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ABSTRACT

The primary research question of this thesis is: has the understanding of the nature of the Church in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) changed over time? The textual analyses which form the data collection component of this thesis will take as normative the perspective of Roman Catholicism. The primary sources examined include early CCR texts and the works of Leon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, who will be established as the key reforming figure in the CCR’s development.

The works of Suenens document his efforts to better integrate early CCR groups into the broader Catholic Church and change the understanding of charismatic practices and experiences in those groups. It will be demonstrated that Suenens believed these changes to be necessary measures to promote within the early CCR a fuller understanding of the ecclesiology developed at the Second Vatican Council and to eliminate theological positions originating in Protestant Pentecostalism that were incompatible with Catholic ecclesiology.

A formulation of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology and select documents promulgated at the Second Vatican Council will be analysed to identify points of differentiation between Catholic ecclesiology and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology. These points of differentiation will be used to evaluate Suenens’ assessment of the ecclesiology of the early CCR.

Pope Francis’ critique of the contemporary CCR and a case study conducted in another work will be analysed to assess the ongoing impact of Suenens’ historical efforts to change the ecclesiology of the CCR. These sources will also be used to establish that change in the understanding of the nature of the Church continues in the contemporary CCR. This thesis concludes with the identification of useful lines of enquiry for assessing the ecclesiology of any given contemporary CCR group utilising quantitative, survey-based data collection.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.0 Chapter Outline

This chapter introduces the fundamental contention of this thesis and addresses the question of its relevance to the contemporary Catholic Charismatic Renewal (hereafter termed the CCR.) A methodology is proposed and consideration is given to its merits and limitations. The aims of each chapter of this thesis are specified and related to the central contention of this thesis.

1.1 The Contention of this Thesis

This thesis seeks to establish a number of propositions:

1) That there has been an appreciable change in the ecclesiology of the CCR.
2) That this change was deliberate and attributable to the work of Cardinal Suenens.
3) That Suenens’ efforts were motivated by a desire to eliminate elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology from the CCR.
4) That Suenens was correct in identifying these elements in the ecclesiology of the early CCR.
5) That the changes which Suenens instituted to correct the ecclesiology of the CCR had consequences which he did not intend.

In order to establish these propositions, a number of questions will be considered:

1) What are the points of differentiation between Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology?
2) Are elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology identifiable in early CCR works, particularly those that predate Suenens’ involvement?
3) Did other commentators share Suenens’ concerns?

4) What were the changes that Suenens sought to institute in the CCR?

5) Which of these changes did Suenens successfully introduce?

1.2 THE RELEVANCE OF PURSING THESE AIDS

At a recent address to CCR leaders in Rome, Pope Francis identified a number of challenges confronting the contemporary CCR. In his brief address, Pope Francis acclaimed the contribution of Suenens to the development of this movement and encouraged the leaders of the CCR to turn to the works of Suenens for “a guide, a reliable path to keep you from going astray.” Clearly, therefore, Suenens’ work continues to be normative in the contemporary CCR.

However, it will be established in this work that a number of the observations Pope Francis makes about troubling trends and sources of contention in the contemporary CCR can be traced directly to the changes that Suenens instituted in the CCR. Moreover, in a more recent address, Pope Francis reiterated his concern that the CCR return to emphases the CCR had at its beginning. This will be shown to call into question the value of some of the changes which Suenens introduced.

This thesis will make a distinction between the merits of the project of ecclesiological reform in which Suenens was engaged and the merits and shortcomings of the various means he selected to effect change in the CCR. It will therefore assist members of the CCR in interpreting Pope Francis’ critique of the challenges currently facing the CCR.

1 Francis, Address to the 37th National Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit, Papal Address (1 June 2014).
3 Francis, Address of His Holiness Pope Francis to Members of the Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships, Papal Address (31 October 2014).
Moreover, this thesis will identify key indicators for Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology that will be of great assistance for anyone wishing to evaluate whether a particular CCR group has an understanding of the nature of the Church and role of the Holy Spirit in the Church which conflicts with Catholic ecclesiology.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

Central to this thesis is the premise that there are fundamental differences between Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiologies. In order to establish this, textual analysis will be employed and a comparative study of formulations of these ecclesiologies will be conducted.

The question of which texts ought to be considered in the analysis of Catholic ecclesiology is complicated by the necessity of situating Catholic ecclesiology in the context of other related theological fields. Without due consideration to Christology or Sacramental theology, it is not possible to present a systematic account of Catholic ecclesiology. Soteriology and ecumenism are also pertinent fields of Catholic theology, since Catholic ecclesiology enables the Catholic Church to affirm the place of non-Catholic Christians in the economy of salvation.

For this reason, some criterion must be identified which would limit the scope of the consideration of Catholic ecclesiology for this thesis. This thesis will take as a point of departure the Second Vatican Council documents most commonly cited by Suenens and in other early CCR literature. Both the final form of these Council documents and the history of their development will be considered to identify principles of Catholic ecclesiology most relevant to the aims of this work.

It is important to note that this approach will not facilitate the development of an exhaustive list of the points of differentiation and harmony between Catholic ecclesiology and Pentecostal ecclesiology. However, this approach will identify the tenets of Catholic
ecclesiology which Suenens and other critics of the CCR perceived to have been compromised by or abandoned in favour of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology, hence this is a suitable method of proceeding.

Identifying the ecclesiology of Protestant Pentecostalism is a significantly more challenging task, not least of all because of the diversity of theological traditions and cultures in Protestant Pentecostalism. Fortunately, studies of Protestant Pentecostalism have been conducted which identify commonalities that are useful for the comparative study which is at the core of this thesis. The doctoral work of David Morgan will be examined in this thesis and shown to be eminently suitable for identifying central tenets of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology.4

Once Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiologies are examined for points of differentiation, texts produced within the first few years of the CCR will be analysed in order to determine whether traces of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology which conflict with Catholic ecclesiology can be detected in these texts.

An argument for the suitability of utilising textual analysis for establishing the ecclesiology of the early CCR comes from within the texts surveyed to provide the definition of the CCR in chapter two. When the largely academic membership of the early CCR is considered, it is likely that popular early CCR texts had a wide readership in the early CCR and influenced its development. One early CCR text, Catholic Pentecostals, is often cited in other texts, providing a strong indication that it was well known in the early CCR. Other texts, composed by Suenens, continue to be normative in the CCR, also making them suitable candidates for consideration.

Greater detail on the justification for the primary texts selected will be provided prior to the textual analysis.

1.5 OVERVIEW OF THE STRUCTURE OF THIS THESIS

The following outline of the succeeding chapters of this thesis has been provided to specify their relevance to the research topic.

Chapter two provides a definition of the CCR and establishes the significance of the role Suenens played in its development. This will assist with attributing the changes which have occurred to the ecclesiology of the CCR to the intervention of Suenens.

The third chapter contains a survey of literature on Catholic ecclesiology. It forms the first part of the comparative study of Protestant Pentecostal and Catholic ecclesiology; however, it is not followed by an examination of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology. The examination of Catholic ecclesiology in this third chapter serves as an introduction to the ecclesiological understanding that Suenens sought to promote in the Catholic Church thorough his work at the second Vatican Council.

Hence, the fourth chapter of this thesis explores Suenens’ assessment of the ecclesiology of the CCR and lists a number of the changes he sought to institute in the CCR. The changes enumerated in this chapter will be used as a basis for the evaluation of the effect of Suenens’ efforts to guide the development of the ecclesiology of the CCR in chapter seven.

The fifth chapter completes the comparative study of Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology with an examination of Morgan’s work and evaluates Suenens’ presentation of the irreconcilable points of differentiation between Protestant Pentecostal and Catholic ecclesiologies.
The sixth chapter seeks to substantiate Suenens’ assessment that elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology were to be found in the early CCR by examining corroborating evidence in other primary sources. Given the influence of Suenens’ work, this chapter will focus on texts that were produced from within the CCR prior to or contemporaneously with Suenens’ first texts.

The seventh chapter seeks to establish the limitations of using textual analysis to evaluate the effect of the changes Suenens sought to institute to eliminate these elements from the CCR.

Chapter eight contains final observations and conclusions.
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING THE CCR AND SUENENS’ ROLE IN ITS DEVELOPMENT.

2.0 Chapter Outline

The CCR is a movement that transcends the confines of the institutional Catholic Church’s parochial and diocesan based prayer and ministry. That being said, the Catholic Church, through the appointment by the Holy See of a body to oversee its operations, has affirmed that the CCR has a place within the structure of the Catholic Church. This body, the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services (hereafter termed the ICCRS ), provides information about the CCR which would seem to be an ideal resource to utilise in this definition.

However, if the information provided by this body were taken in isolation, then there would be a risk of providing a view of the CCR which is intended to be aspirational. Accordingly, for this definition of the CCR, the statutes of the ICCRS will only be used to identify key moments in CCR history. These points in the history of the CCR will be researched independently so as to develop a definition of the CCR which takes into account the organic nature of its development. As part of the consideration of the historical development of the CCR, this chapter will establish that Suenens was instrumental guiding the development of the CCR.

It will be established that Suenens did not do so from an outsider’s perspective but that he had firsthand experience with and great affection for the CCR. It will also be established that the outstanding contribution of Suenens was recognised by the Holy See, in what amounts to a papal mandate for the continuation of his work.
2.1 Important Moments in CCR History

2.1.1 The Founding of the CCR

The definition of the CCR provided on the ICCRS website begins with the statement that the “Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) began at a retreat for college students at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (USA) in February 1967.” Scant detail is supplied regarding the nature of these beginnings, other than a brief description of the phenomenon through which new members were initiated into the CCR.

Much greater detail about the beginnings of the CCR are provided in the text Catholic Pentecostals by Dorothy and Kevin Ranaghan. First and foremost, Catholic Pentecostals presents the CCR as a movement with an ecumenical disposition. The account provided by the Ranaghans of the events which transpired in the days and weeks immediately preceding the retreat at Duquesne University describes how the leaders of the retreat had been inspired to seek out Pentecostal prayer experiences after reading The Cross and the Switchblade “a book which opened the door to a new world for them.”

The Cross and the Switchblade, co-authored by an evangelical pastor David Wilkerson as an account of his experiences ministering to gang members, contains references to ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit,’ the particular Pentecostal experience the leaders sought. The Ranaghans’

---

2 Kevin Ranaghan was not only one of the founders of this movement but would retain a prominent role as one of the members of the Council for the International Communications Office, the predecessor of the ICCRS which had Cardinal Suenens as its Episcopal Adviser.
3 It must be noted that, while Dorothy and Kevin Ranaghan describe the ecumenical disposition of the CCR as “tremendously fruitful,” their concern for the CCR not to be seen as “Protestant pentecostal proselytization,” leads them to assert that the origins of the CCR must be viewed as “primarily Catholic.” Ranaghan, Dorothy and Ranaghan, Kevin. Catholic Pentecostals. (New York: Paulist Press, 1969) 153.
4 Ralph Keifer, Patrick Bourgeois, Kevin Ranaghan and one other unnamed academic- all of whom were lay men.
5 Ranaghan and Ranaghan. Catholic Pentecostals, 9.
account describes at some length how reading and discussing *The Cross and the Switchblade*, as well as another by its co-author John Sherrill, *They Speak with Other Tongues*, prompted the four lay men from Duquesne University to re-examine the passages of the New Testament which pertain to the Holy Spirit, and to seek out ‘baptism in the Spirit.’

This experience, which will be discussed at length in later chapters of this thesis, remains the threshold experience through which a Catholic becomes a member of the CCR.

The four founding members of the CCR sought out ‘baptism in the Spirit’ by making contact with the Episcopalian parish of Christ Church in the North Hills of Pittsburgh. The parish priest, who had been a guest speaker at Duquesne University, advised them to speak with one of his parishioners, Betty Schomaker, who invited them to attend an ecumenical Pentecostal prayer group, which met at the residences of its members.

The four accepted her invitation but only Kevin Ranaghan and Patrick Bourgeois were able to attend the second meeting. It was at this second meeting that they requested the group pray that they might receive ‘baptism in the Spirit.’ Kevin Ranaghan attests to the efficacy of that prayer, describing what followed as an encounter with God unlike anything he or Bourgeois had previously experienced in the Catholic Church. Bourgeois shared this experience with the two other university staff members who were unable to attend this second meeting through the laying on of hands and, together, they began planning the student retreat identified by the ICCRS as the beginning of the CCR.

---

7 Ranaghan and Ranaghan. *Catholic Pentecostals*, 17.
8 Ranaghan and Ranaghan. *Catholic Pentecostals*, 16.
In doing so, no great effort was made to remain within the well-defined pre-existing structures of the Catholic Church. This came to typify the CCR; throughout the subsequent growth described by the Ranaghans, enthusiasm for sharing this ‘powerful experience’ led the participants to establish or visit prayer groups “not only on campuses, but in church basements, convents, monasteries and private homes.” There is no evidence that any initial efforts were made to provide oversight or structure for these prayer groups; however, a fluid exchange of members did provide at least some measure of experiential consistency.

This was not well received by those in the Catholic Church who were uncomfortable with the Pentecostal mode of praying. They observed that there was a general lack of theological understanding in the CCR’s earliest members, some of whom were judged to be expressing a Protestant understanding of Church which was incompatible with Catholic ecclesiology.

These criticisms, and the need for theological reflection in the CCR were the factors which prompted the publication of *Catholic Pentecostals* a mere two years after the first Duquesne retreat. The first page of this text is dominated by a direct quote from a highly critical piece in the May 1967 edition of the National Catholic Reporter, which portrays its origin not in the retreat for Duquesne University students which had taken place earlier that year, much less in an encounter with God in the person of the Holy Spirit, but rather in a similar movement which pre-dated the CCR and was to be found in what the article quite polemically described as “lower class Protestantism and fundamentalism.”

In response to this, the Ranaghans provide an outline of the theological framework within which they understood themselves operating, attempting to demonstrate that this

---

framework is consistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church. However, defending the CCR from accusations of syncretism is not the primary concern of Catholic Pentecostals. Rather, its three-fold focus was on outlining the origins of the CCR, proposing that the CCR meets a pressing need in the Catholic Church and providing insight into the personal benefits its members derive from the various forms of prayer it outlines.

In the first appendix to their work, the Ranaghans identify the Second Vatican Council as the development which, to borrow a Kantianism, was the ‘condition of possibility’ for the CCR, enabling this movement to “exist fruitfully within the institutional structure while at the same time serving and contributing to the renewal of the Church.”

Indeed, it is difficult to overstate how scandalous it would have been even ten years prior to these events for any Catholic, let alone professors and lecturers in prominent positions at a Catholic University, to actively seek out a Pentecostal prayer experience in such a fashion. It is unsurprising, therefore, that one of the four moderators of the Second Vatican Council, Cardinal Suenens, took a keen interest in the CCR when it came to his attention.

2.1.2 THE PARTICIPATION OF CARDINAL SUENENS

Suenens’ first encounter with the CCR was in the early 1970s. At that time, the CCR was still a rapidly growing and relatively new grassroots movement; in fact, so rapid had been the growth of the CCR that in 1973, a mere six years after the events at the Duquesne student retreat, the first international CCR leader’s conference in Rome was honoured by a papal address; an honour that was repeated at the second international leaders’ conference two years thereafter.

---

11 Ranaghan and Ranaghan. Catholic Pentecostals, 252.
In addition to the words of encouragement he offered at these gatherings, Pope Paul VI recognised that the rapid growth of the CCR had created a need for greater coordination and communication than could be achieved at infrequent meetings. Consequently, he created the ‘Office of Episcopal Advisers to the Charismatic Renewal’ in 1978 “under the auspices” of Cardinal Suenens. The selection of Suenens for this role did not occur by chance; by that time he had already written extensively about the CCR.

When characterising the nature of Suenens’ involvement with the CCR, it is important to emphasise the attitude of genuine openness he described in his memoirs *Memories and Hopes*. After providing an account of his instrumental role in ensuring that the role of the laity was given a prominence in *Lumen Gentium*, Suenens provides recollections in his memoirs of the opposition he had to overcome in order to ensure that the term ‘charism’ was not suppressed or misunderstood in relation to ecclesiology. Moreover, Suenens’ interest in ecumenism extended beyond the close of the Council; His memoirs recount the many occasions on which he spoke of his “ecumenical dream” at theological conferences and the many occasions that he engaged in respectful dialogue with Protestant Christians.

As a lay-led ecumenical movement seeking to reawaken an understanding of charismatic gifts in the Catholic Church, the CCR would have immediately piqued Suenens’ interest. Yet, when describing his reaction to first hearing of the ‘Pentecostal grace’ at work in the Church in the United States, Suenens recalls abandoning a book he was writing entitled *The Holy Spirit* –

---

15 Suenens, trans, *Memories and Hopes*, 140.
Source of all our Hopes because he “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.”

This attitude was evident through Suenens’ involvement in obtaining approval of the CCR by the Holy See. He records in his memoirs how he twice wrote to Pope Paul VI in order to obtain approval to be present at an international congress of the CCR in Grottaferrata aware that “in Rome, the presence of a cardinal at a ceremony implies at least the implicit approval of the Holy See.” Suenens also arranged for some of the participants at the congress to have a private audience with the Pope, further demonstrating the sincerity of his desire to promote the growth of the CCR.

Suenens identifies an incident which occurred shortly after this congress in Rome as a “turning point in the history of the Renewal;” the reaction he received to his statements regarding the role of Mary in the Renewal. He recalls that he was criticised for “betraying ecumenism” after making this statement, and reveals that he clearly felt that this criticism was based on an erroneous understanding of both ecclesiology and ecumenism.

This was a watershed moment for Suenens’ involvement with the CCR. Prior to this criticism, he had not attempted to direct the CCR’s theological development. After being criticised for speaking of Mary, Suenens took a more active part in the theological and pastoral commission established after the congress at Grottaferrata to respond to the “serious opposition” the movement was meeting with in the United States and from the Roman Curia.

17 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 267.
18 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 269.
19 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 273.
20 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 273.
21 Suenens’ involvement in the Legion of Mary would undoubtedly have contributed to the force of his reaction to the criticism he received.
22 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 276.
This led to the publication of the first ‘Malines Document’ on the topic of the Renewal, a name which is derived from the fact that it was composed by the theological commission in Suenens’ residence in Malines.23 This document was received favourably by Pope Paul VI, who had obviously come to share Suenens’ favourable assessment of the potential service the CCR could be to the Catholic Church since he requested that Suenens continue to provide similar reports to serve the Renewal.24

Suenens continued to produce these ‘Malines Documents’ after his appointment as head of the ‘Office of Episcopal Advisers to the Charismatic Renewal,’ and he continued this work throughout the transition period as that office was subsumed into the ICCRS. Pertinently, first the Office of Episcopal Advisers and then ICCRS was given the task of fulfilling the ‘moral mandate’ of aiding the development of “ecclesial awareness in the various Catholic charismatic communities throughout the world,” 25 a clear affirmation of the value of Suenens’ work in the field of ecclesiology.

2.2 SUMMARY OF THIS CHAPTER

Suenens played a key role in the development of the CCR over an extended period of time. His texts, which continue to be taken by the CCR as guiding documents, contained expressions of the understanding of ecclesiology, charisms, the role of the laity in the Church and ecumenism which he had formed prior to encountering the CCR. However, he approached

23 Although Suenens attests to the involvement of a number of members of the CCR in the composition of this document in his memoirs, this document continues to be attributed to Suenens by the ICCRS and in several recent papal statements.

24 Suenens, trans, Memories and Hopes, 277.

the CCR with a genuine openness to discerning what the Holy Spirit may wish to work in the Catholic Church through the CCR.

Suenens helped to shape and direct this ‘Pentecostal’ movement in the Catholic Church into the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. He was a strong advocate for the rightful place of the CCR in the Church and was instrumental in the CCR receiving formal recognition by the Holy See. His contribution to the fostering of ecclesial awareness in the CCR was recognised as having such value that he was given a formal mandate to continue this work.

With the help of Suenens, the CCR continues the work of its founders, but with significantly stronger ties to the hierarchical Church. His criticisms of certain trends in the early CCR and the methods he proposed to correct these has made the CCR what it is today and consideration of Suenens’ texts is essential to develop an understanding of the ecclesiology of the contemporary CCR.
CHAPTER 3: SELECT PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLIC ECCLESIOLOGY

3.0 CHAPTER OUTLINE

In this chapter, *Lumen Gentium, Unitatis Redintegratio* and other documents promulgated at the Second Vatican Council will be examined once a case is made for the selection of these primary sources. These documents will be examined to establish that recognising the rightful place of the Holy Spirit in Catholic ecclesiology was a central concern at the Second Vatican Council, but that this place was subordinated to the central place of Christ in Catholic ecclesiology.¹

The primary purpose for this examination is to provide a basis for the identification in a later chapter of this thesis of points of differentiation between Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology.² A secondary purpose is to establish the understanding that Suenens had of charisms and the role of the laity prior to his involvement in the CCR.

Finally, Catholic ecclesiology will be placed in the context of broader Catholic theology and its historical development. This will help to establish that there are significant ecclesiological implications to theological positions and emphases that do not strictly pertain to the field of ecclesiology, which will later be shown to be one of the bases for Suenens’ critique of certain positions in the CCR. Moreover, this contextualisation will assist with the identification in a

¹ It is important to note that it is not possible to make a radical distinction between the action of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Church. As Donald Graham observes in his book *From Eastertide to Ecclesia: John Henry Newman, the Holy Spirit & the Church*, this was recognised as a challenge in Catholic ecclesiology prior the Second Vatican Council by John Henry Newman in his lectures on justification. This is discussed at some length on page 125ff.

² It is necessary to distinguish Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology from a more general consideration of Protestant ecclesiology, since many protestant traditions affirm the centrality of Christ in the Church through their insistence that “the Church of God is present wherever the word of God is spoken” as Paul D.L. Avis observes on page 20 of his book *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers*. 
later chapter of the way in which Suenens interpreted the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

3.1 THE CASE FOR THE PRIMARY SOURCES SELECTED

Quite apart from the prevalence of references to *Lumen Gentium* in texts relating to the CCR, there is a strong case to be made for making this document, and its second chapter in particular, as the point of departure for examining aspects of Catholic ecclesiology relevant to the CCR. Firstly, the second chapter of *Lumen Gentium* ‘On the People of God’ gives the most systematic treatment of the nature and role of charisms of any of the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

Secondly, the reappropriation of the biblical theme ‘People of God’ present in the second chapter of *Lumen Gentium* was seen by commentators as the “fundamentum” for what was arguably one of the most significant changes to occur at the Second Vatican Council; the radical reorientation of ecumenical efforts mandated in *Unitatis Redintegratio*, a document which was promulgated concurrently with *Lumen Gentium*. The significance of this to the CCR becomes evident when it is considered that the CCR was conceived of as an ecumenical movement by its founders and that this ecumenical nature was reaffirmed and valued in both the work of Suenens and in several recent Papal addresses.4

Thirdly, *Lumen Gentium* is significant in priming a place for the CCR in the Catholic Church through its presentation of the need for the Catholic Church’s efforts at “self-criticism and

---


4 Most recently in *Address of His Holiness Pope Francis to Members of the “Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships”* Papal Address. 31 October 2014.
self-correction” to be ongoing. Lumen Gentium therefore demonstrates that, towards the end of the third session of the Council, ‘aggiornamento,’ one the catch-cries of the Council, had come to be understood not as a process to be completed or a goal to be achieved but a necessary attitude which would direct all future developments within the Catholic Church. The openness to new developments within the Catholic Church was as much a prerequisite for the development of the CCR as the openness to “elements of sanctification and of truth” outside of the visible structure of the Church.

Despite what might be termed the initial ambivalence of commentators towards the exploration of charisms in this chapter and Lumen Gentium in general, it is noteworthy that charisms were explored at all, perhaps not with the same depth but certainly in the same breath as other significant topics addressed in this chapter; the ‘common priesthood of the faithful’ and the re-presentation of the ancient notion of ‘sensus fidei’ as an expression of the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in the “entire body of the faithful.”

Pertinently, this inclusion was the direct result of the intervention of Suenens; in response to the intervention of another theologian, who saw great danger in referencing the charismatic dimension of the Church in this Dogmatic Constitution, Suenens “pointed out that the charismatic dimension was necessary to the Church.” Moreover, prior to this exchange,

---

5 Outler, “A Response,” 104.
6 “so that in the weakness of the flesh she may not waver from perfect fidelity, but remain a bride worthy of her Lord, and moved by the Holy Spirit may never cease to renew herself...” Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 9.
7 This term describes an openness to having contemporary developments and understandings factor into the renewal or ‘updating’ of Catholic theology.
9 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n.10.
10 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n.12.
Suenens had been instrumental in ensuring that the second chapter was included in *Lumen Gentium*, arguing that it would provide the necessary context within which various groups within the Catholic Church could then be addressed in subsequent chapters.\(^\text{12}\)

Given the animated nature of the debates which preceded the promulgation of *Lumen Gentium*, which was passed by the smallest margin of all votes taken at the Council,\(^\text{13}\) it is clear that each reference to charisms in this chapter was carefully considered and intended to rectify a deficiency in Catholic ecclesiology as it had been understood prior to the Council. Hence, despite the fact that the second chapter of *Lumen Gentium* is part of a consensus document with somewhat limited references to charisms, a strong case can be made for its eminent suitability for identifying aspects of Catholic ecclesiology relevant to the CCR. Using the second chapter as a starting point, it seems wise to consider the uses of the term ‘charism’ elsewhere in *Lumen Gentium* before proceeding to a more general examination of principles of Catholic ecclesiology.

*Unitatis Redintegratio* has been selected for consideration in this chapter because it is the Second Vatican Council’s systematic treatment of ecumenism. Setting aside the question of the precise nature of the relationship between ecclesiology and ecumenism, the circumstances of the CCR’s founding make a strong case for examining the Catholic Church’s understanding of ecumenism *per se*. Namely, given that the CCR began with the participation of lecturers from a Catholic University in an ecumenical prayer group, there is little doubt that


\(^{13}\) Outler, “A Response,” 103.
the understanding of Church which *Unitatis Redintegratio* expresses would have been familiar to them.

### 3.2 Lumen Gentium

The second chapter of *Lumen Gentium* begins its examination of charisms by identifying them, along with the sacraments and ministries of the Catholic Church, as one of the avenues through which the Holy Spirit endows special graces upon “the faithful of every rank”\(^\text{14}\) to equip them for the task of renewing and building up the Catholic Church.\(^\text{15}\) Hence the first sense in which this chapter uses the term charism is as a collective term for the special graces with which God assists the entire Catholic Church to engage in the ongoing project of ‘aggiornamento.’

Secondly, this paragraph next identifies the importance of being properly disposed to receiving charisms. It does so by emphasising that charisms must be received with thanksgiving, as unmerited gifts. It also encourages the people of God to draw consolation from them, reiterating the Pauline understanding of these gifts as “the manifestation of the Spirit.”\(^\text{16}\) In this way, the authors of *Lumen Gentium* present *aggiornamento* not as an onerous task but as a blessing for the people of God. Moreover, they contend that thankfulness for the charisms which make *aggiornamento* possible must be accompanied by thankfulness for the privilege of being called to participate in the project of building up the Church.

Next, two distinct classes of charisms are outlined, with a contrast made between outstanding charisms and those “more simple and widely diffused.”\(^\text{17}\) Although no further details or


\(^{15}\) This was the very task in which the authors of this document understood themselves to have been engaged at the Council.


examples are provided, each class is commended as being “perfectly suited to and useful for the needs of the Church.” 18 Hence, there is no question of the more outstanding charisms being preferable to the others; to the contrary, this paragraph cautions that “extraordinary gifts are not to be sought after.” 19 Although the examination of these two classes of charisms may seem an extraneous inclusion, in the context of a chapter on the people of God, it is clearly intended to promote unity within the Catholic Church. It is a caution against disaffection addressed to all members of the Catholic Church who might desire particular charisms because they desire a particular role in the life of the Church. Laity and clergy alike are instead encouraged to be passive with regard to charisms, accepting them in thanksgiving and humility if God chooses to impart on them a charism which equips them for a particular service.

Finally, this exploration of the importance of charisms in the life of the Church concludes with an examination of their proper discernment. It begins the consideration of discernment with a ‘via negativa,’ stating that discernment of charisms ought not be based on the ‘fruits of apostolic labour’ since it is ‘presumptuous’ to expect these fruits from the exercise of charisms. 20 Presented as preferable to this flawed method of discernment is deference to the judgement of “those who are appointed leaders in the Church, to whose special competence it belongs.” 21 This competence is described as extending beyond the mere identification of what the text refers to as ‘genuine’ charisms. It includes the discernment of their proper use. It is clarified that this is in no way an effort to ‘extinguish’ the Spirit; rather, this last addendum

18 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 12.
places charisms in the realm of the objective; if a member of the Church does indeed have a
given charism then that ought to be recognisable to a leader of the Church.22

This relationship is hinted at from the outset; in the first chapter of *Lumen Gentium*, reference
is made to the way in which the Holy Spirit both guides the doctrinal development of the
Catholic Church and provides the necessary basis for the communion enjoyed by the Church’s
members.23 Charisms are identified as being, in conjunction with ‘hierarchical gifts,’ the way
in which the Holy Spirit “both equips and directs”24 the Church while guiding the Church “in
the way of truth.”25 It is noteworthy that this expression denotes a journey rather than an
end-state. Once again, therefore, the concept of ‘aggiornamento’ is closely associated with
charisms; indeed, the very next statement regarding the relationship between the Holy Spirit
and the Church is that the Holy Spirit “makes the Church keep the freshness of youth.”26

*Lumen Gentium* goes on to identify as chief among these ‘hierarchical gifts’ the authority and
leadership which is enjoyed by those in episcopal office. In the context of an examination of
the charisms which make ministerial life possible, it is observed that, while the Holy Spirit
gives special gifts for the welfare of the Church “according to His own richness and the needs
of the ministries,”27 special place among the gifts is the “grace of the apostles to whose
authority the Spirit Himself subjected even those who were endowed with charisms.”28

Clearly then, not only does *Lumen Gentium* teach that bishops have the capacity to offer
authoritative discernment of charisms, there can be no charismatic gift which endows a

---

22 Here taken to refer exclusively to the episcopacy. The grounds for this are made clear in subsequent
paragraphs.
bishop with an authority that equates with the authority enjoyed by bishops by virtue of apostolic succession.

The third chapter’s exploration of the nature of papal infallibility on matters of doctrine and morals includes a reference to charisms which illuminates yet another dimension of the understanding of being promoted in Lumen Gentium; the infallibility of the Pope is presented as an individualisation of the “charism of infallibility of the Church.” 29 By implication, the ‘sensus fidei’ examined in this third chapter is being presented as an example of the ‘widely diffused’ charisms mentioned in the second chapter.

The fourth chapter of Lumen Gentium begins with an acknowledgement of the important role of the laity in the salvific mission of the Church and identifies as a duty for pastors the recognition of the ministries and charisms of the laity “so that all according to their proper roles may cooperate in this common undertaking with one mind.” 30 In adding a soteriological telos to the earlier consideration of the purpose of the Holy Spirit’s conferral of charisms, the authors of this document are acknowledging that there is an eschatological dimension to charisms.

The authors of this Dogmatic Constitution clearly regarded this as an important, if secondary, concern since they also include a reference to charisms in the final chapter of Lumen Gentium on the eschatological nature of the ‘pilgrim church’ and its union with the Church in heaven. In lauding the fine example of the saints, mention is made of those faithful departed whose

---

29 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 25.
“outstanding practice of the Christian virtues and the divine charisms” render them suitable for pious devotion and imitation.

Charisms are thereby connected with popular piety in the Catholic Church, and a reminder is given that devotion to a particular saint must include offering thanks to God for the way in which the Church was blessed through the charisms with which that saint was endowed. This extends the theme of thanksgiving as a necessary response to charisms made in the second chapter; this thanksgiving for the ways God blesses the Church should be the attitude of all the people of God, not merely those who receive the charisms he confers.

3.3 **UNITATIS REDEINTEGRATIO**

The understanding that there are multiple ways in which a person can be considered to ‘belong’ to the people of God, including membership in what *Unitatis Redintegratio* terms separated “Christian communions,” adds an ecumenical significance to *Lumen Gentium’s* presentation of charisms. Clearly, those involved in the composition of both these documents wished to place their exploration of the graces imparted by the Holy Spirit for the good of the people of God in a context broader than the Catholic Church.

*Unitatis Redintegratio* begins with a description of the divisions between Christians, and identifies the person of the Holy Spirit as the source of grace fostering the movement “for the restoration of unity among all Christians.” The authors of this decree consider it a duty incumbent upon every Catholic to respond to the promptings of the Holy Spirit, hence they

---

33 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 1
declare that the purpose of this decree is to “set before all Catholics the ways and means by which they too can respond to this grace and to this divine call.”34

*Unitatis Redintegratio* gives first place in its consideration of the means of achieving Christian unity to the way in which the redemption won by Jesus unifies the whole human race and how Jesus “instituted the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist by which the unity of His Church is both signified and made a reality.”35

It is only on account of the way that the Holy Spirit brings those who believe “into intimate union with Christ,”36 that the Holy Spirit is identified in this decree as “the principle of the Church’s unity,”37 adding that the ‘mystery’ of the unity of the Church has “its highest exemplar and source in the unity of the Persons of the Trinity.”38

Having affirmed the centrality of Christ to the project of bringing about Christian unity, *Unitatis Redintegratio* returns to the consideration of how the Holy Spirit performs a broader role in ecumenism than simply providing an impetus towards unity. It recognises that gifts of the Holy Spirit exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church, and that “the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using [separated Christian Communities] as means of salvation.”39 By conferring charisms and working in separated Christian communities in this way, the Holy Spirit brings a unifying experience of the power of grace to all Christians.

The fourth paragraph of this decree contains several formulations of an exhortation for “all the Catholic faithful to... take an active and intelligent part in the work of ecumenism.”40

---

34 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 1  
35 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 2  
36 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 2  
37 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 2  
38 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 2  
39 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 3  
40 Vatican Council II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 4
When the forms which this ‘active and intelligent’ participation in ecumenism can take are explored in this section, it becomes evident that this exhortation was what provided the impetus for the beginning of the CCR. After outlining how best to approach ecumenical dialogue, reference is made to both ‘prayer in common’ and the need “to undertake with vigor[sic] the task of renewal and reform.”41

Although it is possible that this may have been a reference to the need for individuals to engage in the task of personal reform and spiritual renewal, the treatment which follows of the need for prudence, patience and episcopal guidance in this task suggests that this is not the sense in which it was intended. Moreover, there follows a section which commends taking the initiative in ecumenical matters to lay Catholics and identifies the ecumenical duty of all the faithful. The section concludes with a reminder that the primary purpose of ecumenical interactions with other Christians is to facilitate “careful and honest appraisal of whatever needs to be done or renewed in the Catholic household itself.”42 The authors of this decree go further still, recognising that “anything wrought by the grace of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of our separated brethren can be a help to our own edification”43 by bringing Catholics closer to the Christ and the Church.

This corresponds closely with the account of the founding of the CCR which has been provided. Taking the initiative to join in ecumenical prayer with Protestant Pentecostals, those who founded the CCR recognised a grace at work in the group which could serve to edify the Catholic Church and enliven the faith of Catholics. Hence, they set about the task of sharing this new appreciation for charisms with other Catholics, always bearing in mind the

41 Vatican Council II, Unitatis Redintegratio, n. 4
42 Vatican Council II, Unitatis Redintegratio, n. 4
43 Vatican Council II, Unitatis Redintegratio, n. 4
ecumenical orientation which prompted this first encounter. In the context of *Unitatis Redintegratio*’s examination of how ecumenism can lead to an appreciation of the Catholic Church’s need for renewal, it is unsurprising that the movement they founded came to be known as the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.

### 3.4 Recognising the Proper Place of the Holy Spirit in Ecclesiology as a Central Motif in Conciliar Documents

In the documents of the Second Vatican Council, the discourse on the Church is subordinate to the discourse on God. This may seem to be an unremarkable since the primacy of God is self-evident; however, in *Gaudium et Spes*, the final document to be promulgated by the Council, this primacy was taken up for fresh insight into long neglected aspects of Catholic Theology. Christian anthropology was re-expressed on more explicitly scriptural terms and the ecclesiological implications of humanity’s creation in ‘*Imago Dei*’ were reconsidered.\(^{44}\)

Moreover, extended consideration of the unity which is at the heart of the inner life the Most Holy Trinity in this document provided a context for the discussion of an ecclesiology of *communio*.

Prior to the Council, the understanding of the ‘vertical dimension’\(^{45}\) of *communio* was far more developed within the Catholic Church than the understanding of its ‘horizontal dimension.’\(^{46}\) This is perhaps best evidenced by the fact that the first chapter of the first constitution promulgated at the Council sought to emphasise this horizontal dimension by teaching that in “the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy, this full and active

---


\(^{45}\) That is, speaking of the same entity as being the Church militant, suffering and triumphant.

\(^{46}\) That is, the communion shared by all believers and the interconnectedness of the spiritual, moral and liturgical life of all Catholics.
participation by *all the people* is the aim to be considered *before all else*“47 [Emphasis added]

This was a recognition that all Catholics had a right to active participation by virtue of the dignity imparted through sacramental Baptism, a dignity which is conferred through union with Christ and the reception of the Holy Spirit.

The ‘horizontal dimension’ of *communio* is also indispensable for a proper understanding of the structure of the Catholic Church; the universal Church is not a federation of distinct, self-sufficient dioceses. Neither are particular Churches to be understood as executors of a central power. Rather, each particular Church, in communion with all the other Churches, is a portion of the universal Church, not merely a part or region thereof.48 The Holy Spirit is understood in the Catholic Church to play a central part in maintaining this ‘horizontal dimension’ of *communio* particularly during the deliberations at an ecumenical council.

However, the documents of the Second Vatican Council situate Catholic ecclesiology not in the context of Trinitarian theology in general but in Christology in particular. Christ is not only the Church’s origin, He is the Church’s *telos*, He sustains the Church in being and He is the head of the Church. While these relationships were well known and had been the subject of much theological reflection prior to the Council, the way that they were placed in the context of the ‘vertical dimension’ of *communio* at the Council led to the realisation that the Church has an essential sacramental quality by virtue of being in communion with Christ.49

This understanding was partly responsible for the re-evaluation of the importance of the laity at the Council, since it is by virtue of this sacramental nature that the people of God,

collectively, become a kingly, prophetic and priestly people. Hence, while *Lumen Gentium* has much to say about the common priesthood of the laity, it must be understood in a Christological context – the common priesthood is not the possession of any individual Catholic, neither is it possessed collectively; rather, it is Christ’s. What belongs to Christ by right is given as a free gift to the Church because Christ chooses to share it.

That being said, there is a danger in a ‘christomonist’ ecclesiology which would relegate the Father and the Holy Spirit to merely the means by which theologians can demonstrate that *communio* has its origins in the inner life of God. During the Second Vatican Council, there was a concerted effort made to avoid ‘christomonism’ by affirming the proper place of the Holy Spirit in ecclesiology. This was achieved by examining the ecclesiological implications of the pneumatological aspect of the anthropology of ‘Imago Dei.’ This effort was championed by Yves Congar, a French Dominican theologian whose desire to promote a theology of the Holy Spirit would have a significant influence on the documents produced at the Council. As an aside, Congar’s openness to ideas derived from Protestant theology was well known prior to the convocation of the Council and in part helped to break ground for the work that would be done at Duquesne University in the years after the Council.

Through the efforts of Congar and those who came to share his concerns, the important place of the Holy Spirit within the Catholic Church was not neglected at the Council. An important caveat which it is necessary to make after such a statement is that placing too much emphasis on the influence of Congar or setting up too strong an opposition between his concerns and the concerns of the other bishops present would be to make an unfounded assertion that there existed “a separation between Vatican II, the bishops who composed it and Pope Paul
VI.”\(^5\) Congar would be the first to object to taking this view, since doing so relegates the role of the Holy Spirit to inspiration and guide for the final form of the Conciliar texts, leaving little to no room for the Holy Spirit in the deliberations of a diverse and at times even divided episcopacy. Clearly, though, the arguments of Congar were persuasive; this is perhaps best illustrated when the Council’s decree on the ministry and life of priests is considered.

The Catholic understanding of priestly ministry is that it is founded on the person of Jesus Christ and essential for the persistence of the Church through history. A candidate for priestly ministry is conformed to Christ by virtue of the Sacrament of Ordination, undergoing a permanent, ontological change. Accordingly, the treatise on the ministry and life of priests could easily have been expected to focus exclusively on Christ. However, the term ‘Holy Spirit’ appears nineteen times in the short text, perhaps most notably in the first chapter’s description of the effect of ordination, “priests, by anointing of the Holy Spirit, are signed with a special character and are conformed to Christ the priest.”\(^5\) This section of *Presbyterorum Ordinis* concludes with a reference to *Lumen Gentium*’s examination of episcopal Apostolic succession in light of Pentecost. Clearly, then, there was a certain continuity in the minds of those composing the text between what they were outlining and what had already been promulgated at the Council regarding the role of the Holy Spirit with the Body of Christ.

An argument can therefore be made that affirming and exploring the proper place of the Holy Spirit in theology in general and ecclesiology in particular was a central motif at the Council, the promotion of which many commentators attribute to Congar, among others. This concern


was by no means an innovation of the Council and is readily identifiable in pre-conciliar theological texts, particularly in the Eastern Traditions. Nevertheless, it is significant because the concerted effort to explore a pneumatological dimension meant that, while the ecclesiology of the second Vatican Council was Christo-centric, it was not Christomonsit. Although references to the Holy Spirit are made using the term ‘Spirit of Christ,’ there is a discernible trend in the Council documents towards developing a pneumatological ecclesiology that complemented, enhanced but did not have precedence over ‘christo-centric’ ecclesiology.

A possible source of the care which was taken to develop this ecclesiology of the Holy Spirit and subordinate it to more traditional ecclesiological approaches may well have been the understanding the bishops present had of the grace at work in the Council. Parallels may readily be drawn between what had been taught in *Dei Verbum* regarding divine inspiration of Sacred Scripture and the way the Holy Spirit was understood to be at work in and through their deliberations. Irrespective of the way it came about, the care taken at the Council to ensure that the role of the Holy Spirit in Salvation History and in the ongoing life of the Church was both acknowledged and reflected upon was clearly a factor which served to ‘prepare the ground’ for the pneumatological focus of the CCR.

### 3.5 Catholic Ecclesiology in Context

In order to broaden the consideration of Catholic ecclesiology which has been made thus far, the way in which Catholic ecclesiology is shaped by and expressed in other areas of Catholic theology will be considered in this section, taking *Lumen Gentium* as a point of departure.\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{52}\) Section 3.5 incorporates and expands upon elements of my earlier work on the developments which occurred during the Second Vatican Council that was submitted towards a Graduate Diploma in Theology.
Prior to this consideration, however, it is important to note that there are competing interpretations of the ecclesiology presented in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, as well as the ecclesiological implications of developments in other areas of theology. One of these interpretations, the hermeneutic of continuity, holds that the contemporary Catholic Church must be considered as the same entity which existed prior to the Council.\footnote{There is much more to be said about the hermeneutic of continuity; however, the persistence of the Church through time is most salient to this discussion, with other considerations being beyond the scope of this thesis.}

The extent to which this hermeneutic of continuity helped to shape the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church forms a significant part of the debate surrounding whether this hermeneutic ought to inform the interpretation of the documents of the Second Vatican Council. It is possible to identify evidence in the final version of \textit{Lumen Gentium} that affirming the continuity of the Church through time was highly important in the ecclesiology being presented. This is perhaps most apparent in the eighth paragraph and deals with the change to the Catholic Church’s exclusive identification with the one true Church of Christ.\footnote{The more inclusive understanding of the Church of Christ presented in the \textit{Lumen Gentium} is evident in the affirmation that schismatic Orthodox Churches, among others, are members of the one Church of Christ.}

In order to place this discussion in some historical context, it is possible to observe that, from the earliest times, the Church has affirmed the importance of adherence to a ‘true’ faith in Jesus Christ. (Gal 1:9) The Apostles and their chosen companions are presented as making every effort to spread faith in Jesus with great urgency, expecting an imminent eschaton. Many leaders of the early Church travelled extensively and stayed in one place only long enough to establish local communities, or ἐκκλησίαι, of believers. While some remote ἐκκλησίαι were left isolated for an extended period of time,\footnote{Such as the Syro-Malankara and Syro-Malabar Churches, which claim to have been founded in the first century by St. Thomas and were only ‘re-discovered’ by Portuguese explorers in the late fifteenth century.} the majority were in relative...
proximity and began interacting with one another. At times, this led to disharmony between these ἐκκλησίαι, which were in any case not immune to internal disharmony.

Several references to interpersonal conflicts and differences of opinion within ἐκκλησίαι are recorded in the New Testament. The Pauline Epistles, which are dated as amongst the earliest Christian documents,⁵⁶ present unity and harmony within these ἐκκλησίαι as traits to be highly valued and safeguarded, as evidenced by the exhortations they contain to avoid anything which caused tension and possible division within ἐκκλησίαι (cf. 1 Cor 3:4-6, passim.) These epistles contain repeated calls for believers to identify as members of their ἐκκλησίαι in the same way that the diverse members of the human body can be seen to form a whole.

Hence it is possible to identify, even in some of the earliest texts pertaining to ecclesiology, that the community of believers was understood to be logically prior to the individual in formulating an understanding of ἐκκλησίαι. The community of believers is presented as a necessary hermeneutic for the roles and charisms of the individual, a context which both enabled them to construct a proper self-understanding and informed their relationships with one another. (cf. Rom 12:4, passim.)

Having provided believers with an understanding of their place within the local ἐκκλησία, these texts go further to specify that any given local community can never be understood in isolation, that each local ἐκκλησία is only authentically a community of believers in Christ if its members understand it to be part of a broader ἐκκλησία, which is often referred to as the bride of Christ. (cf. Eph 5:21-33) The importance of this universal, collective ἐκκλησία is a recurring theme in the Pauline Epistles, with the letter to the Galatians describing how, after

three years in Arabia and Damascus, St. Paul’s first action was to “get acquainted with Peter,”
(Gal 1:18) the man to whom Christ had entrusted governance of His Church.

St. Paul’s later disagreements with St. Peter over issues such as dietary requirements and
circumcision is a strong indication that the need for consistency in practice and belief amongst
the dispersed Christian communities was considered to be of utmost importance in the
Pauline Epistles. While it is far from systematic, the presentation of early ecclesiology in these
texts clearly takes as its point of departure a single entity, the collective ἐκκλησία, which will
hereafter be called the Church. Given the prominence of these texts in patristic works, it is
clear that understanding was adopted and developed in the early Church.

One of the effects of this ecclesiology in the centuries following the Apostolic age was the
effort to homogenise theology. While it was not always evident whether a given position was
indeed inconsistent with those of the Church, once the need for further theological reflection
on a particular point was recognised by those in leadership, when the need for a
determination became pressing, as many the leaders of local ἐκκλησία as possible gathered
to discuss it in an effort to reach a consensus. Individuals and whole local ἐκκλησία who
maintained theological positions that were deemed to be inconsistent with those of the
Church were declared ἀνάθεμα, that is, no longer counted as members of the one true Church
of Christ.

An ecclesiology which takes the faith of Church as a whole as its point of departure therefore
had a normative effect on the historical development of almost every other field of theology.
Direct evidence for this can be found as early as the beginning of the second century in the
letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch, which contain a warning to be wary of those who persisted
in upholding heterodox positions: “Be not deceived, my brothers: If anyone follows a 

schismatic, he does not inherit the kingdom of God.”

57 [emphasis added]

It is important to note that the salvation of the individual Christian was understood 
throughout this time to be contingent upon a great many things, but this is clear evidence 
that primary among them was continued membership of the Church, the entity whose 
relationship with Christ was understood as making possible the relationship of the individual 
with Christ.

This ecclesiology was so foundational that it was adopted wholesale by almost all schismatic 
ἐκκλησίαι, each claiming to be the true Church of Christ and denouncing all other ἐκκλησίαι. 

St. Ignatius differentiates between the orthodox Church and heterodox ἐκκλησίαι by using 
the term καθολικός58 for the true Church of Christ. In this, the oldest extant usage of the term, 
he expresses the Pauline vision of a single, universal Church to which all true followers of 
Christ belong. An important distinction must be made between this Pauline universality, 
which remains a central part of Catholic ecclesiology, and the concept that the Catholic 
Church is synonymous with Church of Christ, a corollary of which being that it is only through 
direct membership in the Catholic Church that one is able to authentically follow Jesus.

The latter proposition went hand-in-hand with the former for an extended period of time in 
the Catholic Church. Whenever heresy threatened the integrity of the Catholic Church, this 
idea was reaffirmed and the twofold approach of evaluating suspect theology and declaring

ἀνάθεμα as needed was employed. Sts. Irenaeus, 59 Jerome 60 and Augustine 61 are among the many patristic writers who took an extremely hard-line approach to heretics. The leadership of the Catholic Church would also take the same tack; the teaching that membership of the Catholic Church exclusively equated to membership of the Church of Christ was proclaimed by, among others, Pope Pelagius II in 585, 62 the Fourth Lateran Council in 1214, and Pope Boniface VIII in 1302. 63

Closer to the time of the Second Vatican Council, this position was repeatedly re-stated. Pope Pius XI issued his encyclical Mortalium Animos in 1928, in which he equates the Catholic Church with the Church of Christ when he states that “in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors.” 64 Moreover in 1950 Pope Pius XII strongly affirmed in his encyclical Humani Generis that: “the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing” 65 and condemns the reduction “to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.” 66

59 “In the Church God has placed apostles, prophets, teachers, and every other working of the Spirit, of whom none of those are sharers who do not conform to the Church, but who defraud themselves of life by an evil mind and even worse way of acting.” (St. Irenaeus: Against Heresies, III.24; http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103324.htm; Accessed 5 May 2014).
60 “Heretics bring sentence upon themselves since they by their own choice withdraw from the Church, a withdrawal which, since they are aware of it, constitutes damnation.” (Salvation Outside the Church; http://www.staycatholic.com/ecf_salvation_outside_the_church.htm; Accessed 5 May 2014).
61 “Whoever is separated from this Catholic Church, by this single sin of being separated from the unity of Christ... shall not have life, but the wrath of God rests upon him.” (Salvation Outside the Church; http://www.staycatholic.com/ecf_salvation_outside_the_church.htm; Accessed 5 May 2014).
63 Boniface VIII, Unam Sanctam, Papal Bull, (1302).
64 Pius XI, Mortalium Animos, Encyclical letter (1928), n. 11.
65 Pius XII, Humani Generis, Encyclical letter (1950), n. 27.
66 Pius XII, Humani Generis, n. 27.
It would seem, therefore, that the consistent teaching of the Church from the Apostolic period right through to the decade prior to the convocation of the Second Vatican Council was that membership in the Church of Christ, a prerequisite for salvation and the validity of the sacramental life, was synonymous with membership of the Catholic Church. Had this been the case, then the positions taken in *Lumen Gentium* and *Unitatis Redintegratio* on the matter of salvation, and the accompanying explanation of the way in which the Catholic Church had come to understand the dogma that there is no salvation outside of the Church, would have constituted a radical departure from the centuries-long teaching of the Catholic Church.

However, to do so would be to fail to consider how an understanding had developed over time in the Catholic Church that the aforementioned statements were responses to particular questions of the day. Prior to the Council, Catholic theologians had already begun to argue that, when these statements are read with their historical context in mind, it was possible to discern a nuanced and gradual development of the Catholic Church’s understanding of this attitude towards other Christian denominations.

A prime example of this came two years after the promulgation of *Humani Generis*. In response to questions which had surfaced at that time, the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office published the letter *Suprema Haec Sacra* in which the principle *extra ecclesiam, nulla salus* was declared to be an infallible statement. However, this letter did not rule out developing an understanding of this statement which varied from a *prima facie* reading. To the contrary this letter, which had been approved by Pope Pius XII some three years prior to its publication, formed the basis upon which the Second Vatican Council Fathers

---

67 Which would later become the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.
drew their mandate for refining this teaching because of its insistence that “this dogma must be understood in that sense in which the Church itself understands it.” That is to say, that this teaching requires interpretation and its authoritative interpretation is to be found in the Magisterium of the Catholic Church.

The explanation in *Suprema Haec Sacra* of how the Catholic Church understands this dogma demonstrates the inadequacy of a superficial historical examination of this question. This document explained that the Catholic Church understood this dogma to mean that “the Church is necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation with both the necessity of precept and the necessity of means.” Crucially, this letter acknowledges the existence of other means of salvation that lie beyond the confines of the Catholic Church; it maintains that the Catholic Church is the normative means of salvation, but restates the teaching of the Council of Trent that “In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved... can also be obtained in certain circumstances when those helps are used only in desire and longing.”

Moreover, this letter reaffirmed the teaching that, in the case of a person being invincibly ignorant “God accepts also an implicit desire (votum), so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.” Coupled with a true spirit of charity, such a desire to be united with the will of God is

---

70 Joseph Clifford Fenton ‘Pope Pius XII and the Theological Treatise on the Church’
73 Fenton ‘Pope Pius XII and the Theological Treatise on the Church’;
seen by the Church to constitute faith, and thus does not violate the teaching of the Council of Trent on justification, which states that “faith is the beginning of man’s salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and to come to the fellowship of His sons.” Clearly, then, the Catholic Church had accepted prior to the Council that salvation could be found outside of the visible Catholic Church.

Given that the Catholic Church affirms that salvation comes from Christ alone, then prior to the Council, the Catholic Church demonstrated openness to the possibility that Jesus could effect salvation beyond the confines of the institutional Church. The only way for the Catholic Church to affirm this possibility and simultaneously affirm that there is no salvation outside of the Church of Christ is to understand that the Church of Christ is not exclusively synonymous with the Catholic Church. Therefore, by necessity this understanding must predate the ecclesiology of *Lumen Gentium* and the ecumenism of *Unitatis Redintegratio*.

The extent to which this understanding predates *Lumen Gentium* can only be appreciated when *Suprema Haec Sacra* is understood as a synthesis and refinement of the prior teaching on the relationship between salvation, the Catholic Church and other followers of Jesus. Some of this teaching dates to the patristic period, in which it is possible to find texts containing references to what *Lumen Gentium* would later term the ‘sincerity’ of those who do not know the Gospel of Christ. Clement of Alexandria, writing in the early third century, argued that “before the coming of the Lord, *philosophy was necessary for justification to the Greeks*... for

75 Denzinger, *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, 252.
76 Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 15
it brought the Greeks to Christ as the law did the Hebrews.” 77(Emphasis added.) These words echoed those of Justin Martyr, who some sixty years prior had taken up the Johannine concept of Christ as the incarnate divine Λόγος to explain in his First Apology that those “who lived according to reason were really Christians, even though they were thought to be atheists, such as, among the Greeks, Socrates, Heraclitus, and others like them.” 78[Emphasis added]

Yet, this concept was not restricted to those ‘invincibly ignorant’ of Christ. The relationship that Christians beyond the confines of the recognised ‘community of believers’ had with the Church seems to have been a topical issue for Christians from the earliest times, as this can be readily identified in the Gospel of Luke. This first century 79 Gospel includes an account of an exchange between Jesus and the disciples which clearly describes there being at least some merit in relationships with the Church other than formal membership. In this account, John informs Jesus that the disciples had tried to stop a man casting out demons in Jesus’ name “because he is not one of us.” (Lk 9:49) The reply he receives in this pericope demonstrates that there was, from the earliest times in Christian history, an understanding that other Christians outside the ranks of what would shortly thereafter be called the Catholic Church were able to perform legitimate good works in the name of Jesus, and that these good works are of benefit to the Church: “‘Do not stop him,’ Jesus said, ‘for whoever is not against you is for you.’”

---


This truly Catholic\textsuperscript{80} atemporal ecclesiology, which has its fullest expression reaffirmed in \textit{Lumen Gentium}, is the basis for what \textit{Suprema Haec Sacra} explained was the ‘sense’ in which the Church understands the principle of \textit{extra ecclesiam, nulla salus}. The difficulty seems to have been that, although this was the sense in which the Catholic Church came to understand this teaching at a magisterial level, this does not seem to have been the sense in which many Catholics understood this teaching.

So pervasive was an isolationist and adversarial ecclesiology in the Catholic Church that many saw the teaching of \textit{Lumen Gentium} as a departure from Catholic Tradition even for quite some time after its promulgation. Indeed, as recently as 2007, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a \textit{responsa ad quaestiones} regarding certain aspects of the doctrine on the Church in which it was reaffirmed that “The Second Vatican Council neither changed nor intended to change this doctrine, rather it developed, deepened and more fully explained it.”\textsuperscript{81}

The misunderstandings which the Congregation sought to address are, at least in part, the product of the language employed in \textit{Lumen Gentium}. Specifically, the question of the correct interpretation of the definition provided in this Dogmatic Constitution that the Church of Christ as a society “\textit{subsistit in Ecclesia catholica}”\textsuperscript{82} has been one which has been extensively debated in academia. Rather than examining the merits of these interpretations, it is instructive instead to consider the underlying theological principle which affected the

\textsuperscript{80} In the sense of universal.

\textsuperscript{81} Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, \textit{Response to some Questions regarding certain aspects of the Doctrine on the Church} (2007).

\textsuperscript{82} Vatican Council II, \textit{Lumen Gentium}, n. 8.
deliberations at the Second Vatican Council and led to the determination that it was necessary to employ this language.

This principle, which is of no small import to the question of differentiating Catholic from Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology, pertains to the Catholic Church’s understanding of dogma. Once a doctrine is defined authoritatively by the Catholic Church, it becomes prescriptive; assent becomes a requirement for membership in the Catholic Church. The Holy Spirit is seen as the ultimate guarantor of definitive doctrinal statements, and the Catholic Church holds that such statements cannot be revoked.

The implications of this principle for ecclesiology are stark. Firstly, it prevents the Catholic Church from changing, much less reversing, dogmatic propositions such as *extra ecclesiam*, *nulla salus*. This is why the Congregation of the Doctrine and the Faith rejected the proposition that *Lumen Gentium* changed this doctrine. Had this been the case, then the greater openness to other Christian denominations sanctioned by *Lumen Gentium* would have been tantamount to a relativisation of dogma that would have rendered impossible any effort on the part of the Catholic Church to lay claim to objective theological truth.

This principle is therefore a central tenet of Catholic theology. While it is only implied in the texts that have been under consideration, it is clear that Catholic theology seeks to lay claim to truth. This is essential for maintaining the integrity of the Church, yet a corollary of this position is that it is possible for Christians to place themselves outside of the community of believers through the adoption of certain theological positions. Therefore, while the

---

83 The Catholic Church affirms that certain actions can also place a Christian outside of the community of believers; namely, those which result in excommunication *ipsa facto*. 
Catholic Church affirms that “faith is the beginning of man’s salvation,” and recognises that there is often value in an individual’s insights into this faith, these individual insights are nevertheless understood as being subject to assessment and evaluation by the Church; it is the whole Church, at a corporate level, which makes the determination of what constitutes authentic faith in Jesus Christ.

This extends to those outside of the Catholic Church, as can be seen by requirement that Mormon converts be baptised upon reception into the Catholic Church, irrespective of whether they have been through a Mormon baptism ceremony. This is despite the fact that the Mormon ceremony includes both water and the use of a Trinitarian formula.

The Catholic understanding of the sacrament of Baptism in particular, but sacramental theology in general, is essential to developing a well-rounded understanding of Catholic ecclesiology. Baptism is both initiation into the Church and a means of achieving a radical unity with Christ. It makes the new Christian a co-heir with Christ, establishing an indissoluble relationship with God the Father. Baptism confers the fullness of the Holy Spirit upon the one who is baptised. Hence, drawn into the inner life of the Trinity through baptismal waters, the new Christian is called a new creation, so radical is the ontological change which occurs in that person.

Along with the vertical dimension of the communio which is established by Baptism, a horizontal dimension is also established. The New Christian is placed into a relationship with every other Christian in the Church of Christ, irrespective of the particular denomination into which the new Christian has been Baptised. Moreover, from the moment of Baptism, the

---

84 Congregation of the Holy Office, Suprema Haec Sacra, Letter from the Holy Office Concerning Fr. Leonard Feeney. 8 August 1949
moral life of the new Christian has an ecclesiological effect. Meritorious acts or dispositions, even ones which seem entirely personal, serve to edify the Church.

No sin which the new Christian commits after Baptism is ever personal. The Church is wounded by every offence against God, hence the Christian who sins requires reconciliation not only with God but with the Church. This reconciliation confers on the Christian a state of grace which has no small import with regard to soteriology. Moreover, this state of grace properly disposes the Christian to exercise the common priesthood which Baptism confers and so receive Holy Communion,\(^\text{85}\) thereby drawing spiritual nourishment from communion with Jesus. Doing so enables the Christian to participate in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross, since the celebration of the Eucharist transcends the limits of space and time to unite the Church throughout the world and throughout time with the Paschal mystery, with the Church in purgatory\(^\text{86}\) and with the communion of saints.

### 3.6 Chapter Summary

The exploration of the relationship between ecclesiology and Sacramental theology which concluded the previous section was intended to emphasise that a change in either of these two fields of Catholic theology requires careful consideration of the changes it implies in the other. The role of the Holy Spirit as it is understood in each of these was presented, in order to emphasise that the important role which is attributed to the Holy Spirit in the Catholic Church does not have logical precedence over the more foundational role played by Christ.

---

\(^{85}\) In the case of Catholics and separated Orthodox Christians. In other cases, ‘horizontal’ communion with the Catholic Church is an additional prerequisite for the reception of Holy Communion.

Moreover, the exploration served to illuminate the importance to both fields of the understanding that it is the Church as a whole which has the primary relationship of faith with Christ. This relationship is therefore the necessary context within which Catholics are to understand their individual faith lives and the purpose of any charisms which they may be given.

The Holy Spirit was shown to be regarded in the Catholic Church as the ultimate guarantor of definitive doctrinal statements, which therefore cannot be revoked. Accordingly, it was established that the openness the Catholic Church expressed to ecumenism at the Second Vatican Council did not constitute a denial of the principle of *extra ecclesiam, nulla salus* but was rather a reconsideration of the soteriological and eschatological implications of this principle.

Reference to charisms in *Lumen Gentium* were examined and found to emphasise the importance of considering charisms as gifts primarily given for this good of the Church. *Lumen Gentium* was shown to emphasise the need for the correct disposition for the reception of charisms; passivity, humility and gratitude. This Dogmatic Constitution further specifies that this disposition should prevent Catholics from seeking extraordinary gifts and that no charism supersedes the charism of leadership and authority enjoyed by bishops, who enjoy a privileged role of discernment of charisms by virtue of their authority.

Nevertheless, *Lumen Gentium*’s presentation of the way that God selects and empowers lay men and women to perform special, perhaps even unique, roles in the salvific mission of the Church undoubtedly emboldened the founders of the CCR to pursue the ecumenical path they took. In equal measure, the mandate for ecumenical dialogue provided in *Unitatis*
Redintegratio clearly helped those lecturers from Duquesne University to see value in and seek to share in the religious experiences of Protestant Pentecostals.

Finally, it was established that the hermeneutic of continuity is an approach to ecclesiology which regards the Catholic Church as the same entity that existed in earlier epochs, particularly to the Apostolic Church. The examination of the works of Suenens which follows will demonstrate that Suenens was operating from this understanding.
CHAPTER 4: SUENENS’ TEXTS

4.0 CHAPTER OUTLINE

In this chapter, Suenens’ earliest treatments of the CCR in two texts first published in 1974 will be examined to establish the ecclesiology that Suenens sought to promote in the CCR and his assessment of the shortcomings of the ecclesiology he sought to replace. The first is the book *A New Pentecost?* and the second is a much shorter treatise entitled *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. The former is an ecclesiological reflection on the role of charisms written for an audience which necessarily included but was not limited to the members of CCR. The latter was composed for members of the CCR as the first in a series of what came to be called ‘Malines Documents;’ texts which served as early formative guides to the CCR.

A later work of Suenens, the third ‘Malines document,’ will be considered in conjunction with these early texts to establish that Suenens sought to correct problematic elements early CCR ecclesiology by implementing a number of changes to the practices of the CCR and the way that ‘Pentecostal experiences’ in the CCR were understood.

4.1: THE FIRST MALINES DOCUMENT

*Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* begins with a recapitulation of the teaching on charisms found in *Lumen Gentium*, placing particular emphasis on the social dimension of charisms. However, when specifying the norms for discernment of charisms in this document, Suenens does not merely restate but expands

---

upon the teaching of *Lumen Gentium*. After drawing a distinction between mystical experiences, which are directed inward, “toward the perfection of the individual,” ² and charisms, which are directed outward “to the good of the community,”³ Suenens states that, to the degree that charisms are experiential and accompanied by real mystical graces, the norms for their discernment are the same as the “norms for the discernment of spirits found in mystical theology.”⁴ It is only to the degree that the charisms are ministries that they are subject to the “usual doctrinal and communitarian norms for authentic ministry.”⁵ Reference to the special competency of the episcopacy for the discernment of charisms which features in the Dogmatic Constitution is omitted altogether in this section, with the only possible oblique reference to bishops being their presumed inclusion in the ‘usual communitarian norms.’

The likely reason for Suenens’ minimisation of the role of the episcopacy in discernment of charisms becomes clear when the purpose this serves in *Lumen Gentium* is recalled. Requiring bishops to confirm particular claims to charisms was intended to place charisms firmly in the realm of the objective. On a practical level, Suenens no doubt recognised that it would not be possible for the episcopacy to be directly involved in discernment of charisms for the growing membership of the CCR. Suenens chooses other means to place charisms in the realm of the objective, warning against the “tyranny of the subjective experience.”⁶ However, Suenens also warns against the ‘tyranny’ of abstract dogmas and ritual formalism and includes many

---

⁵ Suenens, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations*, 25.
subjective elements when he specifies some norms for discernment in a non-exhaustive list adapted from 1 Corinthians;

*the recognition of the Lordship of Jesus*, distinction of functions, variety and inequality of ministries in terms of functions, equality in terms of goal (building up the community) and equality in terms of source (the Spirit), *love as the matrix*, relative importance of ministries as related to the immediacy with which they serve the community, *mutuality of submission*, discernment as a community process, *obedience to legitimate authority*, liberty and good order.⁷ [Emphasis added]

Although the obedience to legitimate authority which is mentioned in this section would certainly have included deference and obedience to the episcopacy in the mind of Suenens, this exploration of discernment of charisms nevertheless demonstrates that a seismic shift has occurred in his understanding of charisms. No longer is the subjective dimension of charisms considered an irrelevance, neither are the experiential and the objective considered to be mutually exclusive. This is no mere concession to the legitimacy of the subjective experience; this is a validation of its proper place as the necessary counterpoint to a purely objective understanding of charisms.

The only mention of the role of bishops in discernment of charisms comes in a later section of this text which provides further clarification on the discernment of “true from false manifestations of the Spirit.”⁸ When revisiting the topic of discernment, Suenens restates the need to adhere to the mystical norms and references the need to adhere to communitarian norms when he reminds his reader of “St. Paul’s teaching on discernment found in 1 Corinthians 12-14.”⁹ Suenens explicitly places the role of bishops in the discernment of charisms further to the periphery, with their involvement only “in those cases where it is
deemed necessary.” He feels free to do so as a result of the understanding he develops that discernment of charisms is itself a charismatic gift. As such, Suenens argues that it can be granted to any member of the community of believers and has been granted to the community as a whole. Clearly, therefore, this text presents the community as having the primary role in the discernment of charisms, with “certain individuals,” particularly those trained in theology, playing a special role.

This brief revisiting of discernment also contains a reference which demonstrates another appreciable deviation from Suenens’ earlier understanding of charisms. Suenens includes in this text an exploration of the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, which lists the gifts of healing and miraculous powers, as well as prophecy, as some of the many of the gifts which come from the Holy Spirit, and ends with the exhortation to “eagerly desire the greater gifts.” (1 Cor 12:31) This contrasts sharply with the admonition in Lumen Gentium not to seek after the more extraordinary gifts.

Suenens uses this passage as a springboard for his consideration of the problem posed by elitism in the CCR. Suenens specifies that the presence of spiritual gifts, including the more extraordinary are “in no way a sign of spiritual maturity, though they are often experienced as a call to life of greater holiness.” Once again, the value of the subjective experience of charisms is upheld, and the importance of engaging not only the faculties of the intellect and the will but the totality of one’s being in a religious experience, as a criticism of the

---

10 Suenens, Theological and Pastoral Orientations, 36.
11 Suenens, Theological and Pastoral Orientations, 36.
12 Suenens, Theological and Pastoral Orientations, 37.
“overintellectualizing[sic] of the faith”\textsuperscript{13} which he identifies as having occurred in the Western Catholic Church.

Suenens identifies the charism of healing, and by extension all of these extraordinary gifts, as being directed towards the same goal as the CCR; namely, to work towards the reintegration of the “postapostolic experience [of the early Church] into the life of the Church today.”\textsuperscript{14} However, Suenens also recognised that with this goal comes the danger of denying the proper place of the intellect in Christian life, hence he cautions against a biblical fundamentalism which would “damage a re-evaluation of the charism of healing.”\textsuperscript{15}

By affirming the value of the subjective experience of charisms, while maintaining that the service of others is the fundamental orientation of charisms and expanding the understanding of discernment presented in \textit{Lumen Gentium}, Suenens repeatedly demonstrates in this text his willingness to engage with and affirm the attitudes and theological understandings he found in the early CCR. It is in this context that Suenens discusses what he terms ‘problems with vocabulary’ and other challenges facing the CCR. Before identifying Protestant Pentecostalism as the source of these problematic elements and ‘orientations’ in the CCR, Suenens takes great care to demonstrate ecumenical sensitivity and respect for Protestant Pentecostalism:

\begin{quote}
One theological culture can learn from another quite different theological culture. For instance, the theological culture of Classical Pentecostalism or of Protestant neo-Pentecostalism may point to elements in the Catholic theological culture which belong to the foundation of that culture and to the nature of the Church but which are not a normal part of Catholic theological culture, at least as it is manifest in the day-to-day life of the local church.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 38.
\textsuperscript{14} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 56-57.
\textsuperscript{15} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 57.
\textsuperscript{16} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 28.
Suenens identifies the activities of the CCR as the way in which Protestant Pentecostalism has ‘awakened’ these ‘dormant’ aspects of Catholic culture not typically found in Catholic parish life, and in so doing prepares to make an important distinction; it becomes possible for Suenens to affirm the value of the CCR and its service to the broader Church while also critiquing the ‘vocabulary’ used to describe the activities and experiences of Catholics in the CCR. Taking up the work of Walter J. Hollenweger, Suenens observes that in both Classical Pentecostalism and Protestant neo-Pentecostalism the terms “‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’, ‘receiving the Spirit’, ‘Spirit-filled’ have meanings proper to their theological cultures.”\(^{17}\) He discusses these meanings in terms of an understanding of sanctification, and argues that Protestant Pentecostal understanding of sanctification includes the position that the full reception of the Holy Spirit only occurs late in life. This Suenens contrasts with the Catholic understanding that receiving the fullness of the Holy Spirit theologically belongs to the beginning of Christian life.\(^{18}\)

For this reason, Suenens argues that the terms used to describe the experiences of members of the CCR are non-trivial. He warns of the danger of uncritically adopting terms used in Protestant Pentecostalism, since this opens the possibility for the adoption of the “theological content current in the theological culture of Classical Pentecostalism and Protestant neo-Pentecostalism.”\(^{19}\) In addition to arguing that care must be taken when selecting terms to refer to the experiences and practices in the CCR, Suenens also argues for care to be taken in selecting terms to refer to the CCR per se. He acknowledges that there is some basis for concern regarding the use of the term ‘Charismatic Renewal,’ particularly with regard to the
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\(^{17}\) Suenens, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations*, 29.


\(^{19}\) Suenens, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations*, 30.
possibility of this giving the false impression that the CCR lays claim to phenomena not present elsewhere in the Catholic Church. However, Suenens expresses reservations about the decision in some countries to refer to the CCR as “‘the spiritual renewal’ or simply ‘the renewal’”\textsuperscript{20} since this may imply that the CCR presumes to be the only avenue for renewal in the Catholic Church. Suenens does not propose a solution to the challenge of naming the CCR, but observes that the efforts of those who have attempted to address this challenge are a strong indication that those involved in the CCR understood it to be “something that belongs to the [Catholic] Church.”\textsuperscript{21}

This forms the basis of Suenens’ rejection of the contention that the CCR should be considered an import from Protestant Pentecostalism. To the contrary, by identifying the New Testament witness to the life of the early Church as the basis for Pentecostal movements in other Christian denominations, Suenens argues that “the basis for the Protestant renewals is not something which they possess apart from the Catholic tradition.”\textsuperscript{22} Acknowledging the debt that the Catholic Church owes to Protestant Pentecostals for ‘calling attention’ to the need for greater appreciation of this aspect of the Catholic tradition,\textsuperscript{23} Suenens nevertheless argues that the CCR has, from its beginning, recognised the need to separate heeding this call from uncritically adopting “fundamentalist exegesis and systematic theology which were found in some of these traditions.”\textsuperscript{24}

Clearly, Suenens saw himself as assisting the CCR in this task and, in his assessment, insufficient care had been taken to prevent elements of Protestant theology from finding

\textsuperscript{20} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 34. 
\textsuperscript{21} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 35. 
\textsuperscript{22} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 45. 
\textsuperscript{23} In this passage, Suenens goes so far as to state that the “Catholic renewal recognizes that the renewal among its Protestant brethren is an authentic move of the Spirit.” 
\textsuperscript{24} Suenens, \textit{Theological and Pastoral Orientations}, 45.
expression in the activity of the CCR. Although Suenens gives an initial treatment of his specific concerns regarding the understanding of glossolalia and ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ in *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, these are explored in much greater detail in his later works, hence his concerns will be detailed when those texts are presented later in this chapter.

### 4.2: A NEW PENTECOST

These changes to Suenens’ understanding of charisms were expressed in the context of a document prepared for members of the CCR which addresses many issues of particular interest to the CCR. In the same year of its publication, Suenens also published *A New Pentecost?* in which he placed charisms in a broader ecclesial context. He begins by establishing the harmony of the institutional and charismatic dimensions of the Church, and then proceeds to reflect upon the charismatic experience in the Church.

Before considering the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the activity of the Holy Spirit as manifest in Sacred Scripture is briefly outlined, concluding with the statement that the “Holy Spirit reveals himself as power...[endowing the Church] with its missionary dimension, its catholicity.”25 This enables charisms to then be defined as varied expressions of a unique reality conferred for the purpose of building up the Church. Although only some charisms are recognised as being “extraordinary and striking,”26 there is no effort made to classify charisms into classes; rather, the activity of the Holy Spirit through charisms as mundane as service, teaching and administrating is affirmed as being just as important to the Church as the more ‘striking’ charisms.

---

26 Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* 27.
Suenens takes great pains not to separate the conferral of these gifts from the Sacraments of initiation, and reflects at length about the way in which the CCR is a renewal of these Sacraments before speaking about the threshold event, the moment when the first university youth group experienced an outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the conferral of charisms which brought the CCR into being. The language he uses to describe this experience is telling; “the Spirit’s response to them was an experience, over again, of what happened when the first disciples of the Lord were together in the upper-room.”27 As the very title of this book suggests with its final interrogative, Suenens subsequently shies away from directly equating this experience with the experience of the Apostles at Pentecost, but demonstrates a clear openness to the possibility.

When describing the way in which these charisms were conferred on other university students, Suenens describes how the communal prayer of the founders of the CCR triggered in others “the same phenomena, the same outpouring of graces.”28 The integration of this subjective experience of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ with an understanding of the objective nature of the charisms it confers is central to the subsequent discussion of the nature of the “new outpouring of the Holy Spirit”29 at work in the CCR.

Although Suenens uses the term ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ in this text,30 he explains when introducing this foundational CCR experience that it would be preferable to use another phrase to refer to this experience. He argues that this expression too readily implies a duality of baptism, or even that this experience is some sort of ‘super baptism.’ In place of this

27 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 74.
28 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 74.
29 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 80.
30 Sparingly, so as not to confuse those familiar with the use of this phrase. Suenens uses this phrase a total of five times in A New Pentecost?.
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expression, Suenens prefers the phrase ‘outpouring of the Holy Spirit.’ He feels that this phrase better communicates that this ‘transformational encounter with God,’ which may seem to be new, in fact has its origins in the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit conferred in the Sacraments of initiation; “we are concerned here with a new coming of the Spirit already present, of an ‘outpouring’ which ... springs up from within.” Suenens acknowledges that this understanding contrasts sharply with the understanding of Protestant Pentecostalism, asserting that while Catholics can and indeed must admire classical Pentecostals for their faith in the action of the Holy Spirit... as everyone knows, as Catholics we cannot follow them on a doctrinal and exegetical level in their interpretation of "baptism in the Spirit." In speaking of the charisms which are manifest after this ‘outpouring’ as the “latent potentials of the Spirit” which this experience ‘releases,’ Suenens introduces the concept that, as gifts, charisms can be received but lie dormant, requiring actualisation of some kind or other. These charisms are graces which are received not only through the Sacraments of initiation but also through the other sacraments. The context of this exploration of the origins of charisms and ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ must be considered; the caution Suenens gives against elitism earlier in this text makes clear that it is not his intention to suggest that participation in the CCR is required for the full utilisation of the charisms conferred through the sacraments.

In commending the CCR to the consideration of bishops around the world, Suenens provides an insightful guide to the process of discernment. He identifies prudence as the virtue which

---

31 Suenens lists a number of other expressions which he claims were being used to define ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ which are rather prolix. Evidence has not been found that any of the expressions he lists were in popular use.


33 To this Suenens adds ‘nor in the matters of speaking in tongues’ which is a phenomenon he explores as one of the ‘fruits’ of the CCR in a later section of his work.

34 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 79.

35 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 81.

36 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 82.
lies at the heart of discernment and draws a distinction between human prudence, which usually ‘plays for safety’ and supernatural prudence, which “is anxious not to misunderstand an action of God in and for his Church.” 37 To this end, he recommends direct experience with the CCR as the best possible method for discernment, since he contends that a balanced judgment requires “an understanding of this reality ‘from the inside.’” 38 However, he issues a caution along with this invitation; stating that there is a danger that leadership and discernment can lead to a misguided attempt to take authority over the CCR, which runs the risk of “stifling the spontaneity and life of the Renewal.” 39

To provide further support for his positive appraisal of the CCR, Suenens proceeds to outline at some length what he identified as the ‘fruits’ of this movement: “the Lord told us to judge a tree by its fruits, and this is a solid criterion,” 40 a statement at least somewhat at odds with the caution issued in Lumen Gentium not to presume the ‘fruits of apostolic labour’ from the use of charisms. The third fruit Suenens mentions is the one to which he devotes the longest exploration, “praying and speaking in tongues.” 41

When exploring this phenomenon, Suenens emphatically rejects a definition of glossolalia as being “an infused gift enabling someone to pray in a real language which he himself does not understand,” 42 asserting that such a position has its origin in Classical Pentecostalism and that it is incompatible with Catholic theology. Aware that this was a common understanding of glossolalia in the CCR, Suenens argues that his definition of glossolalia as a mode of prayer in which a believer makes “spontaneous verbal expression, in which syllables succeed one

---

37 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 92.
38 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 92.
40 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 95.
another, forming phrases that are unintelligible”\textsuperscript{43} does not minimise nor exaggerate the importance of this mode of prayer. Suenens concedes that there may have been rare instances in the past when the miraculous gift described in the New Testament was given to particular individuals after the event of Pentecost, but argues that the best way to understand the phenomenon of glossolalia in the CCR is to situate it “on a natural plane.”\textsuperscript{44}

Suenens offers a brief defence of his definition of glossolalia as being neither miraculous nor pathological\textsuperscript{45} then uses a number of analogies to assist his reader in understanding how non-discursive, preconceptual prayer can have a legitimate place in the spiritual life. The most accessible of these is his reference to the way in which infants are prone to spontaneously express joy through “varied sounds and unintelligible syllables.”\textsuperscript{46}

When outlining his understanding of the spiritual value of glossolalia, Suenens begins with an account of the benefit derived by the believer praying in this way. He asserts that glossolalia enables the believer to find a new liberation in prayer, since it “brings a freedom from spiritually inhibiting bonds, which block our relationship with God and with our fellowmen.”\textsuperscript{47}

In this Suenens combines the subjective benefit derived by the one engaged in this form of prayer with the benefit that it can have in strengthening or re-establishing communion within particular Churches.

Suenens goes on to give glossolalia a place of significant importance in the spiritual life, asserting that it constitutes a total surrender to the action of the Holy Spirit, a surrender which

\textsuperscript{43} Suenens, \textit{A New Pentecost}? 99.
\textsuperscript{44} Suenens, \textit{A New Pentecost}? 101.
\textsuperscript{45} Suenens refers his reader to the study of glossolalia conducted by William J. Samarin to substantiate the latter assertion.
\textsuperscript{46} Suenens, \textit{A New Pentecost}? 101.
\textsuperscript{47} Suenens, \textit{A New Pentecost}? 102.
is a prerequisite for learning “how to yield to the other gifts.” Moreover, Suenens takes up
the definition of glossolalia proposed by Karl Barth to argue that this mode of prayer is a
means through which believers are able to subconsciously unite themselves to the
“inarticulate prayer of the Spirit”

The indirect benefit the Church as a whole derives from believers praying in this way is one of
the reasons that Suenens states he holds it in high regard. He opines that there is a rigidity to
Western, European Catholicism which has led to true communion in parish life being replaced
by the “juxtaposition of individual lives” in a way which significantly impoverishes the
Catholic Church. Suenens saw signs of this attitude beginning to change in the liturgical
renewal that was mandated by the Second Vatican Council, but also saw this in the non-
formalised, spontaneous unity which shared glossolalia brings to the CCR.

For Suenens, the lack of a direct corporate, ecclesiological benefit of glossolalia is the primary
reason that he does not class it as a charism and argues that it ought to be considered more
properly as one “among the fruits of grace.” When describing how he arrived at this
understanding of glossolalia towards the end of this work, Suenens reiterates that the
understanding of glossolalia which he sought to replace in the CCR had its origins in Protestant
Pentecostalism. As he does, Suenens presents the understanding of glossolalia he was
replacing as a vehicle for Protestant Pentecostal theology to enter into the Catholic Church,
arguing that developing an understanding glossolalia from a Catholic perspective was

48 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 103.
49 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 103.
50 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 103.
51 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 104.
necessary because it had to be disassociated “from a vocabulary and theology which had their origins in classical Pentecostalism.”

In place of what Suenens termed ‘classical Pentecostal’ theology, which considers subjective affect as paramount, Suenens sought to promote in the CCR an understanding that the subjective benefit an individual derives from receiving charisms is superseded by the primary benefit of charisms; meeting the objective needs of the Catholic Church as a whole. For Suenens, affirming the primacy of the objective was not equivalent to a rejection of the subjective dimension of charisms. To the contrary, in *A New Pentecost?* he describes in detail the significant affirmation he received through his experiences of glossolalia and Baptism in the Holy Spirit.

When dismissing the possibility of the CCR being founded upon or leading to subjectivism, Suenens returns to a theme he develops earlier in this text, reminding his readers that the object of faith is not a set of dogmas to which believers must adhere but the living God of whom these dogmas teach. In doing so, Suenens sets out one of the ways in which the CCR could be of great service to the broader Church; encouraging Catholics to set aside disagreements on correct interpretation of ‘objective religious truths.’ For this reason, Suenens argues that members of the CCR must promote “love for the Church, respect for her spiritual motherhood, her institutional dimension and her sacramental life.” Suenens sees the CCR as an ideal source of perspective for those engaged too forcefully in the “conflicts,
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grudges and bitterness” which he saw dividing the Catholic Church at the time he was composing this text.

In addition to this reference to the theological disputes within the Catholic Church at that time, Suenens provides a stark insight into the state of the Church at the time with some statistics from the Church in France which indicated that the majority had “no knowledge of Jesus Christ.” Suenens proposes that the CCR could be of great utility in the task of ‘Christianising’ “such a vast number of nominal Catholics.” As part of his effort to differentiate these ‘nominal Catholics’ from ‘practicing Catholics’ and present his understanding of their relationship with the Church, Suenens outlines what he terms the fundamental communal dimension of Christianity, based on a common baptism.

To this Suenens goes on to add the celebration of the Eucharist as the essential expression of koinonia, of “living communion with the risen Jesus” that is required for the Church to fulfil its mission to be marytrion. Suenens goes on to explore the essential communal dimension of the Church at some length, identifying it as the central teaching of the second chapter of Lumen Gentium; however, what is more significant than the merits of this examination is the way that Suenens uses this as the basis for his contention that there ought to be stronger links between parishes and CCR groups.

In addition to this, Suenens observes that the Ranaghans and the other early founders of the CCR were advocates of the integration of CCR groups into parish life, quoting from a tract in
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60 Suenens, A New Pentecost? 137.
Catholic Pentecostals in which various modes of integration are set out. However, this was not a central concern of the Ranaghans, who describe in their work a willingness to found and promote the growth of CCR groups in universities and private homes that had only loose affiliation with parishes, if any. The lengthy argument that Suenens makes for greater integration of the CCR into parish life is evidence that Suenens believed that, at the time of the composition of A New Pentecost? this integration was far from common in the CCR.

Suenens’ desire to persuade members of the CCR that this transition was in the best interests of both the Catholic Church and the CCR was likely the reason he chose to quote Catholic Pentecostals in this section of his work. Clearly, he believed the proposition would be more palatable if it was couched in familiar terms. Suenens’ desire to present his proposal in familiar terms may also have been the motivating factor for his decision to recount how he witnessed firsthand the benefits which an Episcopalian parish derived from having a renewal guided by the work of a core group of parish leaders. Given that it was the experience of the CCR’s founders in an Episcopalian ecumenical Pentecostal prayer group which began the CCR, it is noteworthy that Suenens presents this parish as “the most striking example known to me of a fully successful integration of institution and charism at parish level.”

Suenens goes on to name a Catholic parish and quote its parish priest to enumerate some of the many benefits which that Catholic parish had derived from an integrated ‘communal life.’ However, his use of an Episcopalian parish in the first instance is an attempt to establish
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63 This is one of only three references to the work of the Ranaghans in this text. Suenens mentions the Ranaghans in earlier section on the origin of the CCR, in this section on integration into parish life and in a later section regarding the essential ecumenical orientation of the CCR. It will be demonstrated in chapter 6 that many of the positions Suenens sought to correct was proposed by the Ranaghans in Catholic Pentecostals, hence these references amount to Suenens extending something of an ‘olive branch’ to those who shared the Ranaghans’ understanding of the CCR.
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himself as someone familiar with the history and concerns of the CCR. The multiple approaches Suenens takes to making this point is an indication that he considered integration of the CCR into parish life to be both an important and difficult change to institute in the CCR.

The only other observation Suenens makes in *A New Pentecost?* regarding the differences between Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology pertains, unsurprisingly, to the understanding of the role of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church. When explaining the source of his concern, Suenens states that

> On the face of it, one might fear that the accent placed on the Holy Spirit within the Renewal would lessen or cause people to forget the role of Mary. All the more so when one remembers that the classical Pentecostal tradition has not been favorable[ sic] to devotion to Mary: Catholics, it could be objected, might imbibe this attitude through a sort of osmosis.66

Suenens recounts how he discovered at the International Catholic Charismatic Conference in 1973 that this was not the case for the vast majority of CCR members. He describes how the brief mention he made in his remarks of the importance of Mary was met with a standing ovation from the thousands who had gathered for the occasion.67 He makes no mention in *A New Pentecost* of later being accused of “betraying ecumenism”68 by mentioning Mary, neither does he identify that “the importance of the Congress in South Bend lay in the stand I felt compelled to take in order to situate the role of Mary in the Renewal.”69 However, Suenens devotes a significant section of *A New Pentecost?* to discussing the role of Mary in the CCR, identifying Mary as the one “illuminated by the Spirit as the first charismatic”70 and strongly advocating for devotion to Mary to remain an integral part of the prayer life of the
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CCR. Suenens concludes *A New Pentecost?* with an acknowledgement that there is a need for more research into the ‘theological and pastoral’ problems which resulted from the early CCR’s adoption of “vocabulary and theology which had their origins in classical Pentecostalism.”

### 4.3: THE THIRD MALINES DOCUMENT

Suenens provides insight into the way his conception of the role of the CCR in the Catholic Church changed over time in *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue*. Although he co-authored this text with Dom Helder Camara, the chapter which explores the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church as described in *Gaudium et Spes* was authored by Cardinal Suenens alone.

In this text, Suenens expands upon his earlier reflections on the evangelical nature of the CCR. Having already established that Suenens saw the CCR as a potential source of unity in the Catholic Church, it is possible to see that this thought developed as Suenens’ involvement in the CCR progressed. He offers a wider vision of the Charismatic renewal than he does previously, appropriating the statement of the Apostolic delegate to the United States when he contends that the goal of the CCR is to bring about the “total transformation of human life and culture according to the demands of the Gospel.”

Suenens explains that the Catholic Church had grown in awareness of the need for transformation of culture due to the attention that Latin American “theology of liberation” had drawn to the institutionalisation of injustice. After offering a critique of liberation
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theology based on the observation that taking economic or political injustice as a starting point “limits the field of Christian liberation from the outset,” Suenens argues that Christian groups have a rightful place in the overall task of liberation that extends to each of the three levels he identifies; “political liberation, the liberation of man through history, liberation from sin and admission into communion with God... These three levels mutually affect each other, but they are not the same.”

This provides Suenens with the opportunity to refer to the teaching of Gaudium et Spes on the interconnected nature of earthly progress and the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Quoting extensively from the section of this conciliar document which states that “the expectation of a new earth must not weaken but rather stimulate our concern for cultivating this one,” Suenens identifies a danger for Christian life in an over-emphasis on the eschaton. Suenens argues that Gaudium et Spes teaches with authority that “full human liberation is the work of grace and the gift of God.” Insofar as the CCR assists Catholics in opening themselves to receive the Holy Spirit, therefore, Suenens contends that the CCR “will hasten, even now on earth, the coming of the new times.”

In a later section of this work, Suenens specifies why taking the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church as a point of departure for an ecclesiology is problematic for Catholic theology. He argues that Jesus’ operative presence in the Church is the very heart of the ‘mystery of the church’ and the Catholic Church’s sacramental understanding. Returning to a consideration
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of *Lumen Gentium*, Suenens observes that the Second Vatican Council taught that it is the abiding presence of Jesus, the Sacrament of the Father, which confers on the Church the sacramental “identity which conditions her action.”\(^\text{81}\) The concluding sentence of this section implies that Suenens continued to identify within the CCR a reluctance to participate in the sacramental life of the Church. Having emphasised that it is Christ acting through the priest, not the priest himself, who baptises, consecrates, absolves and heals, Suenens exhorts his readers to turn to Christ by way of participation in the sacraments: “To neglect or minimise our contact with the Church’s sacramental ministry is to deprive ourselves of our first and normal sources of life.”\(^\text{82}\)

### 4.4 Chapter Summary

In *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, Suenens demonstrated a willingness to consider the merits of the theology he observed in the CCR. Although he was mostly concerned with treating the elements he found problematic, there are indications that aspects of the CCR approach to understanding the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church had an influence on Suenens. Specifically, it is clear that Suenens’ understanding of the proper discernment of charisms had undergone some refinement from the understanding he expressed during the deliberations at the Second Vatican Council. Suenens’ understanding of who was best placed to objectively\(^\text{83}\) discern whether charisms had been conferred on a given believer is expanded to include those who do not possess the office of bishop. By expressing openness to having

\(^\text{81}\) Suenens and Camara *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue*, 133.

\(^\text{82}\) Suenens and Camara *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue*, 133.

\(^\text{83}\) As opposed to subjectively, in the sense that the discernment process was not to be conducted by the member of the CCR laying claim to having received a particular charism.
lay Catholics with a sound formation in theology assist with this task, Suenens demonstrated an openness to being guided in new directions by the Holy Spirit through the CCR.

This document also identifies a number of attitudes which Suenens felt were unhelpful to the CCR. Significant among these was the problem of elitism, which he also references in other texts. Suenens regarded this attitude to be problematic because it informed the interactions between members of the CCR and the broader Catholic Church. In place of an attitude of elitism, Suenens was keen to stress that there is no distinction between the institutional Church and the charismatic church.84

In *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* Suenens also indicated that he saw difficulty in the way that ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ was understood in the CCR. In *A New Pentecost?*, Suenens details the way in which an understanding of a ‘new descent’ of the Holy Spirit was incompatible with Catholic understanding of the Sacrament of Baptism, and proposed that this experience should be understood instead as an ‘outpouring’ of the Holy Spirit from within.85

Suenens proposed further measures to safeguard the CCR from the danger of elitism in *A New Pentecost?*, arguing that greater integration of the CCR into parish life would not only serve this purpose but be of benefit for the parishes in question because of the witness members of the CCR would give to the necessity for Catholics to be open and responsive to the promptings of the Holy Spirit. Suenens also recognised that this integration would increase
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85 This point is expanded upon very well in the section ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal,’ starting on page 372 of Kilian Mc Donnell and George T. Montague’s book *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. 1994. The dedication at the start of this work is also noteworthy: “To Leo Cardinal Suenens, who led the Catholic charismatic renewal into the heart of the Church.”
the prominence of the Eucharist and other sacraments in the life of the CCR, which he regarded as being undervalued in the early CCR.

In order to counter what Suenens regarded to be an overemphasis on subjective experience in the CCR, Suenens also sought to fundamentally alter the understanding of charisms in the CCR. In order to emphasise what he regarded to be the primary purpose for which charisms are imparted, the building up of the Church as a whole, Suenens sought to change the understanding of glossolalia in the CCR so that it was no longer considered a charism.

Moreover, in *A New Pentecost?* Suenens explores in greater details the need for the introduction of objective discernment of charisms in the CCR as a way of preventing overemphasis from being placed on subjective experience. He argues that having such ‘checks and balances’ in place would protect the reputation of the CCR and prevent members from making false claims about having been given miraculous charisms, however sincere their belief that they possessed them may have been.

In *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action: A Dialogue*, Suenens reiterated the need for greater value to be placed in the CCR on participation in the sacramental life of the Church, but he goes further than he does in *A New Pentecost?*, stressing the importance of taking the person of Jesus Christ as the starting point for building Catholic ecclesiology. For Suenens, therefore, even constructing an understanding of ‘outpouring of the Spirit’ must begin with Jesus. This is because the ‘outpouring’ can only take place because of the full reception of the Holy Spirit during sacramental Baptism, which was not only instituted by Christ but, like the entire sacramental life of the Church, remains possible only because of the abiding presence of Jesus in the Church.
The numerous references to ‘classical Pentecostalism’ and ‘Protestant neo-Pentecostalism’ in each of these texts are indications that Suenens saw Protestant Pentecostalism as the source of many of these unhelpful attitudes, theological understandings and emphases. The reference in *A New Pentecost?* to Suenens’ concern that Protestant attitudes towards Mary had found their way into the CCR ‘by osmosis,’ clearly extends to each of the issues he identifies.

This chapter has established that Suenens had a well-defined vision for the role of the CCR in the Church. He considered the CCR to be the necessary counterpoint to the formalistic nature of doctrinal development, a source of animating energy in the Catholic Church that would reinvigorate Catholics who had never found their faith to be spiritually nourishing or enriching. For Suenens, the CCR had the potential to be an ongoing expression of two important ecclesiological developments which he had worked to include in the Second Vatican Council; the role of the laity and charisms in the life of the Church.

It has also been clearly established that Suenens saw the potential for the CCR to cause Catholics to turn away from fundamental aspects of the Catholic faith if elements of Protestant Pentecostalism were not removed from the popular understanding of the CCR. The solutions identified in this summary will be evaluated chapter seven of this thesis, which examines the current state of affairs in the CCR.
CHAPTER 5: PROTESTANT PENTECOSTALISM

5.0 CHAPTER OUTLINE

It has previously been established that Suenens believed that he was engaged in the task of eliminating problematic elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology from the early CCR. It seems logical to evaluate the premise upon which this task is predicated by examining early CCR texts for traces of the influence of Protestant Pentecostalism. Indeed, that is the subject of the next chapter. However, prior to doing so, it is necessary to examine Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology for points of differentiation with Catholic ecclesiology.

Given the diversity of theological positions encompassed by the term ‘Protestant Pentecostalism,’ this chapter will take up a formulation of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology that attempts to consider commonalities rather than the specifics of each particular Christian denomination in which a Pentecostal movement can be found. This formulation will be examined for points of differentiation from Catholic ecclesiology with particular attention to both the understanding of Church and the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church through charisms.

5.1 A FORMULATION OF PROTESTANT PENTECOSTAL ECCLESIOLOGY

The challenges which complicate the task of defining Pentecostal ecclesiology are outlined in the introduction to David Morgan’s 2007 doctoral thesis Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community: A Practical-Prophetic Pentecostal Ecclesiology. Morgan states emphatically that “no complete Pentecostal ecclesiology has yet been published.”¹ He argues that this is

due not only to the dearth of research into this topic but also to the very nature of Pentecostalism, insofar as it is a trans-denominational Christian movement more readily defined by common practices than by a common ecclesiology.

Accordingly, Morgan sets aside the “idealistic ‘blueprint’ ecclesiologies”\(^2\) of even the two denominations he takes as the subject of his work in order to construct an understanding of Pentecostal ecclesiology through an analysis of Pentecostal praxis. Morgan argues that eschatological concerns are at the core of each of these practices and is therefore an overriding theological concern of Pentecostal ecclesiology.\(^3\) For this reason, while Morgan readily provides a definition of Pentecostals as a spirit-led community of “people who believe in the priesthood and prophethood of believers,”\(^4\) he specifies that this statement should not be taken out of context as a summary of Pentecostal ecclesiology.

When describing the historical development of Pentecostalism, Morgan argues that “eschatology sets a horizon for the concrete Pentecostal church and its practices.”\(^5\) This is the product of his reading of the works of Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen and Frank Macchia, who identify the expectation of an imminent eschaton as one of the initial defining characteristics of the Pentecostal movement.\(^6\) This Morgan contrasts with more recent Pentecostal thought, which he presents as the product of a revision of Pentecostal eschatology that occurred when the expectation of an imminent eschaton remained unfulfilled.

In order to differentiate contemporary Pentecostal eschatology from the understanding prevalent in earlier Pentecostalism, Morgan employs the term ‘pre-millennial’ to denote early
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Pentecostal eschatology. Given that the CCR came into being during the mid-twentieth century, Morgan’s use of this term means that his presentation of contemporary Pentecostal ecclesiology cannot be used uncritically to find points of differentiation between Catholic ecclesiology and Pentecostal ecclesiology for the purposes of this work.

However, Morgan’s contention that Pentecostal eschatology is the best point of departure for developing an understanding of Pentecostal ecclesiology is well supported by the literature he quotes. Moreover, sections of his work explore the ecclesiological implications of Pentecostal eschatology that are independent of the chronology of the eschaton hence these likely give an insight into the ‘pre-millennial’ Pentecostal eschatology to which Suenens was reacting. Moreover, one of the five ‘theological motifs’ of ‘pre-millennial’ Pentecostalism which Morgan adopts from Kärkkäinen is “baptism in the Holy Spirit [as] evidenced by speaking in tongues.”

Before examining these experiences in the context of eschatology, Morgan asserts that “While there are multiple understandings of what speaking in tongues involves or does, one understanding is that the person praying is speaking to God in an unknown tongue.” In a footnote to an exploration of the relationship between ‘Spirit-baptism’ and the phenomenon of ‘speaking in tongues’ in a later section his work, Morgan contends that there has been a historical development in the understanding of this relationship. He asserts that, in ‘Classical Pentecostalism,’ speaking in “tongues is expected at Spirit-Baptism.” He contrasts this with ‘Charismatic Renewal’ where ‘speaking in tongues’ is considered possible, but is not expected at Spirit-Baptism, and ‘third-wave’ where ‘speaking in tongues’ is not expected. In doing so,

---

7 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 39.
8 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 39.
9 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 127.
Morgan reveals that, despite the plurality of understandings of ‘speaking in tongues’ which he mentions early in his work but does not explore, this phenomenon is considered by at least a majority of Pentecostals to be a communication with God in a language unknown to the one praying.

Since communicating in a language unknown to the speaker is one of the charisms described in the New Testament, Morgan’s examination of ‘speaking in tongues’ is one of the ways that he explores the question of the relationship between contemporary Pentecostal churches and the Apostolic Church. He contrasts Pentecostals, who embrace “both the practice of miracles and speaking in tongues”10 with ‘Cessationists,’ who contend that these phenomena ended with the end of the Apostolic age. He examines and rejects the arguments of cessationists, ultimately concluding that the contemporary Protestant Pentecostal churches are a continuation of the life of the Apostolic church. This does not merely extend to the capacity these churches retain to receive the same charisms that are described in the New Testament, this also extends to the way that the expectation of an imminent eschaton shaped the development and informed the missionary activities of the early Church.

Morgan’s exploration of the central place of eschatology in Pentecostal ecclesiology builds on the work of Ernest Best who identifies priesthood and prophethood as the primary Pentecostal descriptors of the Church in light of eschatology.11 After enumerating the practices associated with life in the Church, Morgan places them into two categorises; those which exist only before the *eschaton* and those which exist both before and after the *eschaton*. Those in the former category are practices which Morgan classes as being proper
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to the ‘prophethood of believers’ and the later to those proper to the ‘priesthood of believers.’ Since all of the practices he considers are associated with life in the Church, Morgan is keen not to draw too sharp a distinction between these categories, acknowledging the legitimacy of Kärkkäinen’s argument that priesthood and prophethood ought to be considered as ultimately being a ‘single motif.’

Nevertheless, when considering those practices proper to this ‘single motif’ Morgan outlines a number of principles which contrast significantly with the Catholic understanding of faith, sacraments, baptism and soteriology. Morgan states that a Pentecostal understanding of salvation is that it “comes to the individual... [and] is not usually connected to baptism but to a confession of faith.” It is the subjective experience of the faith of the individual, rather than the action of the Church or any objective assessment of the authenticity of this faith, which determines the soteriological destiny of an individual Pentecostal. It may seem, therefore, that Pentecostal ecclesiology is entirely subjective in nature.

However, Morgan would reject this as an oversimplification which fails to consider other elements of Pentecostal ecclesiology. He explores in some detail the necessity of adding a communal dimension to this individuality, establishing an exegetical basis for the importance of community in Christian life and going so far as to reject the contention that the priesthood of believers is seen as individualistic in Pentecostalism. To emphasise this point, Morgan argues that Pentecostalism must be understood as “a community-oriented stream of Christianity.”
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This understanding that Pentecostalism is ‘community-oriented’ does not negate the primacy of the subjective faith and therefore of the individual in Pentecostal ecclesiology. This understanding can therefore be distinguished sharply from the Catholic understanding of the primacy of the corporate, universal Church in matters of faith. Indeed, the essential communal dimension of Pentecostalism which Morgan describes pertains to the particular, local community of believers within which the individual Pentecostal worships. He states that “Pentecostals emphasise the local church as opposed to the universal church and are normally opposed to rigid structures,” an attitude which precludes any claim to doctrinal authority.

Once again, it is important to note that Morgan would contest this reading of his work, and that Morgan insists that Pentecostal ecclesiology is at least equally individual and communal. Even if one were to concede this point, however, it is clear that Morgan presents Pentecostal ecclesiology as being predicated on an absolute equality of the individual in a way which contrasts sharply with the Catholic understanding of the ontological differences between the common and ministerial priesthood. Morgan explicitly states this when outlining the Pentecostal understanding of the nature of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the following excerpt from his work:

Pentecostals believe that the gifts of the Spirit operate at the present time, which further separates them from some Baptists. This belief means that in Pentecostal churches there is a sense of serving one another by using the gifts. This develops into the Pentecostal idea of the priesthood of believers, whereby all are equipped to minister, to serve one another, to pray for one another and to worship God. This equipping is best expressed as equality before God. No person has more access to God than another. Thus there is theoretically no division between laity and clergy, as both groups have equal access to God and equal right to minister.
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In this section of his work Morgan goes on to present charisms, although not named as such, as exclusively the gift of God to an individual. In this presentation of charisms, no room is made for the Church *per se* to mediate grace. Rather, the Pentecostal understanding of the Church which Morgan describes is that the Church is nothing more than the community of those who have been equipped by God to serve one another and worship him. This contrasts with the Catholic understanding that, by virtue of the presence of Christ, the “one mediator between God and humanity,” (1 Tim 2:4-6) in His body, the Church, the Church is “the universal sacrament of Salvation.”

This is the basis for the Catholic understanding that the primary purpose of charisms is to empower individuals to be of service to the Church as a corporate entity, an understanding which seems to be entirely absent from the Pentecostal ecclesiology Morgan describes. Moreover, there is no indication provided that Pentecostalism considers the discernment of these gifts to be proper to the Church. To the contrary, Morgan utilises the work of Stephen E. Parker and Francis Martin to make the case that, from a Pentecostal perspective, discernment is the “initial stage of decision making” and therefore is a spiritual gift given to the individual. Only in this sense that decision making in turn plays a role in the suffering and faith life of the individual does Morgan present discernment as “connected to the community being Spirit-led.”

Despite Morgan’s care to include a description of the communal dimension of the Pentecostal understanding of the Church being ‘Spirit-led,’ and his instance that the Pentecostal
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understanding is “that church is not a set of individuals, but a united group of people,” it is clear that the communal dimension is secondary in Pentecostalism. Morgan concedes, for example, that an individual “can still be Spirit-led in a way that is not dependent on a community, though it would be strengthened by the community.”

Consequently, the Pentecostal conception of the way that the community of believers is ‘Spirit-led’ leads to an understanding of leadership in the Church which contrasts sharply with that present in the Catholic Church. For Morgan, leadership in a worshiping community is the product of “sociological reality.” He sees the origins of leadership in the Church in human nature rather than as an integral aspect of the way in which Christ founded the Church and intended it to function. Morgan goes so far as to explicitly reject the contention that a ‘senior pastor’ emulates or personifies the “headship of Christ over the church.” By contrast, the Catholic understanding is that the Church was established with a hierarchical structure by Christ and the Holy Spirit “equips and directs” the Church with both hierarchical and charismatic gifts.

The Catholic understanding that the hierarchical structure of the Church is a necessary dimension of its nature is incompatible with Pentecostalism’s assertion of the absolute equality of individual Christians. This is expressed in Morgan’s first attempt at a reductive definition of the Church as “a fellowship formed by the Holy Spirit, joining together presently those who will receive God’s redemption, through Christ’s life, death and resurrection.” It is important to note that Morgan goes on to specify that while the presence of the Holy Spirit

---

25 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 156.
26 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 152.
27 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 163.
28 Morgan, Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community, 163.
29 Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Dominus Iesus, n. 4.
“in the members of the Church in the present time”\(^{31}\) makes the Church a present reality, the Church is also a future reality since “redemption will not be felt until after the eschaton.”\(^{32}\)

5.2 POINTS OF DIFFERENTIATION

For Pentecostals, therefore, life in the presence of the Holy Spirit is all that can be experienced in the Church before the **eschaton**. It is only at the eschaton that Christ will once again be truly present in the Church, bringing together the community of believers in a way that will see the primacy of the individual give way to the primacy of the communal dimension of the Church. One of the most significant differences in Pentecostal and Catholic doctrines therefore pertains to Christology. Catholics believe that Christ is truly present in the Church on earth, not only through the Sacraments but also through the sacramental nature of the Church.

For Catholics, the Sacraments are efficacious signs of God’s grace; hence the Sacrament of Baptism, for example, is understood to effect an ontological change in the one who is baptised. The fundamentally different way Pentecostals regard initiation provides a further ecclesiological point of distinction between Catholicism and Pentecostalism. The Pentecostal understanding is that initiation is an “initial commitment or conversion”\(^{33}\) to a life of faith in Christ. Pentecostal ecclesiology therefore holds that an act of the will is required for an individual to be initiated into the life of the Church. This corresponds to a change in disposition of the person who is initiated into the Church, not a change in any quality or characteristic of that person.

---


\(^{33}\) Morgan, *Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community*, 137
This contrasts sharply with the Catholic understanding of initiation into the Church. In some Eastern Catholic rites, baptism, confirmation and first Holy Communion are given to infants, fully initiating them as members of the Catholic Church. In the Latin rite, the Sacraments of initiation are generally not administered in quick succession on the same occasion, with the vast majority of baptisms being of infants. Hence, while there is an accepted variety in approaches to the Sacraments of initiation within the Catholic Church, baptism, is not understood to require a personal ‘commitment or conversion.’

This serves to highlight an important point of difference between Pentecostal ecclesiology and Catholic ecclesiology. Catholic ecclesiology does not view the Church as simply the collection of believers in a given place and time. The claim to universality from which the Catholic Church derives its name means that, upon initiation, the new Catholic enters into a relationship with every other Catholic, a relationship which extends not only throughout the world but also beyond the confines of space and time to the communion of saints.\textsuperscript{34} Initiation into the life of the Church is understood in Catholic theology as the process through which a person’s being is permanently changed; the baptised Catholic is a new creation in Christ,\textsuperscript{35} but is also welcomed into the Christian community as an integral part of a whole.

The meritorious works, the grace and also the sin which forms part of the individual Catholic’s life is therefore seen to affect the Catholic Church as a whole. It is for this reason that the Catholic Church does not hesitate to baptise infants; before they have the capacity to know Christ or make a commitment to living a Christian life, infants can still, by virtue of their humanity, be brought into union with the Church and benefit from the grace with which the

\textsuperscript{34} Vatican Council II, \textit{Lumen Gentium}, n. 50. “Just as Christian communion among wayfarers brings us closer to Christ, so our companionship with the saints joins us to Christ”

\textsuperscript{35} Vatican Council II, \textit{Lumen Gentium}, n. 7.
Catholic Church is blessed. Just as original sin had a negative ‘corporate effect’ on humanity, in an analogous way the sin committed and the grace received by an individual Catholic is considered to have a similar effect;36 “If one part suffers, every part suffers with it; if one part is honoured, every part rejoices with it.” (1 Cor 12:26) It is for this reason that the Catholic Church requires that, along with full disclosure, contrition and absolution, a Catholic receiving the sacrament of reconciliation must also do penance, as a way of reconciling with the Church as a whole and counteracting the ‘corporate’ harm caused by sin.

The paramount nature of the ‘corporate’ Church in Catholic ecclesiology, over and above the faith life of the individual, is perhaps most evident in the Catholic Church’s teaching on the requirements for baptism. Provided that the person administering the Sacrament has the intention of doing what the Church intends and uses both water and the correct formula, any human being can validly administer this Sacrament, even one who is a non-Christian.

Hence, while conversion and a personal commitment to living a Christian life also feature as important elements of life in the Church in Catholic ecclesiology, initiation into the Church has permanent effects in Catholic ecclesiology that do not feature as part of a Pentecostal understanding of Church. The most obvious example of this is that, even if a Catholic should renounce Christ and leave the Church, the Catholic Church would maintain that the soul of that person would retain the ‘mark of baptism;’ that, once initiated, it is not possible for a member of the body of Christ to ever be detached or removed from the Church. For this reason, there would be no ‘re-initiation’ of a lapsed Catholic or an apostate, such people

36 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 11. “Those who approach the sacrament of Penance obtain pardon from the mercy of God for the offence committed against Him and are at the same time reconciled with the Church, which they have wounded by their sins.”
would simply be invited to take the same sacramental steps towards obtaining forgiveness that are available to all Catholics.

It is important to note that this concept of an ontological change at baptism may well be present in particular Christian denominations in which Pentecostal movement has taken hold; however, this is not universally the case and therefore cannot be conflated with the Pentecostal ecclesiology, which sees initiation as merely one of four distinct ‘pillars’ of life in the Church. From a Pentecostal perspective, failure to participate in the life of the Church – or inability in the case of infants – places one beyond a relationship with the Church. This is particularly true of the evangelical protestant tradition, particularly in America where it was used as a model for the prayer and structure of the CCR.

The Catholic Church’s teaching on Sacraments throws into sharp relief another key difference between Pentecostal and Catholic ecclesiology; rather than professing to being ‘Spirit-led’ the Catholic Church maintains that it is Jesus Christ who leads the Church as its head. In terms of Sacramental theology, Christ is the only priest, the only prophet and the only king in the Catholic Church and that it is with His true presence, His body, blood, soul and divinity, that the Catholic Church is united.

It is important not to draw to sharp a distinction in this area as though being ‘Spirit-led’ is somehow in opposition to being ‘Christ-led.’ To the contrary, the Holy Spirit is considered by the Catholic Church to have an ongoing role in sanctifying the Church which Christ leads; in guiding the work of the Council Fathers in the Second Vatican Council and, in short, in ‘teaching and reminding’ the Church as Christ promised. In this way, the Catholic Church maintains that both Christ and the Holy Spirit are present and active in the Church, yet they act in distinct albeit related ways.
An argument can be made that the awareness of the power and presence of the Holy Spirit had been diminished in the Catholic Church prior to the Second Vatican council due to two factors. The first was an over-emphasis on safeguarding the integrity of the ministerial priesthood in response to the rejection of priesthood in certain denominations of Protestantism. The second was the desire to ensure that the Eucharist, the true presence of Christ, was given the utmost respect.

However, this was not true of the whole Church, with many Eastern Catholic rites benefiting from a well-developed appreciation of the action of the Holy Spirit. If, as some contend, the Western Catholic Church regained an awareness of the power and rightful place of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church at the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church nevertheless did not come to understand itself to be ‘Spirit-led’ in the Pentecostal sense.

This is not possible, since Catholic ecclesiology affirms that the Church is much more than the ‘Spirit-led’ community of believers awaiting the triumphal return of Christ at the end of time. If, as Catholic ecclesiology contends, the Church is an integral part of the divine economy of salvation, the Church must be primarily understood as ‘Christ-led’ since it is the means through which Jesus continues to work the salvation of humanity and nourish His followers for the task of spreading the Good News of salvation through His body and blood. So strongly does Catholic ecclesiology identify the Church with the redemptive action of Jesus that the principle of extra Ecclesiam nullus omnino salvatur continues to form part of Catholic doctrine.37

Jesus, therefore, is not only the founder of the Church in Catholic ecclesiology, it is He who is active and present in the life of the Church, with His leadership including the leadership of the

37 Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Dominus Iesus*, n. 20.
liturgy of the Eucharist, the source and summit of Christian life. While various denominations of Protestantism share a commemorative ‘Last Supper’ meal, others, particularly those of the evangelical tradition, do not. The Protestantism from which Pentecostalism emerged therefore, at best, sees the Eucharist as a re-enactment of the Last Supper, a purely symbolic act. Conversely, Catholics believe that every Mass is a participation of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross; it is understood sacramentally as Jesus acting as both priest and victim to offer reparation for the sin of humanity. Although Catholics affirm that Christ is both risen and ascended, Catholics reject the suggestion that Jesus is only present in the community of believers ‘vicariously’ through the presence of the Holy Spirit.

That being said, the Catholic Church also affirms a strong Trinitarian faith; the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three persons in one God. Yet, the Catholic Church sees distinct roles within the Trinity; a distinction which means that the question of whether the Church is ‘Spirit-led’ or ‘Christ-led’ is not merely one of semantics. Sacred Scripture makes clear that it was the Holy Spirit, not the Father or Jesus, who came down on the Apostles at Pentecost to empower them to fulfil the mission they had been given by Christ. It is this same Spirit who sanctifies the gifts during the epiclesis at Mass.

However, through transubstantiation which follows, the bread and wine truly become the body and blood of Jesus, who is therefore present with the Church on earth at all times. Moreover, in the Eucharistic prayer it is Jesus, not the Holy Spirit, who is proclaimed both the font and the agent of the Church’s unity. This is an expression of a central tenet of Catholic ecclesiology the universality of communion. This universality of communion is part of the reason that the Catholic Church gives pre-eminence to the Eucharist in Christian life;38 the

38 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 11.
Catholic Church holds that, even when a priest celebrates a Mass alone, it is not as an individual but in union with the whole Church on earth, as well as those in purgatory and the communion of saints.

Hence, the relationship of the whole Church with God and the role of the Church as a whole in the economy of salvation are the point of departure for Catholic ecclesiology, not the faith or belief of individual Catholics. This can also be seen in the Church’s teaching that “The entire body of the faithful, anointed as they are by the Holy One cannot err in matters of belief”39 when they show universal agreement on matters of faith and morals. Catholics see precursors to this understanding in the way that Jesus chose to structure the life of His disciples and the opening line of Our Lord’s Prayer, which prioritises the relationship of the entire community of believers to God over that of the individual.

Hence, while Catholic ecclesiology does not seek to minimise the importance of the Sacramental life of the individual or the universal call to holiness, it places this firmly within a broader ecclesiological context which does take precedence in the Catholic Church’s conception of Christian life. It is the Church which unites to offer praise and glory to God. It is the Church as a whole, in the first instance, which has been entrusted with the mission of evangelisation, not the individual Christian. It is the Church that discerns vocations and charisms, either confirming or rejecting the individual Catholic’s discernment, as is particularly evident with the conferral of holy orders. In every aspect of Catholic life, from initiation into the Church, to the daily struggle against sin and towards holiness, to specific obligations to do with occasions for worship, to the matter and form that the worship takes,

---

it is first deference to the will of Christ\textsuperscript{40} and then the corporate needs of the Church which have priority in Catholic ecclesiology. The needs, desires and spiritual growth of individual Catholics, while given high importance in the Catholic Church, are secondary to these considerations.

This contrasts sharply with the individualist Pentecostal ecclesiology. Morgan expresses this difference in terms of Catholic sacramentality as opposed to Pentecostal “experience of the living presence of the Spirit,”\textsuperscript{41} which has as a prerequisite some form of assent to the Gospel. While it would do Catholic ecclesiology a disservice to accept without comment the proposition that sacramentality precludes the experience of the presence of the Holy Spirit – which forms part of the Catholic understanding of the Sacraments of initiation\textsuperscript{42} – this analysis does serve to demonstrate that the Catholic Church’s view of incorporation into Christ is seen as direct and sacramental even from the perspective of non-Catholics.

From the perspective of Pentecostal ecclesiology, Christian unity comes about through the democratisation of ministry; it is the ability of each member of a congregation to participate in ministry which brings Christians together into a Church. Moreover, Protestant Pentecostals contend that “strictly hierarchical models of ministry will be in conflict with participative models.”\textsuperscript{43} Therefore, hierarchical models are seen as a barrier to Christian unity which must be removed. The Pentecostal concept of unity through a ‘participative model’ of ministry therefore makes ecclesiological demands that directly impact the structure and operation of the Churches in which it is found.

\textsuperscript{40} As was the case, for example, with the resolution to the question of whether non-wheat hosts or non-alcoholic wine constitute valid matter for the celebration of Mass.
\textsuperscript{41} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 23.
\textsuperscript{42} And likewise that the Catholic approach assigns less value to assent to the Gospel than other Christian denominations.
\textsuperscript{43} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 53.
Moreover, there is an awareness in Pentecostalism that a tendency towards individualism exists which is inconsistent with Christian tradition; hence gathering for worship is seen as a necessary expression of ‘priesthood and prophethood.’\textsuperscript{44} Here, however, the individual still retains pre-eminence in ecclesiology. It is for the good of the individual that the community needs to gather, and it is only with the others present in worship that an individual forms part of a koinonia, not with all those who profess a belief in Christ.

5.3 Chapter Summary

Protestant Pentecostalism is a collective term for Christians who hold a diverse range of theological positions. However, the practices and experiences which these Christians have in common enable them to be identified as Protestant Pentecostals, most significantly these Christians “focus on Spirit-baptism and its evidence being speaking in tongues.”\textsuperscript{45} For this reason, contemporary work in Pentecostal ecclesiology centres on praxis, and extrapolates an ecclesiology from these practices which contrasts sharply with Catholic ecclesiology in a number of ways.

One of the most significant differences between Pentecostal and Catholic theology is Christological. The eschatological focus of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology results in there being no room in Protestant Pentecostalism for the real presence of Christ to abide in the Church on earth. While Protestant Pentecostals do refer to the Church as the body of Christ\textsuperscript{46} and attest that Christ is present in some way “where two or three are gathered in Christ’s name”\textsuperscript{47} this is understood metaphorically or spiritually; for Protestant Pentecostals, Christ is

\textsuperscript{44} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 61.
\textsuperscript{45} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 7.
\textsuperscript{46} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 165.
\textsuperscript{47} Morgan, \textit{Priesthood, Prophethood and Spirit-led Community}, 32.
truly present - body, blood, soul and divinity - only at the right hand of God, not in the Church on earth.

This same eschatological emphasis informs the Protestant Pentecostal understanding of ‘speaking in tongues,’ which is understood as being identical to the charismatic gift described in the New Testament. There seems to be some basis, therefore, in Suenens’ contention that an improper understanding of charismatic gifts can not only be a symptom but in fact a cause of ecclesiological positions which are at odds with Catholic doctrine.

Another significant difference between Catholic and Protestant Pentecostal theology is Pneumatological. The experience of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ is common to all members of Pentecostalism and is considered to be equivalent to initiation into the full life of the Church. Upon reception of ‘Baptism in the Spirit,’ Protestant Pentecostals consider themselves to enjoy a radical equality which results in a number of positions which conflict with Catholic doctrine. Firstly, the hierarchy of the Church is not considered to be a gift or an aspect of the way in which the Church is intended to function but the product of the human condition. Secondly, discernment is considered to be an entirely subjective process. Moreover, discernment it is closely linked to a person’s moral life in that it is considered to be the first step in a decision making process. As such, discernment is not associated with charisms in the same way that it is in Catholic theology.

Moreover, the radical equality which Protestant Pentecostalism contends is conferred to Christians through ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit’ results in an ecclesiology that takes the experiences of individuals and their faith and moral lives as its point of departure. This is at odds with the Catholic approach to ecclesiology, which begins with a consideration of the role of the Catholic Church as a whole and then discerns within that context whether individuals
have particular vocations or charisms which the Holy Spirit has provided for the good of the whole Church, in the first instance, and only secondarily for the spiritual edification of the individual.

Many of these points of contention reflect the concerns that Suenens expressed about the elements of ecclesiology which he found problematic in the early CCR. Moreover, the way in which these elements are expressed in a Protestant Pentecostal understanding of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ and ‘speaking in tongues’ goes some way towards validating Suenens’ concern to ensure that these experiences were understood differently in the CCR so as to harmonise with Catholic ecclesiology.
CHAPTER 6: SUBSTANTIATING SUENENS’ ASSESSMENT

6.0 CHAPTER OUTLINE

It has been established that the texts Suenens published on the CCR propose an understanding of charismatic practices and experiences which is based on the understanding of charisms Suenens advocated at the Second Vatican Council. Suenens clearly believed that doing so would ensure that the activities of the CCR served to promote the ecclesiology developed at the Council. It is possible for this to have been the result of Suenens’ efforts even if his efforts were predicated on a mistaken assessment that elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology were evident in the early CCR.¹

Therefore, in order to establish that Suenens not only promoted Catholic ecclesiology in the CCR, but more pertinently that in doing so he supplanted an understanding of the Church which conflicted with Catholic ecclesiology, it will be necessary to present evidence which supports Suenens assessment that the understanding he believed he was correcting and eliminating was indeed present in the early CCR.

The points of differentiation between Catholic and Pentecostal ecclesiology outlined in the previous chapter will be taken as the terms of reference for determining whether Protestant Pentecostalism was indeed the source of the problematic elements of early CCR ecclesiology as Suenens contended.

¹ This thesis does not contend that Suenens merely enhanced or developed the ecclesiological understanding of the CCR but that he sought to eliminate elements of an ecclesiology which diverged from Catholic ecclesiology on a number of key points.
The attempt to corroborate Suenens’ claim that elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology were present in the early CCR made in this chapter will be structured around responses to the following questions:

1. Is there evidence in the Ranaghans’ book *Catholic Pentecostals* which supports Suenens’ portrayal of the ecclesiology of the early CCR?

2. Did earlier commentators on the ecclesiology of the CCR pre-empt some of Suenens’ concerns?

*Catholic Pentecostals* has been selected because, as a text published prior to Suenens’ involvement in the CCR, it provides an insight into the ecclesiology of the CCR which is in no way influenced by Suenens’ thought.² It is important to acknowledge that, due to the independent nature of the first CCR groups and its early lack of coordinated organisation, it is not possible to determine the proportion of CCR members who subscribed to this framework at the time *Catholic Pentecostals* was published. Moreover, it is imperative to analyse the Ranaghans’ work in the knowledge that was the authors explicitly state that it was not intended to be a syllabus of CCR theological positions. However, this work remains of great utility for the project at hand; given the prominence of the Ranaghans within the CCR, the ubiquity of references to this text in other CCR literature and the chronological proximity of this text’s publication to the beginning of the CCR, it is a resource which can provide an unparalleled insight into the earliest form of ecclesiological understanding at work in the CCR.

² Suenens’ success in promoting his understanding of charisms in the CCR makes it difficult to look to later CCR works for an indication of the theological positions to which Suenens was reacting. Paul Hinnebusch’s 1976 book *Praise, a Way of Life* and Eddie Ensley’s 1977 book *Sounds of Wonder: Speaking in Tongues in the Catholic Tradition*, for example, provide some evidence that, within a short period of time, Suenens’ understanding of glossolalia as prayer of jubilation had become prevalent in the CCR.
Catholic Pentecostals, a book in which Fr. Edward O’Connor C.S.C. attempted to systematise the theology of the CCR, has been selected in order to answer the second question. O’Connor’s involvement in the CCR predates Suenens and his work was written and published prior to Suenens’ first work on the CCR. Moreover, the Ranaghans quote with great deference from correspondence with O’Connor several times in their text, giving a strong indication that O’Connor was a prominent figure in the early CCR. O’Connor’s text was first published two years after the Ranaghans’ work and provides another early compendium of CCR thought along with a complementary account of the early growth and organisation of the CCR. The theological reflections O’Connor offers and the concerns he express regarding problematic ecclesiological attitudes in the CCR making his work an eminently suitable text for analysis.  

Moreover, O’Connor’s work also serves to highlight the significance of the Ranaghans’ earlier text in the first years of the CCR; significantly, he even goes so far as to refer his reader directly to Catholic Pentecostals for an outline of what he terms the ‘Duquesne story,’ the “profound religious transformation” which sparked the CCR movement. Given that O’Connor therefore demonstrates a familiarity with the same text that prompted Suenens to publish his first work on the CCR, O’Connor’s assessment of the need to modify or correct the ecclesiology in the CCR will assist greatly in corroborating the assessment of Suenens.

---

3 Suenens was aware of this text by O’Connor, recommending on page 72 of A New Pentecost that readers refer to it for a “basic work on the subject of Charismatic Renewal.” Given that it predates his earliest work, however, it remains a valuable source of insight into how the ecclesiology of the early CCR was understood by those within the CCR prior to Suenens.

6.1 Is There Evidence in Catholic Pentecostals Which Supports Suenens’ Portrayal of the Ecclesiology of the Early CCR?

As the seminal treatment of the CCR from members of its own ranks, Catholic Pentecostals describes at length the phenomenologically driven early growth of the CCR. Although it contains an outline of the theological principals out of which the early CCR members saw themselves operating, Catholic Pentecostals does not set out to be a systematic exposition of the theology of the CCR. To the contrary, the authors explicitly state in the second appendix that their work “was not conceived or written as a definitive theological treatise.”

The Ranaghans provide two reasons for adopting this approach. The first is that they felt that, at the time of the text’s composition, insufficient time had yet to elapse since the beginning of the CCR to allow for theological reflection. The Ranaghans also contend that there was only a weak sense of corporate identity shared between various CCR groups at that time, and that therefore no consensus then existed on whether there was or even ought to be a preferred theological framework within which to construct a systematic understanding of the CCR. As the text went to print, the authors estimated ‘conservatively’ that there were “at least 5000 Catholic pentecostals[sic] in the United States and several hundred in Canada.”

Given the diversity of these groups, it is important to note from the outset that the following analysis of Catholic Pentecostals will not necessarily yield results that can be attributed to every member of the early CCR. However, the Ranaghans’ work merits consideration since their attempt to provide a “springboard for all types of contemporary theological

---

5 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 259.
6 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 259.
7 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 49.
8 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 261.
9 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 50.
investigations;”\(^{10}\) led to their work being cited in many other early CCR texts. Hence, although an ecclesiological analysis of Catholic Pentecostals must avoid drawing conclusions based on the incomplete nature of some of its theological reflections, it nevertheless provides an invaluable insight into the understanding of the Church which was being promoted in the CCR at the time of its publication.

One recurring theme in Catholic Pentecostals is that of active membership in the Church being contingent on kerygma: “the proclamation of the fullness of the Good News will speak to the hearts of men and bear good fruit in the Body of Christ.”\(^{11}\) This is evident in the very structure of the text, which both directly reproduces and indirectly incorporates a significant number of ‘testimonies’ from various CCR members about the way in which their involvement in the CCR had been the means through which God had enriched their lives.

Each of these testimonies includes an account of how initiation into the CCR brought about conversion or renewal in faith. These testimonies all reference a strong affective response to ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ and how this response was accompanied by the desire to share this experience with others. Clearly, to the Ranaghans, kerygma is not only the primary function of the Church, it is also a necessary sign of the renewal which Christians experience when they experience the ‘transformative’ encounter with God which initiates them into the CCR. It is noteworthy that, for the Ranaghans, ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ carries with it the connotation of both initiation and of effecting a permanent change in the individual who receives it.

The Ranaghans present feeling close to God, which they repeatedly state is one of the primary indicators that ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ has taken place, as a prerequisite for the fullest possible

\(^{10}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 260.

\(^{11}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 262.
experience of life in the Church. Pushed to its logical conclusion, the Ranaghans’ treatment of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ therefore implies that the Sacraments of the Catholic Church may be in some way deficient. Nowhere is this clearer than in those sections of the text which refer to the Sacrament of Confirmation. This is of particular import to the authors and many of the members of the CCR whose testimonies are reproduced in *Catholic Pentecostals* because of the parallels which the authors draw between the gifts and fruits of the Holy Spirit described in the New Testament and the experiences which accompanied the ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ which occurred during prayer meetings of the CCR.

While describing part of the first student retreat conducted at Duquesne University one of the participants, David Mangan, recounts how he “realized what my reception of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of confirmation was supposed to be and how I didn’t participate in it.”  


13 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 34.

14 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 141.

This led him and the others present to seek a renewal of confirmation vows.  

The implication in this and other, similar, testimonies - that the reception of grace at Confirmation is contingent on an act of the will on the part of the one being confirmed - is one to which Eastern Rite Catholics would take some exception.

Not only do the Ranaghans give tacit assent to this understanding by reproducing these testimonies in their work, in a later chapter, the Ranaghans assert that “most truly, most really, the baptism in the Holy Spirit is essentially a part of our Christian initiation.”  

14 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 141.

Moreover, when outlining the process for initiation into the CCR, the Ranaghans describe how a believer seeking renewal joining in prayer with a CCR community is directed to ask the Lord in prayer to “renew in him the gifts and fruits bestowed in baptism but not fully actualized in
a living way. In answer to that prayer, Jesus often becomes more real to the believer."\textsuperscript{15} While it is made clear in subsequent passages that this prayer for renewal and the awareness of God’s presence which accompanied it was just that: “a prayer, not a sacrament,”\textsuperscript{16} this seems to be more a concession to the demands of orthodoxy rather than a point of conviction, as evidenced by the subsequent addendum “if such a radical distinction needs to be made.”\textsuperscript{17}

It is also noteworthy that the understanding at the core of this ‘prayer for renewal’ is that the reception of grace requires more than an act of the will. The Ranaghans concede that, at times, the invocation of the Holy Spirit by the worshiping community does not bring about ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ Hence, the desire to take up the graces received at Confirmation is presented as being insufficient to bring about the renewal which was sought. Rather, some manifestation of what Suenens would term ‘extraordinary charisms’ and an accompanying affective response, an ‘epiphany’ of sorts, is presented as a necessary sign that the gifts of the Holy Spirit received at Confirmation have been actualised in the life of a believer.

When examining episodes in the Acts of the Apostles which refer to the way converts were received into the primitive Church, the Ranaghans are in keeping with the teaching of the Catholic Church that the Holy Spirit is imparted through the Sacrament of Baptism. Yet, when the Ranaghans state that “to join the believers, to come alive in Christ, meant to receive the Holy Spirit,”\textsuperscript{18} they add that this was “always[emphasis added] marked in some manifest way; speaking in tongues, prophesying, healing”\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, they add that this was necessarily because these charisms “play a functional role in the effective preaching of the Gospel.”\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{15} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 144.
\textsuperscript{16} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 150.
\textsuperscript{17} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 150.
\textsuperscript{18} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 127.
\textsuperscript{19} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 127.
\textsuperscript{20} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 127.
this section of their examination of ‘Baptism in the Spirit,’ therefore, the Ranaghans propose that extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Spirit are necessary for both effective kerygma and full initiation into Christian life. Implied by this understanding of charisms is the proposition that Catholics whose faith lives are not marked in this way have some deficiency in their relationship with the Holy Spirit, a strong indication that Suenens’ concerns regarding the danger of elitism in the CCR had some basis.

In their extensive treatment of New Testament texts and Church history, the Ranaghans consistently take the individual Christian and his or her relationship with God as the point of departure for developing an understanding of the activity of the Church and the action of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Hence, while participation in the Eucharist is mentioned several times as part of the activities of the CCR, it is renewed enjoyment in prayer and an increased awareness of God’s presence which the Ranaghans contend “was for many a discovery of what the Christian community is all about.”

*Catholic Pentecostals* therefore presents the Eucharist as neither the source nor the summit of all Christian life. The true summit of Christian life for the Ranaghans is entirely individualised; it is the subjective experience of the presence of the Holy Spirit, which occurs for the first time in a believer’s life when he or she experiences ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ Accordingly, the primary concern of the Ranaghans and those who assisted them in the early development of the CCR was promoting and facilitating a strong affective response to the presence of the Holy Spirit in those who expressed interest in being initiated into the CCR through the conferral of ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ Hence, far from being the source of the early

---

CCR’s unity, participation in the Eucharist seems to have been seen simply as the way in which members of the CCR were to retain their Catholic identity.

Accordingly, *Catholic Pentecostals* describes how the workshop on the integration of charismatic life and liturgical celebration in the ‘life in the Spirit’ retreat at Notre Dame University was only presented to those in attendance after workshops designed to help them “learn ways of witnessing to Christ, the principles of prayer life, the exercise of the gifts of the Spirit [and] the scriptural background to the baptism in the Holy Spirit.”22 Moreover, while the Ranaghans clearly contend that participation in the Eucharist is an important aspect of Christian life, they place much greater emphasis in their work on other sources of spiritual nourishment. Namely, the Ranaghans devote much of their work to describing how ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ prompted in members of the CCR a new interest in reading and reflecting upon Sacred Scripture and participating in communal prayer.

For the Ranaghans, the source of Christian life is not the Eucharist but the event and ‘continuing reality’ of Pentecost, without which “there is no Church and there is no Christian life.”23 When expounding upon this point, the Ranaghans only briefly allude to the Eucharist when they write that “only because it is enlivened by the Spirit can the Church continue to celebrate the paschal mystery of Christ in word and sacrament.”24 This is only one of several examples they provide to argue for the paramount importance of the presence and action of the Holy Spirit as the source of Christian life in the Church. From a liturgical perspective, it is not possible to disassociate the presence and action of the Holy Spirit in the Church from the Eucharist;25 but the Catholic Church continues to teach that the true presence of Christ
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22 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 54.
23 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 122.
24 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 122.
25 The most obvious reason for this being the epiclesis.
abiding sacramentally in the Church is both the source and summit of all Christian life. Hence, in placing stronger emphasis on the event and ‘continuing reality’ of Pentecost as both the source and summit of Christian life, the Ranaghans find themselves somewhat at odds with Catholic theology.

The place of preeminent importance which the Ranaghans give to the moment of Pentecost in the life of the Church leads to another recurring theme in Catholic Pentecostals; equating the encounter with the Holy Spirit which initiates believers into the CCR and sustains their activities with the encounter of the Apostles with the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The clearest example of this is the treatment they give to the phenomenon of glossolalia.

The Ranaghans define ‘speaking in tongues’ as a charism through which a person expresses a sentiment in a language of which they have no prior knowledge. In defence of their affirmation of “the necessity and reality of praying in an unknown tongue,” the Ranaghans reproduce and discuss select passages from the Acts of the Apostles which present ‘speaking in tongues’ as a sign of the reception of the Holy Spirit which was not limited to the day of Pentecost. The Ranaghans state that they “see in them an authoritative witness of the early Christian community to the action of the Holy Spirit” but regard this as being neither biblical fundamentalism nor the practice of ‘proof texting,’ both of which they explicitly reject. Indeed, they acknowledge that the passages they quote contain “allegorical, imagistic or
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26 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 58.
27 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 177.
midrashic elements.” However, they disregard these elements, leaving the consideration of these to “scholars and exegetes.”

The Ranaghans use these passages in the Acts of the Apostles to argue that the day of Pentecost was not the only instance of the charismatic gift which enables people to speak in a language they do not comprehend. Having established this to their satisfaction, the Ranaghans equate glossolalia in the CCR with the charism described in the New Testament account of the events following the descent of the Holy Spirit in the upper room on Pentecost day. For the Ranaghans, glossolalia is therefore a phenomenological link to this definitive moment in the history of the Church.

Prior to providing this definition of glossolalia, the Ranaghans place this phenomenon in the broader context of charisms. When discussing charisms in general, they quote the Second Vatican Council’s *Decree on the Lay Apostolate* and demonstrate awareness that, at the Council, charisms were presented as being primarily directed to the “upbuilding of the Church.” Once they provide and defend their definition of glossolalia, the Ranaghans attempt to reconcile their understanding of glossolalia as charism with the Second Vatican Council’s teaching on the nature and primary purpose of charisms by posing the questions “what are the purposes of glossolalia? How is it essentially oriented towards service of others?”

The answers the Ranaghans subsequently propose demonstrate the extent to which the faith life of the individual Christian remained a point of departure for their understanding of
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31 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 194.
32 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 194.
33 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 184.
34 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 195.
Church. Rather than exploring whether an individual speaking in tongues could provide any service to others in general and to the Church in particular, the Ranaghans simply state that “in tongues we find the words the Lord would have us pray, and through them we find deliverance.” 35 The Ranaghans then argue that one of the ways in which glossolalia is ‘essentially oriented towards the service of others’ is that it may express a petition on behalf of another. 36 Not only does this seem to be rather insufficient grounds to call glossolalia ‘essentially oriented towards the service of others,’ it also directly contradicts their earlier description of glossolalia as a joyous response to an awareness of the glory of God: “Tongues is not an emotional evocation of an experience. Rather, its nature is a response. It is the child’s delight, the glee that greets the fireworks display...” 37

To the concept that glossolalia can express a petition, the Ranaghans add the observation that glossolalia is at times accompanied by the gift of interpretation which edifies those who hear it. Quoting a letter they received from a nun who attended one of the first CCR meetings in 1967, they characterise the gift of interpretation as providing those who hear it “little poetic psalm-like gems of praise or prophesy (in the broad sense of the word, ‘to speak out on behalf of’); the theological content was beyond reproach.” 38

Having attempted to reconcile their experience of ‘speaking in tongues’ with the teaching of the Council on the essential ecclesial utility of charisms to their satisfaction, the Ranaghans return to the consideration of the benefit which the individual who exercises the charism of glossolalia derives from this experience.

Yet, if tongues serves any purpose at all, it is not in the realm of petition or edification or of public prayer that we will find the fundamental, essential and

35 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 195-196.
36 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 198.
37 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 192.
38 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 198.
ultimate “use” of this gift. It is praise! ... This is why it is stressed that tongues is not evocative; it is in the nature of a response, a loving response to the wonder and glory of God.39

This statement utterly negates the weak argument which immediately precedes it. Therefore, this excerpt from Catholic Pentecostals demonstrates that the Ranaghans were aware that their understanding of glossolalia as a charism, particularly with regard to the way it focused overwhelmingly on the benefit to the individual, was at odds with the understanding of charisms outlined during the Second Vatican Council.

The Ranaghans clearly felt that they had provided sufficient justification for disregarding the teaching of the Council and categorising glossolalia as a charism in their earlier citation of scriptural texts. This provides a strong indication that, in the early CCR, the experiences and opinions of individuals were understood to be of greater importance than the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. The individual believer was the point of departure not only for developing an understanding of charisms, but also for developing an understanding of the Church. This can be seen in the way that the Ranaghans imply that glossolalia is a sign that God desires all Catholics to experience Christian life in a way identical to the Apostles.40

The way in which Catholic Pentecostals presents the Church at Pentecost as the model for the way in which Christ intended the Catholic Church to function for all time was evident in the Ranaghans’ treatment of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ and can also be seen in the stark contrasts drawn in the testimonials they reproduce between the joy of a Pentecostal form of Christian life and Christian life prior to the experience of extraordinary charisms.

39 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 199.
40 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 200.
This ‘regressionist ecclesiology’ rejects the possibility that the Christ gave the Church the capacity to undergo positive growth and development,\textsuperscript{41} or that the Christian way of living described in the New Testament could have been the product of a particular set of historical circumstances. Instead, the Ranaghans imply repeatedly that, prior to the ‘rediscovery’ of extraordinary charisms in the CCR, the Catholic Church had neglected a fundamental aspect of the way that Christ intended the Church to function: the direct action of the Holy Spirit in the lives of individuals.

This implication is made explicit and defended by the Ranaghans in a later section of their work, in which they assert that the essential pneumatological character of the Catholic Church, which had been well understood in the Apostolic age, had been gradually neglected or eroded over time. While they largely attribute this ‘stifling of the influence of the Holy Spirit’ to the institutionalisation of the Church,\textsuperscript{42} it is important to note that it is the process by which this came about and its interplay with other historical circumstances which the Ranaghans identify as the root cause. The historical neglect of the pneumatological character of the Church proposed in this section is therefore not presented as cause to criticise the institutional Church; it is presented as a historical observation.

Not only do the Ranaghans present the Holy Spirit as the vital hermeneutic for understanding the Paschal Mystery,\textsuperscript{43} they also contend that Holy Spirit alone makes possible “the new faith-life of the Christian community after Jesus goes to the Father,”\textsuperscript{44} particularly with regard to

\textsuperscript{41} Which is somewhat ironic given that, when recounting the instruction Christ gave the Apostles to await Pentecost day, the Gospel of John portrays Christ as giving the Church precisely this capacity through the gift of the Holy Spirit: “But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you.” (John 14:26)

\textsuperscript{42} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 135.

\textsuperscript{43} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 115.

\textsuperscript{44} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 113.
initiation into the life of this community.\textsuperscript{45} Despite earlier references to the Eucharist, the Sacrament of Holy Communion and the abiding presence of Christ in the Church are notably absent from this discussion.

Two elements of Protestant Pentecostalism are readily identifiable as strong influences on this section of the Ranaghans’ work: an exclusive identification of the presence of Christ in heaven at the right hand of God as humanity awaits the final judgement and the belief that the presence of the Holy Spirit alone makes possible the life of the Church on earth. It is also noteworthy that, although the Ranaghans provide a number of scriptural quotes as ‘evidence’ in support of these statements, the passages selected are read and interpreted ‘at face value’ by the Ranaghans, as a description of events to be analysed, with little awareness demonstrated of what had been taught in \textit{Dei Verbum} regarding the inadequacy of such a fundamentalist approach to Sacred Scripture.\textsuperscript{46}

The authors note that there is a reduction in recorded instances of what they term ‘manifestations of the Spirit’ which coincides with the historical formalisation of structures within the Church. The Ranaghans speculate that this may have been the result of a ‘shying away’ from charismatic movements on the part of the institutional Church as a reaction to those charismatic movements which placed charisms and institution in opposition, which “emphasized tongues, visions and prophecy to the denial of the gifts of authority, judgement and government.”\textsuperscript{47}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{45} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 125.
\textsuperscript{47} Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 136.
The Ranaghans see such an opposition as a false dichotomy and go so far as to state that “no division, no breach is possible between charismatic and hierarchical elements in the Church.”\(^{48}\) To the contrary, the Ranaghans present the hierarchy of the Church as one means by which the charismatic dimension of the Church has been preserved throughout the Church’s history, since “the hierarchy is itself meant to be charismatic, a Spirit-given office.”\(^{49}\) Qualification of this kind is required since even a cursory look at Church history offers ample evidence that authority in the Church has at times been sought and received without any appreciable awareness of this charismatic character being demonstrated.

This exposes an inconsistency in the work of the Ranaghans which is symptomatic of their effort to integrate irreconcilable aspects of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology with Catholic ecclesiology. Having argued that the pneumatological dimension of the life of the Church had been eroded or neglected over time, the Ranaghans also identify periods when awareness of the pneumatological dimension of the Church was heightened by the action of the Holy Spirit in the lives of many great figures within the Church “in the patristic, medieval and modern periods, although not at all times and in all places.”\(^{50}\)

Yet, their assertion that each of the particular manifestations of the Holy Spirit had “some historical justification”\(^{51}\) leads to the consideration of an important question: what did the Ranaghans believe was the ‘historical justification’ for the ‘pouring out of the Holy Spirit’ which they attest had happened and was continuing to happen in the CCR? When the Ranaghans address this question directly, they point to a spirit of openness in the Catholic Church resulting from the Second Vatican Council as providing the ideal conditions in which
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\(^{48}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 158.
\(^{49}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 158.
\(^{50}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 136.
\(^{51}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 136.
the “gifts of the Spirit common in the New Testament Church”\(^{52}\) could once again be manifest. The particular historical circumstances they list as the pressing issues of the day are disaffected youth, social and political revolutions and global strife.

One notable omission in this list was an issue that has had perennial relevance in the life of the Church; ecumenism. The need to redress the disunity among Christians is a central concern of *Catholic Pentecostals*, however the Ranaghans elected not to include it in their consideration of the historical circumstances which precipitated the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Catholic Church. This was likely because it was hardly a novel reality at the time of the CCR’s inception and therefore did not have much to contribute to their examination of the possible justification for CCR’s beginning and rapid expansion in the United States in the late 1960s.

When the Ranaghans do reference ecumenism, it is with a degree of inconsistency that suggests there was awareness in the early CCR of some of the issues Suenens identifies even prior to his involvement. For example, the Ranaghans state that “a new dimension in the ecumenical relations among Christians”\(^{53}\) is a significant benefit of the CCR, particularly with Pentecostal denominational Churches but not exclusively so. Some of the testimonials in *Catholic Pentecostals* identify “praying with Protestants”\(^{54}\) as an important source of renewal and enrichment in the CCR. Yet, the Ranaghans also attempt to cast the ‘outpouring of the Holy Spirit’ which members of the CCR attest to experiencing as an event which had occurred
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\(^{52}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 156.

\(^{53}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 56.

\(^{54}\) Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 31.
“to Catholics within the Catholic Church”\footnote{Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 55.} and they are keen to stress that this means that the CCR neither removes nor separates Catholics from the Catholic Church.

Very few references are made in the text to the ecumenical utility of charismatic prayer and of the Protestant theology of Pentecostal denominational Churches. However, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals} clearly conceives of the Church as being broader than the institutional Catholic Church and reserves a special affection for Protestant Pentecostalism.\footnote{Most likely because this form of Protestantism provided the Christian milieu in which David Wilkerson was raised and then wrote \textit{The Cross and the Switchblade}.} Yet, in the second appendix, protestant fundamentalism is rejected as an invalid approach to developing a proper understanding of Pentecostalism.

It is important to note before examining their critique of fundamentalism that the Ranaghans employ confusing phraseology throughout their work that somewhat obfuscates the meaning of this section of their text. The Ranaghans make a distinction between Protestant Pentecostalism and the Pentecostalism \textit{per se}. The latter they use almost exclusively in reference to the CCR; hence, the expressions ‘charismatic renewal’ and ‘pentecostal movement’\footnote{Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 55.} are used interchangeably in the text. Similarly, the term ‘pentecostalism’ is used synonymously with the expression ‘charismatic movement.’ Accordingly, the Ranaghans refer to CCR groups as pentecostal prayer groups\footnote{Ranaghan and Ranaghan, \textit{Catholic Pentecostals}, 150.} and the Catholic participants of these are referred to as ‘Catholic pentecostals.’

When these factors are taken into consideration, it becomes evident that, when outlining the shortcomings of a fundamentalist approach to Pentecostalism, the authors do not intend to critique Protestant Pentecostalism in general. While the Ranaghans do make polemical
statements such as that Christian fundamentalism has “dried up into dead dogmatism,” they do concede that what they term Pentecostal fundamentalism has been of great service to Christianity. They argue that it helped to form the ‘theological mindset’ of a great number of excellent Christians in the United States and that it has “played an important role in building up the body of Christ in many cultures.”

Setting aside the need for greater clarity on what these conflicting sentiments are intended to convey, this passage serves to emphasise that the Ranaghans considered ecumenism to be a fundamental aspect of the way that the CCR could be of service to the Catholic Church. The Ranaghans demonstrate an understanding that the Church is not completely synonymous with the Catholic Church; that in the early CCR faith in the person of Jesus Christ, preaching the Good News and baptism were considered to grant non-Catholic Christians some relationship with the Church of Christ.

Undoubtedly, this was at least one of the reasons that Suenens took a keen interest in the activity of the CCR. The active role that lay Catholics in the CCR were taking in promoting Christian unity and an understanding of the importance of the Holy Spirit in Christian life was a manifestation of the thoughts Suenens had sought to promote in the Church through his interventions in the Second Vatican Council.

However, if the understanding of the Church evident in Catholic Pentecostals can be considered a ‘snapshot’ of the ecclesiology of the early CCR, then it is clear that Suenens’

59 Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 262.
Ranaghan and Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostals, 261-262.
61 Vatican Council II, Lumen Gentium, n. 8.
contention that elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology had found a home in the CCR had at least some basis.

6.2 DID ANY CONTEMPORARIES SHARE SUENENS’ CONCERNS?

The work of the Ranaghans examined in the previous section provides indications that the Ranaghans and the community they describe were attempting to integrate these elements with Catholic ecclesiology in a way which anticipated and attempted to mitigate many of the risks which Suenens sought to address. The question of whether there was any substantial basis for his concerns about the ecclesiology of the early CCR therefore remains open and a second means of assessing his critique of CCR ecclesiology is needed.

Before outlining this second means, it is important to observe that, while Suenens had the Ranaghans’ text in mind when composing *A New Pentecost?*, their account of the early CCR was not the only basis for Suenens’ assessment, nor was *A New Pentecost?* the only text in which he expressed his concerns. Suenens had direct experience with the CCR over an extended period of time and he made the case for a change in ecclesiological understanding in the CCR in a number of his works. The influence of Suenens’ works and the length of his involvement with the CCR means that it is not possible to substantiate his assessment of the ecclesiology of the early CCR by looking to contemporary CCR groups or theological work.

However, if his assessment of the ecclesiology of the early CCR were reflected in the work of other authors, this would provide some, albeit circumstantial, evidence that Suenens’ assessment of the need for change in the CCR was well founded. The difficulty in taking this approach is that there are very few texts relating to the CCR which were published prior or contemporaneous to Suenens’ work. Indeed, this was one of the factors which motivated Suenens to produce his texts on the CCR. However, Fr. Edward O’Connor C.S.C. is the author
whose work seems best suited for this task. O’Connor was a prominent early figure in the CCR, and the extent of his involvement, as acknowledged by both the Ranaghans and Suenens, lends weight to the analysis and critique of the CCR he provides in his text *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*. O’Connor’s text was first published in 1971, hence, like Suenens’ *Theological Orientations* and *A New Pentecost?*, it provides an insight into the prevailing theology in the early CCR.

Taking up the statements in *Lumen Gentium* which speak of the value of the contributions of non-Catholic Christian denominations, particularly in light of the decree on ecumenism, O’Connor cast the CCR as the inevitable manifestation of the Council’s teaching that “elements of sanctification and of truth” can be found outside the visible structure of the Catholic Church. It is perhaps for this reason that O’Connor begins his effort to define and systematise the theology of the CCR with Protestant Pentecostalism, tracing the origins of the CCR further back than the Ranaghans seemed willing to do in their work.

Moreover, O’Connor asserts that there were Catholic Pentecostal groups which predated the Duquesne University group and argues that Pentecostalism is best conceived of as a non-denominational, experiential mode of prayer, indications of which in the modern era can be found as early as the first year of the twentieth century. O’Connor argues that rejection of Pentecostals by established churches led to the earliest Pentecostals forming new churches and denominations and that the ‘Neo-Pentecostalism,’ into which he categorises the CCR,
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began during the 1950s when Pentecostal Christians felt welcome to remain in the churches to which they belonged.\textsuperscript{65}

O’Connor therefore sees no distinction between the Catholic Pentecostal movement and the movement in other denominations. However, he does not set out to be ecumenical in his theological systemisation of the CCR. To the contrary, O’Connor states from the outset that he will be “unequivocally Catholic”\textsuperscript{66} in his theological reflections. He outlines a two-step method in his introduction: O’Connor first provides an account of the early growth of the CCR at the University of Notre Dame and then uses this as a ‘concrete’ starting point to take up topics of “more general and theoretical concern.”\textsuperscript{67} The justification he subsequently provides for adopting this method reveals what he believes to be the essence of the Pentecostal movement; that the action of the Holy Spirit in the life of an individual is affected by the particular character, circumstances and vocation of that individual. From the outset, then, it is clear that O’Connor regards the individual’s relationship with God as the point of departure for building an understanding of life in a community of believers.

In a footnote to his introduction, O’Connor acknowledges that the term Pentecostal has prejudicial connotations and notes that the term ‘charismatic renewal’ is preferred by some, yet he elects not to use this latter term because “it does not seem to speak to people as loudly and clearly as the term, Pentecostal movement.”\textsuperscript{68} As an aside, this is an early indication that the question of how best to conceive of the CCR in relation to its role and place in the Catholic Church had become a point of contention in the CCR within a few years of its beginning.

\textsuperscript{65} O’Connor, \textit{The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church}, 24.
\textsuperscript{66} O’Connor, \textit{The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church}, 28.
\textsuperscript{67} O’Connor, \textit{The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church}, 29.
\textsuperscript{68} O’Connor, \textit{The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church}, 31.
O’Connor demonstrates another concern early in his work; that what he termed the Pentecostal movement in the Catholic Church must not be misconstrued by Catholics outside this movement as “an incursion of Protestant influence.” This is significant because it provides some evidence that other members of the Catholic Church shared Suenens’ concerns that the CCR might be or become a vehicle through which heterodox theological positions could be popularised in the Catholic Church. Although O’Connor rejects this contention when outlining the history and development of the CCR, he revisits this topic later in his work and makes a number of observations regarding theological positions popular in the CCR. This suggests that his primary concern when making this statement was not to defend every position popular in the CCR at the time but to encourage his readers to recognise the value of the CCR in the first instance before outlining issues which needed to be addressed.

The account that O’Connor provides of the growth of the CCR at Notre Dame complements the work of the Ranaghans, to whose work O’Connor directs his reader at the conclusion of his account of the development of Pentecostalism for further insight into the early days of the CCR. When moving on to providing an account of the theology of the CCR, O’Connor restricts himself to the consideration of the prayer group with which he had closest dealings so as to provide as accurate and balanced an example of a CCR group as possible for use in his theological analysis. By identifying elements of his experience in Notre Dame that resonate with the accounts of other members of the CCR with whom he had dealings,
O’Connor sought to provide concrete examples of experiences which were typical of CCR movements at the time.

Of particular note in O’Connor’s account is the acknowledgement that there were at times disagreements within the CCR which were not readily resolved and his account of how this led to the recognition on the part of some members of the CCR of the need for authority and leadership. The fact that neither disagreements within the CCR nor the question of leadership are treated in the work of the Ranaghans supports O’Connor’s contention that there was an initial period during which these concerns did not arise, a circumstance he attributes to the Holy Spirit maintaining harmony and agreement. It could therefore be argued that, in the early CCR, leadership and, by extension, hierarchical structure was considered by many to be unnecessary at best, and, at worst, an obstacle to the action of the Holy Spirit in the lives of individual Christians.

In his text, O’Connor is a strong advocate for the necessity of formalised leadership, which is unsurprising given the ecclesiological implications of the opposing point of view. He argues for the necessity of formalised leadership and structure in terms which make this contention more palatable for readers who were members of the CCR, asserting that what he terms ‘office and institution’ are “needed by the charismatics for their own protection.” To defend this assertion, O’Connor describes how some members of the CCR were ‘natural leaders’ and came to be known as elders within the CCR group at Notre Dame. However, he also describes individuals stepping forward to meet a particular need through leadership. Although O’Connor uses these examples to demonstrate the benefit which the CCR derived from
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leadership, he is nevertheless quite negative in his appraisal of this *ad hoc* form of leadership: “This hit-and-miss let heavy burdens fall on some and caused others to feel neglected.”

O’Connor recounts how this form of leadership was the cause of significant tensions between various subgroups in the CCR, and how the issue of leadership was brought to a head in November of 1970, at which time a meeting of all the members of the CCR was called and an eight member board of coordinators was appointed for a one year term.

O’Connor does not suggest that this resolved the issue entirely; since he acknowledges that there were still some members of the CCR whose rejection of ‘office and institution’ ran deeper than mere aversion to leadership structures in the CCR. The desire on the part of some to preserve openness to the promptings of the Holy Spirit seems to have led them to regard any form of structure in the Church as antithetical to the free movement of the Holy Spirit. Although the Ranaghans had explicitly rejected this in their earlier work, it seems that this attitude persisted in the CCR at the time O’Connor was writing. When pushed to its logical conclusion, this attitude contradicts the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* regarding the Sacramentality of the institutional Church since it does not regard one of the fundamental aspects of the institutional Church, the hierarchy, as a means but rather an impediment for the communication of grace.

Given that O’Connor refers to the CCR as the ‘Pentecostal movement in the Catholic Church,’ he is required by his choice of terms to reject the proposition that the “Pentecostal movement is anti-institutional.” O’Connor therefore rejects the contention that Christ intended the Holy Spirit to provide the only source of leadership in the Church and presents a strong case
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for regarding membership in the CCR as a means through which Catholics grow in their respect for and appreciation of the structures of the intuitional Church. Citing examples of increased devotion to the formalised prayer of the Divine Office, increased vigour in priestly ministry and religious life and the complete obedience with which certain CCR groups adhered to what he describes as unjust restrictions imposed upon them by their local bishop, O’Connor argues that the CCR has “comparatively little of the anticlericalism or the tendency to deride or defy the bishops”79 which he asserts is more readily discernible in other, unnamed Catholic lay groups. The extent of O’Connor’s exploration of this topic and his recognition that at least some members of the CCR had a poor regard for the hierarchy of the Church corroborate Suenens’ assessment of the need for increased involvement of the Church hierarchy in the life of the early CCR.

In a later section of his work, O’Connor reveals what he considers to be the most damaging consequence of the poor integration of the CCR in the life of the broader Church at the time. He observes that some CCR members had experienced so great an alienation from the Catholic Church that they chose to apostatise and join a Protestant Pentecostal Church. O’Connor identifies a number of contributing factors which, along with issues regarding hierarchy, may have contributed to that situation.

The first he lists is Catholics “not being acquainted with the spiritual richness of their own tradition.”80 One of the factors which O’Connor identifies in an earlier section of his work as having contributed to this state of affairs is the complexity and highly nuanced nature of scholastic theology. He argues that such complexity is not in and of itself a negative quality;

to the contrary, O’Connor presents this as a source of balance and richness in Church doctrine and an aid to the appreciation of realities such as the experience of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Having presented it as such, O’Connor nevertheless suggests that it is unsurprising that many Catholics would not have a firm grasp on the great breadth of a tradition which incorporates “the accumulated experience of saints of many ages and cultures, illumined by the reflections of theologians of diverse schools of thought” and incorporating the theological insights and perspectives of approaches as diverse as biblical, mystical, moral and systematic.

The second he lists is that the relative novelty of ‘the Pentecostal movement within the Catholic Church’ meant that there was little available theological reflection on Pentecostalism from a Catholic perspective. O’Connor proposes that this may have contributed to apostasy because the power of the charismatic experiences common in CCR groups. He observes that these experiences lead to great interest in learning more about Pentecostalism, and contends that the combination of this interest and the wealth of material on Pentecostalism from a Protestant perspective which was available at the time had led them to seek the guidance of members of other Christian denominations. O’Connor argues that the experience which members of other Christian denominations had in these matters had led these Catholics to accept their mentors’ “whole religious system, even on matters unrelated to charisms.”

Although the cautionary tone O’Connor takes in his exploration of this question far from condemns consultation with non-Catholic Pentecostals, it is nevertheless a stark contrast with the benign assessment of such encounters which was made by the Ranaghans, to say nothing
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of the essentially ecumenical character of the early CCR. In the beginning of his text, O’Connor expresses his intention to provide a Catholic theological framework within which Pentecostalism may be understood. In the context of his observations regarding apostasy, O’Connor’s attempt to formulate Pentecostalism from a Catholic perspective can be seen as his effort to safeguard the communion the CCR with the Catholic Church. O’Connor’s presentation of the challenges which confronted the early CCR closely mirror the concerns expressed by Suenens, and go some way towards substantiating Suenens’ concerns regarding the potential for the CCR to lead Catholics to question or reject Catholic doctrine.

Having considered the ways in which the CCR may have inadvertently contributed to Catholics “leaving the Church,” O’Connor proceeds with a consideration of the ways in which the opposite is true. Moreover, he argues that the net effect of the CCR has been to “save people for the Church.” However, O’Connor acknowledges that there is a form of crisis of identity around the issue of membership in the Church which is experienced by many members of the CCR. He points to a period during this crisis which is particularly difficult for many members of the CCR: the time immediately following their first interior affective response to charismatic forms of prayer. O’Connor presents this crisis of identity as an opportunity for those members of the CCR to grow in appreciation and understanding of the nature of the Church and takes this opportunity to promote an ecclesiology which he feels resolves this crisis.

A recurring theme in the explicitly ecclesiological section of the text is the importance of the communal dimension of Christian life and the importance of acknowledging the presence of
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the Holy Spirit within the Church per se rather than solely in the lives of individual Catholics. While the presence of the Holy Spirit in the community of the faithful is not quite given ecclesiological precedence over an individual’s reception of the Holy Spirit, the two are held much closer together than they were in the Ranaghans’ work. This is a clear point of distinction between O’Connor and Suenens, yet O’Connor does not completely diverge from Suenens, recognising the need for an increased awareness in the CCR of the communal dimension of charisms, a central aspect of Suenens’ critique of the early CCR.

This is perhaps most evident in O’Connor’s treatment of the work of St. John of the Cross, whose treatment of charisms is first mentioned during O’Connor’s earlier examination of traditional Catholic Spirituality but can be found again his later account of the historical circumstances which precipitated a mistrust of religious experiences and the devaluing of the mystical patrimony of the Catholic Church. O’Connor acknowledges that St. John’s work contains a largely negative appraisal of charisms “warning against the harm that comes from rejoicing excessively in possession of such gifts;” however, he argues that this appraisal must be understood in the context of the task in which St John was engaged; the purification of the intellect and will which is required for the attainment of perfect unity with God.

Another observation O’Connor makes is that this classical approach to charisms, with which the understanding of charisms then prevalent in the CCR was at odds, has a historical context in the “age of individualism.” O’Connor sees this reflected in the way that St. John acknowledges but then fails to treat the role of charisms in the life of a community, treating them “exclusively in view of the role they play in the spiritual development of the individual.”
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O’Connor uses paragraph 12 of *Lumen Gentium* to argue that it is essential to consider the communal dimension of ‘life in the Spirit’ and thereby recasts St. John’s approach to charisms as a warning against excessive attachment to the personal benefit which may be derived from reception of charismatic gifts.

Accordingly, O’Connor argues that those members of the CCR who fulfil the requirements of Catholicism “minimally, while carrying on their truly personal religious activity in an autonomous way”9⁸⁹ fail to understand that charisms require integration in order for either to have the intended effect. Specifically, he contends that charisms are intended for the building up of the body of Christ and are manifestations of the ‘life of the Spirit’ of the whole Catholic Church. Referencing the corporeal analogy provided in scripture, O’Connor argues that such people place themselves in grave danger of alienating themselves from the very Spirit to whom they seek to dedicate their lives.⁹⁰

O’Connor uses this exploration as a vehicle to identify what he contends is a fundamental point of contention between Catholic ecclesiology and Protestant ecclesiology. As he does so, O’Connor provides further insight into what motivated him to issue a strong caution against members of the CCR seeking out guidance from Pentecostal groups founded in other Christian denominations. He argues that ‘main line’ protestant Churches do not regard the Church as “a concrete historical community that has maintained its identity through all the vicissitudes of its history”⁹¹ but rather hold that the Church is merely a collective term for a gathering of people made in the name of Jesus. While a non-exclusive form of the latter understanding is
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not foreign to Catholic ecclesiology, O’Connor contends that it leads to many of the difficulties he has described when it is affirmed to the exclusion of the former.

Before proceeding with an examination of O’Connor’s defence of this position, two significant points are worth noting. The first is that, in this section of his work, O’Connor explicitly identifies the need for a change in the ecclesiology popular in the CCR as the root of most of the challenges confronting the CCR at that time. In this, O’Connor is in complete agreement with Suenens. The second is that O’Connor explicitly states that the ecclesiology he seeks to promote conceives of the historical development of the Catholic Church from a hermeneutic of continuity.

This point is important enough for O’Connor that he provides an *apologia* for conceiving of the Church as a community which is in continuity with the historical community founded by Christ. In doing so, O’Connor reveals himself to be something of a Thomist by beginning with a consideration of the merits of the counterargument. The historical wrongs perpetrated in the name of the Church are identified as a significant contributing factor to the schisms which abound in the history of the Church. Due to the constraints imposed by the scope of his work, rather than arguing the point at any great length, O’Connor merely states his position that the Holy Spirit has guaranteed this continuity despite the particular evils to which those who historically severed ties with the Catholic Church were reacting.

While enumerating some of the many ways in which the Holy Spirit has and continues to preserve the Church’s identity as the body of Christ, O’Connor refers to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and refers his reader to the speech made by Cardinal Suenens during
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the Council’s deliberations, summarising it by presenting the Sacramental life of the Church, the hierarchical structure of the Church and individual charisms as ways in which the “Holy Spirit sanctifies and directs the Church.”94 Hence, O’Connor argues that it is not possible to make a categorical distinction between preternatural charisms and what he terms the ‘commonplace gifts of grace’ which are more familiar to those unaccustomed to the ‘charismatic’ forms of prayer he describes throughout his work.

This is precisely the distinction which Suenens employs in a slightly different context to differentiate between the supernatural ‘gift of tongues’ described in the New Testament and the understanding of glossolalia he sought to promote in the CCR; namely, as a phenomenon situated almost exclusively on “the natural plane.”95 It is therefore unsurprising that, without this distinction, O’Connor’s treatment of ‘speaking in tongues’ adopts the understanding prevalent in Protestant Pentecostalism; asserting that this ‘common charism’ “enables a person to pray in a language he has never learned.”96 O’Connor seeks to avoid making an individualistic presentation of glossolalia by emphasising that, in his understanding, this charism must be understood in the CCR as having a communal dimension in that it is linked to the charism of interpretation. He argues that one who is given the charism of speaking in tongues does not necessarily have any comprehension of the content of the prayer which they are expressing:

A person whose charismatic tongue is French remains quite incapable of composing a sentence in French of his own free will, or of understanding French spoken by someone else. Even when, through his charism, he speaks in French, he does not know the meaning of the words he is saying.97
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O’Connor believes that emphasising the need for interpretation of ‘speaking in tongues’ is sufficient safeguard against an entirely subjective approach to this charism. By recognising the need for this safeguard, O’Connor, like Suenens, recognises that it is problematic to take the individual as the sole point of departure for developing an ecclesiology. Unlike Suenens, however, O’Connor does not give the role of the Holy Spirit in life of the Catholic Church as a corporate entity logical precedence over the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of individual Catholics. O’Connor clearly believed that it was not necessary to challenge members of the CCR to make so radical a shift in their understanding of charisms. Instead, O’Connor sought to raise the communal benefits of charisms to equal prominence as the individual benefits in the CCR, in this case by explicitly promoting an awareness that glossolalia has a useful purpose in service of the Catholic Church, even if its utility is not as ‘obvious’ as it is with other charisms.98

After taking an extended aside to refute the contention that glossolalia is a pathological phenomenon, O’Connor returns to this point by stating that, while the ‘chief use’ of the charism of ‘speaking in tongues’ is private prayer, there is “another function, called a ‘message in tongues’.”99 In this way, O’Connor makes room for the possibility that glossolalia can be of benefit even to those to whom this charism is not given. O’Connor asserts that, when one who speaks in tongues communicates a message to others, “the message remains unintelligible until it has been interpreted,” thereby placing glossolalia into a closer relationship with the charismatic gift of interpretation than he had previously. However, having previously used the example of the French language, O’Connor feels it necessary to explain that the charism of interpretation is not one of translation; one inspired by the Holy
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Spirit to offer an interpretation does not necessarily have to have “understood the words themselves.”

There are two possible readings of this section of O’Connor’s work. The first is that he was describing an understanding and set of practices that had become common in the CCR at the time he composed his work. The second is that he was describing a way of augmenting or reconceiving the practice of glossolalia in the CCR so as to emphasise that this charism was of benefit to the broader Catholic Church. These two possible readings preclude the contemporary reader from determining the extent to which the understanding of the ‘message function’ of glossolalia was prevalent in the early CCR. However, what is clear in O’Connor’s treatment of this topic is that it was his intention to emphasise that glossolalia had the potential to be a means through which the Holy Spirit enriched the spiritual life of the broader Church and that consideration of this communal benefit was essential in order for it not to imply or give rise to an ecclesiology inconsistent with that outlined in *Lumen Gentium*.

When concluding his section on glossolalia, O’Connor states that, in the early CCR, glossolalia was frequently accompanied by song. He attests to his experiences of the way in which CCR members, sometimes numbering in the hundreds, unite in harmonious song despite the fact that many of whom speak in different languages and at times vastly different melodies. Hence, for O’Connor, the broader Catholic Church context as vital for developing a Catholic understanding the charism of glossolalia, even when it is not accompanied by interpretation.

O’Connor’s desire to emphasise the importance of giving due consideration to the broader Church context when developing an understanding of common CCR practices and
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terminology is also evident in his treatment of ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ O’Connor begins his treatment by acknowledging that significant debate existed at the time on the topic of the relationship between glossolalia and ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ He asserts that “some people begin speaking in tongues at the moment of the baptism. Others do not begin until hours, days or even weeks later, and some never do.”

This forms one of the grounds on which O’Connor contends that there are two types of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ “the manifest and the hidden.” These categories relate to the effect which this experience has on the individual receiving it. Before proceeding with an examination of the way that O’Connor emphasises the role of the broader community in this experience, it is noteworthy that O’Connor sidesteps the debate over the relationship between ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ and the Sacrament of Confirmation by emphasising that Sacramental Baptism “confers the greatest of all the gifts of the Spirit, namely, the very person of the Spirit himself.”

O’Connor’s description of the experience of ‘manifest Baptism in the Spirit’ begins with the worshiping community. O’Connor describes how shared prayer and the ‘laying on of hands’ can sometimes elicit an affective response from one seeking ‘Baptism in the Spirit;’ at the moment of this ‘conscious experience’ “he is filled with an overwhelming sense of the presence, power and love of God. He experiences great joy, but at the same time a deep peace.”
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O’Connor also defines ‘hidden Baptism in the Spirit’ in terms of the response that a person seeking ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit’ has to the shared prayer and laying on of hands for which that person participates in the activity of a worshiping coming. O’Connor observes that this is not always accompanied by a ‘conscious experience,’ but that the joy and peace which are signs of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ may take hold of a person subconsciously, such that a person may take some time to recognise their presence.

In either case, O’Connor contends that “Baptism in the Spirit seems to involve an experience of the working of the Holy Spirit.” According to O’Connor explicitly rejects possibility that the action of the community causes ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ to take place, stating that it is an “interior work of grace which only God can perform.” Despite taking this position, O’Connor also states that shared prayer and the laying on of hands are closely related to ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ While he makes room for the possibility that a person improperly disposed or not called to ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ may not receive it as a result of participation in communal prayer, O’Connor does not make room for ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ to happen outside of the context of the prayer of a worshiping community.

6.3 Chapter Summary

As an early member of the CCR who was respected enough to have been quoted multiple times in the work of the Ranaghans, O’Connor was intimately familiar with the practices and attitudes of the prevalent in the early CCR. This enables him to speak with authority about this diverse and widely dispersed movement. Hence, when O’Connor argues as Suenens does that many of the issues in the CCR stem from taking the faith life of individual Christians as
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the point of departure for constructing an ecclesiology, this constitutes a strong validation of Suenens’ assessment.

O’Connor’s emphasis on the importance of the communal dimension of faith life is evident throughout The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church but is particularly strong in his presentation of both glossolalia and ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ He clearly recognised, as Suenens did, a trend in the early CCR towards an individualist and subjective approach to faith life which was at odds with the Catholic understanding of communio.

Nevertheless, the work of O’Connor suggests that he, like Suenens, had a generally favourable appraisal of the CCR and regarded it to be a largely positive new movement in the Catholic Church. This is evident even in O’Connor’s criticisms, which are intended to eliminate problematic elements of the ecclesiology of the CCR and are far from condemnations of its members or goals.

O’Connor’s presentation of the attitudes he regarded as prevalent in the early CCR closely mirrors Suenens’ observations, and traces of these attitudes are readily identifiable in the work of the Ranaghans. Namely, it is clear that members of the early CCR did not place much value in objectivity. O’Connor references how members of the early CCR had a strong preference for considering themselves as being led by the Holy Spirit alone, not by others and particularly not in any formalised way.

The emphasis on subjective experience seems to have been the direct product of the lack of theological formation which O’Connor describes and the power of the experience of ‘Baptism in the Spirit.’ It found expression in the willingness of the Ranaghans, and presumably many like them, to reject the definition of charisms presented at the Council because they could not easily reconcile it with their experiences in the CCR. Instead of using the understanding
of charisms which had been recently enhanced in the Catholic Church to interpret their experiences, members of the early CCR took their experiences as the point of departure for constructing an understanding of both charisms and the Church which was problematic, at least in part.

The first way in which O’Connor attempts to redress this is by contextualising the advent of the CCR within the broader historical movement of Pentecostalism. By presenting his reader with a history of Pentecostalism, O’Connor attempts to make a distinction between the mode of prayer and experiences which the members of the CCR had found very rewarding and the ecclesiology of the Christian denominations from which the founders of the CCR adopted their Pentecostal prayer.

This enables O’Connor to argue that the founders of the CCR incorporated the individualist emphasis of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology into the CCR without suggesting that this need invalidated or diminished the experiences of CCR members. For O’Connor, this emphasis could be corrected by encouraging those in the CCR to consider the collective Church as being of equal importance to the individual Christian when constructing an understanding of the Church.

The work of O’Connor is therefore significant in that it identifies similar issues to Suenens but presents them in a different way and offers different solutions. Hence, although The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church did not seek to promote the idea that the communal dimension ought to have precedence over the consideration of the individual as Suenens’ works would, it nevertheless assists greatly in substantiating Suenens’ assessment of the ecclesiological issues present in the early CCR.
The work of the Ranaghans assists greatly with evaluating whether the interpretation of O’Connor and Suenens had any basis. *Catholic Pentecostals* depicts the members of the CCR as believing that they had remained within the bounds of Catholic orthodoxy. This can be seen in the exploration and rejection of any suggestion that the CCR was an effort at syncretism which is present early in the Ranaghans’ work.

*Catholic Pentecostals* indicates that, in the early CCR, the Church was not considered to have primacy in the economy of salvation. In its place, the experience of grace through which the individual Christian comes to know God was considered in the early CCR as being of greatest importance. This is most evident through the way in which the Ranaghans dedicate a substantial portion of their text to reproducing testimonies which present the primary effect of participation in the CCR as an increase in commitment to living a Christian life and greater awareness of the presence of God. Only as a secondary consideration do references to enhanced appreciation for the participation in the Sacred Liturgy or other communal forms of prayer appear in these testimonies.

CCR communities described in *Catholic Pentecostals* were not well integrated into the broader Church. Members of the early CCR were intent to start CCR groups wherever they went, opening the CCR to the danger of its members identifying more with the CCR’s idiosyncratic mode of shared life and worship than with membership of and worship in a Catholic parish. This led to a further danger of a diminished appreciation for participation in the Sacramental life, indications of which are identifiable throughout the work of the Ranaghans.

In conclusion, taking the two questions posed in the beginning of this chapter in turn, there is firstly ample evidence in *Catholic Pentecostals* to support Suenens contention that there
was an ecclesiology at work in the early CCR which was inconsistent with Catholic ecclesiology in a number of non-trivial ways. Secondly, O’Connor came to a similar conclusion as Suenens, pre-empting some of Suenens’ concerns but offering different solutions based on an approach which affirmed the equal importance of the individual and the Church corporate in developing a Catholic ecclesiology. Collectively, these considerations make a strong case that the elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology Suenens ascribed to the early CCR were indeed prevalent in the early CCR.
CHAPTER 7: EVALUATING SUENENS’ SOLUTIONS

7.0 chapter outline

In chapter four, the changes which Suenens sought to institute in the CCR in order to eliminate problematic elements of Protestant Pentecostalism from CCR ecclesiology were identified. In summary, those changes were:

1. Changing the understanding of ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ to emphasise that it is not to be equated to a Sacrament.
   - This was seen by Suenens to require the further change of retiring this expression.

2. Changing the understanding of charisms to gifts given to equip one for service of the Church.
   - This was seen by Suenens to require a change in the understanding of glossolalia which had been popular prior to his involvement.
   - This was seen by Suenens to require another change in the practices of the CCR, the introduction of objective discernment of charisms by qualified lay people.

3. Full integration of the CCR into parish life.

Suenens intended the effect of these changes to be increasing an awareness in the CCR of

1. The importance of the Eucharist, and Sacramental life in general.

2. The fundamentality of the ‘christo-centric’ nature of Catholic ecclesiology.
   - Suenens did not see this as devaluing the contribution of the CCR to the Catholic Church with regard to its emphasis on the important role of the Holy
Spirit in the ecclesiology. Suenens simply sought to promote an understanding that the Holy Spirit cannot be the point of departure for developing a Catholic ecclesiology.

3. There was no distinction between the institutional Church and the charismatic church.

4. The ecumenical orientation of the CCR should not cause it to abandon central aspects of Catholic devotional and prayer life.

In this chapter, consideration will be given to the question of how many of these changes were successfully implemented in the CCR. The effects of these changes will be examined and contrasted with their intended effects. To establish this, Pope Francis’ assessment of the challenges confronting the contemporary CCR will be examined for reference to these changes and a case study of one instance of the CCR will be offered as a counterpoint.

These two examples will serve to illustrate the difficulty of using text-based research to establish the ecclesiology of the contemporary CCR. This will be the basis for the argument that it is not possible to identify the ecclesiology of the CCR with the ecclesiology that Suenens sought to promote, but that his work retains utility for making this evaluation by providing lines of enquiry which can be used in quantitative, survey based research to establish the ecclesiology of any given CCR group.

7.1 Pope Francis on the Challenges Confronting the Contemporary CCR

Promoting unity was clearly a strong concern for Suenens. For instance, he took great care to affirm the value of the subjective ‘fulfilment’ which the reception of charisms brings to the lives of individuals. He did so even as he argued that this needed to be subordinated to the corporate effect that charisms have on the Church. By presenting his understanding of charisms as an enhancement rather than a supersession of the understanding prevalent in
early CCR, Suenens sought to ensure that his work would not be a cause for disunity within
the CCR or between the CCR and the institutional Catholic Church.

Therefore, any disunity within the CCR which may have resulted from the changes he
instituted must be considered an ironic reversal of the effects he intended these changes to
have. The following examination of Pope Francis’ June 2014 address to the National
Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit will serve to demonstrate that the pontiff identifies
one of the changes Suenens instituted as the proximate cause of the disunity and animosity
which he recognises in the contemporary CCR.

Pope Francis begins his address with a reference to charismatic Masses, thanking those
present for singing one of his favourite charismatic hymns; “When I would celebrate Mass in
the cathedral in Buenos Aires with the charismatic renewal, after the consecration and a few
moments of adoration in tongues, we would sing this hymn.” 355 This introduction provides
one indication that Suenens may have been successful in instigating change in the CCR;
clearly, other bishops became involved in the CCR, glossolalia is presented by the Pope as a
prayer of praise and the Eucharist seems to have a rightful place of pre-eminence in the life
of the CCR.

After candidly confessing that he did not always have a high opinion of the CCR, Pope Francis
offers a vision of the service which he feels the CCR could provide the broader Catholic
Church. He presents the disunity in parts of the contemporary CCR as impediments to this
service which must be eliminated. The pontiff challenges leaders of the CCR to abandon
attitudes and practices which he contends have contributed to “infighting” 356 within and
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amongst CCR groups. Given the brevity of this address and its focus on identifying and critiquing the root cause of this infighting, it contains only two examples of these divisive attitudes and practices and does not speak to their prevalence. Instead, Pope Francis uses these two examples to support his central contention: that the disunity in the contemporary CCR is symptomatic of an unnecessary and damaging effort to control its activities.

The first example discussed in this address pertains to leadership of entire CCR groups. Pope Francis admonishes leaders in the CCR who exceed the role of facilitators and instead attempt to direct the activity of CCR groups without due regard for other members’ discernment of the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Pope Francis calls this first factor contributing to the disharmony in the contemporary CCR “the danger of getting too organised,” but it is perhaps more readily understood if it is termed the ‘executive approach to leadership.’

The pontiff contends that this approach leads a leader in the CCR to think “of himself or herself as being more important or greater than the others” and therefore better suited to make decisions regarding the activity of a given CCR group. In place of this executive model of leadership, Pope Francis’ address promotes a return to the servant leadership model which characterised the early CCR. He argues that this latter model allows the Holy Spirit to lead the CCR and therefore promotes harmony “because unity comes from the Holy Spirit.”

The second divisive attitude which Pope Francis discusses is related to the first. Having identified the need to return to a ‘servant leadership’ model with respect to entire CCR groups, Pope Francis proceeds to admonish those leaders of the CCR who have sought to
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become what he terms “arbiters of God’s grace;” taking upon themselves the right to determine who may receive “the prayer of outpouring or Baptism in the Spirit.” This is the ‘executive approach to leadership’ applied to an individual; specifically, to one wishing to experience charismatic prayer and become a new member of a particular CCR group. Pope Francis contends that this is not in keeping with the freedom with which the earliest members of the CCR received charisms, engaged in ecumenical activities and evangelised.

Before presenting evidence to support the contention that Pope Francis considers Suenens’ effort to introduce objective discernment of charisms to have led some CCR leaders to seek to direct and control the CCR, it is first important to note that this danger was recognised by Suenens. When Suenens commends the CCR to the leadership and oversight of local bishops, he cautions those in episcopal office not to attempt to impose their will on the CCR or seek to direct its activities. Suenens therefore explicitly presents an ‘executive model of leadership’ as being incompatible with the nature of the CCR.

Awareness that Suenens’ work had been misappropriated to serve as justification for this approach to leadership may well be the reason that Pope Francis did not specify the work of Suenens as the factor which precipitated the change away from ‘servant leadership’ in the CCR. Indeed Pope Francis takes care to ensure that his criticism of the ‘executive model of leadership’ was not conflated with a rejection of Suenens. Firstly, this is evident in the fact that Suenens is one of only three theologians Pope Francis commends by name in this address. Secondly, the only texts explicitly recommended by the pontiff in this address are
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the ‘Malines Documents,’ which Pope Francis encourages members of the CCR to refer to for
“a guide, a reliable path to keep you from going astray.”

Despite singling out Suenens for such high praise, the repeated calls Pope Francis makes in
this address for a return to the practices and attitudes which typified the CCR in the initial
stage of its development indicate that the pontiff considers aspects of Suenens’ work to be
unhelpful in the context of the contemporary CCR. Specifically, the reference which the
pontiff makes to leaders in the CCR acting as “arbiters of God’s grace”363 as they determine
who is disposed to receiving charisms is a clear rejection of the need for ‘objective
discernment’ outlined in A New Pentecost?

The introduction of objective discernment was the means Suenens selected to meet the need
he identified in Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal to
preserve and affirm the value of the affective and the subjective in the CCR while also
upholding the preeminent importance of remaining within the theological boundaries
delineated by the Catholic Tradition. Suenens’ overriding concern in introducing ‘objective
discernment of charisms’ into the CCR was avoiding the ‘tyranny of the subjective.’ Although
Suenens demonstrates an awareness that there is also a danger in the tyranny of ‘abstract
dogmas’ and ‘ritual formalism,’364 it is clearly Pope Francis’ contention that Suenens did not
give due regard to the tyranny which can result from the abuse of power by individuals.

Pope Francis’ exhortation to leaders in the CCR to stop imposing the objective discernment
of charisms on other members of CCR is based on his observation that the ‘executive model
to leadership’ which this practice has spawned has led to an egoism in the minds of some
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leaders which has ‘stifled’ the “spontaneity and life of the renewal”\textsuperscript{365} in precisely the way Suenens warned against this in his works. However, it is noteworthy that Suenens only directs these words of caution to bishops in his texts.

The likely cause of Suenens’ assessment that lay CCR leaders were somehow immune from the same temptation towards taking an authoritarian role in the CCR becomes evident when the attitudes prevalent in the early CCR are considered. By all accounts, the members of the CCR whom Suenens encountered had what must have seemed to him to be an indefeasible sense of freedom. Their willingness to engage in ecumenical prayer is a strong example of this, particularly given that no indication is given that the early leaders sought approval for participation in such prayer from the hierarchy of the Catholic Church as directed in \textit{Unitatis Redintegratio}. Support for this can also be found in the accounts \textit{Catholic Pentecostals} reproduces of members of one CCR group freely starting other CCR groups in new locations and persisting in forms of prayer which had drawn what Suenens describes as heavy criticism from local bishops and the Roman Curia. Given such a pervasive atmosphere of freedom, it is unsurprising that Suenens did not dedicate more of his works to cautioning against a prescriptive model of leadership. This must have seemed to him to be an unlikely prospect for the CCR.

It has been noted that Pope Francis’ critique of the way ‘objective discernment of charisms’ has led to an ‘executive approach to leadership’ in the contemporary CCR is a critique of a selective reading of Suenens, not a direct critique of Suenens’ efforts to introduce his change. However, Pope Francis does offer a direct critique of Suenens in his address when providing a short defence of the use of the term ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit.’

\textsuperscript{365} Suenes, trans, \textit{A New Pentecost}? 93.
By reminding his audience that ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit’ is “a phrase we find in the Acts of the Apostles,” Pope Francis emphatically rejects Suenens’ concerns regarding the use of this term and his effort to change the expression used to describe this experience. As has been established, Suenens advocated ending the use of the term ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit’ in the CCR due to the danger he saw in the term would be misunderstood to mean “a sort of super-baptism, or a supplement to sacramental baptism which would then become the pivot of the Christian life.”

Suenens’ determination to prevent the CCR from becoming a schismatic group was shown to have been the motivation for his position on the use of this expression. Pope Francis contends that this is no longer a danger for the CCR. Although the pontiff does not explicitly state this position in his address, Pope Francis clearly contends that the contemporary CCR no longer lacks the theological reflection which led to the errors in the ecclesiological understanding Suenens observed in the early CCR.

Pertinently, the pontiff refers in his address to the wealth of theological reflection available to the contemporary CCR in Suenens’ work and through the ongoing contribution of the two organisations whose service of the worldwide renewal the pontiff praises. Additionally, the theological guidance offered by contemporary CCR theologians such as Fr Raniero

---

366 Francis, Address to the 37th National Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit.
367 Suenens, trans, A New Pentecost?, 82.
368 The significance of Pope Francis’ defence of this term and the effect of Suenens’ efforts to end its use in the CCR can perhaps best be appreciated in light of the work of Gonti Simanullang. Simanullang’s 2011 thesis on ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ as it is understood in the Indonesian Catholic Charismatic Renewal in the Archdiocese of Melbourne includes an argument that “It seems that the experience of ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’, as it is understood, lived out and promoted by CCR, has not yet been officially recognised by the Catholic magisterium, although some Episcopal Conferences address the issue. After almost a half century of CCR’s existence within the Roman Catholic Church, and knowing that this renewal is a worldwide phenomenon, the universal Church authority should offer an official statement on this experience. This would help the Catholic faithful to speak about it with the same language and understanding.” (‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit’: A Phenomenological and Theological Study, page 157)
369 The ICCRS and Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships.
Cantalamessa, whom Pope Francis also praises and quotes in his address, is clearly seen by the pontiff as a sufficient safeguard preventing heterodox theological positions from re-emerging in the CCR.

Another central concern in Pope Francis’ address is calling for a return to an ecumenical outlook in the CCR. The pontiff twice references the need for what he terms “spiritual ecumenism” in this address and returned to this theme to in October of 2014 in another address to members of the Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships. In this second address, Pope Francis stressed that the CCR is ecumenical by its very nature, and defined spiritual ecumenism as

Praying and proclaiming together that Jesus is Lord, and coming together to help the poor in all their poverty. This must be done while never forgetting in our day that the blood of Jesus, poured out by many Christian martyrs in various parts of the world, calls us and compels us towards the goal of unity.

Pope Francis’ decision to reiterate the need for a return to the ecumenical ‘roots’ of the CCR is a strong indication that he believes that the CCR has significantly deviated from or neglected these activities for some time. When considering the role Suenens’ changes may have played in inadvertently bringing about a reduction in the CCR’s ecumenical activities, it must be noted that Suenens was a strong advocate for retaining this ecumenical outlook. However, the way in which he sought to emphasise in the CCR the importance of the Eucharist in particular and the Sacramental life in general must surely have been a factor contributing to a decline in the CCR’s ecumenical activities, as perhaps was Suenens’ advocacy for the integration of the CCR into parish life.

---

370 Cantalamessa’s chapter on ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ in his book *Sober Intoxication of the Spirit* shows some deference to Suenens’ concerns in its title “The Outpouring or Baptism in the Spirit”, page 38ff.
371 Francis, *Address to the 37th National Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit*.
372 Francis, *Address to the Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships*.
7.1 A BRIEF CASE STUDY: THE CCR IN EPHPHATA

One account of the ‘executive approach to leadership’ in the contemporary CCR which supports Pope Francis’ negative appraisal of ‘objective discernment of charisms’ is provided by Ludvic Lado, who details the history of a Paris-based ‘Africanised’ Charismatic group in his 2009 text *Catholic Pentecostalism and the Paradoxes of Africanization: Processes of Localization in a Catholic Charismatic Movement in Cameroon*. After providing an account of how Fr Meinrad Pierre Hebga SJ founded the Ephphata-Paris CCR group, Lado provides an account of how competition for various charisms within Ephphata led Hebga to exercise ‘executive leadership’ to maintain unity in his group and to eliminating the practice of glossolalia:

Whereas items such as 'speaking in tongues', 'prophecy', 'resting in the Spirit' feature prominently in the ritual life of neo-Pentecostals and North American Catholic Charismatics, I did not see any trace of them in Ephphata... The exercise of leadership in these groups also has to do with controlling access to spiritual resources as sources of power. By not favouring a ritual environment conductive to the expression of haphazard spiritual gifts such as 'prophecy' and 'speaking in tongues', Hebga has tried to shield his movement from potential sources of delusion and disruption.

This negative appraisal of glossolalia as a source of division which is best avoided places the CCR in Ephphata at odds with what would otherwise be considered the unanimously positive appraisal of glossolalia in the CCR. The reasons stated for this negative appraisal give a strong indication that the members of this CCR group understood glossolalia as a charism in precisely the way that Suenens sought to change. This is supported by the references in Lado’s text to the recognition in Ephphata and other CCR communities that the practice of interpretation

---

374 Lado, *Catholic Pentecostalism and the Paradoxes of Africanization*, 110.
assists in the ‘objective discernment’ of glossolalia. Clearly, in Ephphata, glossolalia was understood in a way that Suenens explicitly rejects as “an infused gift enabling someone to pray in a real language which he himself does not understand.” The fact that Hebga eliminated the practice of glossolalia from Ephphata despite attesting “to having spoken in tongues on the occasion of his Baptism in the Spirit” is also a strong indication of the deleterious effect that an authoritarian approach to leadership can have on the understanding of charisms in a CCR group.

This contrasts sharply with the way in which Pope Francis’ address portrays glossolalia, as a unifying mode of prayer which precisely reflects the changed understanding that Suenens sought to introduce in the CCR. Moreover, despite a lengthy examination of the dangers associated with understandings glossolalia as a charism, Suenens is positive in his appraisal of this phenomenon, describing the significant affirmation he experienced through his participation in glossolalia in A New Pentecost?

The example of Hebga’s leadership of Ephphata is therefore one instance in which the ‘objective discernment of charisms’ Suenens introduced to the CCR ironically helped to perpetuate theological positions inconsistent with those Suenens intended it to help universalise throughout the CCR. This exposes a critical flaw in Suenens’ approach to correcting inadequate or erroneous theological positions in the CCR: the ‘objective discernment of charisms’ presupposes that those who have had theological training share a common ecclesiology and understanding of charisms.

---

376 Lado, Catholic Pentecostalism and the Paradoxes of Africanization, 109.
Moreover, the leadership of Hebga in Ephphata is an example which corroborates Pope Francis’ assertion that some leaders in the CCR have taken upon themselves the right to impose restrictions on the activities of a CCR group. In Ephphata, the decision to adopt ‘executive approach to leadership’ was described by Lado as being the direct result of the desire for unity being challenged by the difficulty of ‘objective discernment of charisms;’ of determining the authenticity of charisms “when they actually occur.”377

Pope Francis undoubtedly had such groups in mind when he reminded CCR leaders in his address that unity is not synonymous with uniformity of praxis; rather, “unity comes from the Holy Spirit.”378 His exhortation to “let yourselves be guided by the Holy Spirit, in freedom”379 and calls for a return to the practices which typified the early CCR outline a vision for a ‘permissive’ unity in the CCR in which leaders facilitate the reception of charisms and help others discern how these gifts can be of service to the Church.

7.3 Chapter Summary

Pope Francis’ presentation of the challenges confronting the contemporary CCR enables the identification of a number of unintended consequences of the changes Suenens’ sought to introduce in the CCR. Chief among these was a move away from the ecumenical outlook of the CCR and the introduction of an ‘executive approach to leadership.’

Moreover, the rejection it contains of the need to retire the expression ‘Baptism in the Spirit’ in the CCR is based on the observation that there is no confusion in the contemporary CCR about the meaning this expression is intended to convey. Therefore, while Suenens was unsuccessful in retiring this expression in the CCR, it is clear that Pope Francis believes that

377 Lado, Catholic Pentecostalism and the Paradoxes of Africanization, 109.
378 Francis, Address to the 37th National Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit.
379 Francis, Address to the 37th National Convocation of Renewal in the Holy Spirit.
Suenens was entirely successful in changing the understanding of 'Baptism in the Spirit' to emphasise that it is not to be equated to a Sacrament.

The example of Ephphata demonstrates that there is no universal understanding of charisms in the CCR. This illustrates the limited value of analysing texts to establish the ecclesiology of the contemporary CCR. Despite the work of Suenens, and the ongoing efforts contemporary theologians and groups such as the ICCRS to continue to promote his work, there are clearly still groups and leaders in the contemporary CCR who do not share Suenens’ understanding of charisms. Since Suenens situated his understanding of charisms in the framework of a particular ecclesiology, it follows that Suenens was not entirely successful in his efforts to promote in the CCR an awareness of the preeminent role the Church plays in Christian life.

The case of Ephphata also serves to highlight a difficulty which is not identified in Pope Francis’ work; the danger of selective implementation of Suenens’ proposed changes. While the need for objective discernment of charisms was recognised in Ephphata, the understanding of glossolalia present in the works of the Ranaghans and O’Connor was retained. This is problematic because Suenens clearly saw each of the changes he was implementing as an integral component of his broader effort to change the ecclesiology of the CCR. The example of Ephphata provides some evidence that selective implementation of Suenens’ changes has occurred in some unknown number CCR groups. It also demonstrates that making only some of the changes which Suenens advocated can lead to attitudes and practices with which Suenens would have strongly disagreed.

---

380 It must be noted that objective discernment of charisms was implemented in Ephphata in a way that Suenens would have found objectionable.
CHAPTER 8: OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSION

8.0 OBSERVATIONS

The CCR was conceived in the first instance as a means for lay Catholics to participate in the task of ecumenism in the way outlined in *Unitatis Redintegratio*. This document, in conjunction with *Lumen Gentium* and *The Cross and the Switchblade*, prompted those who started the CCR to share in the prayer life of Protestant Pentecostals so as to experience for themselves the spiritual encounters Pentecostals describe.

Lacking the vocabulary to communicate the experiences they had, those who founded the CCR appropriated terms and expressions from the Protestant churches with whom they had engaged in ecumenical prayer. One of the terms they appropriated was ‘charism,’ a term which was already in use in the Catholic Church and understood differently to the way it was understood in Protestant Pentecostalism. Another term the early CCR appropriated was ‘baptism in the Spirit,’ which was understood in Protestant Pentecostalism to confer the fullness of Christian life, an understanding incompatible with Catholic Sacramental theology.

This led to what Suenens judged to be a disproportionate emphasis in the early CCR on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Suenens was particularly concerned that an overemphasis on the Holy Spirit could displace the centrality of Christ in ecclesiology. This was a point of some significance for Suenens, who had to overcome significant opposition at the Second Vatican Council in order to have the documents it produced recognise the rightful place of the Holy Spirit in Catholic ecclesiology.

---

381 The only exception being failure to seek out the approval of the local bishop before engaging in this task.
The way in which the understanding of ‘charism’ and ‘baptism in the Spirit’ were adopted uncritically by members of the early CCR from Protestant Pentecostalism, was regarded by Suenens as one symptom of a problematic understanding of ecumenism at work in the early CCR. He regarded true ecumenism as a means of coming to a fuller understanding of the mystery of the Church, as a search for the action of the Holy Spirit in other Christian denominations that could illuminate aspects of Catholic theology that needed greater emphasis.

The understanding of ecumenism he identified in the CCR, however, was one which saw theological considerations as secondary to the experience of shared prayer. This way of conceiving of ecumenism ran the risk of seeing central tenets of Catholic theology as impediments towards shared prayer. Although it was the reaction he received from members of the early CCR to stressing the importance of Mary in the life of the Church which prompted Suenens to take a more ‘interventionist’ approach to his dealings with the CCR, he also recognised the danger of deemphasising the celebration of the Eucharist as a by-product of this approach to ecumenism.

Suenens’ ecclesiological project was not intended to appreciably change members’ experience of life in the CCR; rather, his efforts were intended to assist members to understand their experiences in a way that was consistent with Catholic theology and to ensure that they retained an appreciation for the primacy of the Catholic Church in the life of faith.

This is most evident in Suenens’ treatment of the phenomenon of glossolalia. Suenens distinguishes between the description of the gift of tongues made in the New Testament and glossolalia, which he describes as engaging in a humbling form of prayer that abandons any
attempt to put praise of God into words. Suenens argues that this enables members of the CCR to ‘become like children’ and distinguishes this understanding from one which would see ‘speaking in tongues’ as a charism which, when combined with the charism of interpretation, enables people to become instruments through which the Holy Spirit communicates directly to others.

As clear as this distinction may be, one could argue that the premise on which it is based makes Suenens’ task a fool’s errand. Specifically, Suenens’ efforts to get members of the CCR to adopt a new understanding of glossolalia was predicated on there being little relationship between one’s perception of the experiences one has and the way in which one conceives of them. It hardly seems possible, therefore, for Suenens to have successfully altered the way in which members of the CCR conceived of their spiritual experiences without significantly altering their perception of these experiences.

In any case, Suenens clearly saw himself as being engaged in the task of eliminating elements of Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology from the CCR. He had a sound understanding of both Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology and Catholic ecclesiology and was therefore qualified to make this determination, and there is sufficient corroborating evidence to establish that Suenens’ description of the ecclesiology of the early CCR was accurate.

A consequence of this has been an ‘insular’ attitude that is at odds with the free engagement in ecumenical prayer that typified the early CCR. This is best illustrated by the shift away from use of the term ‘Catholic Pentecostals’ and towards ‘the Charismatic Renewal.’ Given Suenens’ strong advocacy for the ecumenical activity of the CCR, it is clear that contemporary attitudes in the CCR do not necessarily reflect the vision he expressed in his texts. Therefore, it is not possible to look to the texts of Suenens for a description of the ecclesiology of the
contemporary CCR. Despite the fact that his texts have taken on a normative role in the
development of the CCR, the inconsistency of the implementation of the changes Suenens
advocated and the significant unintended consequences of the changes he introduced place
limits on the conclusions which can be drawn from a textual analysis.

8.1 CONCLUSION

In order to establish that there has been a change to the ecclesiological understanding in the
CCR, this work has sought to answer the following questions:

1) What was the initial ecclesiology of the CCR?
2) Who sought to effect change?
3) Why?
4) What was intended to replace the initial ecclesiology of the CCR?
5) How was this change attempted?
6) Did a change take place?

The initial ecclesiology of the CCR was identified as a synthesis of Catholic and Protestant
Pentecostal ecclesiologies. This was established by examining Suenens’ texts in chapter four,
looking for corroborating evidence in the work of O’Connor and the Ranaghans in chapter six
and also by contrasting the Catholic ecclesiology presented in chapter three with the
Protestant Pentecostal ecclesiology in chapter five.

Identifying all of those who sought to change the ecclesiology of the CCR is beyond the scope
of this work; however, in chapter two, it was argued that Suenens was the principal agent of
this change. This was substantiated at least to some degree by the length of his involvement
in the CCR, the role he took up in the organisation that became the ICCRS and the references
to Suenens’ substantial contribution to the development of the CCR made in the contemporary commentary presented in chapter seven.

The factors motivating Suenens to change the ecclesiology of the CCR were presented in chapter two. Given Suenens’ advocacy for the role of the laity at the Second Vatican Council, as well as his efforts to promote ecumenism, a greater appreciation of the role of the Holy Spirit and charisms, a strong case can be made that the CCR was a validation of the principles he had sought to emphasise at the Council. Suenens therefore had a vested interest in the success of the CCR and was motivated by a desire to foster the growth of this movement.

Suenens clearly saw the synthesis of Protestant Pentecostal and Catholic ecclesiologies in the early CCR as problematic, particularly with respect to the implications for the Sacramental life of the Church. However, he was initially reluctant to interfere with the CCR’s development, confident that these issues would be resolved through theological reflection from within the ranks of the CCR. For this reason, Suenens seemed willing to act solely in the role of an advocate for the CCR prior to the criticism he received following his address to the International Catholic Charismatic Conference in South Bend. It was this criticism which motivated Suenens to take an active role in changing the ecclesiology of the CCR by eliminating elements of Protestant Pentecostalism that are inconsistent with Catholic ecclesiology. In place of these elements, Suenens sought to introduce aspects of the ecclesiology he promoted at the Second Vatican Council.

Once Suenens’ motivation for seeking to change the ecclesiology of the CCR was established, it was necessary to consider the means Suenens employed to effect this change. Suenens argued that a number of practices and experiences in the CCR needed to be redefined so as
to harmonise with central tenets of Catholic ethology. These were outlined in chapter four and examined in chapter seven.

Having established what the initial ecclesiology of the CCR was, that it was Suenens who sought to change it, why he did so, the understanding of Church he wanted to replace the initial ecclesiology and how he proposed to effect this change, it was next necessary to consider whether the change took place. In chapter seven, two examples were given which illustrate the difficulty of attempting to establish this last point. Differences of opinion within and between contemporary CCR groups on elements as fundamental as leadership, discernment of charisms and the nature of glossolalia mean that it is extremely difficult to find a point of departure for establishing the ecclesiology of the contemporary CCR. The evidence presented in chapter seven in support of the contention that there has been a change to the understanding of Church in the CCR also makes it clear that change has not been uniform and that, in some instances, the changes are ones to which Suenens would object.

The works of Suenens therefore do not provide an account of the ecclesiology of the contemporary CCR, but an aspirational vision for the CCR and its place within the broader Catholic Church. In order to ascertain the nature of the changes which have occurred in the ecclesiology of particular CCR groups, and the extent to which elements of Protestant Pentecostalism can still be identified in them, it is necessary to move beyond the text-based research which has been conducted in this thesis. The value of this text-based research to anyone seeking to make such a determination is that it has identified several pertinent lines of enquiry for use in quantitative research. Applied research in the ecclesiology of the CCR must give due consideration to:
1) The understanding of ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit.’

Is it understood to be a ‘calling down of the Holy Spirit’ which results in the conferral of new charisms, or is it understood to be a ‘calling out of the Holy Spirit,’ an actualisation of charisms already received?

2) The understanding of ‘speaking in tongues.’

Is glossolalia understood as a charism through which the Holy Spirit enables a person to pray in a language of which they have no conscious knowledge, or is it understood as a mode of prayer in which a CCR community is unified in praise of God?

3) The understanding of the importance of engaging in ecumenical prayer.

Is it the responsibility of the hierarchical Church alone to engage in ecumenical dialogue and attempt to resolve theological disputes, or is sharing in prayer with non-Catholics a core dimension of the mission of the CCR?

4) The understanding of the importance of the Eucharist.

Is the Eucharist a hindrance to ecumenism and therefore an aspect of Catholic life that needs to be minimised for the sake of ecumenism, or does the importance of the Eucharist in Catholic life supersede any other considerations?

5) The question of elitism.

Do those who have no interest in participating in charismatic forms of prayer have impoverished spiritual lives, or are there many acceptable and equally valuable forms of prayer in the Catholic Church, of which charismatic prayer is simply one?

6) The need for discernment.

Does every claim to a charism from someone known to be participating earnestly and in good faith with the CCR need to be taken ‘at face value,’ or is it important for those
with a sound knowledge of Catholic theology to assess claims to charisms, particularly
to ones such as prophecy, visions and healing?

7) The group’s connection to a local parish.

Is it best to separate the prayers and other activities of a CCR group from the
sacramental life of a parish, particularly if the group began in a different context like
a school prayer group or is a connection with a local parish important to the life of a
CCR group?

8) The group’s understanding of leadership.

Is the role of the leader of a CCR group one which includes the responsibility to assess
the spiritual progress of the other members, guide the group’s activities and
determine who is well disposed for certain kinds of prayer or is the role simply one of
a facilitator who brings the group together but allows each member of the group
freedom to encounter the Holy Spirit in prayer?

For each of the items above, the different understandings identified are not intended to be
taken as the only possible positions that members of the CCR can take. The first response is
the understanding Suenens sought to replace and the second is the understanding that
Suenens promoted. Academic research conducted in this field via survey would need to
account for the possibility that a member of the CCR could affirm each position to varying
degrees and would therefore need to construct questions designed to place each participant
on a spectrum of results.

These items also merit consideration beyond the realm of academia from those who are
members of the CCR. Pope Francis has identified a pressing need to promote within the CCR
a better understanding of its origins, the service it provides to the Church and the need for
‘freedom in the spirit.’ It is also clear that there are members of the CCR who lack a basic familiarity with the wealth of theological reflection on the CCR identified by Pope Francis. Moreover, evidence exists to suggest that at least some of these members have received guidance and direction from leaders in the CCR which contradicts the understanding that Suenens sought to promote. It would therefore be of benefit for all members of the CCR to consider the responses they would give to the questions above and to familiarise themselves with the recent statements of Pope Francis and the ‘Malines documents’ of Suenens. By doing so, they will deepen their understanding of the important witness they are called to provide to the power of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Jesus Christ.
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