Zizioulas, and Nissiotis), while also benefitting from mutual dialogue with Roman Catholic theologians, most especially Congar, from the period of the Second Vatican Council onward. As Bordeianu suggests, this engagement of

⁷¹¹ Radu Bordeianu, "Priesthood Natural, Universal and Ordained: Dumitru Staniloae's Communion Ecclesiology" *Pro Ecclesia*, vol. XIX: 4 (2010), 417. Note: According to Bordeianu's footnote here, Olivier Rousseau asserts this positive influence of Afanassieff upon the Council, in his preface to Nicolas Afanassieff, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, transl. Marianne Drobot. *Cogitatio Fidei* 83 (Paris: Cerf, 1975), 8-9.

⁷¹² Staniloae identifies three priesthoods: 1) a "natural priesthood" (all humans are priests of creation, but due to the Fall, their priesthood has been impoverished); 2) a "universal priesthood" (the fulfillment of the natural priesthood through Baptism, and thus a sharing in the kingly, priestly and prophetic offices of Christ); and 3) the "ordained priesthood" (where the priest acts *in nomine Christi, in persona Christi et in persona ecclesiae*). For Staniloae, since none of the three are truly separated from each other, all priesthoods coincide within the church itself.

Orthodox and Catholic theologians on the interrelationship of the priesthood and the people has been of great benefit to both churches.⁷¹³

Osborne, himself, had seen contemporary ecclesial and ministerial implications to all the theological research on the laity following the Second Vatican Council. First, since the Vatican II documents seem to base all mission and ministry of the church upon the mission and ministry of Jesus, all ecclesial mission and ministry must have a Christocentric basis. Second, since Jesus himself was, technically, neither cleric nor lay, it follows that his mission and his ministry are themselves, technically, neither cleric nor lay. Osborne notes that the Council documents stress unity within diversity, and the common origin of all mission and ministry in Jesus himself. This centrality of Jesus and the proclamation of his divinity are part of every Christian mission and ministry, whether clerical or lay, ordained or non-ordained.

As such, while I can appreciate the *klerikos/laikos* etymology (especially conditioned by *ordo*), and the nuanced corrective implications offered by the Orthodox theologians mentioned, I do find myself also questioning the resulting ecclesial implications of basing a theology of lay ministries within a matrix of etymologies that are conditioned – not by biblical revelation – but by non-Christian, socio-political, constructs of order.⁷¹⁴ I find myself reluctantly agreeing with Osborne that the *klerikos/laikos* etymologies may not be the best departure point for the study of lay ministries. I also find myself agreeing that one should consider a more biblical basis for a theological departure point from which to understand lay ministries, especially in a post-Conciliar atmosphere of growing ecumenical sensitivity.

⁷¹³ Bordeianu, 433.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid, 31-40.

Chapter 4.2.2: Cleric/Lay Distinctions in Roman Catholic Canon Law

Osborne had also questioned whether the canonical use of the terms “cleric” and “lay” might be a good point of departure from which to consider a theology of lay ministry. Since the time of Gratian, the Roman Catholic Church has set down a legalized justification of the highly dichotomized cleric/lay structure, and seems to have attempted to generalize Christians into a two-tiered cleric/lay framework. In the 1917 code, canon 107 states:

Ex divina institutione sunt in Ecclesia *clerici* a *laicis* distincti, licet non omnes clerici sint divinae institutionis; utrique autem possunt esse *religiosi*.

By divine institution there are in the Church *clerics* distinct from the *laity*, although not all clerics are of divine institution; both clerics and laity may be *religious*.

Osborne suggests it is incorrect to state that the cleric/lay distinction is *of divine institution* on the basis of Sacred Scripture, primarily because there is not enough biblical evidence with which to substantiate that this cleric/lay distinction is *of divine institution*. In fact, the footnote to canon 107 mentions a reference to the *Letter to Clement*, which had made use of the term *laikos*, yet also mentions the fourth canon found in the decree on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, issued from the Council of Trent, which had used the Latin terms for “ordination” and “priest” (although not the term “cleric”), as well as the term “layman.” Here, Osborne argues somewhat convincingly that the Clementine and Tridentine textual references actually offer no theological *proof* that this cleric/lay

structure is *of divine institution* – the two texts simply indicate that there is a sharp *distinction* between the layman and the ordained priest.⁷¹⁵

Osborne suggests that the texts of the Second Vatican Council had been nuanced in a way that modified this primarily canonical-juridical approach – which seems to suggest a two class system – after several centuries of institutional clericalism; he argues that the Council Fathers had intentionally located sacred ministries within the greater community of the People of God (*Lumen Gentium* 18, 32), implying a much broader ministerial approach.⁷¹⁶ Despite these efforts, when the new Code of 1983 was finally promulgated, the revised canon (207.1) read as follows:

Ex divina institutione, inter christifideles sunt in Ecclesia ministri sacri, qui in iure et clerici vocantur; ceteri autem et laici nuncupantur.⁷¹⁷

By divine institution, there are among the Christian faithful in the Church sacred ministers, who in law are also called clerics; the other members of the Christian faithful are called lay persons.⁷¹⁸

Osborne suggests that the terms cleric/lay and their specific meanings in the new *Code of Canon Law* (1983), are highly “juridical.” While the Code, here, states a description of

⁷¹⁵ Ibid, 41-43.

⁷¹⁶ For a nuanced contemporary Orthodox understanding of priesthood, see Radu Bordeianu, “Priesthood Natural, Universal and Ordained: Dumitru Staniloae’s Communion Ecclesiology” *Pro Ecclesia*, vol. XIX: 4 (2010), 405-433. Bordeianu here identifies Staniloae’s conceptual understandings of “Natural” priesthood (all humans are priests of creation, but due to the Fall, their priesthood was impoverished); “Universal” priesthood (fulfillment of natural priesthood through Baptism, and sharing in the kingly, priestly and prophetic offices of Christ); and “Ordained” priesthood (where the priest acts *in nomine Christi, in persona Christi et in persona ecclesiae* in a ministry within the priesthood of the church, through which Christ manifests his priesthood). Bordeianu notes that Staniloae’s considerations about the mutual interdependence between the ordained and the people, or hierarchical and com-munal characteristics of priesthood, are a much needed perspective in Orthodox ecclesiology, and builds upon various works by the Orthodox theologians Afanassieff, Schmemmann, Zizioulas and Florovsky on the concept of the liturgical role of priests in communion with the people.

⁷¹⁷ Codex Iuris Canonici, Liber II (Cann. 204-746) found on the Vatican website at the hypertext: http://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/latin/documents/cic_liberII_It.html

⁷¹⁸ Code of Canon Law, Book II (Cann. 204-207) found on the Vatican website at the hypertext: http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_PT.HTM

the cleric/lay positions, and in what manner these clerics and laypeople presently act (c.1983), what makes the cleric different from the lay person and the lay person different from the cleric seems to have been intentionally left undetermined in the new canon. I might suggest, from my own reading of the texts and their historical development, that this concept may have been potentially left open for debate, or at least left unsettled, by the close of the Council. Unfortunately, however, this has led to a proliferation of divergent views since its publication.⁷¹⁹

Since Osborne had previously determined that the terms “cleric/lay” were foreign to the New Testament, he suggests that Catholics simply cannot say that a juridical-institutionalized, two-class structure of ecclesial ordering is “*of divine institution*,” on the contrary, he argues that the precise terminology of both “cleric” and “layperson” – together with its juridical overtones – which rise from third-century (and much later) theologies, and is therefore “of human origin,” which is Osborne’s rather pejorative way of referring to the development of doctrines within magisterial teachings. Since Canon law is largely based upon these magisterial teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, the incorporation of such teachings into canon law does not make these canons, even indirectly, the source or foundation of these teachings.⁷²⁰ While I would not hold his pejorative reference to the gradual development of doctrine, I would agree with Osborne that canon law is also clearly not the best or even primary theological departure point for discussing the nature of lay ministry.

Chapter 4.2.3: The Meaning of Discipleship

⁷¹⁹ Osborne, *Ministry*, 43-46.

⁷²⁰ *Ibid*, 46-47.

Osborne suggests that a better theological basis or foundational departure point from which to discuss ministry is that of discipleship. As contemporary Roman Catholic theology has deliberately attempted to be more scripturally-based than its preceding Tridentine and Counter-Reformation theologies, he argues that many scholars are now making a concerted effort to base their theologies of ministry upon the data in the New Testament – an effort that has caused a change in perspective for Catholics – as Osborne suggests that there is general agreement that these scriptural texts may not primarily addressed to a leadership group, but the broad-based discipleship within these Christian communities. He articulates that all ministry is discipleship-based ministry, and that discipleship-based ministry is meant for *all* the followers of Jesus; as such, the New Testament description of discipleship is his favored departure point from which to describe and define all categories of ministry, and discipleship is the actual grid against which all ministries are judged for their Christian validity.⁷²¹

In analyzing the concept of discipleship in each of the four gospels, Osborne finds a strong basis for his thesis. Consider the following points:

In Mark, the kingdom of God is the central focus, and whoever wishes to understand this kingdom must look to Jesus as teacher and healer. All those who had aligned themselves with Jesus – his disciples (*mathetai*) – share in his mission of preaching and healing; even the twelve *mathetai* who were sent out (*apostelle*), do exactly what Jesus and all his other *mathetai* were doing – preaching and healing, and these twelve – who all fail Jesus – are not set up as a new priestly leadership caste. In fact, by portraying the weakness of these twelve, Mark focuses his audience’s attention

⁷²¹ Ibid, 48-49.

on one's discipleship to Jesus, and not to a hierarchical in-group. He does not portray a "cleric" in any sense, but what each and every follower of Jesus – male or female, rich or poor, leader or non-leader – should be, and should not be, as his disciple.⁷²²

In Luke-Acts, the preaching (*kerygma*) and teaching (*didache*) of Jesus and the disciples is central. All of Jesus' followers were to proclaim this material, including the twelve (9:1-6), the seventy-two (10:1-16), and the entire community of disciples (24:47). These disciples are men and women, both leaders and followers, both Gentiles and Jews; Luke clearly addresses all of these disciples, even though Jesus selects twelve to be his special "emissaries" that are sent out (*apostoloi*) to witness to him, although *all* of his disciples have been given knowledge of the secrets (*mysteria*) of the kingdom of God. Jesus' final words in Luke (24:36-53) are given to all the disciples – not simply a leadership group – who are then charged to make other disciples. And the Eleven, who are completed with the addition of Matthias, only appear twice more as a special group: in addressing the Pentecost crowd (2:14), and in the selection of the seven deacons (6:2-6). After that, the twelve, as a special group, simply vanish; in Luke's writing, we are not given a clear account of their specific role. Osborne suggests that from this we cannot deduce two separate ways of following Jesus i.e. one way for his disciples and another for these twelve in the inner circle; Luke indicates that the church is made up of servants, and that ministry was made up from the community of disciples – not from a two-tiered community with a "sacred order" in it. Jesus, according to Luke, is the model of discipleship for all, and every follower is called to that servant-ministry of being disciples.⁷²³

⁷²² Ibid, 50-62.

⁷²³ Ibid, 62-77.

In Matthew's gospel, Jesus is at the center of the kingdom of heaven, and the focus is on the dual crisis of ecclesial identity and moral authority; we find the answers to what a disciple should be, and what a leader should be. True disciples of Jesus, male or female, Jew or Gentile, leader or non-leader, are presented in the ideal of the "Sermon on the Mount;" for Matthew, each and every disciple is presented with the ideal of what his or her life in Christ ought to be. Who are the disciples of Jesus if not the "blessed" (*makarioi*) of the beatitudes? Jesus' disciples are salt and light, live by a higher ethic, share with the poor, pray, fast, and trust completely in God, follow the golden rule of charity, and center their lives in Jesus. The leadership of Matthew's own ecclesia is indirectly warned about titles, where they sit, and ostentatious clothing; Osborne seems to think that Matthew quietly wishes for the eradication of nascent clericalism – the prestige, trappings, monopolies, domination, etc. – and Matthew charges every leader to mirror the life of Jesus and act on his words. Community leadership is measured by nothing else, in effect, than the measure of discipleship which every follower must live; there is no higher standard distinct from general spirituality, and no mention whatsoever of *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi* and *diakonoι*. In several references, the twelve are called disciples (*tous dōdeka mathetas*) by Matthew; it would appear that Matthew's *ecclesia* may have had its own power and authority struggle, and that the author was reminding all of the principles of discipleship that are to be found in both the Sermon on the Mount and in the actual life of Jesus.⁷²⁴

In the Johannine gospel and epistles, Osborne notes the development of a new and higher Christology, a unique Pneumatology, and an overriding ethic based on the law of love (agape). John is very clear to articulate his own ecclesial unity against the followers

⁷²⁴ Ibid, 77-88.

of John the Baptist, the Jewish leaders who had expelled Christians from synagogues, and other Christians who had “separated themselves from the community” over Christological affirmations of the divinity of Jesus. The “beloved disciple” clearly speaks in a commanding, authoritative way, and there is leadership and ministerial roles in the Johannine community, but there is no evidence of any *klerikos/laikos* model, or a portrayal of “sacred orders” within his community; his ecclesial structure is one of house churches, centrally linked by traveling missionaries, and they clearly seem to be quite egalitarian as regarding the roles of men and women: Martha and Mary, the sisters of Lazarus, are clearly portrayed as disciples; the Samaritan woman is presented as the first missionary; the mother of Jesus receives a key role with the beloved disciple; Mary of Magdala is the first to visit the tomb, the first to whom the risen Jesus appears, and the one who announces to the disciples that she has seen the risen Jesus. But how one comes to be a leader is never specified in any of the Johannine writings. There is some mention of prophets in the book of Revelation, but even with the evidence of incipient structures of leadership, the Johannine material has as its major goal the formation of true disciples of Jesus; these writings are directed to all followers of Jesus – male and female, slave and free, Jew and Greek – to all Christian disciples, and the qualities and traits that are presented as essential marks of believers apply to all disciples in the Johannine ecclesial structures.⁷²⁵

In the authentic Pauline epistles, written rather independently of each other, Osborne has demonstrated how Paul presents his own presence and authority – with the clear self-identity of a Christian leader and apostle. He mentions other leaders – Timothy, Silvanus and Sosthenes – and identifies charismatic leaders – apostles, teachers, prophets,

⁷²⁵ Ibid, 88-95.

evangelists, *episkopos* (only once), *diakonos* (twice), *hyperetes* (servants), shepherds, the twelve – in major roles within the house churches and larger communities he visits. He gives primary place to the apostles, and identifies himself as one, but it is not clear how others become part of church leadership or exactly how these house churches were structured. A major feature of his epistles is that they are mainly written to various Christian communities; they are not directly addressed to leaders within these communities (although he does extend greetings to leaders in the end of each epistle). In general, Paul is not addressing any form of *klerikoi/kleros* or any form of *ordo*, and there is no indication that he is speaking to a large group of non-leaders or non-ministers that would later be referred to as *laikoi/laos*. Therefore, it would clearly be very difficult to draw distinctions between any leadership group and the rest of the gathered Christians in the Pauline epistles. Nevertheless, Paul does address Christian communities, and, as such, contemporary exegetical research can offer us some key issues from Paul's own vision of discipleship: First, he stresses that the central focus of every disciple should be God. Second, the centrality of Jesus and the disciple's relationship with Jesus dominate Paul's thought and action. Third, the mystery of God and the mystery of Jesus can only be entered through the community, which is also a mystery, made up of other disciples. Fourth, prayer is seen as central to the daily life of a disciple. And fifth, all disciples are called upon to live a highly Christocentric ethic in one's pattern of life; as such, Paul presents each church with principles and motives by which they can struggle towards resolution. For Paul, then, to live as a disciple of Jesus, one must live in a community of disciples, whose service to others is modeled on Jesus himself. In community, the life of

Jesus is open to all, male or female, slave or free, Jew or Gentile – since in Christ, through baptism, all are one.⁷²⁶

Osborne also analyzes the concept of discipleship in both the deutero-Pauline epistles as well as the so-called Catholic epistles, all of which, most scholars agree, appear to have disputed authorship and dating. In recognizing their canonical status, he offers some brief ideas and concepts about discipleship in these writings:

In addressing Titus, a community leader with some sense of authority, the author instructs him to appoint some *presbyteroi*, who appear to have a vague leadership function; the *presbyteros/episkopos* is the steward of God's house (*theou oikonomos*), and must have a grasp of the *didache* so that he can present and defend sound teaching and refute error. But after he presents the administrative qualities of the *presbyteros/episkopos*, the rest of the letter and the bulk of his teaching deals with the theme of true discipleship, not leadership. A similar kind of organization of leadership is apparent in I Timothy, which also deals with erroneous teachers, who are possibly Jewish-Christian "doctors of the law" (*nomodidaskaloi*); here, too, the leaders are to oppose their influence with teaching and preaching that is based on the sound corpus of the *didache*. The necessary qualities and characteristics of both the *episkopos* and the *diakonos* are delineated, and two references to the *presbyteroi* are connected to the action of presiding at communal or liturgical prayer and in the laying on of hands; nevertheless, the precise differences between these three types of leadership remains unclear at this historical stage, and there is no indication of cleric/lay or ordained/non-ordained division within the community. Then, in II Timothy, we have a letter addressed to a precise individual, where Paul is presented as the model of Christian leadership, especially for a

⁷²⁶ Ibid, 95-101.

community such as this intended audience, which appears to be encountering some level of internal turmoil.⁷²⁷

In Osborne's estimation, I Peter is thought to be, at base, a baptismal homily addressing discipleship, since it is clearly directed to the Christian community at large; we do not seem to have a specific two-tiered *klerikos/laikos* structure, but a very pastoral encouragement of the kind of discipleship each Christian strives to emulate. II Peter, however, is quite different, in that it comes from a later date (mid second century), and addresses a Greek community based in a pluralistic setting, that is highly open to philosophical debate; the text is speaking to a highly educated, fairly broad group of Christian disciples, and not a particular group of leaders. The letter of James, on the other hand, is an exhortation written to a Palestinian Jewish-Christian community of disciples after the destruction of Jerusalem, which clearly identifies the *new* Israel, the *true* Israel, as the *new ecclesia* – the new People of God. Here, a small group of teachers in the community exists, but it is the disciples themselves that are challenged to bring about a peaceful solution to the internal squabbling and judgmental behavior that has highlighted the disunity and sinfulness of this particular community. *Presbyteroi* are mentioned in relation to the prayers for the sick, but, otherwise, their precise role is left unclear. Osborne suggests some have “mistakenly concluded” that 5:16 is the *institution* of a sacrament, but he notes that the text here actually indicates that Christians are told to confess their sins *to one another*, and that they should *pray for one another*; he clarifies that certain issues such as “priestly power,” “jurisdiction” and the “power to forgive sins by an official of the church,” technically, are all extraneous to the text itself. His

⁷²⁷ Ibid, 101-104.

impressions, however, seem rather forced to me, and his bias clearly comes to the surface.⁷²⁸

Jude, according to Osborne, is also addressed to a community of disciples, even though their community clearly possesses a leadership group (the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ – v.17), whose teaching is to be recalled and heeded; what is not clear, however, is whether or not this leadership group can be restricted to the twelve, or other apostles, in general. Hebrews is also a letter addressed to a community of disciples. Its rebuking denial of the need for any other “priest” (*hiereus*) after Jesus has made his eternal sacrifice – once and for all – is quite clear; the Levitical-Aaronic priesthods have been terminated. By the second century we begin to see the hierarchical structuring of *episkopos/presbyteros/diakonos* referred to as *hiereus* or priestly leadership, and specifically in connection with the term *ordo*;⁷²⁹ Osborne suggests that these later historical developments of priestly-hierarchical structuring seemingly clash with the theological approach taken in this canonical epistle, although I think he is overstating this “clash.” For Osborne, even the passing allusions to “baptisms” (note the plural) and the “laying on of hands” (6:2) does not present us with unqualified examples of sacramental ordination; yet, at the same time, I do not agree with his suggestion that every attempt to see an *ordination* in these texts is pure conjecture.⁷³⁰ At the same time, however, Osborne is clear in identifying that the author of Hebrews has written to the community of

⁷²⁸ Ibid, 104-107.

⁷²⁹ Ibid, 107-108.

⁷³⁰ For a contrasting investigation and conclusion, see Godfrey Diekmann, “The Laying on of Hands: The Basic Sacramental Rite,” *CTSA Proceedings* 29 (1974), 339-351. Here, Diekmann argues that the ritual imposition of hands had “acquired its signification only by the prayer which accompanied it and the cultic context in which it was inserted.”

disciples in general – and presents the *priestliness* of Jesus to these very same disciples, in general:

Indeed, the splendid portrayal of Jesus the priest relates, both textually and contextually, more to the priesthood of all believers than to an ordained priesthood. Textually and contextually, the presentation of Jesus as priest (*hiereus*) has *per se* no direct relationship to a hierarchical Christian in-group. In other words, this document cannot be utilized in any direct way as a “manual for seminarians” or a “manual for priests.” The author uses the priestliness of Jesus more as a “manual for discipleship.”⁷³¹

Osborne, then, has concluded that the New Testament documents speaks overwhelmingly about discipleship, and only present “small windows on church leadership.” He deduces from his own analysis that the New Testament instructs all men and women in the way they can become disciples of Jesus. These texts do not present a two-tiered way of discipleship i.e. one way for leaders, and one way for followers, but a common portrait of true discipleship that all must strive to emulate in their lives. In fact, it is clear that Christian leaders are charged by these texts to reflect and give evidence of their very own discipleship as *the* most basic criterion for leadership positions within the community of disciples. In that sense, Osborne concludes, New Testament documents present this “manual of discipleship” – not as the “hierarchy’s book,” but as the “people’s book.” And as such, Osborne sees discipleship as the only departure point on which one may base any investigation into the legitimacy of ministries from these communities of disciples – including any and all forms and expressions of “lay” ministries.⁷³²

⁷³¹ Ibid, 109.

⁷³² Ibid,

Chapter 4.3 O'Meara, Charisms and Ministry

The argument for basing all ministries – including lay ministries – upon a departure point of Christian discipleship can be articulated with a certain amount of common sense. I would, however, qualify Osborne's third departure point with the addition of a fourth point, specifically that of the charisms of discipleship. In order to argue this point effectively, I need to develop his third theological concept of discipleship-based ministries further. For this development, I will now turn primarily to the insights of Thomas F. O'Meara, whose popular revised textbook, *Theology of Ministry*⁷³³ has become a standard text in a great many Roman Catholic ministry courses throughout North America, especially in the United States and Canada.

O'Meara begins by immediately confessing the obvious: he is not writing a text that is based upon contemporary Roman Catholic ecclesial documents; his revised text is a particular attempt to situate a *theology of ministry* that is based upon the texts of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, the contemporary experience of expanding parish ministries, and the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit in ecclesial life – an ecclesial life that is continually in the process of expansion and renewal.

[I]f one looks at the ever growing churches with many languages and cultures, with more and more women and men eager to volunteer their baptismal charisms and service (which are prior to every ecclesial ministry and office), one understands why the Spirit, which is the life principle of a diverse community with its potentialities and responsibilities seeks to find forms which enable the expansion of Church and Gospel. Supporting

⁷³³ Thomas F. O'Meara, *Theology of Ministry*, revised ed. (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999).

this vision is St. Paul's metaphor and theology of the Body of Christ in which "the Spirit living in you" (Rom. 8:11) brings "all sorts of services" for the church (I Cor. 12:5).⁷³⁴

For O'Meara, each man and woman is baptized into a community that has a particular vision of humanity, based upon a faith in an unseen divine presence that is essentially and unavoidably *ministerial*. Since all Christian faith is based in community, all Christian community is inherently ministerial. This understanding means that every Christian is a minister with an ability to serve.⁷³⁵

According to O'Meara, throughout Christian history there has been a temptation to reduce ministry to an office of leadership, and to turn the ministerial community into one that passively attends a sacred cult. Each time this reduction occurs, the organic Body of Christ is deformed into a caste system, where baptism becomes divine insurance rather than a divine commission. In the texts of the New Testament, however, Jesus and the Spirit do not invite disciples to a life of passivity, but a life of servant ministry to the kingdom of God. Following the Second Vatican Council, a burst of ministries broke forth that had not been dictated by the Council itself, but that steadily expanded the concept of ministry and brought about many questions about church structure.⁷³⁶

O'Meara suggests that the post-conciliar period saw ministry expand in four specific ways: first, the diocese and the parish began doing much more; second, new ministries began to appear; third, people without any orders or vows began entering ministry; and finally, there was the creation of new ministries which brought thousands of people into very public roles of ministry and leadership who were not priests. Ministry

⁷³⁴ Ibid, 3-4.

⁷³⁵ Ibid, 4.

⁷³⁶ Ibid, 5-6.

itself was suddenly in transition, and Christians began to ask why there were lists of various gifts and ministries in the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, when there was only one active role in the church – that of the priest; new parish models involved a staff of full-time ministers, and a community of ministers, led by the pastor, with their own education, expertise, gifts, talents and commission. O’Meara suggests that the entry of non-ordained people into public ministry roles was a remarkable phenomenon; the simple fact that thousands of women and men emerged into specific lay ministries over the last half-century was and is a powerful, unique development in the past millennium of the Catholic Church.⁷³⁷

O’Meara argues that the Council had determined several new theological impetuses from older, venerable traditions and earlier theologies; one of these main impetuses was recognized in the duty of bishops and priests to shepherd the faithful, to recognize their charismatic gifts of service, and encourage their use of charisms in building up the Body of Christ. The sacrament of baptism was given new appreciation, and its re-emphasis, in turn, raised the issue of *a universal call to ministry* that was incumbent upon all the baptized faithful – the entire People of God. In fact, for O’Meara, all ministries begin with the Spirit’s charisms – whose ends are to serve and build up the kingdom of God; these charisms have prompted the global church to an expansion of the contemporary understanding of ministry. Each of these promptings, in turn, have been the result of dynamic moments from within the history of the Church; basic forms of past theologies and past ecclesiologies lie behind the emergence of various ministries beyond those of the hierarchy. According to O’Meara,

⁷³⁷ Ibid, 9.

[C]harisms lead into the life of the church and are *the foundation* [emphasis mine] for the ministries building up the community (I Cor. 12:7; 3:7, 16; Rom. 12:4, etc.), and so charisma is the contact between the life of the Spirit and an individual personality. ... In the Christian community, a living organism, there is no inactive group nor spiritual elite. ... The fullness of baptism, the universal access to God, the avoidance of dualism, the basic equality of men and women in the kingdom of God – these biblical themes supersede subsequent divisions. One cannot make sense of today's parish in light of the clergy/laity distinction interpreted in a strict dualism. ... Ministries differ in importance, and distinctions among ministries (and ministers) remain, but they are, according to the New Testament, grounded upon a common faith and baptismal commissioning.⁷³⁸

In O'Meara's opinion, the dual theologies of the People of God and the Body of Christ are clear indications that ministry should be *ordinary for all the baptized*. He believes that the model of ministry that arose after the Council goes far beyond the performance of small numbers of clergy and religious in relation to the rest of the church; in reflecting upon the expansion of ministry during the last few decades, contemporary Catholics are able to conclude that the Spirit is determined to continually broaden the ministries originating from Christian baptism.⁷³⁹

I think O'Meara is correct in clarifying that the way one views the kingdom of God will determine the vitality and accuracy of one's vision of Jesus' call to ministry; the

⁷³⁸ Ibid, 27-29.

⁷³⁹ Ibid, 32-33.

presence of the Spirit in our world enables all baptized disciples to minister in freedom. If one's charism and, therefore, ministry is to be effective, how one responds to revelation in faith must make the grace of God concrete; it is clear that the New Testament describes charisms and ministries in the form of specific, concrete services – services whose names are taken from their actions i.e. preaching, teaching, evangelizing, healing, etc. O'Meara argues that contemporary Christians experience less than the richness of ministry found in the New Testament communities; in recognition of this, he argues that contemporary theologies of ministry must develop an understanding of the rich experiences of the early Christians. Moreover, in turning to the early church experience we must revisit the primal, original revelatory experiences – not to revivify exactly these historically conditioned forms, but to discover what these early Christian communities held as essential and charismatic.⁷⁴⁰

In the New Testament, we find that ministry is the activity of the Spirit in co-workers. Jesus calls his followers to a discipleship of charismatic service. What that meant became clear after his resurrection and the Spirit's descent at Pentecost. Slowly the disciples realized that this meant that following Jesus and his Spirit meant a life of service for all and by all. Pneuma, charisma and then diakonia are the realizations of the wide horizon that scripture designates as "the kingdom of God." The risen Christ lives and works through the Holy Spirit; Jesus became "a life-giving Spirit (I Cor. 15:45). For O'Meara, their mutual relationship of dynamic presence (the Kyrios as Pneuma) and representation (the Pneuma as Kyrios) emerges as the key to understanding the pneumatic existence of the risen Christ (Rom. 1:4; I Cor. 15:45); as such, all forms of ministry are

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid, 37-38, 44-46.

grounded in imitation of the historical Jesus and in the personal response to the charismatic call of his Spirit.⁷⁴¹

In the Pneumatology of Paul, the word *charisma* is a facet of the realm of grace (*charis*) that extends to each baptized disciple; each individual is given a *charisma* in which this freely bestowed *charis* is concretized. Etymologically, *charism* has tones of graciousness, generosity and joyful liberality. Paul did not create the term *charisma*, but he used it in a new theological nuance and richness. It is also used in Romans to express several rich meanings of the Spirit's contact with humanity. For Paul, the primal *charism* is "eternal life in Jesus Christ, our Lord" (Rom. 6:23), which is the source of all other charisms; living in the kingdom of God, the disciple of Jesus experiences a life in the Spirit that brings pneumatic gifts and charismatic services. Paul also refers to charismatic gifts as "energies" (*energēmata* – I Cor. 12:6, 11), that also lead to ministries.⁷⁴² O'Meara suggests,

Perhaps these different Greek words represent nuances, theologies, or communities whose identities are lost to us, but the message of the Spirit's activity in variety is clear. For each word, the reality described is power from the Spirit. The community's life... is embraced by the horizon of the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit works charismatically in the personality of each Christian. The presence of the Spirit in baptized men and women is a life, but one which is diaconal in terms of its goal.⁷⁴³

According to O'Meara, the lists of such diaconal charisms and ministries as found in the epistles to the Romans, I Corinthians and Ephesians are not intended to be

⁷⁴¹ Ibid, 48-50.

⁷⁴² Ibid, 53-54.

⁷⁴³ Ibid, 54.

complete lists, and do not, for Paul, exhaust or limit charisms. These lists, in fact, actually indicate expansive, open manifestations of ministry by the early communities of disciples. Early Christian communities would not have understood an ecclesial limitation of charisms or ministries to an elite group or a hierarchy; a sign of the healthy life of early Christians was to accept charisms that resulted in a variety of ministries. For O'Meara, all church ministry is grounded in charism; the Christian life in the Spirit is ministerial, and the church community lives within an atmosphere of ministry coming from the charisms given to and present in its disciples' lives.⁷⁴⁴

Each ministry (*diakonia*) is a particular kind of church action (Rom. 12:7), and includes all the serving and evangelistic roles within a community (Eph. 4:12). Service flows from the community and is channeled in charismatic ministry; but the concept of ministry as service (*diakonos*), suggests O'Meara, has not always been translated well. Once this *diakonos* was Latinized into *ministerium*, it was soon overshadowed by *officium*. The Reformers preferred *minister*, hoping to emphasize the servant nature of the term, although this was unacceptable to Counter Reformation Catholicism. Still, the contemporary rediscovery of the word *ministry* with its etymological sense of *service* captures the role as a graced activity that is a particular service by the people of the Spirit. But regardless of what terminology is used in contemporary cultures, the dual ecclesial motifs of the People of God and the Body of Christ carry with them the radical understanding that ministry is a charismatic activity to, from and of all disciples.⁷⁴⁵

O'Meara concludes his comments by offering a definition of ministry:

⁷⁴⁴ Ibid, 63.

⁷⁴⁵ Ibid, 63-64, 66.

Christian ministry is the public activity of a baptized follower of Jesus Christ flowing from the Spirit's charism and an individual personality on behalf of a Christian community to proclaim, serve, and realize the kingdom of God.⁷⁴⁶

Ministry, as the epistles of the young ecclesial communities in the New Testament show us, began with verbs: preaching, evangelizing, being sent, serving, etc.; but in the course of history, and in dialogue with Greek philosophy and Roman political structures, the developing churches exchanged this verbal dynamism for a more static way of being. Verbs became nouns, and actions became social states (priesthood, clergy, hierarchy, office, etc.). This linguistic shifting began to improperly depict a reservoir of beings (people marked by grace) rather than a concert of agents (graced people in service). In New Testament theology, each and every disciple participates in ministry through their personalized charisms. And while O'Meara's argument for the charismatic base of all ministries may be defined and critiqued as a form of Christian "functionalism," functional forms of ministry clearly presume the primary importance of the individual's spiritual life and some sense of order in the communities of disciples. Ultimately, then, for O'Meara, this kind of charismatic base for ministry will free Christians from "a church life that is only a cult and contagion of sacrality."⁷⁴⁷ These are strong, biting words depicting a stagnant ossification of Roman Catholic ecclesial structures, charisms and ministries.

⁷⁴⁶ Ibid, 150.

⁷⁴⁷ Ibid, 150-151.

Chapter 4.4: Power on Lay Ministries: Established, Un-established and Re-established

David N. Power takes O'Meara's argument for a charismatic base of ministry one step further in his text, *Gifts That Differ: Lay Ministries Established and Unestablished*.⁷⁴⁸ Using a pneumatological phenomenology of charisms, he sets out to reclaim all lay ministries through the charismatic base of gifts within the Christian communities. Power will clearly argue that each and every disciple is possessed the Holy Spirit, and that, together, the community shares a fullness of charismatic gifts; as such, all the disciples are together responsible for the life, expansion and ministries of the growing churches.

Following the Second Vatican Council, and the publication of two unrelated ecclesial texts by Pope Paul VI, the church began to consider its self-image and universal call to holiness as the People of God. In *Ministeria Quaedam*, Paul declericalized the roles of acolyte and lector, which, historically, had been minor orders, and encouraged the official assumption of these roles by unordained lay men; then in *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, Paul endorsed the concept that the whole church is missionary, and that the laity shares in this mission by virtue of having received the sacraments of initiation. The ecclesial principle that the laity were to share in the mission and ministry of the church – on the basis of their share in Christ's own mission and ministry – was soon being actively

⁷⁴⁸ David N. Power, *Gifts That Differ: Lay Ministries Established and Unestablished*, revised ed. (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., Inc., 1985). For a more recent contrasting approach to the themes I am developing here, see Edward P. Hahnenberg, *Ministries: A Relational Approach* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2003).

promoted across the global Catholic Church.⁷⁴⁹ Congar – who had contributed greatly to the Council Fathers’ understanding of the laity – was able to comment in 1965 that the Council had introduced “a new equilibrium into ecclesiology” whose consequences could not have been fully anticipated by the assembled bishops, and would take considerable time to reconcile, both in theory and praxis.⁷⁵⁰

The image of the People of God which prevails today has far-reaching effects on the way in which the respective missions of clerics and laity are conceived and lived. According to this way of looking at the church, it is the church as God’s People which receives and bears Christ’s mission and is his sacrament in the world. The primary mission is not given to the hierarchy... Christ’s mission and Spirit are given to the body of the church, so that laity and clergy share in their respective ways in the one mission of God’s People and in the triple office of Jesus Christ as Priest, Prophet and King.⁷⁵¹

Congar’s influence upon the ecclesiology and developing theology of the laity in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium*, and in the subsequent documents is incontestably great; his understanding of the laity’s share in the priestly, prophetic and royal offices in virtue of their *baptismal consecration* placed the mission and the ministry of the laity in a new perspective, and made it possible to approach the clergy-laity problem from a single, organic source: Christ’s own mission and ministry. This same pattern was then followed in the *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, Apostolicam Actuositatem*, which established particular charisms as sources of special

⁷⁴⁹ Ibid, 38.

⁷⁵⁰ Yves Congar, “The Church as People of God,” *Concilium*, vol. 1 (New York: Paulist Press, 1965), 16ff.

⁷⁵¹ Power, 52.

callings that were particular to the temporal order; this theme was also articulated in the very last conciliar document, the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*, which explicitly corrected the false perception of dualism between the secular and the sacred, or between sacred ministry and service of the world.⁷⁵²

For Power, the legitimacy of both ecumenical dialogue and the exegetical study of the episcopacy make it possible for all lay Catholics to inquire into the reality and possibilities of ministry in the church. Much of the factual information derives from exegetical studies of ministry in the New Testament, especially the authentic letters of Paul which lay claim to his authority, as well as the Acts of the Apostles and the so-called Catholic epistles. Power suggests that most foundational interpretive principle is that these Christian communities existed prior to their ministries; thus, the specific needs of communities – which are based upon their mission – were the primary determinative factors in their creation of ministries. Ministry, then, came from the Spirit of God as a participation in the *diakonia* of Jesus Christ, and a sharing in his power to heal and reconcile humanity to God. The charismatic origin of these services (*diakonia*) is based upon the Holy Spirit's external provision of gifts for the exercise of ministry; since the Spirit is seen to blow where and how he wills, it is these free gifts of the Spirit that determine the nature of the ministry to be conferred, as well as the person to be gifted with these charisms.⁷⁵³ For Power, then, it is this Pauline understanding of the charismatic that is realized in the variety of services or ministries that come forth from the community of disciples:

⁷⁵² Ibid, 52-55.

⁷⁵³ Ibid, 100-103.

This is the Pauline sense of charism. The Spirit gives to the one to whom he comes a knowledge of the mystery of Christ, as he also teaches compassion and teaches how to pray. It is on this basis that a person learns how to speak the word, how to comfort, how to lead, or how to heal. Basil of Caesarea in his treatise on the Holy Spirit has a clear grasp of this sense of charism. Basil felt that all gifts and all services flowed from the inner light of the Spirit which permitted the person gifted to behold and contemplate the mystery of the Father revealed in the image of the Son. From this there flows, he said, the knowledge of mystery, the gift of prophecy and of healing, and all other gifts, and finally godlikeness.⁷⁵⁴

For Power, this understanding of charism and service is the reason why the model of discipleship is the foremost model of ministry; it is from and through these charisms of the disciples, that the call to any service or apostolate is identical with discipleship. Charisms, thus, are gifts of the Spirit that result in ministries to the church and the world; they originate in discipleship and stem from each individual's life in the Spirit – from the outflow of the disciple's following of and adherence to Jesus Christ.⁷⁵⁵

According to Power, the picture of the church that emerges from the Acts of the Apostles is dominated by the sending of the Spirit of Jesus upon the disciples, and this Spirit's continuous presence in the church itself. And since the message of Pentecost is that the Spirit is poured out upon all, Power suggests that this Pentecost-event clearly establishes “a charismatic perception of Christian life and of community ministry.” Moreover, the presence of the Spirit of Jesus in the church links each disciple with Jesus,

⁷⁵⁴ Ibid, 104.

⁷⁵⁵ Ibid, 104-106.

and empowers each disciple to exhibit the same quality of life and ministry that Jesus did; in fact, the whole future of the church is to be guided by the Spirit, and is to be a witness to the power of the Spirit of Jesus in bringing about a new creation that touches all of humanity.⁷⁵⁶

For Power, then, a community's self-identity determines the way ministry develops. By examining how the community experiences the kingdom of God, and the consequent shape of its own identity, one can begin to see the foundation of the ministerial reality of each community. In each of the New Testament communities, for example, how their own disciples experienced the kingdom of God, helped to determine and discern the legitimacy of their charisms and ministries within their community; ministry, then, exists as a quality or fruit of the church community – as a cohesive unit or corporate body – before it is a predicate of any of its individual members.⁷⁵⁷

In his fifth chapter, Power goes on to suggest that the most remarkable characteristic of the contemporary development of ministries within the Roman Catholic Church stems from the post-Vatican II renewal of parish community life – especially where elements of vital grass-roots renewal gave rise to a more abundant vision for and variety of lay ministries. Within renewed post-Vatican II communities of faith, individual disciples slowly began to rediscover their call to service in the Spirit, and, in particular, the charisms whereby each individual disciple in these communities could work together to share in the common evangelical mission of the church.⁷⁵⁸

Power also notes that, over time, the New Testament meaning of *ministry* – expressed in symbolic words such as *diakonia*, *exousia* and *charis* – began to suffer a

⁷⁵⁶ Ibid, 112-113.

⁷⁵⁷ Ibid, 119-120.

⁷⁵⁸ Ibid, 125-127.

kind of sedimentation; this sedimentation occurs when symbolic words are translated and re-translated into conceptual meanings that are then used to support a defined, juridical structure. Power suggests that such a debilitating sedimentation occurred with the word *ministry* itself, since, for many centuries, ministry had come to be applied only to the activity of the sacramentally-ordained members of the church – the hierarchy. Since the Second Vatican Council, technically, had not employed the word *ministry* for the activities of the laity, Power argues that a historical *sacralization* of the term had occurred that eventually came to impose a precise limitation on the way in which the term was used.⁷⁵⁹ A long-term process of sacralization, desacralization and resacralization has resulted from the debilitating sedimentation of this term, as well as other sacramental terms:

It has been necessary to treat of the desacralization of the rite of ordination and of the desacralization of the rite of baptism in order to put the discussion of lay ministry into proper focus. On the one hand, the desacralization of the sacrament of order makes it possible to look to baptism for the foundation of the call to service and ministry in the church. On the other hand, the desacralization of baptismal practices makes it clear that this is done with the reality of the believing community in mind.⁷⁶⁰

Power then continues this correlation:

The theology of ministry, if it is to serve the renewal of its practice, needs to explain how baptism constitutes a call to share in the mission of the church, while at the same time making proper allowance for the sacrament

⁷⁵⁹ Ibid, 128-133.

⁷⁶⁰ Ibid, 133.

of order. The symbol of the “holy people” is a good starting point for a theology which brings these two factors together in a harmonious fashion. The symbol stands out to best advantage when it is applied to the people who have been initiated into the church through baptism and gather together for the celebration of the eucharist.⁷⁶¹

Power reminds us that the symbolic images of the “holy people” and “royal priesthood” have been frequently used to express the symbolism proper to baptismal initiation – as distinct from ordination. *Lumen Gentium*, moreover, distinguished between the *priesthood of order* and the *priesthood of the laity*. But, as Power notes, this begs the question that asks whether some call to ministry comes through baptismal initiation into the People of God. He responds, by suggesting that the baptized have been sacramentally immersed into a mystery that is both the foundation for the disciple’s holiness of life as well as the foundation for the disciple’s share in the mission of the Christian community.⁷⁶²

If this ecclesial reality is identified with the sealing with the Spirit which brings people into the sacramental and eschatological community, then it can be seen as the one ground of both grace and charism. Rather than explaining grace and charism as two quite distinct effects of the one sacrament, they can be explained as organically interrelated effects. In other words, there is an inseparable connection between what is generally called grace and what is generally called charism. They are both gifts of

⁷⁶¹ Ibid.

⁷⁶² Ibid, 135-137.

the Spirit, bestowed on those who share in the mystery of the church so that they can take full part in its life and mission.⁷⁶³

For Power, then, grace is the illumination or enlightenment that gives knowledge of the Lord, Jesus Christ, and, thereby, the possibility of divinization; charisms, on the other hand, are the gifts of service that result from this enlightenment and divinization of the individuals within this community of disciples.⁷⁶⁴

Finally, for Power, there is clearly a link between the sacrament of order and sacrament of baptism that can be made – in line with early church tradition – and that is signified through the charism of leadership. As one of the distinct charismatic gifts that result from baptism, it is a key charism that is sought by the church in those specific candidates approaching the sacrament of order; it is not a charismatic gift possessed by all the baptized, since it is a specific charism that is considered proper to a particular function (i.e. in traditional Christian terminology, one particular state in life), yet it is found as a charism that comes from the anointing with the Spirit in baptism, and belongs properly to the mystery of the church which is celebrated in sacraments of initiation. In light of this, the ministry of order is clearly rooted in the universal call to mission and ministry that is common to membership in the People of God – those who have been sacramentally initiated into a community of disciples through baptism.⁷⁶⁵

Chapter 4.5 Boff and Further Thoughts on Charisms and Lay Ministries

⁷⁶³ Ibid, 137.

⁷⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid, 138-139.

In 1981, Leonardo Boff, a Franciscan and liberation theologian, published a controversial text entitled, *Church: Charism and Power*.⁷⁶⁶ While it quickly became a well-known benchmark for Catholic approaches towards liberation theology,⁷⁶⁷ it contains a remarkable closing chapter that actually advocates for an alternative ecclesial structure – one in which charisms become the organizing principle of the church. Boff suggests that Paul had originally introduced the concept of *charism* within the specific context of organizing the ecclesial community; Paul himself had presupposed that the new ethos begun by the Gospels had been based upon a profound mystical experience of the presence of Christ and the Spirit – as living, active realities in the lives of early disciples.⁷⁶⁸

For Boff, Paul used charism as the structuring element of the new Christian communities, whose sudden and powerful appearance had symbolized the eschatological beginning of the end-times. Charisms and the fullness of the Spirit had arrived, and were no longer seen as unexpected or extraordinary; Paul had identified these charisms as concrete functions that the community of disciples exercised for the good of all. In fact, Paul could not envision a non-charismatic member of the church, since each member of the community occupied a decisive role, and now shared an equal dignity that built up the unity of the whole. For Paul, the essential health of this ecclesial model was preserved in the agreement that, “all the members must be concerned for one another” (I Cor. 12:25). As a result, Boff argues that each baptized Christian *is* charismatic, and that each charism

⁷⁶⁶ Leonardo Boff, *Church: Charism and Power*, transl. by John W. Diercksmeier (New York: Crossroad, 1992).

⁷⁶⁷ Boff had been summoned by the then-prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, to a four-hour interview on his publication of *Church: Charism and Power*. While the text had become a standard in liberation theology, it was criticized for its supposed Marxist overtones and concepts that the CDF had considered “damaging” deviations to the Christian faith and life.

⁷⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 156-157.

is the function of a member of the community of disciples. Moreover, as each charism is seen in the function of a member of the community, each Christian, then, is charismatic.⁷⁶⁹

For Paul, it is precisely this charismatic dimension of ecclesiology that becomes the very pneumatic force (*dynamis tou Theou*) that gives rise to various institutions and that keeps them alive; but it is also clear that charism is much more fundamental than institution. According to Boff, all charisms are *constitutive* of the church – in their essence and nature – and not simply optional elements in the life of the church. Through their use, the Spirit unifies the charismatic community, and builds up its horizontal dimensions. Moreover, Boff notes, not much theological subtlety, sophisticated argumentation, or recourse to authority is needed to discern whether a gift, service, or work comes from God. It is sufficient enough to observe its function and measure its usefulness for the community; the norm is such that no one should seek their own self-interest but, instead, the interest of others. To that end, it is the charism of those who exercise leadership within the community (Boff here suggests this was the original function of the *episkopoi*) that have as their primary charism the responsibility for harmony among the many and diverse charisms within the charismatic community of disciples. In fact, Boff notes, when the New Testament characterizes the role of *episkopoi* (bishops), it was chiefly in their responsibility to oversee that everything functioned satisfactorily; contrary to our contemporary understandings, their original charismatic function had nothing to do with either 1) the sacraments or 2) presiding over liturgical worship.⁷⁷⁰

⁷⁶⁹ Ibid, 157-159.

⁷⁷⁰ Ibid, 159-164.

Chapter 4.6 Ecclesial Conundrum: Is Paul Confronting Peter Once Again?

With a critical eye, I clearly observe that there has indeed been a trajectory of specific theological development of this charismatic element or dynamic within the Roman Catholic Church since Cardinal Suenens' dramatic speech on the Council floor. However, I can also critically observe that, while this charismatic trajectory has been present in council documents, the worldwide development of the Charismatic Renewal, the theology of council *periti* and other Catholic theologians, this charismatic trajectory has not always surfaced or been integrated with the larger bulk of official Roman Catholic magisterial teaching – as is evidenced in this section on lay ministries as a contemporary theological development within the global Catholic Church, in faith and practice. Consider the following two ecclesial documents: *Christifideles Laici* and *Ecclesiae de Mysterio*.

First, on December 30, 1988, Pope John Paul II promulgated the post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Christifideles Laici*, as a response to the 1987 Synod of Bishops, who met in Rome to discuss the topic of the vocation and mission of the lay faithful in the church and world; this ecclesial text was the first official recognition and documentation of the pastoral growth and development of the laity within the Roman Catholic Church, since the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council some twenty-two years previous, specifically by the bishop of Rome.⁷⁷¹ The pope had clearly expressed his satisfaction with the progress of *collaboration* that had been taking place between the

⁷⁷¹ For a collection of texts promulgated by Pope John Paul II on the laity and lay ministries up through 1984, see Leonard Doohan, ed., *John Paul II and the Laity* (n.p.: Le Jacq Publishing, 1984). See also “John Paul II Speaks to the Laity,” *The Laity Today* 31 (1987).

priests, religious and laity following the specific encouragements of the Council's bishops in the documents of Vatican II.⁷⁷²

In his section entitled, "Ministries and Charisms, the Spirit's Gifts to the Church," Pope John Paul II begins by noting the first of several points:

The Second Vatican Council speaks of the ministries and charisms as the gifts of the Holy Spirit which are given for the building up of the Body of Christ and for its mission of salvation in the world. Indeed, the Church is directed and guided by the Holy Spirit, who lavishes diverse hierarchical and charismatic gifts on all the baptized, calling them to be, each in an individual way, active and co-responsible. We now turn our thoughts to ministries and charisms as they directly relate to the lay faithful and to their participation in the life of Church Communion.⁷⁷³

Here, he is explicitly relating ministry and charisms as gifts of the Spirit, and calls all baptized members of the community to an active co-responsibility for the mission of the church. It seems to me that he believes the lay faithful have charisms and ministries with which they participate in the life of the ecclesial community. He goes on to first describes the ministries derived from holy orders, and then follows that section with section 23 entitled, "The Ministries, Offices and Roles of the Lay Faithful,"⁷⁷⁴ in which he clearly states,

⁷⁷² Avery Dulles, "Can Laity Properly Be Called 'Ministers'?" *Origins* 35:44 (April 20, 2006), 728-729.

⁷⁷³ John Paul II, *On the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World (Christifideles Laici)*, Vatican transl. (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1988), no. 21.

⁷⁷⁴ The section title, as it appears on the official English translation pages of the Vatican's own website, can be found at: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_en.html

The Church's mission of salvation in the world is realized not only by the ministers in virtue of the Sacrament of Orders but also by all the lay faithful; indeed, because of their Baptismal state and their specific vocation, in the measure proper to each person, the lay faithful participate in the priestly, prophetic and kingly mission of Christ. The Pastors, therefore, ought to acknowledge and foster the ministries, the offices and roles of the lay faithful that find their *foundation in the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation*, indeed, for a good many of them, *in the Sacrament of Matrimony*.⁷⁷⁵

Here, the Pope specifically acknowledges that because of “their foundation in the sacraments of baptism and confirmation,” the lay faithful can participate in “ministries,” “offices” and “roles” that are to be both acknowledged and even fostered by the clerical hierarchy. Pope John Paul II has clearly recognized that all lay men and women are called to *ministries, offices* and *roles* in the mission and ministry of the Roman Catholic Church itself.

This acknowledgement clearly seems to reaffirm the original encouragement found in the aforementioned texts of the Second Vatican Council. Let me highlight an important point: the Pope clearly acknowledges that lay people have ministries, and that they also have offices and roles in the ecclesial reality that is the community of disciples. In the official Latin text, he uses the three specific terms: ministries (“*ministeria*”), offices (“*officia*”) and roles (“*munera*”). The Latin reads,

Pastores igitur debent christifidelium laicorum ministeria, officia et munera agnoscere et promovere, cum eadem *sacramentale fundamentum*

⁷⁷⁵ Pope John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 23.

habeant in *Baptismo et Confirmatione* et pro eorum pluribus etiam in *Matrimonio*.⁷⁷⁶

Pope John Paul II has also clearly based these *ministries, offices* and *roles* of lay men and women within their own individual baptismal participation of the priestly, prophetic and kingly mission of Christ. As such, he confirms their baptismal nature, noting that it falls within the primary duty of pastors to acknowledge these various *ministries, offices* and *roles* of the lay faithful, while exercising “the maximum care to institute them on the basis of Baptism, in which these tasks are rooted.”⁷⁷⁷

In support of this baptismal basis of the various *ministries, offices* and *roles* of lay men and women, the Pope goes on in section 24 to speak of the connection of the charismatic graces to these ministries.

The Holy Spirit, while bestowing diverse ministries in Church communion, en-riches it still further with particular gifts or promptings of grace called *charisms*. These can take a great variety of forms... Whether they be exceptional and great or simple and ordinary, the charisms are *graces of the Holy Spirit that have, directly or indirectly, a usefulness for the ecclesial community*, ordered as they are to the building up of the Church, to the well-being of humanity and to the needs of the world... Even in our own times there is no lack of a fruitful manifestation of

⁷⁷⁶ The official Latin text of *Christifideles Laici* can also be found on the Vatican website, at: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_lt.html

⁷⁷⁷ Ten years later, after his pastoral visit to the United States, the USCC published a collection of his US speeches in, John Paul II, *The Church in America / Ecclesia in America* (Washington, DC: USCC, 1999). In no. 44 of this collection, the Pope had made a consideration of the lay faithful according to their activity in the secular realm, which he saw as “the best one suited their lay state,” while intra-ecclesial activity was given a strong qualification: “In any event, while the intra-ecclesial apostolate of lay people needs to be promoted, care must be taken to ensure that it goes hand in hand with the activity proper to the laity, in which their place cannot be taken by priests: the area of temporal realities.”

various charisms among the faithful, women and men... In referring to the apostolate of the lay faithful the Second Vatican Council writes: "For the exercise of the apostolate the Holy Spirit who sanctifies the People of God through the ministry and the sacraments gives the faithful special gifts as well (cf. 1 Cor. 12:7), 'allotting them to each one as he wills' (cf. 1 Cor. 12:11), so that each might place 'at the service of others the grace received' and become 'good stewards of God's varied grace' (1 Pt 4:10), and build up thereby the whole body in charity (cf. Eph 4:16)."⁷⁷⁸

Clearly, Pope John Paul II saw the connection between all these lay *ministries*, *offices* and *roles* and the charisms by which the lay faithful could serve others and build up the People of God, the Body of Christ, as a spiritually-gifted community of charismatic disciples, here on earth.

However, while this Pope was encouraging the laity to minister with their charisms, he was also dramatically limiting their use at the same time. While noting that the Synod Fathers had expressed a desire for "more study" into the relationship of *ministries*, *offices* and *roles* of lay men and women or what he identifies as the "common priesthood"⁷⁷⁹ with the "ministerial priesthood," Pope John Paul II echoed the need for clarity as to the "essential difference between the "ministerial priesthood and the "common priesthood:"

In the same Synod Assembly, however, a critical judgment was voiced along with these positive elements, about a too-indiscriminate use of the

⁷⁷⁸ Ibid, no. 24.

⁷⁷⁹ Personally, I am fascinated by the Pope's use of the term "common priesthood" in place of the ancient biblical references to the "royal priesthood" as found in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. I wonder if this choice reflects an unintended although possible pejorative meaning that is reflective of a clergy/laity tensions.

word ‘ministry,’ the confusing and the equating of the common priesthood and the ministerial priesthood, the lack of observance of ecclesiastical laws and norms, the arbitrary interpretation of the concept of supply, the tendency towards a ‘clericalization’ of the lay faithful and the risk of creating, in reality, an ecclesial structure of parallel service to that founded on the Sacrament of Orders... Precisely to overcome these dangers the Synod Fathers have insisted on the necessity to express with greater clarity, and with a more precise terminology, both the unity of the Church’s mission in which all the baptized participate, and the substantial diversity of the ministry of pastors which is rooted in the Sacrament of Orders, all the while respecting the other ministries, offices and roles in the Church, which are rooted in the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation.⁷⁸⁰

Interestingly enough, following the 1987 Synod on the Vocation and Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World, Pope John Paul II established a Commission to respond to this “desire” expressed by the Synod Fathers, which was understood to specifically provide an in-depth clarification of the various theological, liturgical, juridical and pastoral considerations associated with the great increase of involvement by the lay faithful in contemporary ministries, offices and roles that had been established and grown considerably in the two decades between the Second Vatican Council and the promulgation of *Christifideles Laici*.⁷⁸¹

⁷⁸⁰ John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 23.

⁷⁸¹ Ibid.

While it was never publically revealed exactly who had been invited to or appointed to this newly established “Commission” that would deal with the “desires,” questions (and quite possibly some of the inherent insecurities) of the Synod Fathers vis-à-vis these lay *ministries, offices* and *roles*, it is interesting to note a strong correlation between the publication of three ecclesial statements by the US Catholic Conference, the national publication arm of the US Catholic Bishops, and a *corrective* document published as a joint effort by several curial departments of the Vatican.

In its annual meetings of 1980, 1995 and 2005, the US Catholic Bishops had published significant documents on lay ministries. The first text, *Called and Gifted*, recalled the strong encouragement of the Second Vatican Council for all adult lay men and women to use their gifts and charisms as ministries for the building up of the church and the world. Here, baptism and confirmation were the basis for all lay ministries in the church; all lay men and women had a right and a duty to use their gifts and charisms in ministry. It also encourage the development of ministries by those laypersons who had been professionally prepared i.e. baptized Catholics who, either formally instituted or simply recognized, were being newly designated as lay “ecclesial ministers.”⁷⁸²

The US Bishops second text, *Called and Gifted for the Third Millennium*, had then introduced a clear distinction between the witness and service of the laity whose primary focus was upon the secular society, and the specific kinds of lay service that arose within the ecclesial communities, essentially identifying only this latter form of activity as “ecclesial lay ministry.” Yet, all the baptized were called to co-responsibility

⁷⁸² US Bishops’ Committee on the Laity, *Called and Gifted – The American Catholic Laity: Reflections of the American Bishops Commemorating the Fifteenth Anniversary of the Issuance of the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity* (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1980).

and collaboration in the church, based upon the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd.⁷⁸³

The growing question of terminology became central, as the terminology itself became a lightning rod of controversy within some circles of the church. In 1997, the Holy See responded by issuing a joint instruction of several dicasteries in the Vatican Curia,⁷⁸⁴ whose stated goal was “simply to provide a clear, authoritative response” to the bishops, priests and laity who were seeking “clarification” on the “new forms of ‘pastoral activity’ of the non-ordained on both parochial and diocesan levels.” This joint- text *Instruction on Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priest*,⁷⁸⁵ immediately sparked anger and confusion across all levels of lay ministries by forbidding all lay men and women from assuming common ministerial titles such as "chaplain," "coordinator," and "moderator,"⁷⁸⁶ and

⁷⁸³ US Bishops Committee on the Laity, *Called and Gifted for the New Millennium: Reflections of the US Catholic Bishops on the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity and the Fifteenth Anniversary of Called and Gifted* (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1995).

⁷⁸⁴ This joint text, entitled, *Ecclesiae de Mysterio*, was composed by the following eight separate Vatican dicasteries: Congregation for the Clergy: Darío Castrillón Hoyos, *Pro-Prefect*; Crescenzo Sepe, *Secretary*. Pontifical Council for the Laity: James Francis Stafford, *President*; Stanislaw Rylko, *Secretary*. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: Joseph Card. Ratzinger, *Prefect*; Tarcisio Bertone SDB, *Secretary*. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments: Jorge Arturo Medina Estévez, *Pro-Prefect*; Geraldo Majella Agnelo, *Secretary*. Congregation for Bishops: Bernardin Card. Gantin, *Prefect*; Jorge María Mejía, *Secretary*. Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples: Jozef Card. Tomko, *Prefect*; Giuseppe Uhac, *Secretary*. Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life: Eduardo Card. Martínez Somalo, *Prefect*; Piergiorgio Silvano Nesti CP, *Secretary*; Pontifical Council for the Interpretation of Legislative Texts: Julián Herranz, *President*; Bruno Bertagna, *Secretary*. The joint Instruction was approved “*in forma specifica*” (meaning that any practices contrary to the Instruction are to be discontinued) by Pope John Paul II in an audience on 13 August 1997, and was promulgated by the Vatican Press on 15 August 1997, the Solemnity of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It is interesting to note that while *Christifideles Laici* had been issued in the eleventh year of the pontificate of John Paul II, *Ecclesiae de Mysterio* was approved in his twentieth.

⁷⁸⁵ *Instruction on Certain Question Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priest (Ecclesiae de Mysterio)* Vatican transl. (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1997).

⁷⁸⁶ In its footnote on this point, the *Instruction* stated that such “unlawful” titles should include all those linguistic expressions “that are similar or equal and indicate a directive role of leadership or such vicarious activity.” It argued that certain practices (non-specific) had developed which “had very serious negative consequences,” and that damaged the “correct understanding of the true ecclesial communion.”

went on to recommend a more discriminating use of the term “minister.” Avery Dulles noted,

Some, going beyond this instruction, contend that the terms *minister* and *ministry* should be reserved to the ordained and never applied to laypersons. Others object that the term *ministry* should be restricted to the exercise of an established office in the church. But neither of these positions seems to be warranted by official Catholic teaching; still less by Scripture and tradition.⁷⁸⁷

Dulles continued his critique,

In official Catholic documents since Vatican II there has been a growing tendency to apply the term *ministry* to lay activities where the Council would probably have used *apostolate*. *Ministry* is used in particular for services intended to build up the church from within, whereas *apostolate*, to the extent that it is still used, connotes activities directed outward to the world.⁷⁸⁸

What Dulles had articulated was a rather odd and anachronistic ecclesial tendency that many men and women involved in ecclesial lay ministries found restrictive and disheartening.

Three items stand out as deeply problematic to me. First, the document’s tone is deeply confusing; it highlights an ambiguous identification of lay activity within the church, while also highlighting the completely *secular* nature of the lay vocation. Second, while admitting that the *Instruction* is not a theological treatise on the nature and role of

⁷⁸⁷ Avery Dulles, “Can Laity Properly Be Called ‘Ministers?’”, 728.

⁷⁸⁸ Ibid.

the lay faithful in the church, it seems clearly preoccupied with ensuring that the “sacred” role of the ordained clergy is respected and not undermined by the laity who may – albeit temporarily – be asked to take up tasks traditionally reserved to priests in the past; so, while safeguarding the mission of the “sacred ministry,” it seems to be identifying and *narrowing* the mission of the lay faithful as purely and only secular in its character.

Third, the title of the *Instruction* itself betrays a fundamental preoccupation with the “sacred ministry” of the priest, and immediately indicates its intent to correct what the hierarchy will go on to describe as the “abuses” surrounding certain pastoral activities that are “proper” to the domain of the ordained priest, and require the sacrament of orders for their exercise. So while the document is not primarily aimed at all baptized men and women faithful, it is clearly corrective to the ongoing development of ministries, offices and roles of the lay faithful – who, it seems to suggest, do not actually act in ministries, offices or roles *per se* – but act only in ways that it now defines as the “sacred ministry” of ordained priests; if women and men are called upon to serve in a substitutionary capacity or manner for ordained priests, then these women and men are simply *collaborating* in roles that are essentially proper to sacramentally ordained priests and, as such, considered as “sacred ministry.”

One easily overlooked but significant article would seem to indicate that I am interpreting the situation correctly. On 29 April 1988, the Vatican’s daily newspaper, *L’Osservatore Romano*, published a one page “reflection” by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, then prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and one of the primary co-signatories of this specific *Instruction*. In his reflection, which had appeared nearly nine months after this joint text was issued, Ratzinger indicated that the need for such

corrective pastoral instruction was motivated by the “abuses” that were seen as prevalent in North-Central Europe, North America and Australia. He indicated that the various dicasteries who had jointly sponsored the *Instruction* had each been concerned “by the growth of a type of parallel ministry among so-called ‘pastoral assistants or workers’ who are addressed by the same titles as priests: *pastors*, *ministers*, and who, when exercising a leadership role in the community, wear liturgical vestments at celebrations and cannot be easily distinguished from priests.”⁷⁸⁹ Ratzinger’s reflection seems to convey a sense of fear on the part of the Curial leadership of these combined dicasteries responsible for the *Instruction*.

This universal baptismal call to charismatic ministries by all the lay men and women was only further obfuscated (intentionally or unintentionally) with the highly anticipated publication of the 2005 document entitled, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord*, the third and most recent ecclesial text of the US Catholic Bishops on the subject of the laity and lay ministries. In this new statement, the US bishops have presented a rationale for naming the more professional forms of ministry by lay men and women as “Lay Ecclesial Ministry.”⁷⁹⁰ The specific history of the text is interesting in light of the fact that it was Avery Cardinal Dulles,⁷⁹¹ who, after a two-year consultation process and

⁷⁸⁹ Joseph Ratzinger, “Reflection on the Instruction on Certain Question Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priest” *L’Osservatore Romano*, English ed. (29 April 1998), 18. Note: While Ratzinger conveyed this palpable sense of Curial fear, on a more personal note, it is striking that such a statement has come from an individual who was a Council peritus, who had collaborated with Küng, Rahner and Congar, who was a consultant to Cardinal Suenens, who had then contributed as a theological advisor on the first Malines Document and who had later written the preface to the fourth Malines Document, soon after his selection as a Cardinal and his appointment as prefect to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

⁷⁹⁰ US Bishops’ Committee on the Laity, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord: A Resource for Guiding the Development of Lay Ecclesial Ministry* (Washington, DC: US Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005).

⁷⁹¹ Avery Cardinal Dulles was created a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church in 2001, by Pope John Paul II. At the time of this 2005 annual meeting of the US Bishops, he had been the Laurence J. McGinley Professor of Religion and Society at Fordham University, and had previously served on the faculties of Woodstock College, The Catholic University of America, The Gregorian University (Rome), Weston

seven separate drafts, had convinced the bishops to accept the specific wording of the text regarding “ministry” and “ministers,” by arguing that the drafting subcommittee’s use of the term “minister” was actually in complete accord with both the official documents of the Holy See, and a whole series of documents published previously by the US Catholic Bishops, themselves. The text of *Co-Workers* was then immediately approved in the very next round of voting, with 190 votes in favor, 45 opposed, and 5 abstentions.⁷⁹²

The US Bishops’ rationale for their use of the term “Lay Ecclesial Ministry” and their corresponding use of the term “Lay Ecclesial Minister,” are both situated within the context of the primary, universal baptismal call to ministry of all lay men and women.

“Lay ecclesial minister” is not itself a specific position title. We do not use the term in order to establish a new rank of order among the laity. Rather, we use the terminology as an adjective to identify a developing and growing reality, to describe it more fully, and to seek a deeper understanding of it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit...

Notice the immediate pneumatological connection. The bishops then continue,

The term reflects certain key realities. The ministry is *lay* because it is service done by lay persons. The sacramental basis is the Sacraments of Initiation, not the Sacrament of Ordination. The ministry is *ecclesial* because it has a place within the community of the Church, whose

School of Theology, Union Theological Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, Episcopal Seminary, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Boston College, Campion Hall (Oxford University), University of Notre Dame, the Catholic University at Leuven, Yale University, and St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie. He had published twenty-two books and over 700 articles prior to his death in 2008, and had served on the International Theological Commission. Of special note, he was one of theological consultants (along with Rahner, Küng, Congar, Laurentin, Hurley, Kasper and Ratzinger) assisting Cardinal Suenens with the very first Malines Document, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*.

⁷⁹² The details of the historical background to this document are taken from the website of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, found at the hyperlink: <http://www.usccb.org/laity/laymin/background.shtml>.

communion and mission it serves, and because it is submitted to the discernment, authorization, and supervision of the hierarchy. Finally, it is *ministry* because it is a participation in the threefold ministry of Christ, who is priest, prophet, and king.⁷⁹³

Here, the bishops are careful to explain several interrelated points. First, they identify ministry (*servitium*) as a kind of service (*diakonia*). Second, they apply the terminology ministry to certain works by the laity that find their one source in the ministry of Christ. Third, lay ecclesial ministry is in accordance with the specific lay vocation; as such, it is distinctive to bringing the secular order into conformity with God's plan. Fourth, while lay ecclesial ministry carries responsibilities rooted in the universal baptismal call and charisms, public service in the local church requires authorization by the proper ecclesial (hierarchical) authority. Fifth, any lay collaboration with ordained ministers is not meant to be a substitution for ordained ministry. Sixth, the lay ecclesial minister typically expresses a sense of personal call that shapes their life choices and commitment Church ministry.⁷⁹⁴ Seventh, the proper preparation for all lay ecclesial ministers requires their human, spiritual, academic and pastoral formation toward an integrated growth of the individual.⁷⁹⁵ Once the competence of the lay ecclesial minister is established, there must be a formal *appointment* to a specific ministry by the bishop, and the *announcement* of this appointment, most typically in writing.⁷⁹⁶

In retrospect, then, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord* is an ecclesial text that is primarily concerned with the nature, calling, preparation, recognition,

⁷⁹³ US Bishops' Committee on the Laity, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord*, 11.

⁷⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 11-12.

⁷⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 33-50.

⁷⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 54-60.

collaboration and public appointment of professional *lay ecclesial ministers* in service to the Church. But then, what has happened to the rest of the *Christifideles laici*? What of the universal call to all the baptized lay men and women who have been initiated into the priestly, prophetic and kingly mission and ministry of Jesus Christ – as his community of charismatic discipleship?

Chapter 4.7 Concluding Remarks

The mission and ministry of all the lay faithful – the whole People of God – is clear, despite any partial or even complete obfuscation in the contemporary ecclesial texts and pastoral realities that we can identify within the Roman Catholic Church. The universal call to all baptized lay men and women in a community of charismatic discipleship is the foundational basis for all forms of ministry in the church. It is the pneumatology of charisms that forces the laity to confront their life in the Spirit, and their own full and active participation in the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ.

Having questioned Osborne's departure points except for the focus on Christian disciple-ship, and having integrated this resonating concept of discipleship with the theologies of charismatic ministries based on the original works of O'Meara, Power and Boff, I would now argue that the best basis for a theology of contemporary ministry, specifically lay ministries, can be found in a theology of *charismatic discipleship*. From both the Pneumatological and Ecclesiological points of view this is a rich, biblically-based foundation for a contemporary and relevant theology of ministries. The seeds of this particular theological approach have clearly been present in the exegetical research

on the authentic Pauline epistles, the teachings of at least four documents of the Second Vatican Council, in Cardinal Suenens work as the papal appointed shepherd the international Renewal in the Spirit / Catholic Charismatic Renewal, in the ecclesial statements issued by most mainline Protestant, Classical Pentecostal and Roman Catholic churches over the last sixty years, and in the often overlooked theological articles and sections of books by Vatican II *periti* such as Küng, Rahner and Congar, as well as the self-declared, practicing Catholic Charismatic theologians Montague and McDonnell, both of whom worked along with Cardinal Suenens and have continued to promote not only the Renewal Movement, but the biblical and patristic bases for such a Renewal, both internationally and here in the United States.

In my own view, the pneumatology of charisms has its most profound theological impact upon contemporary Catholic understandings of ministry; charisms and the resulting impact of charismatic discipleship within the ecclesial communities bears its most significant fruit in a contemporary praxis of the ministerial functions of the whole People of God. I would argue that charismatic discipleship is the foundational ecclesial basis and structure from which all forms of ministry arise – lay or clerical. Are there existing ecclesial documents from the Roman Catholic Church that support and nourish this view? I would answer both yes and no.

When I consider the four Vatican II documents *Lumen Gentium*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, *Ad Gentes* and *Presbyterorum Ordinis*,⁷⁹⁷ as I have analyzed them in chapter one, I find what I would identify as the seeds of a theology of ministry from the perspective of charismatic discipleship. When I consider the six Malines Documents

⁷⁹⁷ Specifically, the sections treated in *Lumen Gentium* 4, 7, 12, 25, 30 and 50; *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 3 and 30; *Ad Gentes* 4, 23 and 28; and *Presbyterorum Ordinis* 9.

produced under the leadership of Cardinal Suenens, I also have the seeds of this theology. When I consider that these Malines Documents became the foundation and support structure for more than two dozen ecclesial statements produced by national Catholic Bishops Conferences, as well as the basis for the official position of the Vatican and several popes,⁷⁹⁸ as I have analyzed in chapter two, I also have the seeds of a theology of ministry based upon charismatic discipleship. In the works of Küng, Rahner, Congar, McDonnell and Montague, each of whom was responding to the initiative of Cardinal Suenens' Conciliar speech, in which he issued a challenge to explore the meaning of the charismatic element of the church, which I analyzed in chapter three, and its meaning for the future of Roman Catholic faith and practice, I have the seeds of a theology of ministry based upon charismatic discipleship. Then, with the contributions of O'Meara, Power and Boff, we find a fruitful exploration of ministry based upon the Holy Spirit's charismatic gifts, services and energies present within the ecclesial communities of baptized disciples who identify with and are responding to the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ. So, in answer to my first question, yes, the church is teaching elements of charismatic discipleship and ministry of all who are baptized in Christ.

I would not want to lose sight of an important issue, however. I would argue that with the primary contemporary focus turned toward the Curial legitimacy or illegitimacy of professional forms of lay ecclesial ministry, and with the growing recognition and stresses on "lay ecclesial ministers" themselves – while truly an important step in the effort to encourage professional types of lay ministries – so much recognition and stress

⁷⁹⁸ See a collection of papal speeches, homilies and correspondence on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal by Popes Paul VI, John Paul I and John Paul II in: Kilian McDonnell, ed. *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989).

may also have had the unintentional effect of obfuscating the universal call to ministry that all baptized men and women receive through their individual share in the priestly, prophetic and kingly mission and ministry of Jesus Christ, and share within the charismatic discipleship of their ecclesial communities, as stated in *Lumen Gentium*. This is a sad, albeit indirect and unintentional, consequence.

At the same time, the confusing tones of *Christifideles Laici* (“ministries, offices and roles” versus the “secular character” which is “proper to the laity”), and *Ecclesia in America* (working to transform “temporal realities”), and then the *Instruction* by the joint dicasteries, which, I would argue, pejoratively nuanced lay intra-ecclesial activities as only temporary “collaboration” in the “sacred ministry” that is proper to “ordained priests.” While laity who are professionally trained may seek to be named and even recognized as “lay ecclesial ministers,” and designated as “co-workers” in the Lord’s vineyard, it is clear that they do so only under the auspices of bishops and presbyters who seem to be limiting (at worst) or redirecting the energies of the laity (at best) to purely secular pursuits, and the transformation of the temporal order alone. The tone of fear in the *Instruction*, reinforced by the “reflection” of (then-Cardinal) Ratzinger, strikes an ominous chord, in the symphonic and universal call to both charismatic discipleship and charismatic ministries *by all the baptized faithful* – a tone that has obfuscated the charismatic trajectory more and more in official ecclesial statements on lay ministries by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

CONCLUSIONS

What are we to make of the life and teachings of Cardinal Suenens? What is the real significance of his impulse for the “charismatic dynamic” at the Second Vatican Council? What kind of insights can be gained by the Roman Catholic Church, and how will they impact our practices, and, in turn, impact the way we relate to the other churches?

It is clear that Suenens was no ordinary man of the Church. Consider his background and his influence: He was raised by a single mother, in the poverty of a rectory where his uncle was a priest. He was attracted to the priesthood, languages and parliamentary procedure at an early age. He was sponsored by the primate of Belgium, who took an active interest in his education; sent to Rome, he studied canon law, and obtained dual doctorates in theology and philosophy. There, he learned the art of debate from some of the finest theologians of his day. He also learned how to maneuver about in the inner sanctums of the Roman Curial system.

He was a seminary professor, and a university rector that was marked for death by the Nazi regime. As an auxiliary bishop, he attracted the patronage of the supreme pontiff, was quickly selected to leadership as an archbishop, and was created a cardinal with unprecedented speed. He was hand-picked as one of ten presidents of the largest Ecumenical Council in Church history. As a papal advisor, he was the secret author of a massive *alternative plan* that was then promoted by Pope John XXIII and unanimously adopted by the Council Fathers. He preceded any Roman Pontiff in presenting a papal encyclical to a General Assembly of the United Nations, and found courage in that audience to address the universal Church. He was chosen over more senior hierarchs to

eulogize one pope and would gain unprecedented access to the next pontiff, who appointed him as one of four permanent moderators of the Council. He championed the conciliar teachings on the Church *ad intra* and *ad extra*, and was charged to oversee the completion of two constitutions. In Council, he defended the grace of charisms, and convinced nearly 2,800 bishops of the contemporary, dynamic power of the Holy Spirit.

After the Council, Suenens was named papal representative to the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and co-founded the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services. With the help of one dozen Council *periti*, he published six theological and pastoral studies on charismatic dynamics known as the *Malines Documents*. In order to strengthen many Catholic charismatics who had experienced criticism and misunderstanding, he wrote *A New Pentecost?* – just one of twenty-two books he authored during his career. In 1976, he was awarded the *Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion*, for his specific advancement and guidance of the Charismatic Renewal. Even upon his retirement as Primate of Belgium, he continued to publish his thoughts and present lectures to Catholic and Protestant groups for another sixteen years.

For many who have taken an initial, cursory glance at his work and life, Cardinal Suenens was, perhaps, one of nearly two dozen leaders who seemed to draw the attention, admiration and praise of many during the Second Vatican Council. Looking deeper, however, it becomes clear that this Belgian cleric was the principal, driving force behind many of the most proactive decisions and positive fruits of the Council. For example, the papal endorsement and unanimous adoption of his *alternative plan* was, in my opinion, one of the central turning points in the overall direction of the Council. Then, with his insight to approach ecclesiology *ad intra* and *ad extra*, I would argue that Suenens

provided the theological framework to capture and balance the dynamic, influential forces of *aggiornamento* and *resourcement* that became the conceptual backdrop to the sixteen conciliar documents. In his dual responsibility and oversight for *Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes*, Suenens exercised unparalleled influence over the most debated and most rewritten texts, both behind the scenes, and during each of the four autumn sessions of the Council.

Most importantly, Suenens introduced the concept that charismatic gifts were still being freely given by the Holy Spirit to all the baptized faithful. Each baptized Christian has received charisms in order to contribute his or her role in the universal mission to build up the kingdom of God. It was no accident, then, that *Lumen Gentium* – a constitution that was the responsibility of Suenens – would contain six of the twelve references to charisms that are found in the corpus of Vatican II documents. Or that eleven of the twelve references speak of charisms being exercised by lay persons i.e. “the laity” (1), “the lay faithful” (1), “the faithful” (3), “the entire church” (1), “the church” (1), “each person” (1), “every disciple” (1), “all the people of God” (1), and “those who were endowed” and subjected to the authority of the apostles (1). In fact, only one of these twelve references mentions charisms being exercised by the hierarchy – “the charism of infallibility,” which is actually given to “roman pontiffs,” to “the body of bishops,” and to the Church in its entirety. In light of this, the documents of the Second Vatican Council clearly identify the majority of charisms in relation to how they are exercised by lay men and women; no other Vatican II document speaks of charisms in direct relation to pastors, bishops or popes.

Vatican II taught that all baptized laypersons – male and female – are given charisms by the will of the Holy Spirit, in order to participate in the communion and overall mission of the Church. Each lay person has both the right and the duty to use their charisms in the Church. Pastors are called to uncover, acknowledge and foster all the charisms of the laity, encourage them to show their initiative, and weigh the fruit of lay charisms without extinguishing them. Charisms are seen to sanctify the Church in addition to sacramental ministries; they can be extraordinary or simple and widely diffused, but they are to be received with thanksgiving; they may be desired and even eagerly sought after, but never rashly sought after or presumptuously expected to bear fruit. They are spontaneous and independent from ordained ministerial gifts; they are not a shared participation in gifts proper to the hierarchy, but they are seen to qualify their recipients and make them fit for roles and offices in the Church. Charisms, as they were then acknowledged, may even signify evidence of holiness in contemporary men and women.

Suenens collaborated with theologians and Council *periti* like Philips, Küng, Rahner, Congar, Häring, Ratzinger, Hauptmann, Colombo, Tucci, Camara, McDonnell, Mühlen, Dulles and Kasper. Six *Malines Documents* were produced that articulate and develop a theology of charisms, and which soon became the backbone of Rome's official position on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Suenens and his collaborators continued to study, write and articulate a fresh understanding of the Holy Spirit and his role in the Church, in missionary activity, in the role of the laity, and in the sacramental and ministerial practices of the Church.

While it is clear that the one hundred nineteen ecclesial statements that I have examined and analyzed were diverse and represented a variety of approaches to the Charismatic renewal, several patterns can be deduced from the entire body of ecclesial texts, and specifically from those that are Roman Catholic.

First, the Charismatic renewal penetrated directly into the heart of major Churches between the 1960's and the 1980's; it surfaced in Anglican, , Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian-Reformed, Baptist and other Protestant Churches, as well as in the Catholic Churches of Europe, North and South America, Africa, Australia and various island nations. Second, the vast majority of *initial* ecclesial statements attempted to understand the external manifestations of glossolalia or speaking in tongues; a secondary issue, in order of importance, was the biblical and historical theologies of the “baptism (of, with, or in) the Spirit,” as well as a question as to the interrelationship between water baptism and Spirit baptism; there was no universal consensus on whether this experience constituted a revivification of the Spirit previously received in act of conversion and water baptism, or whether this experience actually constituted a “second blessing,” which was a traditional doctrine of some Classical Pentecostal Churches.

Third, while the vast majority of early ecclesial documents had called for some level of caution towards the Charismatic renewal, each of these churches above had gradually opened to the movement over additional time, as this was frequently documented within their historical statements they had produced; a very common caution was voiced toward the unwarranted proselytism of practicing Christians toward membership in classical Pentecostal churches. Fourth, with mounting internal pressures to recognize the individual and ecclesial benefits of the renewal, a variety of churches

and ecclesial communions had produced a second distinct level of *international* ecclesial documentation, mostly supportive, yet clearly with a host of appropriate recommendations to ensure the internal ecclesial peace and harmony; this included the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Communion, the World Council of Churches, etc.

Fifth, many of the later ecclesial statements recognized the ecumenical benefits of the Charismatic renewal, as one defining element of the renewal was its ability to transcend ecclesial boundaries; a high percentage of Charismatics had occasionally, some even frequently, joined together with members of other churches for Charismatic prayer and worship, enough to warrant hierarchical interest and even warnings against a loss of “faith identity” and the adoption of incompatible doctrines. Sixth, the international levels of Catholic participation in the renewal led to the appointment of a Papal Representative, Suenens himself, an international coordinating office based in Rome, the establishment of regular meetings of representatives with the Pope and Vatican Curia, as well as the pontifical and canonical recognition of “private associations of the faithful” for various Charismatic groups within the Catholic Church.

With the creation of the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue, the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and roughly 95 representatives from some Classical Pentecostal Churches established a longstanding ecumenical relationship with each other. This dialogue allowed theologians from the Catholic and Pentecostal churches to explore similarities and differences in their approaches toward speaking in tongues, prophesy, healing, the rites of Christian initiation, and how Christians understood their membership within the community. As a result of what originally began

as a simple "dialogue on spirituality," five phases of ecumenical dialogue took place over a period of thirty-five years.

The most important ecumenical text produced from this international dialogue came in the publication of *On Becoming a Christian: Insights from Scripture and the Patristic Writings*, published in 2006 as the Final Report of the Fifth Phase. The nucleus of this document is clearly the patristic contributions of Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom on the relationship of the charismatic gifts and the baptism in the Spirit to the Sacramental rites in the earliest accounts of Christian initiation. The weight and authority of these four Church Fathers allowed the Catholics and Classical Pentecostals to find deeper meaning and even agreement on various points in their discussions, and set a clear tone for the potential future of their joint discussions on the Holy Spirit and his charismatic graces.

In chapter three, I analyzed the writings of five Catholic theologians who worked alongside Cardinal Suenens in the promotion and understanding of the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit. Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, SJ, and Yves Congar, OP were each leading theologians at the time of the Second Vatican Council, were each appointed *periti* to the Council itself, and were three of the founders of the international theological journal *Concilium*,⁷⁹⁹ that helped to spread their new views to a wide post-conciliar audience of Catholic men and women across the globe. Kilian McDonnell, OSB and George T. Montague, SM had both worked along-side Suenens in the implementation of the contemporary Catholic Charismatic Renewal that would stretch across the full global

⁷⁹⁹ Küng, Rahner and Congar founded the journal in 1965, along with Edward Schillebeeckx, Johann-Baptist Metz, Anton van den Boogaard, and Paul Brand.

reach of the Roman Catholic Church. Several conclusions can be made of the combined efforts of these five theologians.

Küng had been the ghostwriter for the famous October 1963 speech on charisms by Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens that was delivered to the full assembly of bishops at the Second Vatican Council. In attempting to publically defend the charismatic nature of the church, Küng later on picked up on two major trajectories of the original Suenens speech: 1) the charisms as spiritual gifts, and 2) the charisms as personal callings. For Küng, all baptized Christians had been anointed by the Holy Spirit and endowed with their own charisms, which meant that it was actually *normal* to exercise their charisms as contemporary Christians. Then, in seeing that the charisms could be grouped by their similarity of function, he determined that every charism was a call to service, and that every service was a call to a ministry; Küng reasoned that if each baptized Christian had received charisms, then each baptized Christian was *called to ministry*. Thus, it was absolutely erroneous, according to Küng, to think of the charismatic gifts as the privilege of a few select individuals (e.g. the *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi* and *diakonoï*); charismatic ministries clearly belonged to the entire community of the faithful.

Rahner, like Küng, heard the Suenens speech on charisms, and decided to republish some earlier articles, including one that had identified all ordained ecclesial offices and ministries as charismatic in character. But following both *Lumen Gentium* and Küng's supporting article, his own view that the non-hierarchical charismata were "equally important" and "just as essential" as hierarchical offices and ministries, took on fresh meaning: the plurality of charismatic gifts clearly had a *democratizing* effect upon the entire people of God. According to Rahner, Paul envisioned each charismatic grace as

simultaneously *sanctifying* the recipient and *building up* the Body of Christ; charismatic dynamics belonged to the *essence* of the Church and would always exist as *properties* of the Church. As a trained Jesuit priest, Rahner knew that traditional Catholic mystical theology had focused on the individual's progression in the life of sanctity; by its historical relegation of charisms to the category of *extraordinary mystical phenomena*, they were typically seen as peripheral and unimportant to the mystical life; as a result, charisms had come to be neglected by the majority of Catholic mystical writers. Ultimately, Rahner believed that it was possible to recover a theology of charismatic experiences. Toward the end of his life, with his awareness of the developing "American charismatic efforts," Rahner suggested that the contemporary baptism in the Holy Spirit and charismatic experiences *could be necessary* for the life of each Christian.

Congar's unexpected insight from his conversation with two Orthodox observers at the Second Vatican Council allowed him to reconsider the inherent connections existing between ecclesiology, pneumatology and theological anthropology. This inspired his efforts over the next quarter century to reunite pneumatological anthropology and pneumatological ecclesiology. He attempted to recover the *living Pneumatology* that had been present in biblical and patristic texts, mirrored by Aquinas, and touched upon by Möhler, but that had largely been forgotten and even replaced after Trent, by devotion to Mary, to the Pope and to the Eucharist. Following the Second Vatican Council, he clearly identified the experiences of the contemporary Renewal as this *living Pneumatology*, and wrote of the charismatic gifts and the baptism in the Holy Spirit in his magnum opus of Roman Catholic pneumatology. His efforts brought him the attention of the Pontiff of Rome, who in great admiration of his theology of the Holy Spirit recognized him as a

Cardinal, shortly before his death.

McDonnell and Montague, who had both worked alongside Suenens as participants in this global Catholic Renewal movement, had each previously contributed to the field of Catholic pneumatology, but their significant joint-text propelled them to the forefront in the Pneuma-tology of charisms. While Montague does not believe that the biblical texts allow us to reconstruct a *completely certain* and *consistent* rite of Christian initiation, water-baptism is clearly an essential element to the rite; the laying on of hands and anointing with chrism oils do not consistently appear in the initial stage, but had been adopted as elements by the late fourth century. It is, however, assumed in the majority of biblical texts that there is an *experiential dimension* to Christian initiation, along with a clear *expectation of charismatic manifestations* on the part of the newly-initiated.

Montague implies that the Greek term *anakainōsis* (“renewal”) suggests that *new outpourings* of the Spirit were to be continually sought in the life of a believer, especially in light of the fact that charisms were considered *essential equipment* for building up the local communities of charismatic discipleship.

In the post-biblical texts investigated by McDonnell, he finds that a major paradigm shift had taken place which drew away emphasis from the “new birth” imagery of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and charismatic experiences. Whether in reaction to the feared spread of Montanism or the rise of pilgrimages from Europe and Asia Minor to Jerusalem’s new Constantinian Church of the Holy Sepulcher – with its emphasis on orthodoxy and orthopraxis – the charisms that had been associated with the *common empowerment* of all of believers who had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit during the rite of Christian initiation clearly began to decline; by the end of the fourth century,

Chrysostom even laments the loss of the charismatic gifts that clearly had been experienced by Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory Nazianzus. The weight of the fact that the charisms had been a *normal* part of Christian initiation and life in the Holy Spirit is emphasized by McDonnell's reminder to us that Hilary, Cyril, Basil, Gregory Nazianzus and John Chrysostom were all later named Doctors of the Church, whose teachings were seen as identifying the faith and practice of the Church itself.

With the Syrian emphasis on the "second baptism" of monastic life, the charisms would eventually come to be associated with the ascetic lifestyle of monastic enclosures, which would, as McDonnell has suggested, eventually come to preserve the charisms from the secularization of the darkening empire. The *essence* of Christian initiation was untouched, the charisms remained sheltered in monasteries, and the once *democratized ministries* were then gradually subsumed into the official ecclesial offices and sacred ministries of the hierarchy.

In my fourth chapter, I explored how the mission and ministry of all the lay faithful – the whole People of God – continues despite any partial or even complete obfuscation in contemporary texts and pastoral realities that I can identify within the Roman Catholic Church. I believe that the universal call to all baptized lay men and women in a community of charismatic discipleship is the foundational basis for all forms of ministry in the church. It is this pneumatology of charisms that forces the laity to confront their life in the Spirit, and their own full and active participation in the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ.

Having echoed Osborne's critiques of popular departure points for the study of lay ministry, I did find myself resonating with the focus on Christian discipleship, and have attempted to integrate this concept of discipleship with the theologies of charismatic ministries based on the original works of O'Meara, Power and Boff. I would now argue that the best basis for a theology of contemporary ministry, specifically lay ministries, can be found in a theology of *charismatic discipleship*. From both the Pneumatological and Ecclesiological points of view this is a rich, biblically-based foundation for a contemporary and relevant theology of ministries. The seeds of this particular theological approach have clearly been present in the exegetical research on the authentic Pauline epistles, the teachings of at least four documents of the Second Vatican Council, in Cardinal Suenens' work as the papal appointed shepherd of the international Catholic Charismatic Renewal, in the ecclesial statements issued by most mainline Protestant, Classical Pentecostal and Roman Catholic churches over the last sixty years, and in the often overlooked theological articles and sections of books by Vatican II *periti* such as Küng, Rahner and Congar, as well as the self-declared, practicing Catholic Charismatic theologians Montague and McDonnell, both of whom worked along with Suenens and have continued to promote the biblical and patristic bases for such a Renewal, both internationally and here in the United States.

In my own view, the pneumatology of charisms has its most profound theological impact upon contemporary Catholic understandings of ministry; charisms and the resulting impact of charismatic discipleship within the ecclesial communities bears its most significant fruit in a contemporary praxis of the ministerial functions of the whole People of God. I would argue that charismatic discipleship is the foundational ecclesial

basis and structure from which all forms of ministry arise – lay or clerical. Are there existing ecclesial documents from the Roman Catholic Church that support and nourish this view? I would answer both yes and no.

When I consider the four Vatican II documents *Lumen Gentium*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, *Ad Gentes* and *Presbyterorum Ordinis*,⁸⁰⁰ as I had analyzed them in chapter one, I find what I would identify as the seeds of a theology of lay ministries from the perspective of charismatic discipleship. When I consider the six Malines Documents produced under the leadership of Suenens, I also have the seeds of this theology. When I consider that these Malines Documents became the foundation and support structure for more than two dozen ecclesial statements produced by various national Roman Catholic Bishops Conferences, as well as the basis for the official position of the Vatican and several popes,⁸⁰¹ as I have analyzed in chapter two, I also have the seeds of a theology of ministry based upon charismatic discipleship. In the works of Küng, Rahner, Congar, McDonnell and Montague, each of whom was responding to the initiative of Suenens' conciliar speech, in which he issued a challenge to explore the meaning of the charismatic element of the church, which I analyzed in chapter three, and its meaning for the future of Roman Catholic faith and practice, I have the seeds of a theology of ministry based upon charismatic discipleship. Then, with the contributions of O'Meara, Power and Boff, I find a fruitful exploration of lay ministry based upon the Holy Spirit's charismatic gifts, services and energies present within the ecclesial communities of baptized disciples

⁸⁰⁰ Specifically, the sections treated in *Lumen Gentium* 4, 7, 12, 25, 30 and 50; *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 3 and 30; *Ad Gentes* 4, 23 and 28; and *Presbyterorum Ordinis* 9.

⁸⁰¹ See a collection of papal speeches, homilies and correspondence on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal by Popes Paul VI, John Paul I and John Paul II in: Kilian McDonnell, ed. *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989).

who identify with and are responding to the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ. So, in answer to my first question, yes, the church is teaching elements of charismatic discipleship and ministry of all women and men who are baptized in Christ.

I would not want to lose sight of an important issue, however. I would argue that with the primary contemporary focus turned toward the Curial legitimacy or illegitimacy of professional forms of “lay ecclesial ministry,” and with the growing recognition and stresses on “lay ecclesial ministers” themselves – while truly an important step in the ongoing efforts to encourage these professional types of lay ministries – this recognition and stress may have had the unintentional effect of obfuscating the *universal call to ministry* that all baptized men and women receive through their individual share in the priestly, prophetic and kingly mission and ministry of Jesus Christ, and share within the charismatic discipleship of their ecclesial communities, as stated in *Lumen Gentium*. This is a sad, albeit indirect and unintentional, consequence.

At the same time, the confusing tones of *Christifideles Laici* (i.e. “ministries, offices and roles” *versus* the “secular character” which is “proper to the laity”), and *Ecclesia in America* (working to transform “temporal realities”), and then the *Instruction* by the joint dicasteries, which, I would argue, pejoratively nuanced lay intra-ecclesial activities as only temporary “collaboration” in the “sacred ministry” that is proper to “ordained priests.” While laity who are professionally trained may seek to be named and even recognized as “lay ecclesial ministers,” and designated as “co-workers” in the Lord’s vineyard, it is clear that they do so only under the auspices of bishops and presbyters who seem to be limiting (at worst) or redirecting the energies of the laity (at best) to purely secular pursuits, and the transformation of the temporal order alone. The

tone of fear in the *Instruction*, reinforced by the “reflection” of (then-Cardinal) Ratzinger, strikes an ominous chord, in the symphonic and universal call to both charismatic discipleship and charismatic ministries *by all the baptized faithful* – a tone that has obfuscated the charismatic trajectory more and more in official ecclesial statements on lay ministries by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Thus, to be completely honest, what I have discovered in my research is both the clear trajectory of charismatic discipleship and charismatic ministries by all the baptized, and a slow but very methodical counter-theology or counter-trajectory that seems to be based in reactionary fear i.e. fear in the real potential for the laypeople to encroach upon the “sacred ministry” of the ordained hierarchy, and fear of perhaps displacement or loss of clerical status and privileges. In fact, as I have researched, studied and analyzed the written documents that have been published by or on behalf of these bishops, it is amazing to recognize how much these human fears have impacted and greatly limited the growth of the Charismatic renewal, across the board, in every church and denomination.

I also notice a particular nuance to the expressed fears related to the renewal. In the beginning, the stated fears of the Roman Catholic bishops seemed to be twofold: 1) the fear of tongues and other externally extraordinary phenomenon that may not have been commonly known and practiced; and 2) the fear of the participants’ potentially losing their Catholic identity (by what was then determined as an *unwarranted integration* with charismatics from other churches). These two fears, which were clearly associated with the beginnings of the renewal in each church or denomination, including the beginnings of the Catholic Charismatic renewal, are truly dwarfed by the real, palpable fear that charismatic experiences and charismatic ministries inherently imply a

challenge to the legitimate authority of the hierarchy who have jurisdiction over the churches. I would argue that any potential threats implied by the challenge of the charismatic ministries of all baptized women and men is greatly lessened when these very same hierarchical ministries are theologically grounded as the true charismatic manifestations and functions of the *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi* and *diakonoi* – who each share in charismatic graces of oversight and coordination of the very same ministries and services performed by all the baptized men and women who are called to build up the body of Christ.

An awakened, charismatically-charged movement of lay persons does not necessitate a threat to any established institutional or hierarchical authority in each local or regional church setting. I would argue, in fact, that such a movement has the clear potential to become a very powerful renewal that actually integrates itself across a broad spectrum of churches and denominations, and is continually discerning within a community of charismatic discipleship whether it is acting in accord with well established Roman Catholic pneumatology, which implicitly promotes the clear understanding that the Spirit never ceases ongoing efforts toward the unity of body of Christ. I find this to be a refreshing perspective and see much potential for the further, ongoing theological examination of charismatically-based ministries and charismatic discipleship as a foundation for all forms of lay ministries, especially since – as Suenens himself pointed out in his 1963 speech on charisms – the Charismatic renewal has a real potential to greatly affect ecumenical progress towards the realization of the full unity in the body of Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Walter M. *Twelve Council Fathers*. (New York: MacMillan, 1963).
- Afanassieff, Nicolas. *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, transl. by Vitaly Permiakov (South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2007).
- Alberigo, Giuseppe. *A Brief History of Vatican II*, transl. by Matthew Sherry (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006).
- American Lutheran Church, USA. "A Report on Glossolalia" (1963). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960- 1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 55-63
- American Lutheran Church, USA. "A Statement with Regard to Speaking in Tongues" (1964). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 108-111.
- American Lutheran Church, USA. "Christian Faith and the Ministry of Healing" (1965). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 121-131.
- American Lutheran Church, USA. "Guidelines" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 369-374.
- Anglican Church, Australia. "Both Sides to the Question" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 374-441.
- Anglican Church, Canada. "Report of the Commission on the Charismatic Movement," (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1-13.
- Anglican Church, Great Britain. "Gospel and Spirit: A Joint Statement" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 291-307.

- Anglican Church, International. "Resolution on the Holy Spirit and the Church" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973- 1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 77-78.
- Apostolic Faith Mission, Republic of South Africa. "The Charismatic Movement" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 377-378.
- Assemblies of God, USA. "Charismatic Study Report" (1972). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960- 1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 318-320.
- Austin, Gerard. *Anointing with the Spirit: The Rite of Confirmation, The Use of Oil and Chrism. Vol. III. Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1985).
- Baptist General Conference, USA. "Biblical Charisma and the Contemporary New Testament Church" (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 517-519.
- Baptist Union, Great Britain and Ireland. "Working Group on the Charismatic Movement" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 379-390.
- Baptist Union, New Zealand. "The Effects of neo-Pentecostalism on New Zealand Baptist Churches" (1970). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 211-219.
- Baptist World Alliance, International. "Summary Statement and Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 79-81.
- Bennett, Dennis and Rita Bennett. *The Holy Spirit and You*. (Gainesville, FL: Bridge-Logos Publishers, 1971).

- Boff, Leonardo. *Church: Charism and Power*, transl. by John W. Diercksmeier (New York: Crossroad, 1992).
- Bordeianu, Radu. "Priesthood Natural, Universal and Ordained: Dumitru Staniloae's Communion Ecclesiology" *Pro Ecclesia*, vol. XIX: 4 (2010), 405-433.
- Cantalamessa, Raniero. *Come, Creator Spirit: Meditations on the Veni Creator*. English transl. by Denis and Marlene Barrett. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).
- Christian and Missionary Alliance, USA. "Seek Not – Forbid Not!" (1963). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 63-69.
- Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), USA. "Statement on Charismatic Renewal" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 484-486.
- Church of Scotland (Presbyterian). "The Charismatic Movement within the Church of Scotland" (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 519-547.
- Church of Scotland (Presbyterian). "The Work and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 442-443.
- Church of the Nazarene, USA. "Resolution of the Board of General Superintendents" (1970). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 219-221.
- Code of Canon Law*, Book II (Cann. 204-207) found on the Vatican website at the hypertext: http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/___PT.HTM
- Codex Iuris Canonici*, Liber II (Cann. 204-746) found on the Vatican website at the hypertext: http://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/latin/documents/cic_liberII_lt.html
- Comblin, Joseph. *The Holy Spirit and Liberation*. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 1989).
- Congar, Yves. "I Believe in the Holy Spirit in the Church," *La Croix* (March 4, 1972).

- Congar, Yves. "The Church as People of God," *Concilium*, vol. 1 (New York: Paulist Press, 1965), 16ff.
- Congar, Yves. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, from the original *Je crois en l'Esprit Saint* transl. by David Smith (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Co., 1979-1980, 1983, 2001).
- Congar, Yves. *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*, transl. by D. Attwater (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957).
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, et al. *Instruction on Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priest (Ecclesiae de Mysterio)* Vatican transl. (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1997).
- Cordes, Paul Josef. *Call to Holiness: Reflections on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1997).
- Creemers, Jelle. "Time Will Teach Us... Reflections on Thirty-five years of Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue" *Ecclesiology*, vol. 5 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2009), 325.
- Dallen, James. "Review of Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 29:2 (Spring 1992), 270-271;
- Daughters of St. Paul, *The Sixteen Documents of Vatican II*, NCWC transl. (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1966).
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Norman P. Tanner, ed. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 1990).
- Diekmann, Godfrey. "The Laying on of Hands: The Basic Sacramental Rite," *CTSA Proceedings* 29 (1974), 339-351.
- Documents of Vatican II*, Walter M. Abbott, ed., Joseph Gallagher, transl. (New York: Guild Press, 1966).
- Doohan, Leonard. *The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1984).
- Dulles, Avery. "Can Laity Properly Be Called 'Ministers'?" *Origins* 35:44 (April 20, 2006), 728-729.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970).

- Dunn, James D.G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975).
- Dunn, James D.G. *The Christ and the Spirit: Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Dunn, James D.G. *The Christ and the Spirit: Pneumatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Dupuis, Jacques. "Lay People in Church and World: The Contribution of Recent Literature to a Synodal Theme," *Gregorianum* 68(1987), 347-390.
- Dutch Reformed Church, Republic of South Africa. "Guidelines on the Charismatic Movement and the Charismatic Gifts" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 391-429.
- Episcopal Church, USA. "1971 Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops," (1971). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 282-285.
- Episcopal Church, USA. "New Movements in the Church" (1962). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 20-21.
- Episcopal Church, USA. "Report on the Special Commission on Glossolalia" (1960). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 10-20.
- Episcopal Church, USA. "Study Commission on Glossolalia," (1963). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 70-95.
- Episcopal Church, USA. "The Speaking in Tongues and the Church" (1960). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1-9.
- European Charismatic Leaders Conference, Schloss Craheim. "Charismatic Renewal and the Unity of the Church" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Docu-*

- ments. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 13-14.
- Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, Germany. "Theological Guidelines for the Charismatic Congregational Renewal in Protestant Churches" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 147-150.
- Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, Germany. "Evangelical Spirituality" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 486-489.
- Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren, Czechoslovakia. "The Charismatic Movement" (no date). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 521-530.
- Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do With Christian Initiation? Heart of the Church Consultation.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague. (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1991).
- Gaillardetz, Richard. "Shifting Meanings in the Lay-Clergy Distinction," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 64(1999), 115-139.
- Gelpi, Donald L. *The Spirit in the World. Zacchaeus Studies in Theology.* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988).
- Gelpi, Donald L. *The Turn to Experience in Contemporary Theology.* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1994).
- Goldie, Rosemary "Lay, Laity, Laicity: A Bibliographical Survey of Three Decades," *The Laity Today* 26 (1979), 107-144.
- Groppe, Elizabeth T. *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Hahnenberg, Edward P. *A Concise Guide to the Documents of Vatican II* (Cincinnati, OH: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2007).
- Hahnenberg, Edward P. *Ministries: A Relational Approach* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2003).
- Haughey, John. "The Pentecostal Thing and the Jesuits," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, 5 (June, 1973), 113-120.

- Huebsch, Bill. *Vatican II in Plain English: The Council*, vol. I. (Allen, TX: Thomas More, 1997).
- Huebsch, Bill. *Vatican II in Plain English: The Decrees and Declarations*, vol. III. (Allen, TX: Thomas More, 1997).
- Imbelli, Robert P. "Review of Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries," *Theological Studies* 53:2 June 1992, 344-345.
- Jenkinson, Ronald. "Cardinal Suenens Preaches the Mission at Oxford University." *The Tablet* (Feb. 26, 1977).
- John Paul II and the Laity*, Leonard Doohan, ed. (n.p.: Le Jacq Publishing, 1984).
- John Paul II Speaks to the Laity," *The Laity Today* 31 (1987).
- John Paul II. *Christifideles Laici*. Found on the Vatican English website at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_en.html
- John Paul II. *Christifideles Laici*. Found on the Vatican Latin website at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_lt.html
- John Paul II. *On the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World (Christifideles Laici)*, Vatican transl. (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1988).
- John Paul II. *The Church in America / Ecclesia in America* (Washington, DC: USCC, 1999).
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical and Global Perspectives*. (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002).
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002).
- Kavanagh, Aidan. *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation. Vol. I. Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1978).
- Kildahl, John P. *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
- Komonchak, Joseph A. "Clergy, Laity and the Church's Mission in the World," *The Jurist*, 41 (1981), 422-447.

- Komonchak, Joseph A. "The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," *History of Vatican II*, vol. I. Guisepppe Alberigo, ed., Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 338-344.
- Küng, Hans and Jurgen Moltmann, eds. *Conflicts about the Holy Spirit*. (New York: Seabury Press, 1979).
- Küng, Hans. "The Charismatic Structures of the Church." *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*, vol. 4: *The Church and Ecumenism*. (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1965).
- Küng, Hans. *Disputed Truth: Memoirs II*, transl. by John Bowden. (New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing, 2008).
- Küng, Hans. *My Struggle for Freedom: Memoirs*, transl. by John Bowden. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2003).
- Küng, Hans. *Structures of the Church*. English translation by Thomas Nelson and Sons. (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1982).
- Lutheran Church in America, USA. "Anointing and Healing," (1962). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 21-55.
- Lutheran Church in America, USA. "The Charismatic Movement in the Lutheran Church in America: A Pastoral Perspective," (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 547-567.
- Lutheran Church, Mekane Yesus, Ethiopia. "The Work of the Holy Spirit" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 150-182.
- Lutheran Churches, East Germany. "The Charismatic Movement in the German Democratic Republic" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 453-483.
- Lutheran Churches, Germany. "Mühlheim Theses on Community and Charism" (1963). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 104-108.

- Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, USA. "Policy Statement Regarding the Neo-Pentecostal Movement," (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 15-22.
- Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, USA. "The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology," (1972). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 321-363.
- Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, USA. "The Lutheran Church and the Charismatic Movement: Guidelines for Congregations and Pastors" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 307-324.
- Lutheran Council, USA. "Report of the Lutheran Council in the United States" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 429-453.
- MacNutt, Francis. *The Nearly Perfect Crime: How the Church Almost Killed the Ministry of Healing*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books, 2005).
- Magnani, Giovanni. "Does the So-Called Theology of the Laity Possess a Theological Status?" *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, vol. 1 (New York: Paulist, 1988), 568-633.
- Martin, Francis. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Scriptural Foundation*. Revised English version of "Le baptême dans l'Esprit; tradition du Nouveau Testament et vie de l'Eglise," published in *Nouvelle revue théologique* 106 (1984) 22-58.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Ministry: A Theological, Pastoral Handbook* (New York: Harper-Collins, 1987).
- McDonnell, Kilian and George T. Montague, "A Response to Paul Turner on Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit," *Worship*, 71:1 (January 1997), 51-62.
- McDonnell, Kilian and George T. Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, 2nd rev. ed. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994).
- McDonnell, Kilian. *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989).

- McDonnell, Kilian. *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, 3 vols. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980).
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan: The Trinitarian and Cosmic Order of Salvation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996).
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*, (New York: Paulist, 1978).
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Charismatic Renewal and the Churches*, (New York: Seabury, 1976).
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, (New York: Doubleday, 1975);
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Other Hand of God: The Holy Spirit Along the Trinitarian Highway* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).
- Melloni, Alberto. "The Beginning of the Second Period: The Great Debate on the Church," *The History of Vatican II*, vol. III. Guisepppe Alberigo, ed. Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000).
- Mennonite Church, USA. "The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 325-344.
- Mennonite Church, USA. "The Holy Spirit" (1971). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 285-287.
- Methodist Church, Australia. "The 'Pentecostal Ministry' Report" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 22-37.
- Methodist Church, Australia. "The Report on the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 443-449.
- Methodist Church, Australia. "The Place of the Charismatic Movement in the Methodist Church" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 182-199.

- Methodist Church, Great Britain. "Report on the Charismatic Movement by the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Conference" (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 567-573.
- Methodist Church, Great Britain. "The Charismatic Movement and Methodism" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 449-494.
- Methodist Church, Great Britain. "The Impact of Charismatic Renewal on Methodism" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 215-221.
- Methodist Churches, Europe. "Charism and Renewal of the Church" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 199-215.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*. English transl. by Margaret Kohl from the original *Geist des Lebens*. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001).
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Source of Life: The Holy Spirit and the Theology of Life*. English transl. by Margaret Kohl from the original *Quelle des Lebens*. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997).
- Montague, George T. "Twenty Years and Counting," *Pentecost Today*, January 2010, 6.
- Montague, George T. *First Corinthians: Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011).
- Montague, George T. *Growth in Christ: A Study on Saint Paul's Theology of Progress* (Fribourg: Regina Mundi, 1961).
- Montague, George T. *Holy Spirit, Make Your Home in Me: Biblical Meditations on Receiving the Gift of the Spirit* (Ijamsville, MD: Word Among Us Press, 2008).
- Montague, George T. *Riding the Wind: Learning the Ways of the Spirit* (Ann Arbor, MI: Word of Life, 1974).
- Montague, George T. *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976).

- Montague, George T. *The Spirit and His Gifts: The Biblical Background of Spirit-Baptism, Tongue-Speaking, and Prophecy* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974).
- Mühlen, Heribert. *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit*. (London: Burns and Oates, 1978).
- O'Meara, Thomas F. *Theology of Ministry*, 2nd rev. ed. (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999).
- O'Meara, Thomas. "Order and Ordination," *The New Dictionary of Theology* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1987).
- Oden, Thomas C. *Life in the Spirit: Systematic Theology*, Volume Three. (San Francisco: Harper, 1994).
- Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal*, Kilian McDonnell, ed. (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1989).
- Osborne, Kenan B. "The Meaning of Lay, Laity and Lay Ministry in the Christian Theology of Church," *Antonianum*, 53 (1988), 227-258; K.
- Osborne, Kenan B. *Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church – Its History and Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993).
- Osborne, Kenan B. *Priesthood: A History of the Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1998).
- Paul VI. "Papal Address (May 19, 1975)" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 70-76.
- Paul VI. "Papal Address (October 12, 1973)" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 11-12.
- Payne, Robert. *The Holy Fire: The Story of the Fathers of the Eastern Church*. (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 1980).
- Pike, James A. "Pastoral Letter," (1963). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 96-104.
- Pius XII. *Mystici Corporis*. Found at the Vatican website hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi_en.html

- Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. *On Becoming a Christian: Insights from Scripture and the Patristic Writings, with some Contemporary Reflections (1998-2006) – Report of the Fifth Phase of the International Dialogue Between Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders and the Catholic Church*, Found at the PCPCU pages of the Vatican website at hypertext: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/eccl-comm-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20060101_becoming-a-christian_en.html
- Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. “Five Documents from the International Pentecostal-Catholic Dialogue” (1972-1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 373-395.
- Power, David N. *Gifts That Differ: Lay Ministries Established and Unestablished*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., Inc., 1985).
- Presbyterian Church in the United States. “The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, with Special Reference to ‘The Baptism in the Holy Spirit’” (1971). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 287-317.
- Presbyterian Church, Australia. “Renewal by the Spirit” (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 37-52.
- Presbyterian Church, Canada. “Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement” (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 573-579.
- Presbyterian Church, Canada. “Report of the Committee to Study the Charismatic Movement” (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 53-68.
- Presbyterian Church, Canada. “The Work of the Spirit” (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 221-255.
- Presbyterian Church, New Zealand. “Pentecostalism” (1967). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and*

- Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 139-146.
- Presbyterian Church, New Zealand. "The Church and Pentecostalism" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 494-509.
- Presbyterian Church, New Zealand. "The Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal of the Church" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 510-517.
- Presbyterian Church, USA. "Glossolalia" (1965). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 131-139.
- Rademacher, William J. *Lay Ministry: A Theological, Spiritual and Pastoral Handbook* (Middlegreen, UK: St Paul Publications, 1991).
- Rahner, Karl. "Experiencing the Spirit" in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original *Erfahrung des Geistes*, transl. by John Griffiths. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979).
- Rahner, Karl. "Notes on the Lay Apostolate," *Theological Investigations*, vol. 2 (Baltimore, MD: Helicon, 1963), 319-352;
- Rahner, Karl. "Prophecies" in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original 1962 *Visionen und Prophezeiungen*, transl. by Charles Henkey and Richard Strachan. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979), 90-104.
- Rahner, Karl. "Some Criteria for Genuine Visions" in *The Spirit in the Church*, from the original 1962 *Visionen und Prophezeiungen*, transl. by Charles Henkey and Richard Strachan. (New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1979), 77-82.
- Rahner, Karl. "The Charismatic Element in the Church," in *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, from the original *Quaestiones disputatae 32*, transl. by W. J. O'Hara. (New York, NY: Herder & Herder, 1964).
- Ranaghan, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan. *Catholic Pentecostals.* (Paramus, NJ: Deus Books, 1969).
- Ratzinger, Joseph. "Reflection on the Instruction on Certain Question Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priest" *L'Osservatore Romano*, English ed. (29 April 1998).

- Reformed Church in America, USA. "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 68-82.
- Re-reformed Church, Holland. "The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Community" (1967). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 147-207.
- Rinere, Elissa. "Conciliar and Canonical Applications of 'Ministry' to the Laity," *The Jurist*, 47 (1987), 204-227.
- Robeck, Jr., Cecil M. "Review of Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries," *Pneuma*, 14:2 (Fall 1992), 209-213;
- Roman Catholic Church, Antilles. "Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 256-267.
- Roman Catholic Church, Argentina. "Orientation of the Episcopal Theological Team to the Local Ordinaries Concerning the Movements of Spiritual Renewal" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 345-348.
- Roman Catholic Church, Australia. "Charismatic Renewal" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 82-83.
- Roman Catholic Church, Belgium. "The Charismatic Renewal: A Pastoral Evaluation" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 490-503.
- Roman Catholic Church, Brazil. "Charismatic Renewal in Brazil" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 348-357.
- Roman Catholic Church, Canada. "Message of the Bishops of the Western Province of Quebec on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and*

- Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 580-584.
- Roman Catholic Church, Canada. "Charismatic Renewal: Message of the Canadian Bishops Addressed to All Canadian Catholics" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 84-98.
- Roman Catholic Church, Costa Rica. "Circular Letter of the Costa Rican Bishops" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 503-506.
- Roman Catholic Church, Germany. "Temporary Ordering of Procedures for the Charismatic Parish Renewal in the Catholic Church in the Geographical Area in which the German Bishops' Conference is Competent" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 507-511.
- Roman Catholic Church, International. "The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 175-279.
- Roman Catholic Church, International. "Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (1973). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 1-11.
- Roman Catholic Church, Latin America. "Puebla: Evangelization in the Present and in the Future of Latin America" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 511- 515.
- Roman Catholic Church, Latin America. "Renewal in the Spirit" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 358-364.
- Roman Catholic Church, Latin America. "The Charismatic Renewal and Puebla" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 516-521.

- Roman Catholic Church, Mexico. "Christian Renewal in the Holy Spirit" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 98-100.
- Roman Catholic Church, Panama. "Collective Letter from the Episcopacy of Panama Concerning the Movement of Renewal in the Spirit, Directed to Priests, Religious, and Lay People Who Work in Apostolic Movements" *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 100-103.
- Roman Catholic Church, Puerto Rico. "Declaration on the Pentecostal Movement" (1972). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 364-368.
- Roman Catholic Church, Puerto Rico. "Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (1977). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 365-376.
- Roman Catholic Church, USA. "Report of the Committee on Doctrine" (1969). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 207-210.
- Roman Catholic Church, USA. "Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979.* Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 104-114.
- Sachs, John R. "Do Not Stifle the Spirit': Karl Rahner, the Legacy of Vatican II, and Its Urgency for Theology Today." *Catholic Theological Society Proceedings*, Ed. Dwyer, 51 (1996), 15-38.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *The Church with a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry* (New York: Crossroad, 1985).
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *The Church with a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry.* English transl. by John Bowdon from the original *Pleidooi voor Mensen in de Kerk: Christelijke Identiteit en Ambten in de Kerk.* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1992).
- Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elizabeth. *In Memory of Her* (New York: Cross road, 1983).

- Second Vatican Council. *Ad Gentes*. (December 7, 1965). Found at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html
- Second Vatican Council. *Apostolicam Actuositatem*. (November 18, 1965). Found at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html
- Second Vatican Council. *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (December 12, 1965). Found at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html
- Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*. (December 7, 1965). Found at the hyperlink: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html
- Southern Baptist Convention, USA. "Resolution of the Dallas Baptist Association" (1975). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. KilianMcDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 114-116.
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. "The Charismatic Dimension of the Church," in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, Hans Küng, Yves Congar, OP, and Daniel O'Hanlon, SJ, eds. (Glen Rock, NJ: Deus Books/Paulist Press, 1964).
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. *A Controversial Phenomenon: Resting in the Spirit: Malines Document VI*. (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1987).
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. *A New Pentecost?* Francis Martin, transl. (New York: Seabury Press, 1975).
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. *Nature and Grace: A Vital Unity: Malines Document V* transl. by Olga Prendergast. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986).
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness: Malines Document IV*. Forward by Joseph Ratzinger (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983),
- Suenens, Léon-Joseph and Helder Camara. "Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue – Malines Document III" (1979). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 291-357.
- Suenens, Léon-Joseph. "Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal – Malines Document I" (1974). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents*.

- Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 13-70.
- Suenens, Léon-Joseph. "A Plan for the Whole Council," *Vatican II Revisited, By Those Who Were There*, Alberic Stacpoole, ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1986).
- Suenens, Léon-Joseph. "Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations – Malines Document II" (1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 82-174.
- Suenens, Léon-Joseph. *Memories and Hopes*, transl. by Elena French (Dublin: Veritas, 1992).
- Sullivan, Francis A. *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study*. (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Press, 1982).
- Trader, Alexis. *In Peace Let Us Pray to the Lord: An Orthodox Interpretation of the Gifts of the Spirit*. (Salisbury, MA: Regina Orthodox Press, 2001).
- Tugwell, Simon. *Did You Receive the Spirit?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1972).
- Turner, Paul. "Review of Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries," *Worship*, 70:5 (September 1996), 446-452.
- Turner, Paul. *Confirmation: The Baby in Solomon's Court*. (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980).
- United Evangelical Lutheran Church, Germany. "Renewal in the Holy Spirit" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 268-270.
- United Methodist Church, USA. "Guidelines: The United Methodist Church and the Charismatic Movement" (1976). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume II – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 38 to 80, 1975-1979*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 270-291.
- United Presbyterian Church, USA. "The Work of the Holy Spirit" (1970). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume I – Continental, National, and Regional Documents. Numbers 1 to 37, 1960-1974*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 221-282.
- University of Notre Dame Latin Dictionary and Grammar Aid. Found online at the hyperlink: <http://www.archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/lookit.pl?latin=temere>

US Bishops Committee on the Laity, *Called and Gifted for the New Millennium: Reflections of the US Catholic Bishops on the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity and the Fifteenth Anniversary of Called and Gifted* (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1995).

US Bishops' Committee on the Laity, *Called and Gifted – The American Catholic Laity: Reflections of the American Bishops Commemorating the Fifteenth Anniversary of the Issuance of the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity* (Washington, DC: US Catholic Conference, 1980).

US Bishops' Committee on the Laity, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord: A Resource for Guiding the Development of Lay Ecclesial Ministry* (Washington, DC: US Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005).

Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents, new revised ed., Austin Flannery, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1992).

Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives, Rene Latourelle, ed. (NY: Paulist, 1988).

Weinandy, Thomas. *Receiving the Promise: The Spirit's Work of Conversion*. (Washington, DC: The Word Among Us Press, 1985).

Wilkerson, David R. with John Sherrill and Elizabeth Sherrill. *The Cross and the Switchblade* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1963).

Williams, George H. "The Role of the Layman in the Ancient Church," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 1 (1958), 9-42.

Wittstadt, Klaus "On the Eve of the Second Vatican Council (July 1 – October 10, 1962)," *History of Vatican II*, Guiseppe Alberigo, ed., Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 440-442.

World Council of Churches, International. "'A Statement of Concerns' and 'Towards a Church Renewed and United in the Spirit'" (1975-1978). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 280-291.

World Council of Churches, International. "Report of the Consultation on the Significance of the Charismatic Renewal for the Churches" (1980). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Volume III – International Documents. Numbers 1 to 11, 1973-1980*. Ed. Kilian McDonnell. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 358-369.