

2012

Mary and the Catholic Charismatic Renewal

Robert Hogan

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ml_studies



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hogan, Robert (2015) "Mary and the Catholic Charismatic Renewal," *Marian Library Studies*: Vol. 30, Article 6, Pages 237-372.
Available at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ml_studies/vol30/iss1/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Library Studies by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

MARY AND THE CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL — 1971–1978

I. General Introduction

The Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) both affirmed and gave an impetus for many movements of renewal in the Catholic Church. Organized efforts for renewal in the areas of *liturgy*, the reading and study of Sacred Scripture, and the work of *ecumenism* were strengthened by the Council. A new impetus was given to reflection on the *role of the laity* in the Church, and the involvement of the Church in the *social justice* issues of the world.

At the same time, Marian movements and devotion lost much of their impetus after the Council. A variety of factors influenced the decline in participation and influence. One of the factors was the general perception that Vatican II was deemphasizing Marian devotion. The Council taught that piety should be centered in the liturgy.¹ We are to worship the Triune God with a special focus on Jesus and his paschal mystery.² Piety should have a strong biblical basis,³ and communal celebration of liturgy is to be emphasized more than individual devotions.⁴ Many popular Marian devotions seemed to go against these approaches. The average Catholic did not understand the place of devotion to Mary within the new emphases of renewal that was flourishing after the Second Vatican Council. Even for the clergy and theologians, the decision of the bishops to include a chapter on the Blessed Virgin with the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)*, rather than produce a separate document on Mary, gave the impression that the role of Mary was being deemphasized. It is not surprising that Marian devotion, with a weakened sense of its purpose, experienced a decline in participation and influence.

The decline of Marian devotion was an unexpected aftereffect of the Council. The birth of a movement that would come to be known as Catholic Charismatic Renewal, or the Catholic Pentecostal Movement, was also a surprising development after the Council. Marian devotion and reflection does not seem to become an important aspect of Catholic Charismatic Renewal until the 1980's.

¹ Vatican Council II, "Sacrosanctum Concilium [Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy]," in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. W. M. Abbott (New York: The American Press, 1966), art. 7, 13. (hereafter cited as SC).

² SC 5, 6.

³ SC 24.

⁴ SC 27.

Why did this movement have only a minor influence and involvement in Marian devotion at first, but later became a major factor in the renewed focus on Marian devotion in the Church? This study will give the context needed to answer this question by offering an historical presentation of the development of Marian reflection and devotion in the first twenty-seven years (1967–1994) of Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR will be used as an abbreviation).

Before reflecting further on the purpose and method of this study, we will begin with an explanation of the important concepts and terms that are needed as a starting point for understanding CCR.

Catholic Charismatic Renewal

What has been commonly known as “Catholic Charismatic Renewal” is not a movement that an individual or a group of people planned as a new approach to facilitate renewal in the Catholic Church. The movement developed out of the similar experiences of a number of Catholics who sought and prayed for an infilling of the Holy Spirit that would transform and empower them in the same way that the Spirit had transformed and empowered the disciples of Jesus on Pentecost (Acts 2). From the beginning of CCR, members of the movement commonly believed that God had brought about this movement of grace and renewal for the sake of the whole Church. God wanted to bring about a deeper spiritual rootedness in the Church. In the introduction to *As the Spirit Leads Us*, an important collection of essays by many of the early leaders in CCR, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan describe CCR as having a “double-edged thrust of continual personal conversion of life to Jesus as Lord and Savior, and an ever-ready desire to live and act as his disciples by the power-filled direction of the Holy Spirit.”⁵

The first names, used by these Catholics to describe their experience of the Holy Spirit (and the effort to share this experience with others) were “Catholic Pentecostalism”⁶ or “the Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church.”⁷ What historians call the “Pentecostal Movement” had its origins at the beginning of

⁵ Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, eds, *As the Spirit Leads Us*, (Paramus, New Jersey: Paulist, 1971) (hereafter cited as Ranaghan, *Spirit Leads*), 1.

⁶ Used by Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (Paramus, New Jersey: Paulist, 1969; J. Massingberd Ford, *The Pentecostal Experience* (New York: Paulist, 1970); Donald L. Gelpi, SJ, *Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint* (New York: Paulist, 1971) (hereafter cited as Gelpi, *Pentecostalism*); A *Theological Viewpoint* (New York: Paulist, 1971) (hereafter cited as Gelpi, *Pentecostalism*); etc.

⁷ See especially Edward O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1971) (hereafter cited as O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*).

the Twentieth Century. Some of the "Holiness Churches"⁸ in the United States started to study the effects of the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, and to seek the same kind of experience of the Spirit. Two events are highlighted in the accounts describing the origins of the Pentecostal Movement.

The "holiness" preacher, Charles Parham, directed a bible school in Topeka, Kansas. He and his students studied the action of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and entered into a special time of prayer to prepare for the coming new year, 1901. On New Year's Day, 1901, a student of Parham, Agnes Ozman, asked Parham to lay his hands on her head so that she might receive the Holy Spirit. She had the feeling of being filled with the presence of the Spirit and prayed with the gift of tongues in the same way as it is described in the New Testament (see Mark 16:17; Acts 2, 10:46, 19:6; 1 Corinthians 12, 14). Many of the other students at the school sought and received the same kind of experience in the following days. When these students shared the story of their experience with others in their churches, there was much opposition. However, there started to be a slow spreading of this experience among some of the people who heard about this event.⁹

The second event occurred in 1906. A revival was being held at a church on Azusa Street in Los Angeles, California. After a time of fasting and prayer many of the people at the revival experienced the presence of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues. Thousands of people experienced an infilling of the Holy Spirit at the Azusa Street Mission over the next three years.¹⁰ Most of these people were driven out of the established churches. Eventually, new churches were established. These churches are usually known as "Pentecostal" churches. In this document the designation of "Pentecostal," without further description, will refer to the new churches that formed out of this type of spiritual experience in the early years of the Twentieth Century. Another common designation in the literature on the Pentecostal Movement is the term "Neo-Pentecostalism." This term is used to designate the phenomenon (beginning in the 1950s) of people receiving the "Pentecostal experience," but deciding to remain in the particular Protestant Church to which they already belonged, rather than join a Pentecos-

⁸ The Holiness Churches were formed in the United States in the nineteenth century. They were strongly influenced by the theology of John Wesley and the practices of American revivalism. For further information see Vinson Synan, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International, 1975).

⁹ This information is contained in many publications, including the previous citation (Synan). For the first eye-witness account see Agnes N.O. LaBerge, *What God Hath Wrought* (Chicago: Herald, n.d.), 28-29.

¹⁰ This information is found in many publications. See O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*, 23, and Synan, 2.

tal denomination. Many of the neo-Pentecostals continued to worship in their own churches, but also participated in prayer groups or interdenominational fellowships.¹¹ Pentecostal literature sometimes describes the CCR as a movement within the neo-Pentecostal movement. More frequently, CCR is given its own separate designation. It is clear that CCR was influenced by the neo-Pentecostal Movement,¹² but CCR from its beginning also took on its own unique character.

Catholic leaders involved in this movement at first used names like "Catholic Pentecostalism" and "the Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church" that express CCR's relationship to the Protestant Pentecostal Movement. The leadership of CCR became concerned about being perceived by Catholics as a "Protestant" influence within Catholicism because of the use of the word, "Pentecostal." To overcome this barrier, starting in 1970, the leadership within the movement decided to use the term "Catholic Charismatic Renewal."¹³ Although other designations for the movement continue to be used, Catholic Charismatic Renewal became the common term used in the United States, and the term used by the international office for the movement.¹⁴

¹¹ A major influence has been the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship founded in 1953 by Demos Shakarian. This fellowship encouraged members to be fully open to the Holy Spirit while remaining loyal to their churches. This fellowship has branches throughout the U.S., and has expanded to other countries. See the pamphlet, *The Demos Shakarian Story*, published in Los Angeles, CA. by the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International. The fellowship also had a monthly magazine, *Voice*.

¹² We will see that Catholics who first became involved in CCR were strongly influenced by one book written by a Pentecostal man, and another book written by a neo-Pentecostal man. Also, an interdenominational, neo-Pentecostal prayer group was directly involved in the birth of CCR in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

¹³ This term has not been totally satisfactory to leadership in the movement. The word, charismatic, comes from the New Testament Greek word for "gifts" (charismata). The charisms are expressions of divine grace through the Holy Spirit. The word, charismatic, gives the sense that the movement wants to encourage openness to the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit. This is a central concern of the movement. However, as we will see, the movement's leadership understands CCR to be a renewal instigated by God that has a broader purpose than simply encouraging openness to charismatic gifts. Another difficulty with the term is that people who are involved in the movement often are called "charismatics." This can give the impression that other Catholic Christians are not "charismatic." The CCR movement has continually spoken against this notion.

¹⁴ In 1970 the first service committee for the national movement is formed. They give themselves the designation "Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee." The national conference at Notre Dame in 1970 for the first time takes the title, "National Conference on Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church." While different titles for the movement are preferred in some countries, the international office for the movement is called "International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Office."

The movement's leadership also believed that CCR developed, not only through the influence of Pentecostalism from outside the Catholic Church, but through Spirit-led influences *within* the Catholic Church. The early authors in CCR often described the movement as a flowering of the prayer of Pope John XXIII for the Second Vatican Council: "O Holy Spirit ... Renew Thy wonders in this our day as by a new Pentecost" (Abbott 793), and of aspects of the council's teachings, especially on the role of charisms in the Church."¹⁵ In addition, a number of early authors in CCR were struck by the fact that Pope Leo XIII was emphasizing the Holy Spirit at the turn of the century (19th-20th centuries).¹⁶ The Pope's emphasis on the Spirit occurred at the same time that the Pentecostal Movement was unfolding among Protestants. The Catholic bishops around the world along with their churches did not give a strong response to Leo XIII's call for ongoing prayer to the Holy Spirit. A number of CCR authors have proposed this theory: When the Catholic leadership only gave a half-hearted response to the Pope's plea, God poured out His Spirit on those who were actively seeking and ready to receive a special grace from God (i.e., certain "holiness" groups, starting the Pentecostal Movement).

Many of the early authors wanted to demonstrate how CCR is a development rooted in the entire heritage of the Catholic Church from its beginning. Edward O'Connor and other leaders in the early years of CCR believed that charismatic activity never completely disappeared from the Church. However, there was a diminishing of charisms such as speaking in tongues, prophecy and healing after the first few centuries of Christianity. O'Connor pointed out that

¹⁵ For the early authors' reflections on Vatican II and CCR see: Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 6, 153-154; J. Massingberd Ford, "Holy Spirit in the New Testament," *Commonweal* 89: 6 (November 1968): 173- 179; Edward O'Connor, "Holy Spirit in Catholic Thought" *Commonweal* 89: 6 (November 1968): 179- 185; Stephen B. Clark, *Baptized in the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (Pecos, New Mexico: Dove Publications, 1970), 106-107; James E. Byrne, *Threshold of God's Promise* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1970), 69-73; David E. Rosage, *Retreats and the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Pecos, New Mexico: Dove Publications, 1971), 4-6, 41, 62; Ranaghan, *Spirit Leads*, 11-12, 19, 125, 189, 199, 236. Common examples of Vatican II's teaching on charisms can be found in "Lumen Gentium [The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church]" art. 4, 7, 12, 15, 34, etc.

¹⁶ Leo XIII wrote an encyclical on the Holy Spirit, *Divinum illud munus* (1897). Sr. Elena Guerra influenced Leo to both write about the Holy Spirit, and to enjoin the whole Church to invoke the Holy Spirit for the new century, celebrating a novena of prayer to the Holy Spirit in all the parish churches of the world before Pentecost. Reflections on Leo XIII and Sr. Elena can be found in Ford, "Holy Spirit in the New Testament," 179; O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*, 185; Gaudet, Val Fr., "A Woman and the Pope," *New Covenant*, October 1973, 4-6; Gerald J. Farrell and George W. Kosicki, *The Spirit and the Bride Say, "Come!"* (Asbury, NJ: AMI, 1981), 3-4; Patti Gallagher Mansfield, *As by a New Pentecost* (Steubenville, Ohio: Franciscan University, 1992), 7-8.

the Spirit's presence is not only in the more manifest charisms, but in the essential, yet often more invisible, work of sanctification. So the disappearance of certain charisms does not imply the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit from the Church ("Holy Spirit in Catholic Thought" (179-180).

The concern for understanding CCR within the heritage of the Catholic Church will also be noticed as we study descriptions of the central concept of the pentecostal/charismatic experience, "baptism in the Holy Spirit."

Baptism in the Holy Spirit

From the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement, the term used to describe the new experience of the Holy Spirit, which gave rise to the movement, was the New Testament term "baptism in the Holy Spirit." In all four gospels (Mark 1:8; Matthew 3:11; Luke 3:16; John 1:33) John the Baptist describes the one coming after him as he who will "baptize in the Holy Spirit." Also, in the Acts of the Apostles (1:5, before the Ascension) Jesus tells the disciples that "in a few days you will be baptized in the Holy Spirit. So the experience of the disciples on Pentecost (Acts 2) is a baptism in the Holy Spirit. Since the Pentecostal Movement originated with people who were seeking to have the same experience as the disciples at the first Pentecost in Acts, they naturally called this experience "baptism in the Holy Spirit." When Catholics entered into the same kind of experience as the Pentecostals, they used the same terminology.

The problem with the term "baptism in the Spirit" among Catholics is that it could easily suggest the idea that a second baptism was being promoted. Early authors in CCR wanted to dispel the idea that they were promoting a second baptism, but still do justice both to the newness of their graced experience, and to the full meaning of their sacramental baptism. In 1969 Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan wrote, "To evangelical Pentecostals baptism in the Spirit is a "new" work of grace. In the life of the Catholic it is an "old" work, yet practically "new" because the phrase as used by Catholic Pentecostals is a prayer of renewal for everything that Christian initiation is and is meant to be...an experience of reaffirmation rather than initiation."¹⁷ Other authors in the early years of CCR used words like "revitalization," "release," "renewal," or a "later reawakening" of the original sacramental grace of baptism.¹⁸ They wanted to

¹⁷ *Catholic Pentecostals*, 142.

¹⁸ See J. Massingberd Ford, *Baptism of the Spirit* (Techny, Illinois: Divine Word, 1971), 24 and *The Pentecostal Experience*, 51; Clark, *Baptized in the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 84-87; O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*, 131-136; Kilian McDonnell, OSB and Arnold Bittlinger *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit As an Ecumenical Problem* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Catholic Renewal Services, 1972), 45-47; Simon Tugwell, OP, *Did You Receive the Spirit?* (New York: Paulist, + 1972), 50-58, 91. Donald L. Gelpi and Heribert Mühlen relate baptism in the Spirit to an actualization of Confirmation, rather than Baptism. Gelpi, *Pentecostalism*, 180-186; Heribert Mühlen, *A Char-*

make it clear that they were not denying the efficacy and importance of the sacrament of baptism.

In 1974 a group of theologians and leaders in CCR at the suggestion of Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens published a document, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. This document was the most authoritative theological statement by CCR leaders at that time. Concerning baptism in the Spirit, the document states:

Within the Catholic renewal the phrase 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' refers to two senses or moments. First, there is the theological sense. In this sense, every member of the Church has been baptized in the Spirit because each has received sacramental initiation. Second, there is an experiential sense. It refers to the moment or growth process in virtue of which the Spirit, given during the celebration of initiation, comes to conscious experience. When those within the Catholic renewal speak of 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' they are ordinarily referring to this conscious experience, which is the experiential sense. (30)

When the Spirit given at initiation emerges into consciousness, there is frequently a perception of concrete presence. This sense of concrete, factual presence is the perception of the nearness of Jesus as Lord, the realization at the personal level that Jesus is real and is a person, that he fills the believer with the personal "I" who is Jesus. With great frequency this sense of presence is accompanied with an awareness of power, more specifically, the power of the Holy Spirit (22).¹⁹

Kilian McDonnell, OP, and George T. Montague, SM in 1991 published a book, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit, Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. The National Service Committee of the CCR considered McDonnell and Montague's work so important that they brought together eleven other leaders and theologians in the movement to meet with these two theologians. This group of leaders published a booklet, *Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do with Christian Initiation?*²⁰ Using this booklet, the CCR leadership actively attempted to disseminate McDonnell and Montague's ideas on Baptism in the Spirit to the wider Catholic Church.

ismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit (New York: Paulist, 1978), 140-143. Two important works are written in the 1980s: Francis Aloysius Sullivan, SJ, *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Books, 1982) and Francis Martin, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Steubenville, Ohio: Franciscan University, 1986). Both of these authors describe "baptism in the Spirit," as manifest in the 20th century Pentecostal Movement in the various churches, as a specific grace of renewal for our time that does not have to be seen in relationship to the sacraments of initiation.

¹⁹ *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, 30, 22. The International team consisted of Carlos Aldunate, SJ, Salvador Carrillo, MSPS, Ralph Martin, Albert-Marie de Monléon, OP, Kilian McDonnell, OSB, Heribert Mühlen, Veronica O'Brien, and Kevin Ranaghan. The theological consultants were Yves Congar, OP, Avery Dulles, SJ, Michael Hurley, SJ, Walter Kasper, René Laurentin, and Joseph Ratzinger.

²⁰ McDonnell and Montague were the editors.

The major thesis of McDonnell and Montague's studies on baptism in the Spirit is that "the New Testament church and the major streams of the church's tradition for the first four centuries considered Christian initiation itself to be the "baptism in the Holy Spirit," with all that meant of conferring the fullness of the Spirit, including charisms."²¹ They do not take a stand on whether the Pentecostal experience of our century (named baptism in the Spirit by those involved in this movement) is essentially a sacramental grace (coming to consciousness of the original baptismal gift, as the 1974 CCR theological orientations document stated), or a unique, God-given outpouring of the Spirit for our time.²² However, they do believe that the imparting of the charisms within Christian initiation constitutes the basic pattern of the New Testament, and the Church in its first few centuries. The sacraments are divinely-willed, but the Spirit is not imprisoned by them. The Spirit bestows graces and charisms as the Spirit wills. At the same time, the New Testament portrays an expectation that those who experience the Spirit will eventually enter into the full pattern of sacramental initiation. Baptism in the Holy Spirit can legitimately refer both to Christian initiation, and to its reawakening in Christian experience. It belongs not to private piety but to public liturgy. It is not a special grace for some but a common grace for all.²³

Constitutive of baptism in the Spirit is the reception of charisms for building up the body of Christ. The gift of tongues, especially, has raised many questions. Many Pentecostal denominations do not believe that a person has been baptized in the Spirit unless he or she has received the gift of tongues. The leadership of CCR throughout the first twenty-seven years encouraged people to ask for the gift of tongues when they receive prayer for the baptism in the Spirit. The gift of tongues is described as a gift of prayer that helps people to be alert to the inner workings of the Holy Spirit. CCR leadership, unlike some Pentecostals, has continually said that a person can be baptized in the Spirit without receiving the gift of tongues. The general belief is that God will give the gift of tongues to anyone who is prepared and open to receiving it. However, there can be other manifestations of the Spirit's presence and power, besides the gift of tongues, that are also biblical signs of baptism in the Spirit (gifts of prophetic inspiration; being filled with joyful praise and proclaiming the greatness of God; freedom from fear, and the desire to witness to Christ; charisms

²¹ *Christian Initiation*, 337.

²² As religious communities, or Marian apparitions, or the Sacred Heart devotion are special gifts of the Spirit to the Church at various times in her history, but not directly related to the sacraments, so Sullivan and Martin would see the Pentecostal Movement that has influenced many churches during this century. See Sullivan and F. Martin in endnote #18.

²³ *Christian Initiation*, 338-339.

of healing, teaching, etc.). Because baptism in the Spirit is related to *Christian initiation*, it does not bring instant Christian maturity. Baptism in the Spirit enlivens faith and gives a strong inner desire for growing in the Christian life. However, some people, who have never had the experience of baptism in the Spirit, may be far more mature in many aspects of the Christian life than some individuals who have received baptism in the Spirit.

Prayer Meetings

From the beginning of Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and throughout the years, the prayer meeting has been the main structural element of the movement.²⁴ A major result of baptism in the Spirit is a deepened desire to pray, and to share the ways that God works in our lives. People experience a desire to praise God for who He is and what He does. There is a strengthening of the belief that God acts powerfully as we turn to Him in prayer.

Over the first twenty-seven years of CCR prayer meetings have developed in a variety of ways with different emphases among groups. However, most CCR prayer meetings have certain commonalities. The beginning of the meetings is usually characterized by a time of praising God in song and vocal prayer.

While Catholic groups tend to be more restrained than some Pentecostal Churches, the practice of individuals praying aloud in their own words (at the same time as others do this) is common. An atmosphere of praise is created as each person's individual prayer supports the prayers of all the other people. Often this time will include praying or singing together with the gift of tongues.

Following the opening time of praise, there is usually a time of quiet prayer during which the group remains open to any inspirations that God may give someone. Within this time individuals may read a Scripture passage that struck them, share a prophetic inspiration, share words of wisdom or knowledge inspired by the Spirit, or witness to some way that God has acted in one's life. The purpose of this time is not for giving everyone a chance to share anything that is on their mind. The hope is that people share the words, experiences and Scriptures that they "sense interiorly" the Holy Spirit leading them to share. The belief is that the meeting should be led and formed by the Spirit's action in people.

Usually there is a teaching given by someone in leadership, and frequently prayer groups will have time to "pray over" (prayer with the laying on of hands; see Acts 8:17-18) anyone who wants prayer for healing or for some intention.

²⁴ See O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*, 111-121.

Some prayer groups eventually go beyond having a weekly prayer meeting. They believe that God is calling them to develop into Christian communities that have some level of specific commitment to one another. We will hear more about this development as we look at the history of the movement. Whether a group continues sponsoring a prayer meeting, or develops into a more committed community, the strong belief and emphasis on prayer continues in all these groups as they seek to be continually open to the Holy Spirit's guidance and power.

State of the Topic

At the present time there are not any critical, historical studies of the first twenty-seven years of CCR. From 1969-1977 there were a number of authors who wrote books on the early development of CCR.²⁵ Also during this time three important collections of essays by leaders and theologians in CCR were written.²⁶ Some significant scholarly studies have been written on aspects of the development of CCR. These studies do not cover any material beyond the year 1980.²⁷ In 1992 Patti Gallagher Mansfield wrote a book, *As by a New Pentecost*, that gave extensive information concerning the birth of CCR. She also gave some reflections on the continuing development of the movement, but in a brief fashion with little documentation.

One magazine and two newsletters have followed the movement and reflected on CCR for a significant amount of time. *New Covenant* was a monthly magazine for CCR from 1971-1994 (the time of this study). This magazine gives

²⁵ Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*; O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement*; Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* (New York: Seabury, 1975); René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1977); Ford, *The Pentecostal Experience*, and *Which Way for Catholic Pentecostals?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976) (hereafter *Which Way*); Gelpi, *Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint*, and *Pentecostal Piety* (New York, Paulist, 1972); Tugwell, *Did You Receive the Spirit?*; Robert A. Wild, *Enthusiasm in the Spirit* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1975); Vincent M. Walsh, Rev., *A Key To Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey, 1974); McDonnell, *Charismatic Renewal and the Churches* (New York: Seabury, 1976); Richard Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976); J. Kerkhofs, *Catholic Pentecostals Now* (Canfield, Ohio: Alba House, 1977). The books by the Ranaghans and O'Connor give the earliest eyewitness accounts of the beginnings of CCR.

²⁶ Ranaghan, *Spirit Leads*; Robert Heyer, ed., *Pentecostal Catholics* (New York: Paulist, 1974) Kilian McDonnell, OSB, ed., *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975).

²⁷ Joseph H. Fichter, *The Catholic Cult of the Paraclete* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1975); Meredith B. McGuire, *Pentecostal Catholics. Power Charisma and Order in a Religious Movement* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1982); Richard J. Bord and Joseph E. Faulkner, *The Catholic Charismatics. The Anatomy of a Modern Religious Movement* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983).

the most complete ongoing record of the significant events in CCR. From 1975-1994 the National Service Committee of the CCR also published a newsletter almost every month. Finally, the "charismatic" Benedictine Abbey in Pecos, New Mexico published an eight page newsletter from 1973-1994. These three publications are helpful in studying the ongoing development of CCR. However, they give us more breadth than depth, since the articles are usually brief with little documentation. This literature is helpful for studying the major "popular" concerns of the movement, and for giving us the full context of the growth and development of Marian devotion and reflection in CCR. The present study will be the first to research the three publications from their beginnings until 1994.

Concerning the Marian aspect of the research, there are a number of articles²⁸ and chapters from books²⁹ that reflect on "Mary and CCR" (or at least the Mary/Holy Spirit relationship from the perspective of CCR). There are also a number of books on Mary that are influenced by the author's involvement in CCR.³⁰ Only *The Spirit and the Bride Say "Come!"* (Kosicki and Farrell, 1981)

²⁸ Heribert Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church: Dogmatic Aspects of Charismatic Renewal," *One in Christ*, no. 4 (1976), 333-347; René Laurentin and others, "Mary and the Holy Spirit," in *Mary in the Faith and the Life of the New Age of the Church* (Ndola-Zambia: Franciscan Mission, 1983), 222-289; Kevin McNamara, "The Holy Spirit and Mary," *The Way, Supplement*, no. 51 (Autumn 1984): 8-22; Christofer O'Donnell, OCarm, "Mary and the Charismatic Renewal," *One in Christ*, no. XXI. 1 (1985): 72-75; Robert Faricy, SJ, "Mary in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, Part I and II," *Religious Renewal in Hope*, no. 7.4 and 8.1 (1989): 4-5. These are articles in journals other than *New Covenant*.

²⁹ See Joseph A. Pelletier, AA, *A New Pentecost* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Assumption, 1974); George Montague, SM, *Riding the Wind* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1974); Suenens, *A New Pentecost?*; Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*; Ronda Chervin, *Why I Am a Charismatic* (Liguori, Missouri: Liguori, 1978); John Randall, *Wisdom Instructs Her Children* (Locust Valley, New York: Living Flame, 1981); George A. Maloney, *Manna in the Desert* (Locust Valley, New York: Living Flame, 1984), *Communion of Saints* (Hauppauge, New York: Living Flame, 1988).

³⁰ See David E. Rosage, *Mary, The Model Charismatic* (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1971); *Praying With Mary* (Locust Valley, New York: Living Flame, 1988); Joseph A. Pelletier, *Mary, Our Mother* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Assumption, 1972) and *The Queen of Peace Visits Medjugorje* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Assumption, 1985); Louis Pfaller, OSB and J. Alberts, BOC, *Mary is Pentecostal: A Fresh Look at Mary from a Charismatic Viewpoint* (Pecos, TX: Dove, 1973); George A. Maloney, SJ, *Mary: The Womb of God* (Denville, NJ: Dimension, 1976); John Randall, Helen P. Hawkinson and Sharyn Malloy, *Mary: Pathway To Fruitfulness* (Locust Valley, New York: Living Flame, 1978); Paul Hinnebusch, OP, *The Mother of Jesus Present With Us* (Libertyville, Illinois: Prow, 1980); Christofer O'Donnell, OCarm., *Life in the Spirit and Mary* (Wilmington, Ohio: Michael Glazier, 1981); Ronda Chervin and Sr. Mary Neill, *Bringing the Mother With You* (New York: Seabury, 1982); Ronda Chervin and Terri Vorndran Nichols, *Woman to Woman, Handing on our Experience of the Joyful, Sorrowful and Glorious Mysteries of Life* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988); Robert Faricy, SJ (four books on the reported apparitions of Mary at Medjugorje—first book in 1984), *The Lord's Dealing: The Primacy of the Feminine in Christian Spirituality* (New York: Paulist, 1988); George W. Kosicki, CSB, *Born of Mary*

reflects specifically, and in a fairly detailed way, on the relationship of CCR to Marian movements and Mary's role. *New Covenant*, the newsletter of the National Service Committee, and the *Pecos Benedictine* newsletter have published articles about Mary at various times. Finally, there is available some information from major conferences on Mary sponsored by groups in the CCR.³¹

Purpose of the Study

This study will present and evaluate the Marian content (at times the lack of Marian content) in the literature, conferences and significant events within the first twenty-seven years of CCR. By placing the literature and events within the context of the historical developments and issues at particular stages of the movement, a study will be made of the influence of these issues on the development of the Marian aspect in CCR and how the Marian aspect has influenced the overall development of the movement. We will see how some of the special concerns of CCR (the work of the Holy Spirit, ecumenism, building community, prayer of praise, prayer of intercession, healing prayer, focus on Scripture) shine a particular light on Marian reflection. Since this will be the first systematic research of the unfolding of the first twenty-seven years of CCR, the content will be useful for further studies of CCR.

During the period of this study, I personally have been involved with CCR since 1971 and as of 1974 a member of the Advisory Committee to the National Service Committee of the CCR in the United States³² and a Diocesan Liaison for the CCR in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, Ohio.³³ This research will be a service for CCR, since there has not been a study covering the first twenty-seven years. There has also been a growing Marian interest in CCR. Some people involved

(Stockbridge, Massachusetts: Marian, 1985) and *Spiritual Warfare, Attack Against the Woman* (Milford, Ohio: Faith, 1990); Farrell and Kosicki, *The Spirit and the Bride Say "Come!"*; Kenneth Roberts, *Mary, The Perfect Prayer Partner* (Huntington, New York: Our Sunday Visitor, 1990 – cassette tape from 1983); George Montague, SM, *Our Father. Our Mother: Mary and the Faces of God* (Steubenville, Ohio: Franciscan University Press, 1990).

³¹ Conferences on Mary and CCR were held at the University of Dayton in 1978 and 1979. The presentations from the 1979 conference were published in a book, Vincent P. Branick, ed. *Mary, the Spirit and the Church* (Ramsey, Minnesota: Paulist, 1980). The Franciscan University of Steubenville sponsored conferences on Mary in 1986, 1988-1992, 1994. The topics of the presentations and some audio tapes of presentations are available. The National Liaison Committee for the CCR sponsored a symposium on Mary and the Holy Spirit in 1984. The unpublished papers are available through the liaison committee.

³² As of 1993 the National Service Committee for the CCR is made up of 12 members. The Advisory Committee meets with the National Service Committee twice a year. The Advisory committee at this time has about 80 members.

³³ Liaisons are appointed by the local bishop. They serve as the bishop's contact person with the local CCR, and a contact person for CCR with the bishop.

with CCR are uncomfortable with the Marian emphasis, while others wonder how the Marian influence relates to God's purpose for CCR in the Church. This study will give background that will better enable the CCR to discern the place of Marian devotion within the movement.

CCR developed during a time of decline in Marian devotion after the Second Vatican Council. It was a time in which the place of Marian devotion and reflection, and their significance, was being reevaluated. This study will show particular ways that CCR helped or hindered the process of reevaluation.

Marian movements have frequently been rooted in a particular spiritual experience or apparition. CCR places a strong emphasis on spiritual experience. This study will help to deepen the understanding of the role of spiritual experience in influencing the growth and renewal of the Church. A focus on spiritual experience has been a part of some of the most important renewal movements in the history of the Church.³⁴ Focusing on spiritual experience has also caused problems throughout the Church's history.³⁵ Strengths and weaknesses of a "spiritual experience" emphasis will be described and evaluated in this study. This research will lead to some conclusions about a proper approach to the whole area of spiritual experience.

Methodology

An historical approach is used in this study involving a quantitative presentation and analysis of the significant documents and events throughout the first twenty-seven years of CCR in the United States. CCR originated in the United States, but expanded to many countries around the world within a few years. It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the Marian manifestations of this movement in all these countries. The focus of the research will be on CCR in the United States which has given the greatest impetus and focus to the movement throughout the world. Authors and events from other countries are considered when they had some influence on CCR in the United States.

The research is divided into several historical chapters plus a final chapter containing overall evaluations and conclusions. Each of the historical chapters will follow this format:

Timeframe

Each chapter will begin with an explanation of the reasons for choosing the particular time segment. The choice of the starting date will be explained, and

³⁴ Sacred Heart devotion, Miraculous Medal devotion, Our Lady of Fatima devotion, St. Anthony's call to sell everything and go to the desert, St. Francis's call to "rebuild my Church," St. Paul's experience on the road to Damascus, etc.

³⁵ Gnostic groups, Montanism, false apparitions, etc.

a description of the overall character of the years within the time segment will be given. In this way the appropriateness of studying the segment as one piece will be demonstrated.

Major Influences and Issues

This section will present the major influences and issues of CCR as they developed over a period of time. A special emphasis will be given to the influences and issues that had some relation to the development of Marian devotion and reflection in the movement. This information will enable us to understand more completely the particular influences on Marian devotion and reflection as they unfolded over the years. The section is divided into two subsections: *Significant Events* and *Issues and Influential Persons and Authors*.

Catholic Pentecostals (1969) by Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, and *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (1971) by Edward O'Connor are the most important works for understanding the first 3-4 years of CCR. They were written by eye-witnesses who became involved in the movement from its beginnings at Notre Dame. Kevin Ranaghan and O'Connor were on the first National Service Committee for CCR. Other literature of the first four years of the movement will also be used to augment these two most important works.

From 1971-1994 *New Covenant* magazine will be the major resource for studying the unfolding of CCR. This monthly magazine followed the development of CCR, and expressed the major concerns of the leaders of the movement. The newsletter of the National Service Committee (NSC) and the *Pecos Benedictine* newsletter will be used to augment *New Covenant*. The NSC newsletter helps to see the particular ways that the major leadership body in CCR influenced the movement. The *Pecos Benedictine* newsletter offers a helpful counterpoint to the *New Covenant* and the NSC newsletter. The *Pecos Benedictine* is similar in content to the other two documents in most areas, but some areas of disagreement arose between the National Service Committee and the Pecos community over the years.

The information gained from these three sources will be supplemented by studies of the movement, papal and episcopal statements on CCR, information from important conferences, official statements from leadership groups in CCR, an analysis of the major publishing houses that developed within CCR, and the significant literature from individual authors. An evaluation will be given of the relative significance of events and literature.

Marian Content

This section will involve a presentation of the people, events, and literature in CCR that express some type of Marian content. The presentation in this section is mainly a quantitative study. The research will enable us to view the

whole picture of the quantity and content of Marian reflection as it developed over the first twenty-seven years of CCR.

New Covenant, the NSC newsletter, and the *Pecos Benedictine* will be used to see the "popular" development of Marian reflection and devotion within the wider movement. Individual authors within CCR will also be studied in order to understand the ideas, and the particular individuals, who most influenced the development of Marian reflection and devotion.

Evaluation and Conclusions

Finally, each chapter will have an analysis of the two types of information that have been presented (the overall CCR context and the Marian content). The major concern will be the analysis and evaluation of the Marian content of the timeframe. However, the Marian content will be analyzed in relationship to the overall historical context of the movement. The final chapter of the study will give an overall evaluation of the information presented, and conclusions based on the research. The chapter will have two types of conclusions. First, conclusions will be given based on the chronological unfolding of Marian reflection and devotion throughout the first twenty-seven years of CCR. These conclusions will integrate the historical data that has been presented. Secondly, there will be a critical evaluation of the content (and focus) of Marian reflection and devotion in the movement. Here, we will evaluate the contribution of CCR toward enhancing modern scholarship in Marian Theology. In addition, we will evaluate the content of Marian reflection and devotion in the light of Church pronouncements on Mary from Vatican II until 1992.

It is not within the scope of this study to do a full systematic evaluation. However, the research that has been presented gives a historical base for further theological study.

The Catholic Church in the United States after Vatican II

The reaction to Vatican II in the U.S. can be characterized by both initial enthusiasm and much confusion. There was enthusiasm about such issues as changes in the liturgy, the role of the laity, ecumenism, and involvement with the justice issues of the world. However, at the same time, both the laity and the clergy had not been adequately prepared for the changes brought by Vatican II. The Church in the United States experienced a great deal of uprooting of traditional helps to the faith. From 1965-1971, 180 Catholic newspapers and magazines in the U.S. passed out of existence. During the same time hundreds of new periodicals expressing the climate and issues of Vatican II were initiated.³⁶

³⁶ See John Deedy, *The Catholic Fact Book* (Chicago: The Thomas More Press, 1986), 243-245.

Devotional life was supposed to become more rooted in the Scriptures and the liturgy of the Church, but older devotions tended to be put aside without anything offered to replace them. With the emphasis on liturgy as the focus of prayer life, and on being active and involved in the world, very little was being written about personal prayer and the spiritual life immediately after Vatican II. Marian Theology, following the thrust of Vatican II, emphasized Mary's relationship with Christ and the Church. The focus was on a more "sharing-oriented" versus a "privilege-oriented" Mariology. A practical example of this new focus was seen in the decision in 1967 of the Jesuit affiliated "Sodalities of our Lady" to change their name to "Christian Life Communities." These developments tended to discourage, rather than encourage, any renewal in devotion to Mary among the average Catholic.

The excitement about lay involvement in the Church was seen in the founding of the National Council of Catholic Laity in the U.S. in 1967. However, after rapid initial growth of this organization, within five years membership had greatly decreased, and the council was paralyzed by ideological differences.³⁷

Polarization in the Church grew rapidly after Vatican II in the U.S. The lay Catholic newspaper, *The National Catholic Reporter*, has expressed concern that change is not happening fast enough in the Church. On the other hand, *Catholics United for the Faith* was organized (1968) as an association of lay Catholics that strive to defend Catholic doctrine and morals in accordance with the magisterium.

CCR appeared during this time of great activity, but much confusion, in the U.S. Catholic Church. Many of the early leaders of CCR were on Catholic college campuses where they were involved with Scriptural and liturgical renewal, and involved with social justice issues. However, they also felt the vacuum in the Church in the area of personal spiritual renewal. A number of people who would become leaders in CCR became actively involved in the Cursillo Movement, which was one of the few movements that was emphasizing personal spiritual renewal.³⁸

While there certainly was a need in the U.S. Catholic Church for new approaches to personal spiritual life after Vatican II, CCR was not expected. CCR defies an easy explanation in relation to the other trends in U.S. Cathol-

³⁷ Deedy, *The Catholic Fact Book*, 378.

³⁸ "Cursillo de Cristiandad" (little course in Christianity) was started in Spain around 1949. It came to the U.S. among Spanish-speaking Americans. By 1961 there was an English version of its three day program for spiritual renewal. The program is presented by priests and laity. The emphasis is on the dynamic and personalistic aspects of the Catholic faith. See J. Hervás y Benet, "The Cursillos de Cristiandad: A Magnificent Instrument of Christian Renewal and of Apostolic Conquest," *Christ to the World* 7 (1962): 161-178, 312-324.

icism. CCR would seem to fit with other progressive college initiatives. However, the movement from the beginning stayed deeply rooted in the Catholic Church, and in later years is considered theologically conservative by liberal theologians in the Church. CCR gave a strong impetus to lay involvement, but also sought close relationships with the bishops and clergy. While many efforts in ecumenism were begun after Vatican II in theological circles, and some in shared concern for social justice issues, only CCR has had a major influence in “grass-roots” ecumenism.

II. Growth and Apologetics, June 1971 – July 1974

Timeframe

During the first time segment (1967-1971), Catholic Charismatic Renewal expanded mainly by “word of mouth.” People usually came to know about the movement through friends and acquaintances. Near the end of the time period, CCR started to develop more organization through the Communications Center at South Bend, Indiana, and the National Service Committee (NSC).

The transition to a new period is placed at June 1971 because of some significant events which gave CCR a more public status. The National Service Committee was now fully organized, and began to take an active role, providing direction and leadership. Three events were particularly important in marking this transition:

1) The Fifth International Conference on Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church (University of Notre Dame) attracted over 5,000 people (in 1970 there were ca. 1,500). For the first time the conference was called “international,” rather than “national” because of the presence of representatives of other countries (besides the United States) where CCR was also developing. The Notre Dame conference continued to grow every year throughout this period (11,500 in 1972; over 20,000 in 1973; 33,000 in 1974).

2) *New Covenant* magazine began publishing in July 1971 as a service to promote and support CCR. The magazine’s original subtitle was “Monthly Publication Serving the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.” *New Covenant* developed from the *Pastoral Newsletter*. While the *Pastoral Newsletter* was mainly for leaders in CCR, *New Covenant* was published for the general public. Ralph Martin from the Word of God Community (Ann Arbor, Michigan) was the first editor. The number of subscriptions increased rapidly (22,000 by July 1973; 35,000 by March 1974; 60,000 by March 1975; peaking at 65,000 by January 1977).

3) The first *Team Manual for the Life in the Spirit Seminars*³⁹ was published in 1971, bringing an organized and unified approach for initiating people into CCR.⁴⁰ This seminar, developed by the Word of God Community (Ann Arbor,

³⁹ Stephen Clark, *Team Manual for the Life in the Spirit Seminars* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Charismatic Renewal Services, Inc., 1971). In the introduction Clark mentions that the seminar was developed by his community (The Word of God Community in Ann Arbor, Michigan). Starting in 1973, the revised edition does not mention Clark as the author. Authorship is designated as “developed by the Word of God, Ann Arbor, Michigan.”

⁴⁰ *The Life in the Spirit Seminar* is a seven-session program (usually one meeting a week for seven weeks) for helping people “to be baptized in the Spirit and find a deeper Christian life” (introduction to *Team Manual*, 3). The focus is on the “basic Christian message,” “conversion to Christ,” and “living a new life in the Spirit” (4-5). The seven topics are *God’s Love, Salvation, The*

Michigan), became widely used throughout CCR (First edition (1971), 25,000 copies; Second edition (1972), 25,000 copies; Third edition (1973-1978), 80,000 copies; a revised edition, and a Catholic edition were published in 1979). The changes in the various editions were minimal.⁴¹ Leaders in CCR continued to use the first editions along with later editions. The 1971-1974 period can also be characterized as "apologetic." CCR continued and increased its efforts to be recognized and accepted in the Catholic Church. Our study of the significant events and issues of this period will show this emphasis.

Major Influences and Issues from 1971-1974

The study of *New Covenant* magazine gives us a good sense of the overall perceptions and directions of the major leadership in CCR. The magazine came under the direction of the National Service Committee for CCR. The first editor, Ralph Martin, was a member of this committee.

ECUMENICAL YET FULLY CATHOLIC

A significant issue for CCR was finding the right balance for the desire both to have a strong *ecumenical* influence, and to demonstrate that the movement was *fully Catholic* (apologetic emphasis). In *New Covenant* (March 1974) Kevin Ranaghan stated in the feature article: "The charismatic renewal is in the Church, for the Church, for the renewal of the Church."⁴² Later in the article he wrote, "The area of responsible ecumenism is one of the greatest challenges in the charismatic renewal today."⁴³ Since the "ecumenical/fully Catholic" issue is a foundational one for understanding the unfolding of CCR, we will now give some background for understanding the development of CCR's reflections on ecumenism within the 1971-1974 timeframe.

Within its first year *New Covenant* already included "non-fundamentalistic Protestant charismatics" (language used by Ralph Martin in *New Covenant*, February 1972) among the people who regularly contributed articles.⁴⁴ Reports

New Life, Receiving God's Gift, Praying For Baptism in the Holy Spirit, Growth, and Transformation in Christ. It attempts to present the basic message "in such a way that it could be received by every type (denomination) of Christian" (5-6).

⁴¹ Further implications of this fact will be discussed. At this time we specifically note the wide and common use of this particular manual.

⁴² "Catholic Charismatic Renewal: The First Seven Years," *New Covenant* (March 1974): 4.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁴ From 1971-1974 this included Larry Christenson, Charles Simpson, Ken Pagard, J. Rodman Williams, Vinson Synan, David Wilkerson, David DuPlessis.

were given occasionally, yet consistently, on the development of charismatic renewal among Protestant churches.⁴⁵

Because of the ecumenical aspect of the magazine, Ralph Martin (April 1973 issue) asked the readers whether *New Covenant* should publish two magazines. One magazine would focus on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. The other magazine would focus on the charismatic renewal among all the Christian churches. The readers' response overwhelmingly favored keeping one magazine that included both of these areas. This response led to the decision (June 1973) to drop the subtitle of *New Covenant*, "monthly magazine of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal." Later in that year (December), Ralph Martin announced that the focus of *New Covenant* would be "Catholic-ecumenical," and that a board of fourteen contributing editors (six Catholics, eight Protestants) was authorized by the National Service Committee of the CCR. These decisions were based on the growing hope in CCR that God wanted to create a "charismatic unity" (based on a common experience of the Spirit) among Christians that would be deeper than their divisions.

While the excitement over the ecumenical possibilities of charismatic renewal was growing, *New Covenant* (expressing the concerns of the National Service Committee) was also trying to show that CCR was a *fully Catholic* development within the Church. The primary way that *New Covenant* demonstrated the "fully Catholic" concern was by frequently publishing 1) articles by Catholic bishops⁴⁶ who showed a positive attitude toward the movement, and 2) articles about priests and members of religious orders who had become involved in CCR.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ See May 1972 on the Classical Pentecostal Movement, July 1972 on the Mennonite Church, September 1973 for a general update, and April 1974 on the Lutheran Church.

⁴⁶ See September 1971 (includes Bishop Zaleski's report on CCR to the U. S. bishops; Bishop Joseph Hogan, Rochester, New York; Bishop G. Emmett Carter, London, Ontario), October 1971 (Bishop Cosgrove, Cleveland, Ohio), November 1971 (Bishop Stephen A. Leven, San Angelo, Texas), January 1972 (Archbishop Hannon, New Orleans, Louisiana), June 1972 (Bishop Joseph McKinney, Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Bishop Vathon, Birmingham, Alabama), July 1972 and June 1973 (Cardinal Suenens, Belgium), August 1972 (Archbishop Hayes, Halifax, Nova Scotia), December 1972 (Bishop Dozier, Memphis, Tennessee), September 1973 (Bishop McKinney), October 1973 (Popes Leo XIII and John XXIII on prayer for a new Pentecost), December 1973 (international leaders meet with Pope Paul VI in Rome), January 1974 (Archbishop Whealon, Hartford, Connecticut).

⁴⁷ See July 1971 (describes three priests actively involved in CCR; Fr. John Randall, Fr. Harold Cohen, Fr. George Kosicki), March 1972 (feature article on "Sisters and the Holy Spirit"), June 1972 (feature article on "Priests and the Holy Spirit"), September 1973 (Bishop McKinney encourages the involvement of parish priests in CCR), July 1974 (feature article on Fr. Heribert Mühlen, German theologian involved in CCR).

Continual efforts were made to demonstrate CCR's desire to be submitted to the hierarchical leadership of the Catholic Church. The First International Leaders' Conference (sponsored under the leadership of the U.S. National Service Committee) was held in Rome (October 8-12, 1973) as a sign of this submission. *New Covenant* (December 1973) featured an article on Pope Paul VI's private audience with thirteen leaders in CCR after the First International Leaders' Conference. Paul VI's prepared statement was generic and brief with a cautious, but encouraging tone. The statement recognized the fruits of a renewed spiritual life in many places in the Church. The Pope mentioned the need for discernment "even in the best experiences of renewal," as well as the need for not extinguishing the Spirit.⁴⁸ This basically positive audience with the Pope was considered by CCR leaders as a significant initial step in the recognition of CCR as a legitimate development throughout the entire Catholic Church.

The January 1974 issue of *New Covenant* contained two statements from leadership groups in CCR that expressed the state of the *ecumenical/fully Catholic* issue at that time.

First, the National Service Committee for CCR in the U.S. published a statement formally committing itself to serve the broader charismatic renewal (beyond the *Catholic* Charismatic Renewal). The committee explained that many people involved in charismatic renewal in other Christian churches already looked to the CCR for inspiration and teaching. The committee believed that they were called to work for unity among Christians, and, at the same time, work for renewal in the Catholic Church. Their service would be done fully in subordination to the teachings, discipline, and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. They would provide some services that were explicitly Catholic, some Catholic-ecumenical, and, as often as possible, service offered to "all men of good will." The committee believed that the Catholic and ecumenical emphases could work together.

Secondly, Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens of Belgium suggested during the First international Leaders' Conference in Rome (he was the one who suggested that the conference be held in Rome) that "A Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal"⁴⁹ be composed. Fr. Kilian McDonnell prepared the preliminary draft. Six theologians (all priests)⁵⁰ discussed the text with McDonnell, and aided in its revision. The statement was directed to people

⁴⁸ The full text can be found in Kilian McDonnell, ed., *Open The Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend, Indiana: Greenlawn Press, 1989), 3-5.

⁴⁹ *New Covenant* (January 1974), 21-23.

⁵⁰ Fathers Salvador Carrillo from Mexico, Albert de Monléon from France, Francis Martin from Canada, Donatien Mollat from Rome, Heribert Mühlen from Germany, and Francis Sullivan from Rome.

not involved in CCR who were seeking to understand it. More specifically, the statement was meant to support the basic desire of CCR leadership "to situate the renewal within the Catholic theological tradition."

The statement emphasized that the charismatic renewal made "no claim to a special spiritual endowment or to a special grace which distinguishes those involved in the renewal from others not involved." The foundational graces of the faith are given in the sacraments of initiation. CCR promotes a greater "expectation, awareness, and openness as to how the Spirit comes to visibility in the life of the community." This greater awareness and expectation can lead to a "personal conscious experience" of the Spirit's presence and power. The first two chapters of the Acts of the Apostles give an example of the type of experience of the Spirit that Christians should expect and seek.

The vast majority of the statement (29 paragraphs) explained charismatic renewal within a Catholic understanding. Two paragraphs raised some problem areas for CCR (the need for discernment of spiritual manifestations; exaggerated supernaturalism at times; the need for better theological training for some of the people in leadership in prayer groups; the reluctance of some leaders to listen carefully to criticism; and the problem of sometimes not perceiving sufficiently the social implications of life in Christ and the Spirit). The final paragraph mentioned briefly the ecumenical hopes found in CCR. The conclusion of this paragraph stated that "those within the renewal recognize the presence of the Spirit in those who proclaim the Lordship of Jesus to the glory of the Father. That presence in all streams of the renewal is the bond of their unity" (even though the different Christian churches may give differing theological explanations for the same spiritual realities). Both of these leadership statements in the January 1974 issue of *New Covenant* demonstrated a strong hope among CCR leaders that the "charismatic experience of the Spirit" could lead to greater unity in the Christian churches. At this stage in CCR very little was being said about the need for Catholics in CCR to know their whole Catholic faith well. The National Service Committee was calling those involved in CCR to be *fully Catholic*. However, being *fully Catholic* was emphasized predominantly in such ways as: 1) trying to show how the "charismatic experience" is rooted in Catholic tradition (a person can be "charismatic" and Catholic), 2) printing positive statements on CCR from bishops, and 3) seeking to express, and show, that the movement is fully subject to the bishops and the Pope. While no specifically Catholic teachings concerning spiritual life or doctrine were being denied by CCR leadership, not much was being done to help people involved in CCR to integrate the specifically Catholic aspects of their faith with their newly found "charismatic" experience. This difficulty was magnified by the fact that the whole Catholic Church in the aftermath of Vatican II was experiencing

turmoil about various approaches to the spiritual life and an uncertainty about what should be emphasized in Catholic teaching and doctrine.

The focus on the basics of the faith, and the desire to foster unity in the churches through charismatic renewal, subtly, worked against the integration of "charismatic" experience with all the aspects of Catholic life. A statement from the *Team Manual for the Life in the Spirit Seminars* demonstrates this subtle influence:

The Life in the Spirit Seminars are designed to be universal. They were originally developed in a community that is a majority Catholic but that contains a high percentage of other Christians from conservative Fundamentalist to "high-church" Lutheran and Episcopalian. We long ago had to learn to present the basic message in such a way that it could be received by every type of Christian. Surprisingly enough, we found that it could be done. All of us want to say more about the Christian life than is contained here. But all of us agree that what is said here is true and is adequate to lead people to be baptized in the Spirit and to speak in tongues. Our hope is that the Life in the Spirit Seminars can be used by a broad spectrum of Christians and will prove to be unifying throughout the Charismatic Renewal....Adaptations of the seminars can certainly be made....But in any adaptation, we would like to share two things the Lord has been teaching us 1) the basic teaching about what the Lord is willing to do for all who come to him can be stated in a simple enough way to by-pass all dogmatic or theological questions and reach directly to a person's heart 2) serious theological issues are usually best taken care of outside of the seminars and not in them.⁵¹

This widely used manual gave the *impression* that the basic message of the gospel and life in the Spirit, and promoting unity among our Christian brothers and sisters, are what really matter. Dogma, theology, and denominational concerns seem to have only secondary importance, since leaders were told that it is best to keep these matters out of the seminar. This description gave an unfortunate impression in an otherwise very beneficial manual.

NOTRE DAME CONFERENCES (1972 AND 1973)

The yearly conferences at Notre Dame within this time period became an ever greater force in influencing CCR. The conferences were both an expression of what the National Service Committee believed the Holy Spirit was doing in CCR (they chose the speakers and gave an overall focus to the conference) and a way that the leadership received a further sense of direction as they discerned what God was "saying" during the conference (through prophetic inspirations, the speakers, and the overall impression of the conference).

The 1972 conference expressed the *ecumenical yet fully Catholic* tension. On the one hand a prominent Pentecostal leader, Vinson Synan, spoke about build-

⁵¹ *New Covenant* (January 1974), 5-6.

ing "charismatic bridges" among Christians, and that the Catholic charismatic movement should aim at nothing less than the complete renewal of the church, from top to bottom. On the other hand, Bishop Joseph McKinney (newly appointed U.S. bishops' advisor to CCR, and personally involved with CCR) received a tremendous response from the assembly when he said that "we need Peter" (meaning the role of the Pope). He exhorted the CCR to stay rooted in the Catholic Church and to recognize the teaching and discerning role of the Pope and bishops.⁵²

The prominent Pentecostal minister, David Wilkerson, in a *New Covenant* article⁵³ quoted Bishop McKinney's statement about Peter, and said in reply: "we need, not Peter or Paul, but Jesus Christ."

The tendency of Protestant Pentecostal leaders in speaking to the CCR was to emphasize how much CCR has to give to the Catholic Church, rather than what CCR needed to receive from the wider Catholic Church. At that time CCR leaders emphasized that they have much to learn from the Pentecostal movement, but infrequently implied that the Pentecostal movement may have much to learn from the Catholic heritage.⁵⁴

The 1973 Notre Dame conference⁵⁵ demonstrated that the movement was moving from its apologetic phase toward asserting its own identity and role in the Catholic Church. The prophetic messages⁵⁶ during the conference proclaimed that God had begun to act in pouring out his Spirit with power over the face of the earth. There was a strong call to respond to this action of God. CCR saw itself as an important part of this work of God and His Spirit.

The tension between being *fully Catholic* and *ecumenical sensitivity* again appeared in this conference. Fr. Harold Cohen was the keynote speaker at the

⁵² See *New Covenant* (July 1972) for further information on the 1972 Notre Dame conference.

⁵³ (April 1973), 4-5.

⁵⁴ An example of this would be in Ralph Martin's introduction to Vinson Synan's book, *Charismatic Bridges* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1974), v-vi. Word of Life is the official publishing branch for CCR.

⁵⁵ This conference is covered in the July and August 1973 editions of *New Covenant*.

⁵⁶ Prophetic inspirations or "prophecies" are one of the charismatic gifts seen in the New Testament churches (Acts 11:27-30, 13:1-3; Romans 12:5-8; 1 Corinthians 12:4-11, 14: 1-40; Ephesians 2:20, 4:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:19-21; 2 Peter 1:19-21; 1 John 4:1-6; Revelations 1:1-3). CCR believes that the gift of prophecy is a normal working of the Holy Spirit within the Christian community. A person will receive a word, phrase, or idea that comes to his/her mind. Along with this "word" there will be an inner sense ("anointing") of the Spirit's urging them to speak out that "word." As the person begins to speak the rest of the message comes into their mind. These messages need to be tested and confirmed by the community, since "our prophesying is imperfect" (1 Corinthians 13:9). People can be moved by their own desires and hopes, rather than by the Spirit of God. However, true prophecy can move a group deeply, and give them a sense of God's direction for their lives.

Friday evening session. He received a spontaneous ovation when he stressed the importance of seeking the discernment of the Pope and bishops and pledging obedience to them even if a bishop asked for an end to using charismatic gifts in his diocese.

Cohen's exhortation did not receive total approval within CCR. Paul de Celles, a coordinator of the People of Praise community in South Bend, Indiana, wrote in *New Covenant*: "I take issue with the notion that we should automatically obey a bishop who asks us to stop participation in the Catholic charismatic renewal."⁵⁷ De Celles emphasized the importance of the lay character of the movement. New ministries should be allowed to unfold without direct church intervention.⁵⁸ He described priests as having a more direct obedience relationship with their bishop than the laity.

Participants at the 1973 conference were very excited that Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens of Belgium came to the conference and expressed great hope in CCR. In his homily at the closing Mass Suenens told the over 20,000 participants that CCR needed to come into the "bloodstream of the Church."⁵⁹ He described CCR as a response to the God-is-dead theologians. He rejoiced in the emphases that "charismatics" gave to prayer of adoration, Jesus as a *person* whom you love and follow, loving the Word of God (Scriptures), and believing that the Holy Spirit is among us. Suenens described how he had once asked the theologian, Karl Rahner, "How do you explain that Christians today are so aloof from the Blessed Lady?" Rahner replied, "I think the people of God are making out of Christianity an abstraction and abstractions don't need a mother." Finally, he concluded his homily with these words:

Just to conclude, I want to confide in you a little secret, which you may tell to everyone, about how to receive the Holy Spirit in the best way. Unity in the Spirit is in our unity with Mary, the mother of God. Christ was born out of the Spirit by the cooperation of Mary. On the day of Pentecost the Church was born the same way. Mary was there helping the apostles to receive the Spirit of God. May we be simple children of Mary, the woman, and open all that we are to the fullness of the Spirit of God. Thank you for being here in the name of the Church. Thank you for the future coming out of this.

The September 1973 issue of *New Covenant* included a letter to the editor from Fr. Joseph M. O'Meara, and an accompanying article from him responding

⁵⁷ Paul de Celles, "Reflections on the 1973 Conference," *New Covenant* (August 1973), 24-25.

⁵⁸ Grounds for de Celles' concern about recognizing the laity's rights to form associations of the faithful can be found in Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, #37. The revised version of the Code of Canon Law published in 1983 spells out more specifically the rights of the laity to form their own associations (canons 215, 216, 299, 321).

⁵⁹ See *New Covenant* (July 1973), 11, and Robert J. Voigt, *Go To the Mountain: An Insight into Charismatic Renewal* (St. Meinrad: Abbey Press, 1975), 10-13.

to the closing statements about Mary in Cardinal Suenens' homily at the 1973 conference at Notre Dame.⁶⁰ O'Meara wrote, "I felt a bit of pain run through my spirit, knowing that many of my brothers and sisters in our ecumenical community would be wincing. I do not mean to imply that Cardinal Suenens was wrong, or that he should not have broached the subject. I merely wish to point out the tension and confusion that ensued." O'Meara then offered an article that he wrote to explain the Catholic Church's approach in its devotion to Mary.

While areas of concern such as obedience to Church authority, the need for discernment, and the problems of excessive enthusiasm were addressed at the 1973 conference, the feeling of optimism that God was going to use CCR to renew the whole Church was clearly dominant. Bord and Faulkner in their study of CCR offer a fair appraisal: "Even though the 1973 convention had both optimistic and cautionary tones, later publications, like *New Covenant*, sought to stress the optimism. In order to create a definition of reality that would encourage CCR participants, the triumphal elements of 1973 were stressed."⁶¹

SUMMARY OF OTHER SIGNIFICANT ISSUES (1971-1974)

Briefly, here are some other important issues that began to surface during this timeframe:

1) Developing Christian communities and Christian family life:⁶² Many of the National Service Committee members were in groups that were developing beyond prayer groups toward a more committed community lifestyle. The early Jerusalem community in the Acts of the Apostles was a model for this development. The Holy Spirit is the one who builds the Church.

2) The place of social action in CCR:⁶³ This topic was presented as one that needed discernment, and the gathering of information. One of the emphases at this time (Steve Clark and others) was that CCR was being called to develop strong Christian communities that could become foundations from which lasting social action could take place. It was thought that, if there were not true communities in society, then social action would have little lasting effect.

⁶⁰ Rev. Joseph M. O'Meara, *New Covenant* (September 1973), 28-29.

⁶¹ Richard J. Bord and Joseph E. Faulkner, *The Catholic Charismatics: The Anatomy of a Modern Religious Movement* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983), 120.

⁶² See the feature article "New Christian Communities, Hope For the Future," *New Covenant* (April 1972); "The Church: A Charismatic Community," *New Covenant* (March 1973); the feature article "Husbands and Wives," *New Covenant* (January 1974); also *New Covenant* (February 1974) continued to emphasize the Christian family.

⁶³ See *New Covenant* (October and November 1972 feature articles; also December 1972, January 1973, and June 1974).

3) Prayer for healing:⁶⁴ Starting with the November 1973 issue, *New Covenant* began to publish articles about prayer for physical and inner healing, and stories of people who had experienced healing through prayer.

4) The role of the national leadership in CCR: On the one hand, the July 1971 issue of *New Covenant* published a statement from the National Service Committee (NSC) that said, "the service committee does not claim any authority over groups or individuals in the Charismatic Renewal."⁶⁵ On the other hand, this same statement mentions that J. Massingberd Ford was excluded by the committee from the 1971 Notre Dame conference because of her "disruptive and divisive behavior." The NSC clearly was not attempting to form any official authority structures in relation to the particular groups in CCR throughout the country. However, the participants in CCR tended to give these leaders a great deal of authority in discerning how the Spirit was leading the movement. They were perceived as leaders that God had anointed with His Spirit for this task.

While the NSC membership remained all Catholics, in 1974 an advisory committee to the NSC was established that included Protestant "charismatics." At that time, Fr. Edward O'Connor expressed his uneasiness with some of the directions being taken by the NSC, but Bishop Joseph McKinney (the episcopal advisor to CCR) expressed confidence in the committee's directions.⁶⁶

Influential Persons and Authors

Five members of the National Service Committee for CCR wrote books during this timeframe (Steve Clark, Ralph Martin, Kevin Ranaghan, Fr. Edward O'Connor, Fr. George Kosicki). By the early 1970's Steve Clark, Ralph Martin, and Kevin Ranaghan were the most well-known and influential lay leaders in CCR. Their perspectives carried a great deal of weight in the movement. Along with O'Connor and Kosicki a number of other priests began (or continued) writing about CCR (Donald Gelpi, Kilian McDonnell, Simon Tugwell, John Randall, Michael Scanlon, Joseph Pelletier, Vincent Walsh, George Montague, John Haughey, Francis Sullivan).

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMITTEE AUTHORS

STEVE CLARK

In 1972 Steve Clark authored *Building Christian Communities, Strategy for Renewing the Church*.⁶⁷ This work was widely read and had a strong influence

⁶⁴ See *New Covenant* (feature article November 1973, feature article May 1974, July 1974).

⁶⁵ *New Covenant* (July 1971): 7-8.

⁶⁶ See *New Covenant* (February 1974).

⁶⁷ Stephen B. Clark, *Building Christian Communities* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1972).

on the thinking in CCR. Clark developed five theses concerning the way to improve the overall situation of the Church:

- 1) The main goal of pastoral efforts in the Church today is to build communities which make it possible for a person to live a Christian life.
- 2) The Church should be restructured to form basic Christian communities.
- 3) Vital Christian communities are formed only through centering upon Christ (through spiritual renewal).
- 4) The Church today needs leaders that can work with an environmental approach.
- 5) Constructive social change in the Church today should be fostered through the intelligent use of movements.⁶⁸

For Clark an environmental approach is more relationship-oriented than function-oriented. In a Christian environment there would be "personal, that is, free, voluntary, and spontaneous interaction that centers on Christ."⁶⁹ Clark encouraged the integration of movements (Liturgical movement, Christian Family Movement, Cursillo movement, Charismatic movement, ecumenical movement, social justice movement) more fully into the life of the Church. Clark explained that these movements already have a committed group of people, and are environments that can encourage positive social change.

Also, Clark in 1972 demonstrated his emphasis on a strong spiritual focus in his two popular booklets, *Growing in Faith* and *Knowing God's Will*.⁷⁰ Both of these booklets have official Catholic approval through an *imprimatur* and *nihil obstat*, as do most of the books published by Charismatic Renewal Services in the first ten years of CCR. At the same time, both books were written for an ecumenical audience with little specifically Catholic content.

Finally, Charismatic Renewal Services in 1973 published Clark's eighty-page booklet, *Where Are We Headed?*⁷¹ This booklet offered guidelines for leaders in CCR to help them develop the groups for which they are responsible. Many of the emphases in *Building Christian Communities* were also found in *Where Are We Headed?* Clark's strong ecumenical focus was also present:

If we want to follow what the Lord is doing in the church today and in the charismatic renewal today, we in the Catholic charismatic renewal, have to have an ecumenical concern. The unity with other Christians that we experience is something the Lord wants to continue. He is moving all Christians towards a oneness

⁶⁸ Ibid., 11.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 33.

⁷⁰ Steve Clark, *Growing in Faith* (Notre Dame: Indiana: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1972) and *Knowing God's Will* (Notre Dame Indiana: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1972).

⁷¹ Steve Clark, *Where Are We Headed?* (Notre Dame. Indiana: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1973).

of brotherly communion and service, and we should be open to following his leading.⁷²

So we have seen that Clark placed special emphases on the three areas of community development, spiritual renewal, and ecumenism.

RALPH MARTIN

In his book *Hungry For God*, Ralph Martin expressed many ideas that were similar to Steve Clark's writings.⁷³ This book about personal prayer demonstrated that Martin, like Clark, was not only interested in helping to direct the structures of a movement (the two of them were major architects of many structures in CCR⁷⁴), but continually emphasized the centrality of spiritual renewal.

Hungry For God also was written from an ecumenical perspective. In the first chapter, "At the Intersection of Traditions," Martin explained how Catholics, Protestants, and Pentecostals have much to learn from each other. He described his own community (The Word of God in Ann Arbor, Michigan) as an "evangelical-pentecostal-catholic community." He wrote:

There is the great stress on personal knowledge of Jesus as Lord and Savior found in Evangelical Protestantism; the emphasis on the power of the Holy Spirit and the free expression of charismatic gifts that marks Pentecostalism; and the recognition of the tremendous importance of community unity, the place of the Eucharist and the proper role of authority within the body of Christ that is found in Catholicism.⁷⁵

Martin explained that *Hungry For God* was his attempt to bring together the Protestant emphasis on "initial new birth" with the Catholic emphasis on the "whole process of salvation."⁷⁶

Furthermore, Martin emphasized the need for community. He stated, "Each Christian is called to community--not to a vague theologically abstract community, but to a flesh-and-blood commitment to a concrete group of people, a commitment expressed in frequent contact, common service and multiple acts of love."⁷⁷

⁷² Ibid., 25.

⁷³ Ralph Martin, *Hungry For God* (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Spire Books, 1974).

⁷⁴ The Word of God Community in Ann Arbor, Michigan already had over 900 members in 1974. This community, which Martin and Clark had the major roles in developing, was the most influential group in CCR in the 1970s. Servant Publications, which became the major publisher for CCR books, was one of the ministries of this community.

⁷⁵ *Hungry For God*, 13.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 28-29.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 111.

KEVIN RANAGHAN

Charismatic Renewal Services in 1973 published a booklet by Kevin Ranaghan called *The Lord, the Spirit, and the Church*. This booklet discussed the relationship of the charismatic renewal to the Catholic Church. Ranaghan emphasized the need to work for unity among the Christian churches. He didn't want Christians to ignore their differences, or to ignore church directives related to ecumenism. However, he believed that we should accept all Christians as fully brothers and sisters in the Lord, renounce any attitudes of superiority, and feel the pain of separation which can create a longing for unity. Ranaghan believed that the charismatic renewal movement was a privileged moment for the work of ecumenism:

This movement of grace simply cannot be confined to Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox categories. God is moving among his people. His movement is bigger and more powerful than we can imagine. What is the Lord's plan? Certainly he is moving in our history, preparing his people by the renewal of his Spirit to be his witnesses. If his purposes match the uniqueness and power of his present methods among us, then surely we are on the verge of an era of total renewal throughout the Church and of a uniquely effective witness to the world.⁷⁸

Ranaghan's booklet was both apologetic and prophetic. He wanted to help CCR to be fully rooted in the Catholic Church, and he believed that CCR had important insights to bring to the Church. He explained that every effort must be used to be one with the Catholic Church. Attitudes or actions that made CCR seem like a special "in group" claiming to have the full truth needed to be avoided. Any attitude that tended to reject teaching and counsel from "non-charismatic" Christians must be overcome. In summary Ranaghan wrote:

The charismatic renewal in the Catholic Church is the expression or embodiment of a movement on the part of Almighty God for the purpose of charismatically renewing the Church. It is a renewal of the fullness of the gift of the Holy Spirit on every level of Catholic life, especially imparting lively faith in Jesus, a lively sense of worship, and the gifts and ministries of the Holy Spirit. Therefore the charismatic renewal is not an end in itself nor can it have an existence separate from that of the Church. Rather, the charismatic renewal is part of the Church and exists for the renewal of the Church. Thus the resources, spiritual energies, and very lives of individuals and communities in the Catholic charismatic renewal are to be laid down in service for the wellbeing of the whole Church.⁷⁹

Ranaghan also offered ten aspects of Catholic Charismatic Renewal that he believed God wants integrated into the whole Catholic Church:

- 1) Jesus is Lord: making Him the center of our lives.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 28.

- 2) The Spirit is among us: expectancy of His work and power.
- 3) Praise and worship: God-centered, not human-centered prayer.
- 4) The Word: becoming immersed in Sacred Scripture.
- 5) Community: concrete associations with close relationships.
- 6) Ministry: lay ministry; diverse gifts and ministries.
- 7) Authority: Jesus as source and model of authority in Church.
- 8) Subordination: community and ministry need a positive attitude toward being submitted to the leadership of others.
- 9) Relationships: mutual submission, laying down one's life for one another; leadership and ministries should emerge, be tested, and accepted from within a community, not imposed from outside.
- 10) Evangelism: all Christians have the responsibility to bring others to an explicit commitment to Jesus Christ as their risen Lord and Savior.⁸⁰

EDWARD O'CONNOR

Edward O'Connor (one of the two priests on the National Service Committee) in 1972 authored a booklet, *Pentecost in the Modern World*.⁸¹ It was an apologetic work that attempted to demonstrate how the charismatic movement responds to many of the concerns of the modern world raised by Vatican II. He described the movement as transcending the distinction between liberal and conservative. The movement was promoting aspects of the more liberal agenda, such as the issues of dignity and freedom, interpersonal relationships, hunger for religious experience, the actuation of the laity, ecumenism, the liturgical movement, and the biblical movement. At the same time, CCR was following a more conservative tendency in seeking to stay rooted in the Church, and having a positive attitude toward legitimate authority.

Concerning the issue of ecumenism, O'Connor explained that "these people do not get together to compare traditions or discuss differences, but to worship the Father together in the Spirit of Jesus. They do not in any sense renounce or gloss over the beliefs that divide them."⁸²

GEORGE KOSICKI

Fr. George Kosicki (the other priest on the NSC) edited a book in 1973 called *The Lord is My Shepherd, Witnesses of Priests*.⁸³ The book contained stories of priests who had become involved in CCR. The stories focused on the ways that CCR had strengthened and deepened their lives as priests.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 31-45.

⁸¹ Edward O'Connor, *Pentecost in the Modern World* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1972).

⁸² Ibid., 34.

⁸³ George Kosicki, ed., *The Lord is My Shepherd* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1973).

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION ON CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL: GELPI AND MCDONNELL

Donald Gelpi and Kilian McDonnell (both priests) continued their writing about CCR during this time frame. Most of the articles and books in CCR at this time tended to be inspirational writings or theological writings with a *practical /pastoral* emphasis. Gelpi and McDonnell were two of the earliest authors to write from a more *systematic* theological focus. Gelpi's book, *Pentecostal Piety*,⁸⁴ contained three chapters: 1) The Ministry of Healing, 2) The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism, and 3) True and False Conversion. The book promoted both the gifts and insights that Gelpi believed CCR was bringing to the wider Church. He offered background, cautions, and guidelines for CCR in the areas of healing, ecumenism, and conversion. Gelpi believed that there was a need for more Catholic theological reflection on the experience of CCR in order to clarify the relationship of this experience to the whole tradition of the Catholic Church. He feared that some people in CCR too easily assimilated certain Protestant concepts in the areas of healing, ecumenism, and conversion that were not consistent with Catholic theology and spirituality.

Gelpi related prayer for healing to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Anointing of the Sick, but he also explained the appropriateness of prayer for healing outside the sacraments. He emphasized that conversion was not just a single religious experience: "It is obvious that true conversion is a complex human process, far more complex than the mere experience of God in prayer, the experience of 'Spirit-baptism' or the reception of any single gift, including the gift of tongues."⁸⁵ According to Gelpi, Christians need to be aware of the *human factors* that influence conversion, and realize that it is an *ongoing process* of purification and transformation. Some Protestant approaches tend to downplay these aspects of conversion.

Gelpi presented thirteen principles that he derived from the Decree on Ecumenism from Vatican II. He reflected on whether CCR followed these guidelines in its approach to ecumenism. According to Gelpi, since charismatic renewal is a movement of popular piety, there can be a tendency to emphasize common beliefs and downplay differences. These quotes summarize Gelpi's concerns:

Sometimes the soft-pedaling of differences proceeds from ignorance or from error, both of which usually spring from the lack of proper religious instruction...need for a massive educational effort in the charismatic renewal...need systematic instruction both about their own religious tradition and about the points at which their tradition differs from that of other communions...The euphoria and feel-

⁸⁴ Gelpi, *Pentecostal Piety* (New York: Paulist Press, 1972)

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 95.

ings of friendship generated by the experience of praying with others of different Christian communions is no proof whatever of complete solidarity in doctrine...at present the charismatic renewal often does not show sufficient concern to implement the directives of Vatican II concerning the proper theological and historical instruction of individuals who engage in regular ecumenical contacts.⁸⁶

Gelpi explained that the reasons for this lack of concern were not malicious, but stemmed from misguided zeal. Charismatic renewal participants tended to feel that the most important concern was to bring individuals into a deeper experience of Jesus and the Spirit through the charismatic renewal. Then, other issues would take care of themselves.

Kilian McDonnell's writings displayed many of the same concerns as Gelpi. In an article in *Commonweal*⁸⁷ McDonnell spoke positively about CCR as a force for spiritual renewal in the Church. However, like Gelpi, he thought that CCR sometimes borrowed too uncritically from Protestant Pentecostalism, and needed to be more deeply rooted in the Catholic tradition. He thought that the basic lay orientation and language of the movement was not a negative aspect. This orientation supported CCR's focus on primary evangelization. The emphasis in the movement was more on proclamation than theologizing. However, McDonnell believed that "before it is too late, the Catholic charismatics have to rework the charismatic spirituality within the broad framework of the Catholic tradition."⁸⁸

Gelpi emphasized conversion as a process. McDonnell thought that "opening up to the Spirit" (baptism in the Spirit) can be either a kind of "crisis moment" or a gradual "growth process."⁸⁹ According to McDonnell it is important to recognize the validity of both of these ways that God acts in a person's life, but not over-emphasize the "crisis moment" approach that is typical for American Protestant evangelical churches.

McDonnell wrote positively about CCR's work in developing community life, but he thought there would be problems arising from prayer groups and communities being too separate from the parish structure. He stated, "As long as the charismatic groups are groups distinct from the parish, the movement cannot effect its goal which is to renew the whole church charismatically... until the movement relates to the parish in other ways than through prayer groups, the ideal of renewing the church charismatically will be an illusion."⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Ibid., 67-68.

⁸⁷ Kilian McDonnell, "Catholic Charismatics," *Commonweal* (5 May 1972), 207-211.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 211.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 208.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 210.

McDonnell, like Gelpi, was also concerned about ecumenism in CCR. Charismatic Renewal Services published an essay by him that was entitled, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an Ecumenical Problem*.⁹¹ McDonnell explained that each of the major Christian churches has preserved elements of the Christian mystery that we all need to learn from. However, he thought that it was essential, in order to give "credibility to the Pentecostal charismatic reality," that a theologian involved in charismatic renewal work out "the theology of the charismatic experience within the categories of his own denominational tradition."⁹² McDonnell then demonstrated this approach by reflecting on baptism in the Spirit in light of the Catholic Church's development of the whole rite of initiation.

SIMON TUGWELL

Like Gelpi and McDonnell, Simon Tugwell, OP attempted in his book, *Did You Receive the Spirit?*,⁹³ to do a more systematic study of Catholic Charismatic Renewal. He was basically positive toward the movement, but raised a number of concerns. He contended that CCR needed to study more thoroughly the complex relationship among scripture, personal religious experience, church tradition, and theological studies. It was not enough to emphasize "experience" without being rooted in the Catholic tradition of spirituality and theology. Tugwell described "baptism in the Spirit" and the charismatic gifts in light of Catholic teaching and the mystical tradition in Catholicism. He clarified topical areas where Catholics cannot follow the prevalent Classical Pentecostal teaching.

Tugwell's conclusions in his final chapter included some significant areas of disagreement with the directions of CCR encouraged by the National Service Committee.⁹⁴ He wrote, "We should not make a 'thing' out of this. We do not have to become 'Pentecostals,' nor do we have to start a 'movement.'"⁹⁵

He was against the development of a type of catechumenate for baptism in the Holy Spirit (like the Life in the Spirit Seminars). To him this seminar seemed like a type of pseudo-sacramental initiation. He also believed in minimal structure and leadership for prayer groups. He focused on the experience of baptism in the Spirit as encouraging the spiritual life in a general way, rather than the development of particular groups that continue to grow in an ongoing process of spiritual and communal development.

⁹¹ Kilian McDonnell and Arnold Bittlinger, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an Ecumenical Problem* (South Bend, Indiana: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1972).

⁹² Ibid., 31.

⁹³ Simon Tugwell, OP, *Did You Receive the Spirit?* (Great Britain: Darton, Longman & Todd, and New York: Paulist, 1972). Tugwell is writing from Great Britain.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 108-112.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 108.

PASTORAL REFLECTION ON CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

JOHN RANDALL

One of priests who became actively involved in Catholic Charismatic Renewal in the early years was Fr. John Randall. From 1977-1983 he was a member of the National Service Committee. In 1973 he wrote a short book (63 pages), *In God's Providence: the Birth of a Catholic Charismatic Parish*.⁹⁶ Randall explained that "We (he and the members of their prayer group) knew that the Charismatic Renewal, if it ever was going to prove itself, would have to show what it could do in transforming a parish, a territorial parish, an ordinary parish. We were led to propose to the Bishop that we be given the opportunity to try this approach in running a parish."⁹⁷ The bishop of the Providence, Rhode Island diocese accepted their proposal. In the book Randall emphasized the importance of prayer in all the activities and services that the parish was involved with. The parishioners did a great deal of service and organizational work in the poor community around the parish. The parish included in their outreach programs a strong focus on evangelizing the people they contacted and inviting these people to the parish prayer meetings. Randall mentioned that the parish recently had started to develop smaller groups and Christian households within the parish structure. The Word of God Community in Ann Arbor, Michigan was a "mother community" for them in developing an approach to Christian community life.

MICHAEL SCANLON

Other priests also began to write books that reflected their experience in CCR. Fr. Michael Scanlon, T.O.R. (member of National Service Committee 1975-1978) wrote *The Power in Penance*.⁹⁸ The book described how Scanlon's experience in CCR helped him to realize, in a deeper way than he had known before his involvement in CCR, the power of God available for reconciling and bringing Christ's healing to people through the Sacrament of Penance.

JOSEPH PELLETIER

Fr. Joseph A. Pelletier, A.A. wrote a booklet, *A New Pentecost*.⁹⁹ It was a basic introduction to CCR describing CCR's historical beginnings, the influence

⁹⁶ John Randall, *In God's Providence: The Birth of a Catholic Charismatic Parish* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1973).

⁹⁷ Ibid., 35-36.

⁹⁸ Michael Scanlon, T.O.R., *The Power in Penance* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1972).

⁹⁹ Joseph A. Pelletier, A.A., *A New Pentecost* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Assumption Publications, 1974). This booklet was published by Pelletier's religious order. It, therefore, was mainly distributed on the east coast of the U.S. However, over 8,000 copies were sold in its first 2-3 years.

CCR can have on a person's spiritual life, the sense of community and mission, reflections on the sanctifying and ministry gifts, and the basis of CCR in the scriptures. The booklet had a very positive tone. For example, Pelletier wrote, "The people involved at the very start of this new Pentecost and were destined to direct the movement in this country (and indeed even beyond it) were clearly "hand-picked" by the Lord. They were all highly qualified intellectuals..."¹⁰⁰ Pelletier described CCR as a new Pentecost for the Catholic Church. He believed that CCR was both a movement rooted in the Catholic faith as well as a gift to the Church for its continual renewal.

VINCENT WALSH

Another book that introduced people to CCR was *A Key to Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church* by Fr. Vincent M. Walsh.¹⁰¹ It is a large book (286 pages) written in a question and answer format. Walsh was very positive about the movement, but also used the question and answer format to give responses to the most common concerns and questions that people had about CCR. His final chapter was called "Problems in Charismatic Renewal." Walsh warned charismatic leaders about possible problem areas. The areas covered in the book included the understanding of baptism in the Spirit and the charismatic gifts. It also included the issues of social action, ecumenism, and leadership. Possible problem areas included:

To allow the Baptism of the Spirit to become almost sacramental, both in its explanation and in its practice.

To use this term to sharply distinguish between "Spirit-filled" and those not "Spirit-filled," leading to all kinds of unsound theological conclusions.

To overlook the fact that many do experience the Holy Spirit in their lives, even though they might not have received the Baptism of the Spirit.

To see the Baptism of the Spirit as so important that other means of sanctification (Sacraments, liturgical prayer, normal Church life) are overlooked or looked down upon.

To deny the objective help of sacraments because of overstressing the importance of subjective dispositions.

To afford people who exercise striking charismatic gifts a larger role in Church life than God wills.

To confuse the presence of gifts with holiness, so that the gifts cover up the lack of even basic goodness.

To see God's action only in the charismatic gifts, being unwilling to listen to other sources for direction, e.g., complaints of others, guidance of Church authorities.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 5.

¹⁰¹ Vincent M. Walsh, *A Key to Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1974).

To contrast too sharply the charismatic and noncharismatic Church leadership, and being willing to listen only to those who exercise gifts.¹⁰²

Walsh did not want to emphasize ecumenism as much as the National Service Committee. He thought that CCR was not primarily an ecumenical movement. He described CCR as a still-young and unformed movement that cannot carry the weight of a strong ecumenical focus. He, also, thought that if CCR moved too quickly toward ecumenism "it will be totally unable to touch the millions of Catholics who have not yet experienced a full life in the Spirit."¹⁰³ CCR would be seriously weakened if it did not use all the elements of sanctification that are a part of the Catholic tradition. Walsh specifically mentioned that Life in the Spirit Seminars needed to draw on Catholic tradition and practices. Groups that were already interdenominational needed to foster charity and thoughtfulness, not accent ecumenical difficulties and religious differences, but still face honestly their religious divisions and diverse practices and beliefs.¹⁰⁴

BIBLICAL/PASTORAL REFLECTIONS ON CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL GEORGE MONTAGUE

A major figure in CCR surfacing near the end of this timeframe was Fr. George Montague, SM. Montague, a highly respected biblical scholar, was the general editor of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* in 1973-1974 when he began to write about his involvement in CCR. From 1978-1982 he was a member of the National Service Committee for the CCR.

In *The Spirit and His Gifts*¹⁰⁵ Montague gave a scholarly biblical study of baptism in the Spirit, glossolalia (praying in tongues), and prophecy. He challenged some of the classical Pentecostals who said that people cannot be baptized in the Spirit if they do not receive the gift of tongues. In opposition to some classical Pentecostals, he concluded that *conversion, baptism, and receiving the gift of the Spirit* are meant to be united in the process of Christian initiation, rather than three totally separate events or experiences.

In the book *Riding the Wind*, Montague wrote a more popular reflection on the charismatic experience, and his own involvement in CCR.¹⁰⁶ He reflected on the Spirit's role in transforming us in body, soul, and spirit. He described the needed balance of both being *led by the Spirit* and *rooted in the Word of God*. He included a final chapter on "Mary and Learning the Ways of the Spirit."

JOHN HAUGHEY

¹⁰² Ibid., 277.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 282.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 281.

¹⁰⁵ George T. Montague, SM, *The Spirit and His Gifts* (New York: Paulist, 1974).

¹⁰⁶ George T. Montague, SM, *Riding the Wind* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1974).

*The Conspiracy of God: The Holy Spirit in Us*¹⁰⁷ by Fr. John C. Haughey, SJ was not specifically about the charismatic movement. However, the preface was written by Cardinal Suenens who mentioned that the book would be helpful for people in CCR, and would help others to understand the focus on the Holy Spirit in CCR. In the first two chapters Haughey traced the presence of the Spirit in Jesus' life and that of the early Church. In chapter 3 he attempted to give a description of the personality of the Spirit. His final two chapters were a discernment of contemporary spiritualities of the Spirit, and reflections on an approach for discerning what is truly the work of the Spirit.

Haughey placed contemporary spiritualities within three general categories: 1) *Programatic* – focusing on the teaching that the visible Church passes on to me; 2) *Autogenous* – focusing on what I have personally found that gives meaning to my world; looking at the Church selectively; 3) *Pneumatic* – focusing on the immediate presence and relationship with God; felt knowledge; reveres the Church but focuses on the inner relationship with Jesus. The “pneumatic” should not be equated with “pentecostal” since Haughey thought that some “pentecostals” are more “programmatic.”¹⁰⁸

Haughey's conclusion was that the Holy Spirit can be acting in all three approaches. People with any of these three approaches can tend to have an egotism that understands God working only in the way they have come to understand and be comfortable with. We must look for the legitimate work of the Spirit in all three approaches.¹⁰⁹

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES OF CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

Based on information from a sociological study she did in 1973, Mary Ellen Greeley, RSM, wrote an article, “Charismatics and Non-charismatics: A Comparison,” that was published in *Review for Religious* in 1974.¹¹⁰ The study compared Catholics involved with CCR with Catholics who were not involved. She concluded that CCR members “cannot be distinguished in any obvious or simple way from their non-charismatic peers.” They are highly orthodox, and not actively concerned with “forcing change in church structure, either in liturgy or in authority.” Praying in tongues is very meaningful to them, but it is not seen as such an extraordinary means of prayer to them. CCR members are not more problem-ridden than others, but they do tend to be more pessimistic about the

¹⁰⁷ John C. Haughey, SJ, *The Conspiracy of God* (American Press, 1973, and Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 79-84.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 89.

¹¹⁰ Mary Ellen Greeley, RSM, “Charismatics and Non-charismatics: A Comparison,” *Review for Religious* 33 (1974/2): 315-335.

state of the world, and show signs of more cultural alienation (watch less television, less enamored by popular spectator sports, more suspicious of politics). Finally, “non-charismatics” who know people involved in CCR acknowledge the sincerity of members, and are surprised at some people they never thought would become involved, but still tend to perceive CCR as an “emotional” movement.¹¹¹

Marian Content

First, we will investigate the Marian content of *New Covenant* magazine and *The Pecos Benedictine* newsletter. This investigation will give us an overall sense of how CCR approached Marian devotion and reflection within this timeframe. Secondly, we will look at individual authors.

MARIAN CONTENT IN NEW COVENANT

New Covenant did not have any articles that had Mary as the specific focus during this timeframe (May 1975 will be the first article on Mary). However, Mary was mentioned occasionally within articles.

Mary was most commonly mentioned as a model for responding fully to God (especially to the Holy Spirit). Five examples can be found:

1) Bishop Joseph McKinney in “An Open Letter to Priests”¹¹² encouraged priests to be involved with CCR. He described the continual openness that priests need to have to the workings of the Spirit. He used Mary as a model: “Mary’s *Fiat* is a splendid example. We must keep saying yes. This presumes we are willing to listen and adjust as God requires.”¹¹³

2) In an article, “Yahweh Speaks: Creation Responds” by Sr. Renee Domier,¹¹⁴ Mary’s response to God was also mentioned: “Marvel at the fullness of response which Mary, and her Son, Jesus, gave to the Father.”¹¹⁵

3) Patty Gallagher concluded the description of her experience on the Duquesne Weekend by quoting Mary’s Magnificat, and writing “May Mary’s hymn of praise be truly our own.”¹¹⁶

4) Fr. Salvador Carrillo Alday, M.Sp.S. in the article, “The Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Theological and Pastoral Questions,”¹¹⁷ twice referred to Mary. After quoting Acts 1: 14 he wrote:

¹¹¹ Ibid., 334-335.

¹¹² *New Covenant* (June 1972), 8-9.

¹¹³ Ibid., 9.

¹¹⁴ *New Covenant* (September 1972), 18-21.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 20

¹¹⁶ “Are You Ready?” *New Covenant* (February 1973), 2-3.

¹¹⁷ *New Covenant* (April 1974), 27-30.

This list is important because this is the small community that will receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit in a few days. The reference to Mary is important because just as the Holy Spirit descended on her and covered her with his shadow so she could conceive Jesus (cf. Luke 1: 35), so now the power of the Holy Spirit will descend on this small nucleus to give life to the growing Church. Mary had an essential role to play in the birth of Jesus and it is fitting that she also assist in her role as mother at what Pope Paul VI has called "the historical birth of the Church"...In the baptism in the Spirit, a receptive attitude prevails: Jesus glorified is asked to pour out his Spirit and his abundant gifts upon the person who is "baptized in the Holy Spirit." This receptive attitude is similar to Mary's when she answered to the will of God, as spoken by the angel Gabriel: "Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let what you have said be done to me" (Luke 1: 38).

5) Robert Frost in the article, "Dynamic Tension," mentioned Mary among the faithful remnant who awaited God's redemption, and were given to us today as examples of "ordinary individuals who responded in extraordinary faith and obedience."¹¹⁸

Two individuals also gave personal testimonies to Mary's help in their being able to respond to God. One man recalled how the moment he finally began to be open to the Spirit's leading was during a time he was praying the rosary and asked Jesus and his mother to help him.¹¹⁹ Another man, Audrey Guillet, explained the effects of being baptized in the Spirit in his life: "Not only do I have a tremendous new interest in Scripture but also my childhood devotion to Mary has returned, with the daily recitation of the rosary with my parents."¹²⁰

CARDINAL SUENENS IN NEW COVENANT

By far the most influential person who described Mary as a model, and a helper in responding to God was Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens. The June 1973 issue of *New Covenant* included an interview with Cardinal Suenens, and the July 1973 issue gave excerpts from his homily at the 1973 Notre Dame international conference.

In both of these issues Cardinal Suenens stressed Mary's role:

I sensed the working of the Spirit in various ways over the years. I sensed him at work in the Legion of Mary. The main promise of the Legion of Mary is to the Holy Spirit, not to Mary. To me, this illustrates an important truth. Christ is born both of' the Spirit and of Mary. We need to recognize both elements to keep the right balance. If you are only pneumatological, concerned with the Spirit, you risk remaining up in the air. There is a need also to stress the Incarnation, the way God works through our common humanity. This we find in Mary. [He then

¹¹⁸ *New Covenant* (June 1974), 30-32.

¹¹⁹ *New Covenant* (August 1971), 2-3.

¹²⁰ "A New Life With God," *New Covenant* (March 1973), 7-8.

quotes Karl Rahner's response to Suenens that Christianity today is being made into an abstraction, and that abstractions do not need mothers.]"¹²¹

Just to conclude, I want to confide in you a little secret, which you may tell to everyone, about how to receive the Holy Spirit in the best way. Unity in the Spirit is in our unity with Mary, the mother of God. Christ was born out of the Spirit by the cooperation of Mary. On the day of Pentecost, the Church was born the same way. Mary was there helping the apostles to receive the Spirit of God. May we be simple children of Mary, the woman, and open all that we are to the fullness of the Spirit of God. Thank you for being here in the name of the Church. Thank you for the future coming out of this.¹²²

As was mentioned earlier in describing the 1973 international conference, Rev. Joseph M. O'Meara wrote a letter to the editor of *New Covenant*¹²³ because he believed that Suenens' words about Mary caused tension and confusion, especially for people in ecumenical charismatic groups. He then offered a short reflection on the place of Mary and the saints in the Church.

O'Meara explained how Catholics believe that revelation comes to Christians from both Scripture and tradition. Scripture itself points to this understanding. Catholics believe that devotion to Mary and the saints has its "seed" in the Scriptures and the apostolic Church, but continues to develop within the Church over the centuries. For Catholics to have the same mind as Christ Jesus (Philippians 2:5) includes honoring Jesus' mother. While sometimes in history this honor became too exclusive, devotion should not be judged by distortions. O'Meara points out that it would be wrong to judge all Pentecostals by those who go to excesses (like drinking poison because of Mark 16:18). A balanced understanding of honor given to Mary has always led to greater honor and praise for Jesus.

Finally, O'Meara touched on the issue of praying *to* Mary and the saints. He stated that explaining this practice was beyond the scope of his brief reflections. However, he proposed that we cannot ignore the experience of many Christians who "testify that their love, honor and praise for the Lord has been nurtured and deepened by their love, honor and prayers to those who most perfectly reflected the Lord in this life."¹²⁴ O'Meara rejoiced that God was working to create unity among Christians especially through charismatic renewal.

One other time the issue of excessive honor given to Mary was raised in a *New Covenant* article.¹²⁵ This article, focusing on social justice, used the example of excessive honor to Mary in talking about the issue of excessive pro-Ameri-

¹²¹ *New Covenant* (June 1973), 4.

¹²² *New Covenant* (July 1973), 11.

¹²³ *New Covenant* (September 1973), 28-29.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹²⁵ Phil O'Mara, "Social Action: Part Two," *New Covenant* (November 1972), 13-14, 19-20.

canism in a church. Both honoring Mary and pro-Americanism are good things, but can become negative factors in the church when they become so influential that they take the place of the most central truths in the church.

Previously, we described the influence of Sr. Elena Guerra on Pope Leo XIII at the end of the 19th century. An article in *New Covenant* (October 1973) quotes from some of Guerra's letters to Leo XIII. Guerra expressed a positive attitude toward Mary's role in the Church, but also implied that Mary had sometimes overshadowed the role of the Holy Spirit. Guerra expressed her "desire to see the whole Church united in a continuous union of prayer in the same way that Mary and the apostles were united in prayer in the Upper Room before Pentecost....Oh, if ever the 'Come Holy Spirit' which, since the Cenacle and after, the Church has not ceased repeating, could become as popular as the 'Hail Mary.'"¹²⁶

The author, Fr. Val Gaudet, offered the hypothesis that there was a connection between the pope's focus on the Holy Spirit, and the start of Pentecostalism around the same time at the turn of the century. Gaudet also perceived a similar connection between Pope John XXIII's prayer for the Holy Spirit before the Second Vatican Council, and the start of CCR soon after the council.

While most of the reflections on Mary in *New Covenant* were related to her being a personal model and helper in being fully open to God, a few writers touched on the Mary/Church relationship which was a major emphasis in the documents of Vatican II. We have already seen how Cardinal Suenens described the importance of Mary's presence at the birth of the Church at Pentecost, and that he believed she is a means to unity in the church.

Bishop Stephen A. Leven of San Angelo, Texas encouraged CCR to both become more Pentecostal while remaining fully Catholic. He stated that no one honors Jesus by downgrading Mary, or downgrading the church which Mary represents: "Jesus Christ comes to us as the son of Mary. No one accepts Christ as he comes to us by neglecting Mary; no one honors him by downgrading her."¹²⁷ Lee Gilbert, in an article about the liturgy of the Eucharist, also used the idea of Mary's relation to the Church, describing both of them as being bride, mother, virgin, and New Eve of the New Adam.¹²⁸

Finally, we should be aware of some significant literature in *New Covenant* that had no mention of Mary. The "Statement on the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" published in *New Covenant* (January 1974) had no mention of Mary. Kevin Ranaghan's reflections on the first seven years of

¹²⁶ Fr. Val Gaudet, "A Woman and the Pope," *New Covenant* (October 1973), 4-6; quote from 5.

¹²⁷ *New Covenant* (November 1971), 24-25.

¹²⁸ "Celebration," *New Covenant* (August 1972), 8-9.

CCR in the March 1974 *New Covenant* also had no mention of Mary. His booklet, *The Lord, the Spirit, and the Church*, which reflected on the role of CCR in the Church did not mention Mary.

MARIAN CONTENT IN THE PECOS BENEDICTINE NEWSLETTER

The Pecos Benedictine monthly newsletter (circulation of 20,000 by July 1974) contained somewhat more Marian content than *New Covenant*. Since the Benedictine Abbey that published the newsletter was called Our Lady of Guadalupe Abbey, Mary would easily be in their thoughts. In 1973 Dove (the Abbey's publishing department) published a pamphlet called *Mary is Pentecostal*.¹²⁹ The authors of this pamphlet gave us an idea of how Marian devotion was perceived in CCR at that time. They sensed a tension between Marian movements and CCR:

I have friends who are dedicated to the Blessed Mother who look with fear and apprehension on those who are in the Charismatic Movement and pray for the conversion of those straying brethren. And there are sincere people in the Charismatic Movement who think that devotion to Mary detracts from the true worship of God and has no place in the life of the Spirit.

With a foot in both camps, I have been pained to witness this needless antagonism. Though it is not true that all charismatics are opposed to Mary, and all Marian devotees against the Charismatic Movement, there has been much opposition due to mutual misunderstandings.¹³⁰

The booklet presented a few basic ideas on the ways that Mary is closely associated with the Holy Spirit in Scripture.

The December 1973 *Pecos Benedictine* contained an article called "The Spirit-filled Mary" by Tere Scully. The article became one of their leaflets.¹³¹ Scully explained that the Scriptures call us to praise the Lord in his works (cf. Psalm 150:2), and Mary is one of God's masterpieces. Jesus and Mary were always united, and the bond between them was the Holy Spirit. Mary was able to move with the wind of the Spirit embracing unmarried motherhood, visiting Elizabeth, traveling to Bethlehem and Egypt, and following Jesus in his ministry even to the cross. Mary, like Jesus, is a person of prayer who pondered and kept in her heart God's actions in her life (cf. Luke 2:19, 51). Mary's *Magnificat* shows that she knew the Scriptures and had taken them deeply into her life, like her Son. As Jesus witnessed that it was his Father doing great things in him, so Mary testified that it is God who has accomplished great things in her. Jesus demonstrated many charismatic gifts in his ministry. Mary also demon-

¹²⁹ Louis Pfaller, OSB, and J. Alberts, BOC, *Mary is Pentecostal* (Pecos: Dove, 1973).

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹³¹ Tere Scully, "The Spirit-filled Mary," *The Pecos Benedictine* (December 1973), 8-9.

strated a gift of *prophecy* in Luke 1:46-55, *discernment* in knowing she should visit Elizabeth, and the gift of *knowledge* at the wedding feast of Cana. Both Jesus and Mary entered into glorification through suffering. Mary accepted her destiny that was prophesied by Simeon "...you yourself shall be pierced with a sword" (Luke 2:35). Romans 8:17 teaches us that if we suffer with Christ, we shall be glorified with him. Scully concluded by saying that Mary in a special way shows us how to be formed in Christ's image through docility to the Spirit.

Also in the December 1973 issue of *The Pecos Benedictine*, Abbot David Geraets, OSB. of Pecos wrote an article, "Jesus Christ Is Lord!"¹³² In the article Geraets mentioned that Jesus' humanity was preserved from sin through Mary's Immaculate Conception and the virgin birth. He emphasized that the marriage feast of Cana points to the beginning of a new marriage covenant of God with his people. Mary had a special role in asking Jesus to bring forth the new wine. She seemed to be asking Jesus to "pour out" (baptize with) your Spirit so that Israel may give a perfect response to Yahweh's loving invitation."¹³³ The new wine symbolized the new covenant and new order of the Spirit that was begun with Jesus.

In addition to glossolalia (praying in tongues), Pecos promoted the *Jesus Prayer* and the *rosary* as approaches for entering into contemplative prayer and prayer of the heart. Dove sold a scriptural rosary booklet that was advertised in a section that promoted books on glossolalia, the Jesus Prayer, and prayer of the heart.

Finally, the July 1974 issue included a "Pastoral on the Holy Spirit" by Bishop Edward A. McCarthy of Phoenix. This letter to his diocese reflected on spiritual movements with a special emphasis on Catholic Charismatic Renewal. McCarthy quoted Pope Paul VI's words to the CCR leaders in Rome in 1973; described baptism in the Holy Spirit; and reflected on Pentecost, spiritual gifts, and community. In this context he mentioned Mary being overshadowed by the Spirit in conceiving Jesus, and the apostles being gathered together "around Mary" in prayerful waiting for the gift of the Spirit that would come on Pentecost.

MARIAN CONTENT IN BOOKS OF THIS TIMEFRAME

MARY AND ECUMENISM

Previously, we studied how the authors of the *Life in the Spirit, Team Manual* described the manual as being written for the use of all Christian denominations and concerned with the basics of the Christian life that lead to a new

¹³² David Geraets, OSB, "Jesus Christ Is Lord!" *The Pecos Benedictine* (December 1973): 3-4.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 4.

life in Christ and the Spirit. Mary was not mentioned in any of the editions of this frequently used manual until a special Catholic edition came out in 1979.

Two of the authors in this timeframe mention Mary in relation to the CCR's concern with ecumenism. Donald Gelpi expressed the opinion that most charismatic Catholics are largely oblivious of the issues that divide the various churches. He included "devotion to Mary" among the areas that divide Catholics from most Protestants. Gelpi emphasized that Catholics involved in ecumenism must have a basic understanding and acceptance of the Catholic teaching in such areas as the sacramental system, the papacy and role of bishops, and the role of the Blessed Virgin Mary.¹³⁴

Kilian McDonnell proposed an insight concerning the reason why Mary may be more or less important in various Christians' lives:

What does focus do in terms of the quality of character of spiritual growth? Let me illustrate by speaking of a good friend of mine who has a great devotion to Mary. I must hasten to add that this devotion to Mary is thoroughly biblical and theologically balanced. Though Mary plays a role in my own personal life it has never been of the character of Mary's role in the life of my friend. The focus of his spirituality is on Mary while mine is elsewhere. I must honestly say that the manner in which Mary is operative in my friend's life is remarkable in terms of prayer, recollection, service to others, openness. I do not perceive that Mary is operative in my own life either to that degree or with that character.

Focus makes a difference. If there is a focus on fullness of life in the Spirit, if there is a special openness to the Holy Spirit, if one's expectations are wide, if one has a special concern to allow the Holy Spirit to live and reign within so that Jesus may be proclaimed as Lord, then it is quite possible that in terms of that focus the Holy Spirit will be operative in the life of this Christian in a manner and to a degree not found in one who is devout but who has a different focus.¹³⁵

McDonnell emphasized that *focus* and *expectation* are aspects of the gift of faith. When our faith is focused on receiving a certain gift, and we grow in expectation of receiving that gift, we become more open to receiving that particular gift.

A good example of the importance of focus and expectation is found in Ralph Martin's book, *Hungry For God*. Martin, like Steve Clark and Kevin Ranaghan, tended to say very little about Mary, because of his conscious attempt to write for an ecumenical audience. However, in this book he described how the experience of visiting the house where St. Ignatius of Loyola lived led him to a new insight about the saints and Mary:

I went with him (a Jesuit priest), not knowing what to expect, since the whole cult of the saints of the Catholic Church had become a background part of my

¹³⁴ Gelpi, *Pentecostal Piety*, 64.

¹³⁵ Kilian McDonnell, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an Ecumenical Problem*, 49.

life. I really didn't know quite how to make sense of it in light of the need for the overwhelming centrality of Christ to stand out clearly.

Also, I was concerned about the unfortunate practical results of exalting a few great Christians, "the saints," in a way that gave people the idea that full union with God was only for the few and not for the whole people of God... As we arrived at the section of the building where St. Ignatius lived, something began to happen within me. I began to experience the presence of God in a marked way, and I began to feel my heart drawn to a single-minded love for Jesus... I also began to experience Ignatius present *with us* in what God was doing today in bringing about a true gospel renewal of His people in a way that was encouraging and inspiring, in a way that moved me to a deeper love for Jesus and a desire to serve Him more completely as Ignatius himself had done in his day. Ignatius is with Jesus now and with us, as an elder brother in the Lord who by his life and example and active concern for us now is moving us on to love of Jesus. It began to click what the "cult of the saints and Mary" could mean. I saw their transparency and how when we truly came into contact with them, we noticed not so much them, but Jesus within them, and found our hearts and attention turning, not so much to them as to the One who dwells within them, the One whom they serve.¹³⁶

It was the focus of this particular experience that brought Martin to a new understanding of the role of Mary and the saints. Before his experience, the saints were only a "background" issue for him. The saints were "pastorally" problematic for him because he thought they could take away from the centrality of Jesus in people's lives. It was a spiritual experience, aided by the focus that came from being at St. Ignatius' house that changed his perspective.

MARIAN APPARITIONS

A number of authors continued to mention Marian apparitions. Gelpi compared CCR to charismatic movements related to the Sacred Heart, Lourdes, or Fatima.¹³⁷ The only citation related to Mary in Clark's book, *Growing in Faith*, was the inclusion of *The Miracle of Lourdes* among four faith building books he recommended at the end of his book.¹³⁸ In *Building Christian Communities* Clark's only reference to Mary involved his use of the Legion of Mary as an example when describing different kinds of movements in the Church.¹³⁹ Walsh mentioned Lourdes and Fatima to help demonstrate that the Church has affirmed the legitimacy of healing ministry.¹⁴⁰ He also noted how involvement in CCR reawakens an appreciation of traditional practices such as the rosary.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Ralph Martin, *Hungry for God*, 129-130.

¹³⁷ Donald Gelpi, *Pentecostal Piety*, 28.

¹³⁸ Steve Clark, *Growing in Faith*, 56.

¹³⁹ Steve Clark, *Building Christian Communities*, 152-153.

¹⁴⁰ Vincent M. Walsh, *A Key to Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church*, 9.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 12.

There have been only brief references to Mary in the authors that we have studied so far in this timeframe. The authors did not demonstrate any significant focus on Mary. However, during this time frame some priest-authors began to give more of a focus to reflection on Mary in relationship to the charismatic experience.

MARIAN CONTENT IN PRIEST-AUTHORS

Tugwell demonstrated his own devotion to Mary when he ended the preface to *Did You Receive the Holy Spirit?* with the prayer: "And may Mary, the mother of the Lord, pray with us, as she did with the first disciples at Pentecost, that upon us too the Holy spirit may be poured out, the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, then the eyes of our heart being opened, we may know the hope of our calling, and rejoice with unspeakable and holy joy, and speak with boldness the Word of God. Amen,"¹⁴² However, in the rest of the book he did not refer to any connectedness between Mary and the Spirit. His only other citation on Mary was to say that involvement in CCR leads to an increased devotion to Mary in many cases.¹⁴³

JOHN HAUGHEY

In *The Conspiracy of God* John Haughey reflected on the relationship of Mary with Jesus and the Holy Spirit. He wrote:

It should prove fruitful, I think, to try to understand the relationship between Jesus and His Father in terms of presence. But even before the full presence of the Father as Father could be experienced by the Son, there had to be a capacity in Jesus for relationship, or an ability to be wholly present to the other as oneself and fully receptive to the otherness of the of the other. In this connection, his mother presumably played an enormously important role. In fact, the significance of her virginity may pale in importance by comparison to her ability to accept the complete otherness of her Son without erasing any of his uniqueness which she could not fully understand. Scripture takes note of Mary's capacity for pondering events and other's words. She makes room in her heart for words of men and angels that speak of unexpected things. She received them in their otherness... Her whole being made room for him (Jesus) first in her womb and then interpersonally. He, in turn, developed his own immense capacity for receiving and being present to the other, first of all from his mother... Mary is the instrument the Spirit used to bring about the union of God with man and Jesus with his Father.¹⁴⁴

Haughey explained Jesus' capacity to be present to others as the work of Mary and the Spirit.

¹⁴² Simon Tugwell, *Did You Receive the Holy Spirit?*, 11-12.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁴⁴ John Haughey, *The Conspiracy of God*, 13-14.

Later in the book, Haughey reflected on the need to live with mystery if we are to be open to the Spirit. He described Mary's response to the angel, "Be it done unto me according to thy word," as an example of being able to live with mystery.¹⁴⁵ Both Mary and the Holy Spirit help people to have a capacity for relationship with others, and to be able to live graciously with the unknown and with the mystery of God's action in our lives.

JOHN RANDALL

Fr. John Randall in his first book, *In God's Providence*, and in later books and conferences, demonstrated a strong belief in Mary's influence within CCR. In describing the gathering place of the first prayer group in his parish, he wrote, "The address, incidentally, was Notre Dame Avenue, very significantly bringing Mary into the picture here, as she seems to be in so much of the Pentecostal Renewal."¹⁴⁶ He explained that many people in their prayer community have a strong devotion to the Blessed Virgin. The prayer community decided to send to Portugal for a replica of the Lady of Fatima statue known as the Pilgrim Virgin. The statue travels from family to family in the parish. Randall explained that "Mary always points to Jesus. Where she is, He is glorified."¹⁴⁷

JOSEPH PELLETIER

Fr. Joseph Pelletier was not as widely known in CCR, but was known for his Marian writings and devotion.¹⁴⁸ In his booklet, *A New Pentecost*, Pelletier included a special section on Mary and CCR, as well as weaving reflections on Mary throughout the booklet. He pointed out that the outpouring of the Spirit on the Duquesne Weekend took place on a Saturday night. Saturday is traditionally linked with Mary and reminds us of Mary's presence at the first Pentecost. Further, he believed that it was not without significance that the movement quickly spread to a university officially dedicated to the mother of Jesus (Notre Dame).¹⁴⁹

In describing the effects of baptism in the Spirit in people's lives, Pelletier wrote that people are drawn "very powerfully to the great traditional sources of grace; prayer, scripture, the Eucharist, and Our Lady."¹⁵⁰ He believed that the love of Mary which was significantly lost since Vatican II was being en-

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 64.

¹⁴⁶ John Randall, *In God's Providence*, 20.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 56-57.

¹⁴⁸ He had already authored two books on Mary: Joseph Pelletier, A.A., *The Sun Danced at Fatima* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Caron, 1957), and *Mary, Our Mother* (Worcester, Massachusetts: Assumption, 1972).

¹⁴⁹ *A new Pentecost*, p.4.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 12.

kindled by the Holy Spirit through the charismatic renewal both in Catholics and in other Christians. He made a bold statement that not all CCR leaders at that time would tend to agree with: "Specifically Catholic prayer groups whose leaders deliberately exclude or discourage acknowledgement of Mary in their meetings cannot expect the blessing of her Son; they cannot hope for the rich and abundant fruit that normally could be anticipated."¹⁵¹

Pelletier went on to emphasize that Mary is an important channel of grace in leading us to Jesus. He quoted Cardinal Suenen's words at the 1973 Notre Dame conference about the importance of Mary's help in receiving the Spirit fully.

Pelletier explained that the Holy Spirit is leading us to Mary so that we can continually grow closer to Jesus, and that Jesus leads us to Mary so we can be born of Mary like Jesus. We should have Jesus' own tender affection for his mother.¹⁵²

Finally, Pelletier, in talking about the sanctifying gifts of the Spirit, stated that Mary had these gifts operative in her to a supreme degree. However, he also wrote: "The charismatic gifts were not active for this would not have been understood by her contemporaries and would have drawn attention away from Jesus."¹⁵³ Other authors in CCR disagreed with the idea that Mary did not display the use of charismatic gifts. We have already seen authors who explained how Mary exercised such gifts as prophecy, discernment, and knowledge. Future authors will include the gift of tongues (she was among the disciples at Pentecost who all began to speak in tongues) and other charismatic gifts.

GEORGE MONTAGUE

Fr. George Montague, SM, a member of the Society of Mary, became a major figure in encouraging Marian reflection in CCR. Most of the CCR authors focusing on Mary had written mainly popular and devotional reflections. Montague's literature brought together scholarly biblical reflection along with a spiritual and pastoral sensitivity.

In *The Spirit and His Gifts* Montague demonstrated some of his scholarly reflection in responding to another author's statement that there are no Christians (properly speaking) before Pentecost:

The case of the Virgin Mary would seem to be an exception, in the light of what Luke says of her in 1:45, and implicitly in 1:38 and 11:28. But the exception is precisely that her personal Pentecost was anticipated in order that the child might be conceived (1:35) and also, most probably, if we follow the par-

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 22.

¹⁵² Ibid., 23.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 34.

allel of Luke with Acts, that she might be the prototype of the believing (Luke 1:45; Acts 1:15, 17) and Spirit-filled (Luke 1:35; Acts 2:11) community. But see also Luke 1:15, 41, 67; 2:25).¹⁵⁴

Other authors had described Mary as "pentecostal" or "the model charismatic," but Montague, like J. Massingberd Ford, used the evidence from comparing Luke 1-2 with Acts 1-2 (also written by Luke) to describe Mary as the prototype of the Church, especially in her faith and response to the Holy Spirit.

Montague in *Riding the Wind* gave the most substantial reflections on Mary of anyone in CCR up to the time of its publishing in 1974. In describing how the work of the Spirit precedes that of the Word, he explained that the Spirit hovering over us prepares our hearts to receive the Word as the Spirit hovered over Mary to bring about the enfleshment of the Word in person.¹⁵⁵ As Mary had to trustingly await the "womb-dark work of the Spirit," all of us can allow the Spirit to hover over the chaotic and dark aspects in our lives until the creative Spirit begins to make all things new.¹⁵⁶

The final chapter of Montague's book was called "Mary and Learning the Ways of the Spirit." Montague indicated that we grow in the ways of the Spirit not only through private illumination, but through the community of believers who dispose us to the Spirit's gifts by the way they witness and model a life of yielding to the Spirit. Montague responded to the question about why we need Mary as a model when we have Jesus as our model by saying, "Jesus cannot embody *response* to Jesus, any more than Mary can be the gift to which she is responding."¹⁵⁷

Montague noted that the Gospels of Luke and John portray Mary embodying two basic aspects of the Christian life: *faith in the Lord's Word* and *docility to the Holy Spirit*. He described Mary's faith by studying these passages: 1) the wedding feast of Cana (John 2); 2) comparing Zechariah's seeking a sign, with Mary's not needing a sign from the angel; 3) Elizabeth proclaiming Mary blessed for having believed (Luke 1:45); and 4) Luke 11:28 where Jesus proclaims that blessed are those who hear the Word of God and keep it.

Mary, also, is a type of the Church in her docility to the Holy Spirit. Montague wrote:

The movement of the Spirit is thus translated in more assimilable light by the deep desire and longing of this woman-type. Thus the invitation of the Spirit is echoed by the invitation of the Church, personified as a woman:

¹⁵⁴ George Montague, *The Spirit and His Gifts*, 53.

¹⁵⁵ George Montague, *Riding the Wind*, 61.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

"The Spirit and the Bride say, 'Come.'" The Bride's "Come" is the Spirit's "Come" put in her heart, and that "Come" is addressed on the one hand to the Lord Jesus to hasten his return, and, on the other hand, to the believer to lead him to the waters which will give him the refreshing foretaste of that coming (Rev. 22:17). All of this suggests that the Spirit's activity in the individual and in the community is experienced in an intuitive, integral "feminine" receptivity that cannot be fully known in analytical "masculine" ways. The most amazing thing is that the Lord has given his Church not merely a Jungian archetype but a very real person from whom this "intuitive" way can be learned. It is Mary. With Mary I learn to listen in the Spirit to the Word. I learn above all to wait for the fullness of that word and not to seize too rapidly on that partial aspect of the word which appeals to my impetuosity. If Mary is the model listener, then recalling her can dispose me to the Spirit's action of preparing my heart for the Word.¹⁵⁸

Finally, Montague thought that cultivating devotion to Mary in CCR could bring a sense of balance and wholeness. According to Montague, sometimes "charismatics" can focus too much on the initial movement of the Spirit. They can seize on a partial view, rather than patiently discerning the whole picture in a balanced, Marian way. Mary's presence and wholeness help us to interpret the Spirit in the most wholesome way. Montague wrote, "As a word takes its meaning from the context in which it appears, so the word of God takes its meaning from the context in which God chooses to have it appear. That context two thousand years ago was the womb and heart of Mary. Is there any reason to think that it would be different today?"¹⁵⁹

Montague indicated that "charismatics" can have a great zeal to share their faith. Mary can help to keep zeal from becoming impatience, self-righteousness, or frustration. In the upper room she was surrounded by Jesus' disciples who still did not understand what Jesus was all about, who were still hiding in fear, and didn't know how or what to pray for. Mary, on the other hand, had already received her personal Pentecost at the Annunciation. Montague explained that Mary knew how to await the moment of God's grace in patience, prayer, love, and presence. She had waited nine months for the fulfillment of God's promise in the birth of her son. Montague imagines her aiding the upper room disciples with maternal love and tenderness, radiating the Spirit without becoming demanding.

Montague summarized his ideas with these thoughts: "The experience of Mary, then, is one of the most precious gifts of the Spirit. She is a charism of the Spirit in person. From her I learn to believe more purely, to discern the Spirit more clearly, to listen to the Word more intently, and to await more cre-

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 96.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 97.

actively the hour of the Lord's coming."¹⁶⁰ We have studied other authors who described Mary as having charismatic gifts, but Montague was the first author to describe the very person of Mary as a charismatic gift for the sake of the Church.

Evaluation and Conclusions

From the study of this timeframe four areas stand out as central concerns for CCR:

1) *Evangelizing* people to a personal relationship with Jesus and the Spirit (and ongoing spiritual growth) through rooting people in the basics of the Christian life, especially through the Life in the Spirit Seminar.

2) An *apologetic* concern for demonstrating that CCR is *fully Catholic*, especially by presenting priests, religious, and bishops who have a positive attitude toward the movement, and by demonstrating the movement's submission to the leadership of the bishops and pope.

3) The strong belief of the National Service Committee that God wanted charismatic renewal to be an instrument for *ecumenism*. Our study has shown that leaders in CCR had disagreements that related to the dual goals of being fully Catholic yet ecumenical.

4) The need for *community building* in the Catholic Church so that people become actively involved with groups that truly share their faith and lives together.

1971-1974 was a time of rapid growth, excitement and optimism for CCR. The movement's primary concern was to awaken more and more people's spiritual lives through the baptism in the Holy Spirit. The focus on primary evangelization and the basics of Christianity were (and still are) a great need in the Church.¹⁶¹ CCR prayer groups provided people with 1) places of prayer and worship; 2) opportunities for initiation into a personal relationship with Christ and baptism in the Spirit; 3) groups that were attempting to build Christian communities modeled after the first Jerusalem community; and 4) biblically based teaching on prayer, openness to the Spirit, charisms, and practical ways to live the Christian life.

The National Service Committee was very busy 1) working to support and give guidance to the rapid proliferation of new and growing groups; 2) working to form strong ties with the Catholic hierarchy; and 3) working with many leaders involved in charismatic renewal from other churches.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 98.

¹⁶¹ Both Pope Paul VI in *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (*On Evangelization in the Modern World*, 1975), and Pope John Paul II in *Redemptoris Missio* (*Mission of the Redeemer*, 1990), and in many other statements have expressed the need for evangelization in the Church.

The general feeling in CCR could be characterized by these statements:

1) Keep inviting more people to get involved in CCR groups. Encourage them to go through a Life in the Spirit Seminar, become active in the group, and the Holy Spirit will take care of the rest.

2) Jesus Christ must be the center and Lord of a Christian's life (Ralph Martin was concerned that focusing on saints could damage the centrality of Jesus; other authors raised similar concerns about excessive Marian devotion in the past). Dogmatic and theological issues are not unimportant, but are secondary to allowing the Holy Spirit to renew the Church spiritually, and creating unity among the churches (the *Life in the Spirit, Team Manual* summarized this impression).

While these statements characterized the prevailing mood, we have seen that a growing number of priests involved in CCR were concerned that the movement needed to be integrated better with the whole Catholic tradition of theology and spirituality (see reflections by Gelpi, McDonnell, Walsh, Tugwell, and Haughey in this chapter).

Gelpi, McDonnell, and Walsh thought that focusing too strongly on ecumenism would hurt CCR in influencing the whole Catholic Church. McDonnell did support the basic *lay* language and *lay* orientation of CCR because this supported the movement's primary evangelization focus. However, he believed that sometimes CCR, in trying to be ecumenical, borrowed too uncritically from Protestant sources. Gelpi said that a massive educational effort was needed in CCR to help Catholic "charismatics" to understand the ways that their church differed from other Christian churches. Considering all the changes in the Catholic Church, and the confusion after Vatican II about what is central in Catholicism, the *whole* Church needed this massive educational effort. The hunger to grow in the spiritual life, that came from the experience of baptism in the Spirit, made good education even more necessary in CCR.

Books as well as radio and television shows by Protestant Pentecostals gave spiritual nourishment, but also could cast a negative light on some Catholic practices, traditions, and teachings. "Charismatic" Catholics, who sought to follow what CCR leaders described as "God's call" to work for ecumenism, could too uncritically assimilate ideas contrary to Catholic teaching, and spiritual language that was foreign to average Catholics.

With this background in mind, we can now reflect on the changes and growth in Marian reflection and devotion in the 1971-1974 timeframe. Several conclusions can be proposed:

1) One of the conclusions, which came from our study in chapter one, was that a number of *people developed a devotion to Mary not because of study, but because of a spiritual experience associated with Mary*. This chapter mentioned

some similar examples (e.g. Ralph Martin's experience at St. Ignatius' house). The 1973 "Statement on the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal" (McDonnell was the major author) stressed that CCR doesn't bring anything totally new to the Catholic Church, but focuses on a greater expectation, awareness, and openness to the work of the Holy Spirit in a person's life. McDonnell also stressed the importance of focus and expectation to explain how a friend, who had a greater focus on Mary in his life than McDonnell, experienced Mary having a much greater influence and role in his life.

Jesus taught, "Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you" (Matthew 7:7). It is common in the Scriptures for God's revelation to come to people within the context of their asking and seeking in faith.

Frequently, Jesus commends the person's faith after curing someone. While the Holy Spirit has always been active in the Church, we can expect a greater experience of the Spirit when people are seeking the Spirit with an active, expectant faith. In a similar way, we can expect a greater experience of Mary in a person's life when some experience brings a person to seek Mary's influence.

2) *The focus on the "basics of the Christian life," and the ecumenical approach of not focusing on differences in the Christian churches, continued to keep Marian reflection in the background of CCR.* However, Bishop Joseph McKinney's words at the 1972 Notre Dame Conference, "*we need Peter*" (the pope), followed by Cardinal Suenens words at the 1973 Notre Dame Conference that, in effect, said "*we need Marv,*" demonstrated a *growing concern to more publically address specifically Catholic issues.* We have seen that both McKinney's and Suenen's statements caused some tensions in CCR. Suenen's words did plant a "*Marian seed*" in CCR. However, the rapidly growing movement was more invested in growth and expansion, than in finding ways to integrate a fully Catholic spirituality within CCR.

3) We have seen that *New Covenant* had no articles specifically on Mary in this timeframe. Dove Publications had a pamphlet and a leaflet on Mary. Montague, and Pelletier had a chapter on Mary in their books. Randall spoke very highly of Mary. Dove Publications, Montague and Randall will become even greater influences in CCR in the future.¹⁶² However, it still must be said that *there was not a major focus on Mary.*

4) A development that was new to this timeframe was a *growing frequency of authors describing Marv as a biblical model of response to God and the Holy Spirit.* The account of the Annunciation was commonly used to describe this

¹⁶² In 1977 Randall became a member of the National Service Committee, and in 1978 Montague also became a member of the NSC.

quality of Mary. Mary is described as a model of faith in God's Word, and docility to the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, Mary was frequently described, not only as a model, but as someone who could help people today to respond more fully to God and the Holy Spirit.

Only J. M. Ford and Rosage (who was only publishing locally) were presenting biblical evidence to support devotion to Mary in the 1967-1971 period. Biblical reflections on Mary became more common from 1971-1974.

5) Besides the Annunciation, the other biblical passage that was mentioned most frequently in relation to Mary was her presence at Pentecost (Acts 1-2). The Annunciation was described as Mary's "*personal Pentecost*." Mary was able to help the apostles and disciples to prepare for Pentecost because she had already experienced the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. The most complete reflections that showed the relationship between Luke 1-2 and Acts 1-2 was done by Montague. Only Geraets used the story of the marriage feast of Cana (John 2) as another way of expressing Mary's involvement in helping others to be open to the outpouring of the Spirit.

6) The description of Mary as *type of the Church* was now being used by a number of authors. The idea that Mary helps Christians to stay rooted in the Church became more frequent.

7) While Pelletier did not understand Mary as manifesting any charismatic gifts, more commonly Mary was described as manifesting a number of *charismatic gifts*.

8) Randall, Pelletier, and Gaudet, like O'Connor, Ford, and Clark in our first time period, believed that Mary had an important *role in the beginnings of CCR*.

9) *Marian Apparitions* like Lourdes and Fatima continued to be mentioned as examples (usually of healing ministry), but no one gave an actual study and description of these apparitions.

10) Finally, Mary's *Magnificat* was mentioned once in relation to the *prayer of praise*, and the Pecos Abbey began to promote the *rosary as an approach to contemplative prayer of the heart*.

Mary was still a background figure during this timeframe. However, there was a growing biblical content in reflections about Mary, showing how Mary can be related to the basics of the "charismatic experience." Cardinal Suenens' remarks about Mary at the 1973 International Conference brought the issue of Mary's role in CCR into a more public and widespread discussion.

III. Ecumenical and Prophetic, July 1974 - August 1978

Timeframe

The cover of the August 1974 issue of *New Covenant* proclaimed a new stage for Catholic Charismatic Renewal: "Notre Dame Conference - A Turning Point." In a major address at this conference (June 14-16, 1974), Ralph Martin announced his belief that CCR was moving "from an apologetic phase to a prophetic phase."¹⁶³ He believed that CCR had laid the groundwork of properly relating to the Catholic Church, and now, building on this good relationship, "we (CCR) can really speak out and work for the radical changes that need to happen in all the Christian churches if we are to become one, effective, visible body of Christ in the world today."¹⁶⁴ At the opening session of the conference (30,000 people attended), a healing service was conducted by Fr. Francis MacNutt, OP, and Barbara Shelmon (Catholic nurse and mother involved in healing ministry through prayer). About half of the people present claimed that they received some kind of physical or spiritual healing. This event was highly publicized in both Catholic and secular media.¹⁶⁵

The September 1974 issue of *New Covenant* was entitled "What the Spirit is Saying to the Churches." Ralph Martin, speaking for the National Service Committee, wrote that the NSC believed that this issue of the magazine was the most important issue that they had ever published. The issue built on Martin's words at Notre Dame. There was an excitement that it was God's providential time to bring restoration and reunion to the Church. Also, a book by Ralph Martin, *Fire on the Earth, What God Is Doing in the World Today*, was published in 1975, expanding on Martin's words at Notre Dame. Some quotes from the book will help to give a sense of the focus and tone of CCR at this time:

God plans to fully restore and reunite his people, bringing them back into total harmony with his original purpose... God intends the charismatic renewal to make a special contribution... God has been at work in this outpouring of the Spirit known as the Pentecostal movement for over seventy years now, preparing it for this moment... God gave a clear, prophetic call (at Notre Dame) to unity with the other streams of the pentecostal movement.¹⁶⁶

This new prophetic stage for CCR involved two interrelated focuses:

¹⁶³ *New Covenant* (August 1974), 4-7.

¹⁶⁴ Ralph Martin, "How Shall We Relate to the Church," *Pentecostal Catholics* (New York: Paulist, 1974), 16.

¹⁶⁵ For other reflections on this service, besides *New Covenant*, see René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1977), 102-105.

¹⁶⁶ Ralph Martin, *Fire on the Earth* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1975), 29-36.

1) The belief that God was teaching the church important aspects of Christian living, and the unity of Christians through the charismatic renewal. All Christian churches needed to learn from the experience of the charismatic renewal, and the charismatic renewal had the responsibility to proclaim this message to all the churches.

2) The CCR initiated a more public and open use of charismatic gifts like healing and prophecy (as demonstrated at the Notre Dame conference, and supported by many new books on this subject).¹⁶⁷

In the previous timeframe there was a growing focus on ecumenism within CCR's leadership. In this timeframe CCR leadership expressed the belief that it was a mandate from God that CCR work for unity among Christians together with the Pentecostal movement in all the churches. The most visible expression of this ecumenical concern came in 1977 when CCR leaders canceled the yearly conference at Notre Dame so they could encourage people to attend an interdenominational, charismatic conference in Kansas City. Half of the 50,000 people who attended the Kansas City conference were Catholic. The National Service Committee for the CCR was active in planning and promoting the conference.

Major Influences and Issues from 1974-1978

VARIANT EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLE OF CCR IN THE CHURCH

The 1974 Notre Dame conference set the initial tone for this timeframe. Some of the events that influenced Ralph Martin's belief that CCR had moved from an apologetic to a prophetic stage included the meeting of leaders of CCR in Rome with Pope Paul VI (October 1973), and the publishing (towards the end of 1974) of a document entitled *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, Malines I*.¹⁶⁸ The involvement of Cardinal Suenens

¹⁶⁷ Many books on healing and prophecy were published at this time. The most important ones include: Francis MacNutt, OP, *Healing* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1974) and *The Power to Heal* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1977); Dennis and Matthew Linn, SJ, *Healing of Memories* (New York: Paulist, 1974) and *Healing Life's Hurts* (New York: Paulist, 1978); Michael Scanlon, T.O.R., *Inner Healing* (New York: Paulist, 1974); Michael Scanlon, TOR and Ann Thérèse Shields, *And Their Eyes Were Opened* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant, 1976); Bruce Yocum, *Prophecy* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1976); Fr. Jim Ferry and Dan Malachuk, *Prophecy in Action* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1978).

¹⁶⁸ *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1974). Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens invited an international group of theologians and lay leaders involved in CCR to Malines, Belgium, from May 21-26, 1974. Fr. Kilian McDonnell wrote the first draft and formulated the final text. The other people involved in the process were Ralph Martin and Kevin Ranaghan of the United States; Carlos Aldunate, SJ. from Chile; Salvador Carrillo, M.SP.S. from Mexico; Albert de Monléon, OP from France; Heribert Mühlen from Germany; Veronica O'Brien from Ireland; and Cardinal Suenens. The text was also sent to a number of other theological consultants who gave written suggestions. The consultants

in the writing of this document, the highly regarded theological consultants, and the international composition of the authorship team gave significant stature to the document. In the introduction to the document it was stated, "The growth of the charismatic renewal is seen by observers of the religious scene as an indication of a vital new stream in the life of the Church. Indeed, it is seen by many not personally involved as being of major significance for the life of the Church."¹⁶⁹

The authors of *Malines 1* expressed the belief that CCR had a very important role to play in the life of the Church:

The renewal does not seek to create a special group within the Church which specializes in the Holy Spirit and his gifts, but rather the renewal of the local and universal Church through a rediscovery of fullness of life in Christ through the Spirit, which includes the full spectrum of the gifts.

The renewal sees its theological basis as a renewal of baptismal consciousness (Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist). Its concern is to renew the whole of Christian life through the power of the Holy Spirit under the Lordship of Jesus.¹⁷⁰

The common belief was that God had started charismatic renewal as a means to renew the whole Church. God was "prophetically" speaking through CCR a message for the whole Church.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops of the U.S. in early 1975 published a brief *Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal* from their Committee for Pastoral Research and Practices.¹⁷¹ This statement seemed to confirm in some ways Ralph Martin's belief that CCR was moving beyond an apologetic stage, but it fell short of confirming a specific prophetic role for CCR. The statement acknowledged "many positive signs" (#5) in CCR. The committee concluded by stating: "We encourage those who already belong and we support the positive and desirable directions of the charismatic renewal" (#15).

At the same time, the statement had many notes of caution. The positive signs in CCR were described as "clearer in some groups than in others" (#5).

were Yves Congar, OP, Avery Dulles, SJ, Michael Hurley, SJ, Walter Kasper, René Laurentin, and Joseph Ratzinger. This booklet (71 pages) came to be known as *Malines Document 1*, or simply *Malines 1*, since a number of other documents concerning CCR were later published under Cardinal Suenens' guidance from Malines, Belgium.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 1.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 61,63.

¹⁷¹ Committee for Pastoral Research and Practices of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of the U.S., *Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Washington, DC: Publications Office U.S. Catholic Conference, 1975). The actual statement is six pages. An address by Pope Paul VI from October 16, 1974, is added at the end (an additional three pages). The Pope talks about the need for the Holy Spirit and charismatic gifts in the Church. He specifically cites Cardinal Suenens' book, *A New Pentecost?*, as a resource.

Dangers “continue to exist here and there” with such issues as elitism, biblical fundamentalism, ignoring the intellectual and doctrinal content of the faith, and reducing it to a felt religious experience (#6). The need for caution was also expressed about exaggerating the importance of healing, prophecy, praying in tongues, and the interpretation of tongues (#6).

The strong ecumenical focus of charismatic renewal also received a strong caution:

Continual or exclusive participation in ecumenical groups runs the risk of diluting the sense of Catholic identity. On the other hand, occasional ecumenical sharing in prayer groups can be beneficial. Catholics who participate in such groups should be mature in their faith and committed to the principles of Catholic belief. They should be well informed of and careful to follow the Church's guidelines for ecumenical activity. (#12)

The statement called for CCR “to have a strong bond with the total life of the Church” (#7). The overall sense of the statement was that CCR could be a positive addition to the Church. However, the importance of the movement for the Church was not understood in as grand a scale as Ralph Martin and the *Malines 1* document portrayed it. The bishops' statement differed from the expressions of leaders in CCR, in that it did not portray CCR as a specially unique instrument for God's purposes for the present time.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

From May 16-20, 1975 (Pentecost weekend), the International Conference on the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church was held in Rome, Italy. On May 19 Cardinal Suenens was given permission to celebrate the Eucharist for the 10,000 participants at the high altar in St. Peter's Basilica. Afterwards Pope Paul VI addressed the congregation.¹⁷² The pope acknowledged that convening the conference in Rome and asking the pope to speak to them was a way of showing the movement's attachment to the Church and the pope. The pope's words expressed a stronger belief in the significance of CCR than the U.S. bishops' statement of 1975:

Nothing is more necessary to this more and more secularized world than the witness of this “spiritual renewal” that we see the Holy Spirit evoking in the most diverse regions and milieux [He describes various manifestations of this renewal.]... How then could this “spiritual renewal” not be a “chance” for the Church and for the world? And how, in this case, could one not take all the means to ensure that it remains so?

¹⁷² “Pope Paul Addresses Charismatics in St. Peter's,” (Pecos, New Mexico: Dove, 1975). This is a leaflet giving the official English translation of the Pope's remarks as taken from *Osservatore Romano* (May 22, 1975). The text can also be found in Kilian McDonnell, *Open the Windows: The Popes and Charismatic Renewal* (South Bend, Indiana: Greenlawn, 1989), 12-19.

Paul VI then gave three principles for discerning the genuine work of the Spirit. He concluded by encouraging the reception of the sacraments and an openness to the intercession of Mary.

Kilian McDonnell reflected on Paul VI's statement [in this address] that "the miracle of Pentecost should continue in history."¹⁷³ McDonnell described leaders in charismatic renewal as desiring to see the charismatic renewal as "the Church in movement rather than a movement in the Church" [phrasing of German theologian Heribert Mühlen]. In describing CCR as a "chance" for the Church, and proclaiming the importance of the continuation of Pentecost in history, Paul VI was much closer to the CCR leaders' understanding of the movement than the U.S. bishops at that time.

The strong sense of interest, encouragement, and hope that Paul VI expressed in his words to the CCR conference was a confirmation for many people that CCR had moved beyond the apologetic stage. The movement was publically affirmed by the visible head of the Church. At the same time, the belief in a new prophetic time for the movement took an unexpected turn at the Rome conference. Many prophecies at the conference expressed the idea that difficult days (days of darkness) were coming and that people needed to be prepared. God would strip them so they must cleaved only to God. People were to band themselves together around the Lord to be formed into a mighty army.¹⁷⁴

VARIANT MEANINGS GIVEN FOR "HARD TIMES" MESSAGE

This theme of "hard times ahead" became a major focus in CCR throughout the rest of this timeframe. However, there was not a clear consensus about the meaning of "hard times." Fr. Francis Martin in *New Covenant* (October 1975) described the Rome prophecies as calling CCR to a new "purity of heart" and a commitment to love and humility. He stressed that God was purifying CCR because of its own sins, failures, and lack of humility and love. God was also preparing CCR for the task ahead which would demand a greater holiness.

The first *National Communications Office Newsletter (NCO Newsletter)* (December 1975)¹⁷⁵ gave a summary of common themes (p. 3) from five regional conferences for the CCR during the summer of 1975. One theme was the "seriousness of this hour and the critical nature of our response to what He [God] wants to bring about, calling us to set our whole lives in His Kingdom—relationships, business practice, marriage, family, time, possessions and money—and to

¹⁷³ *Open The Windows*, 9-10.

¹⁷⁴ *New Covenant* (July 1975), 26

¹⁷⁵ This newsletter was for leaders in CCR. It came under the direction of the National Service Committee for CCR in the U.S. and was published by the National Communications Office for CCR in South Bend, Indiana.

be more committed to Him and to each other, to be reconciled, to be righteous and holy, to be one. Like Francis Martin's words, the emphasis was on the need for an interior conversion of life both personally and communally.

On the other hand, many understood the "hard times" to mean external events that would work against God's purposes in CCR and the Church. The *NCO Newsletter* of February 1976 reported on the National Leader's Conference for CCR held in January 1976. The report stated: "The need was seen for a constant, vital witness in a world situation which is getting darker. Although it may not look like it in the current political and economic climate, there was in the meeting a sense of an approaching tribulation for God's people. A number of prophecies foretold persecution. Leaders shared of receiving similar prophecies in their own prayer groups and communities" (p. 3). Three prophecies from the meeting were transcribed which included such ideas as:

The time is short and darkness lies before you...unite yourselves...lose your attachments...act as if there is no tomorrow. ... The structures are falling and changing...it is not for you to know the details now...but do not rely on them as you have been. ... I've brought you to the point of martyrdom...many of you will die...that kind of radical commitment is what I require of you...prepare yourself for martyrdom (3-4).

1976 NOTRE DAME CONFERENCE

The May 28-30, 1976 Continental Conference on the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church (30,000 people attended at Notre Dame University) continued the emphasis on "hard times ahead." Fr. Michael Scanlon, chair of the National Service Committee, in the major address on Saturday evening said that "we in the renewal want and need to respond to the word of the Lord that has been growing in our midst since the Rome conference concerning the darkness that is coming upon the world."¹⁷⁶ Scanlon went on to say that the renewal cannot say precisely what this darkness is, but signs of it can be seen in such things as the lack of morals in the media, pornography, spirit of disrespect, abortion, violent crime, drugs, and the breakdown of family life.

Scanlon offered ideas on how to create the solid spiritual foundations that would be needed in the times ahead. He included such areas as: 1) a substantial daily prayer life that includes allowing God to correct our sinfulness; 2) solidifying our personal relationships in families and communities under Jesus' Lordship, and this may entail "many people" moving to new locations to find the support they need; 3) prayer groups should center not so much on what they do at meetings as on supporting one another in all areas of their lives, which may entail smaller groups becoming part of stronger groups in order to face

¹⁷⁶ *National Communications Office Newsletter* (May-June, 1976), 3.

the time of darkness and difficulty (Scanlon specifically mentioned that parish prayer groups are often too weak); 4) many groups need to clarify what their commitments are to one another, and resolve old hurts and wrongs; 5) groups need to establish relationships of mutual support with other groups, especially among leaders; 6) relationships with church authorities should be honest, supportive, and clarified where needed. Scanlon ended by emphasizing the need to eliminate from our lives as many weaknesses as we can. He believed that in the future groups and communities would be called to provide great service in helping people who will be suddenly without spiritual and material support.¹⁷⁷

The continuation of this "hard times" theme can be further substantiated in many of the titles of *New Covenant* from the fall of 1976 until the fall of 1978.¹⁷⁸

At the opening session of the 1976 conference Archbishop Joseph Bernardin of Cincinnati, President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, endorsed the good that the movement had produced, and encouraged those in the movement to continue to open themselves to the power of the Spirit.¹⁷⁹ Gabe Meyer, a member of the National Service Committee, speaking after Archbishop Bernardin, mentioned that the archbishop's words, as well as the Rome Conference of 1975, demonstrated that CCR had been accepted as being in the heart of the Church. He proposed that CCR had an opportunity to be used by God in a number of important ways:

- To restore within God's people the experience of the life that is theirs in Christ Jesus.
- To confront a growing secularism and uncertainty in many parts of the Church with a renewed and living focus on the essential realities of the Christian life.
- To be a key piece in God's plan to restore unity to the body of Christ.
- To be a task force to prepare the people of God to live in the midst of the perilous and darkening age.
- And to live as the light of the world.¹⁸⁰

Ralph Martin also spoke at the conference. He emphasized how amazing was the rapid fashion with which CCR had spread worldwide and had been received into the very heart of the Christian Churches. He believed that it was

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 3-4.

¹⁷⁸ "The Coming Challenge: Are We Ready? What Must We Do?" *New Covenant* (September 1976); "Christian Maturity" (October 1976); "The Test of Christian Living: Personal Relationships" (November 1976); "The Testing of Faith" (July 1977); "War Between the Kingdoms" (September 1977); "The Church in Uncertain Times: What Should It Do Next?" (January 1978); "I Raise My Voice: Who Will Answer to My Call?" (February 1978); *Living in the Face of Death* (March 1978).

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 1.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 2.

not anyone's special virtue or hard work which brought about this rapid development. Instead, he said, "I feel like God is giving special dispensations of grace, a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit because of what He's preparing, what He knows is coming, and He knows He's got to work quickly because the time is short, and He's moving us along at an incredibly rapid pace."¹⁸¹ Martin reiterated the belief that there was going to be tribulation and persecution. First of all, he thought that people would be personally tempted to fall away from serving God when they were pushed by the pressures of the crowd to lessen their commitment to God's work. Secondly, there would be public trial and persecution for Christians, which could even happen in the United States.

KANSAS CITY INTERDENOMINATIONAL CONFERENCE -1977 HOW TO APPROACH ECUMENISM IN CCR?

In the summer of 1977, CCR did not have its own national conference in the United States so that it could take an active part in the Conference on Charismatic Renewal in the Christian Churches held in Kansas City, July 21-24. The interdenominational gathering of 50,000 people (half of them Catholic) served as a rallying point for the ecumenical thrust of CCR. However, it is important to note that CCR, at this time, was in the midst of significant reflection concerning what should be the proper approach in its ecumenical efforts.

The January, February, and March issues of *New Covenant* (1976) focused on the issue of ecumenism. The January issue was entitled "The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism: Unity in Diversity." The February and March editions continued the discussion with articles by Kilian McDonnell. McDonnell's articles on "A Churchless Christianity" and "The Vaporization of the Church" challenged some of the attitudes in CCR toward ecumenism.

McDonnell wrote that there is a hierarchy of truths in which salvation's *ends* (Trinity, divine love and grace for sin, the kingdom of God, eternal life) have priority over salvation's *means* (seven sacraments, papacy, hierarchical structure of the Church, Mary). However, these means are not just "Catholic baggage."

Some would make a distinction, at least on the attitudinal level, between what is Christian teaching and what is Catholic dogma. In this framework the Catholic dogma concerning the sacraments and Mary does not really belong to the gospel, but just to the definition of a Catholic. Catholic dogma in relation to Christian unity can be seen as a bureaucratic obstacle involving denominational pride. This can push prayer groups and covenant communities in the

¹⁸¹ Ibid., (July-August 1976), 4-6.

direction of a free-floating Christianity, a churchless Christianity, which is without the larger structures of ministry and authority.¹⁸²

McDonnell encouraged CCR to take a truly ecumenical approach, in which differences are expressed and faced, rather than a non-denominational approach which attempts to bypass differences. Such attitudes as "I believe in Christianity, not Churchianity" or "experience unites; doctrine divides" cannot be the Catholic approach. McDonnell offered four suggestions:

- 1) In communities there should be some manifestation of what divides Christians as well as what unites. Pain has real ecumenical value and without it there is no progress toward unity.
- 2) Strengthen bonds with the local Church. Take part in parish and diocesan life.
- 3) Develop a "sense" of Church (liturgical life, spiritual tradition, pope's teachings, saints, and history). Realize that there were spiritual manifestations in every age.
- 4) Understand how Church and gospel are inseparably linked.¹⁸³

The National Service Committee through *New Covenant* continued to explore the right approach to ecumenism throughout 1976 and 1977.¹⁸⁴ The February 1977 issue of *New Covenant* reflected on the first ten years of CCR. It described a "pause" within CCR concerning whether there should be separate Catholic groups and a predominantly Catholic focus in the movement, or whether the focus of CCR and the membership of groups should be ecumenical. The February 1978 issue of *New Covenant* mentioned that some people in CCR believed that efforts done ecumenically seemed to thrive more than efforts done with only a Catholic focus. However, Kilian McDonnell continued to emphasize that "if the Catholic charismatic renewal is not to restrict the Spirit, it needs to see in the whole historic experience of the church the footprints of the Spirit," and should establish no "zones of silence" in its ecumenical contacts.¹⁸⁵

CONCERN FOR A GREATER CATHOLIC INTEGRATION IN CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

A number of signs pointed to a growing concern among some leaders in CCR that the movement needed to work more at being integrated with the whole Catholic Church, and its tradition. The National Service Committee, which had a strong degree of responsibility for *New Covenant* magazine, announced in January 1976 that *New Covenant* was now functioning primarily as

¹⁸² Kilian McDonnell, "A Churchless Christianity," *New Covenant* (February 1976), 29.

¹⁸³ Kilian McDonnell, "The Vaporization of the Church," *New Covenant* (March 1976), 27-28.

¹⁸⁴ Avery Dulles wrote a two-part article, "Ten Principles of Ecumenism," *New Covenant* (June 1976), 29-33, and (July 1976), 26-29; also the February, March, August, October, and November 1977 issues of *New Covenant* have significant reflections on the issue of ecumenism.

¹⁸⁵ Kilian McDonnell, "Protestants, Pentecostals, and Mary," *New Covenant* (March 1977); 29.

a Catholic magazine for Catholic participants in the renewal, although it would continue to be ecumenically open with responsible ecumenical input.¹⁸⁶ Also, in March 1976 the bimonthly magazine, *Catholic Charismatic*, was first published by Paulist Press. The magazine described itself in this way:

Catholic Charismatic seeks to relate charismatic experience to the wealth of Catholic tradition in order to put Catholic charismatics in touch with the roots of Catholic communal life as it has appeared and developed in history. *Catholic Charismatic* also seeks to foster an appreciation for the workings of the Spirit within the Church. And, *Catholic Charismatic* seeks to reflect on the life which has been and is being lived by Christians committed to the Lordship of Jesus Christ in order to strengthen and broaden the quality of life experienced by Catholic charismatics.

The editors of *Catholic Charismatic* believed that this magazine was giving something important to CCR that *New Covenant* was not sufficiently giving. Seventy-five percent of the editorial staff were priests involved in CCR. Almost all the priests were from religious orders, rather than diocesan priests.¹⁸⁷ The magazine was never as influential or popular in CCR as *New Covenant*. It always had a much smaller circulation than *New Covenant* and had to discontinue in 1981. However, it did influence the growing movement toward a greater concern for the integration of Catholic tradition with "charismatic" experience in CCR.

In 1977 the first Steering Committee for the Association of Diocesan Liaisons to the CCR was elected. The diocesan liaison was the local bishop's representative in helping to keep contact between the bishop and the local expressions of CCR. The U.S. Bishops' Ad Hoc Committee on CCR had suggested that each bishop appoint a liaison. In the early years the liaisons were mainly priests. The Association sponsored an annual Fall Symposium and Spring Conference. Liaisons tended to be more concerned with the specifically Catholic dimension of CCR and the parish expressions of CCR, as compared to the National Service Committee. There was not any significant conflict between these two groups, but there was not a great deal of active cooperation until the mid-1980's. The 1977 Conference on Charismatic Renewal in the Christian Churches (Kansas City) took place right in the midst of all the discussion concerning ecumenism. One of the prophecies given at the final general session contained

¹⁸⁶ *National Communications Office Newsletter* (February 1976), 3.

¹⁸⁷ Editor in Chief: Robert Heyer; *Managing Editor*: Joseph Lange, OSFS; *Board of Consultants*: Joseph Breault, Dorothy Donnelly, CSJ; George Montague, SM; *Contributing Editors*: Rev. Frank Bognanno, Doris Donnelly, David Geraets, OSB, Margie Grace, Donald Gelpi, SJ, John Haughey, SJ, Archbishop James Hayes, Paul Hinnebusch, OP, Ernest Larkin, OCarm., George Maloney, SJ, Brendan McQuillan, RSHM, Edward O'Connor, CSC, James Reese, OSFS, Richard Rohr, OFM.

a good summary of the major focus which leaders in CCR emphasized after the conference:

The Lord has a word for church leaders... The Lord says you are all guilty in my eyes for the condition of my people who are weak and divided and unprepared... Now humble yourselves before me and come to me repentant in fasting, mourning and weeping for the condition of my people because if you do not humble yourselves now and seek me earnestly, then my people will be unprepared for the difficulties that lie ahead... Hold fast to one another because I am about to let you undergo a time of severe trial and testing and you will need to be in unity with one another. But I tell you this also, I am Jesus, the victor King, and if you hold fast to one another and follow after me, then I will vindicate my holy name on this earth and in the sight of the people of this earth. It will be manifest and it will be clear and it will be in your lifetime because I am Jesus the victor King and I have promised you victory.¹⁸⁸

Ralph Martin emphasized that people needed to be clear that God's plan and purpose was the reunion of Christians.¹⁸⁹ We are to pray and work aggressively for the unification of all Christians. Martin described four obstacles that keep people (and churches) from working for unity:

- 1) Fear of fellowship with other Christians because of becoming less Catholic: Martin felt that we need not be afraid of this.
- 2) Denominational pride: We should be secure and peaceful in our own faith, but not "flaunt" it, or be blind to our own weaknesses.
- 3) Rash enthusiasm: We should grow into God's wisdom and leadings for the work of unity, not move ahead rashly.
- 4) Resentment towards one's own church: God cannot use us effectively if we have this attitude.¹⁹⁰

At the CCR Advisory Committee meeting following the Kansas City conference, several persons pointed out that healing divisions among Catholics themselves and among "charismatics" themselves was at least as important as healing divisions between Catholics and other Christians.¹⁹¹

Finally, through the prophecies heard at the Kansas City conference, the "hard times ahead" message was reinforced. As a response to this message, already a number of covenant communities were developing ties as a "community

¹⁸⁸ *National Communications Office Newsletter* (September-October 1977), 2.

¹⁸⁹ Ralph Martin, "The Sin of Disunity," *New Covenant* (November 1977), 17.

¹⁹⁰ *The Sin of Disunity*, 18.

¹⁹¹ *National Communications Office Newsletter* (September-October, 1977), 3.

of communities" for mutual support. Some groups even moved to a different city to become a part of a larger community.¹⁹²

Much of the spirit of the Kansas City conference continued in a day-long, ecumenical "Jesus 78" rally in New Jersey on May 13, 1978. The idea for the rally was the inspiration of Fr. Jim Ferry, a CCR leader. Other CCR leaders were active in planning and speaking at this event which drew 55-60,000 people.

CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL'S "PROPHETIC" MESSAGE TO THE CHURCH

The National Service Committee of the CCR issued a statement in December 1977 entitled "Some Reflections on the Current Condition of Church Life." A copy of this statement was sent to all the Catholic bishops of the United States. The *NCO Newsletter* (December 1977) carried the complete text of the statement. *New Covenant* (January 1978) gave a major summary of the statement in its headline article. The statement was a major step beyond the "apologetic" stance of CCR toward offering "prophetic" recommendations to the leaders of the U.S. Catholic Church. The ending of the introduction to the statement stated:

We see strengths and weaknesses in American Catholic life. We recognize strengths in the Church, but we are focusing in this statement on weaknesses. We are conscious that the Catholic charismatic renewal which we represent also has weaknesses and need for improvement. But we speak to crucial issues out of our strengths and out of our experience of what works in building the kingdom of God.¹⁹³

The statement went on to say that the "situation of the Church is grave," and that "a process of disintegration of Church life in vital areas is apparent to us." Five vital areas were described:

- 1) Lack of *conversion*: many nominal and cultural Catholics; the gifts of grace from Baptism are not personally known and actualized; need for the acceptance of Jesus as Lord and the experience of new life in the Spirit.
- 2) Most Catholics have little significant experience of *community*: too much of an individualized Christianity without meaningful relationships with fellow Christians.
- 3) *Family* breakdown is widespread: absence of effective teaching in the Church on building up family life among the pressures of contemporary society.
- 4) Crisis in *pastoral leadership* in the Church: too influenced by the agenda of secular society.
- 5) General dilution of the requirements and riches of the Christian life in current *theological and pastoral teaching*: authority of Scripture and Tradition, and the imperatives of orthodox Christian living have been in a large measure dis-

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ National Communications Office Newsletter (December 1977), 1.

missed as irrelevant; no objective standards of truth; values grounded in secular humanism not revelation.

In the next section, "Principles For a New Strategy," a strong statement about the important role of CCR was made: "The reality and authenticity of these new and renewed ministries must be accepted by the Church. Their gifts and services must be affirmed and employed, particularly by the bishops." Such strong wording came out of the belief that the present days were critical (the statement mentions the consistent prophetic word in the CCR for several years about the present critical time). CCR leaders considered it a time of spiritual warfare in which "Christians need to be a disciplined, trained, holy, righteous, sacrificing people ready to endure all sorts of difficulties, and to persevere by God's grace in preserving and building the Church of Jesus Christ." Their belief was that radical steps must be taken or Catholic Church life would continue to deteriorate. The statement recommended that the Church take advantage of what CCR has learned in the areas of adult conversion, effective preaching, evangelization, building community, and the development of strong, mature Christian men. Church authorities and CCR leaders should work closely together, but CCR should be given the freedom to develop new models of community living and ministries within the basic structure of the Church.¹⁹⁴

THE ISSUE OF UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN CCR

While CCR leadership was offering ideas to the U.S. bishops, they were also having to deal with greater diversity within their own movement. The issue of "Unity and Diversity Within the Charismatic Renewal" was the major topic at the December 1977 meeting of the National Service Committee with its Advisory Committee. Father Michael Scanlon, the NSC chairman, gave a talk where he described CCR as a house with four floors. The four floors were 1) those who attend a prayer group; 2) the core group of a prayer group; 3) regional service centers; and 4) covenant communities. All of these groups call for a different set of requirements and agreements. Scanlon said that it seems clear that God was not calling everyone to live on the same "floor" at this time. Areas like the operation of leadership, the differentiation of the roles of men and women, and the extent of ecumenical participation should be approached differently on the various "floors." However, Scanlon deplored the idea, that some people were promoting, that CCR was divided into two camps, and that a judgment could be made about which camp was right. This kind of argumentation created divisiveness, Scanlon said.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ *National Communications Office Newsletter* (February 1978), 2.

Hours of discussion followed Scanlon's talk. Ideas that surfaced included: 1) putting aside any attitudes of accusing various expressions of CCR; 2) recognizing legitimate diversity and plurality in CCR; 3) the tension of not hiding behind diversity to avoid the prophetic call that God was giving. There was a strong call to continue to work for a sense of unity in CCR. However, there was not a common agreement about what was legitimate diversity.

THE ISSUE OF THE ROLES OF MEN AND WOMEN

The understanding of the roles of men and women in CCR became an important topic for debate from 1976-1978. The National Service Committee convened a special study group that met in July 1976 and March 1977. In January 1978 a statement from this study group was approved by the NSC.¹⁹⁶ No consensus emerged. Some groups had women and men at all levels of leadership, while other groups wanted to follow what they saw as a biblical model of male elders. The NSC encouraged whatever approaches were bearing fruit. A strong majority did emerge supporting the New Testament teaching that the man is to serve in the role of head of his family. However, the husband and wife are meant to complement and support each other in the fulfillment of their joint task. The gifts of each should be used fully. The couple shares responsibility and decision-making. The husband has the final responsibility. The NSC called groups with differing approaches to respect one another, as everyone sought to be docile to God's further guidance in this area.

Our study of various authors will further demonstrate the disagreements about men's and women's roles. Ralph Martin's book, *Husbands, Wives, Parents, Children*,¹⁹⁷ gave the basic understanding of men's and women's roles in the family which was practiced by the Ann Arbor and South Bend covenant communities (along with many other groups). Since this issue will be frequently mentioned in our study of various authors, an extensive quote from Martin is appropriate to clarify his ideas:

When Paul spoke to husbands and wives, he clearly intended to give more than a rule of conduct for particular cultural conditions. He saw his advice as having universal significance, for all times and all cultures, because he believed that it was based in a reality that transcends culture—the nature of God and the order of creation. In the passages I quoted above (1 Corinthians 11:3; Ephesians 5:23) and in other Scriptural instructions on marriage, we are told that the authority of the husband is directly linked to the unchanging reality of Christ's authority in the Church and the Father's authority in the life of the Trinity.

¹⁹⁶ The full statement can be found in the *National Communications Office Newsletter* (March-April 1978), 2-3; and in *New Covenant* (March 1978), 18-19.

¹⁹⁷ Ralph Martin. *Husbands, Wives, Parents, Children* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant, 1978).

I also believe that the order of governmental authority in the family goes beyond cultural rules. I feel that we are touching here on something that is fundamental to God's plan for unity of husband and wife. He wants to establish a seat of authority in marriage to focus and safeguard a couple's unity. Avoiding both the false unity of domination and the disunity of anarchy, he offers us the way that he himself takes headship and submission in the Spirit of love.

The scriptural pattern for authority in the family carries no judgment on the value of either husband or wife. The wife's submission does not mean that she is passive, inferior, unequal, or immature, nor does the husband's authority say that he is better, smarter, or more important. There is an equality of worth between husband and wife in Christ, yet a distinction of responsibilities.

Authority and submission enable a husband and wife to move forward together as one, just as Jesus' submission to his Father allowed God to act for our salvation. It does away with the struggle for power that paralyzes many marriages. It enables a couple to settle minor decisions quickly, saving their discussion time for more important matters. And it provides them with a way to settle their differences and move ahead when they cannot reach full agreement.

...When decisions affecting the life of the whole family must be made, husband and wife should normally discuss the matter together thoroughly, looking for God's direction. Ordinarily, couples who discuss these decisions can reach an agreement on them. If they cannot, it is the husband's responsibility to decide how to settle the issue. He might exercise his authority by deciding to wait until the two of them can reach an agreement. He may decide to follow his wife's opinion, or to follow his own, or to seek outside counsel. The fact of his headship does not mean that a husband makes all the decisions by himself, or even that, in a conflict, his opinion must prevail. He seeks always to do what is wise and right.¹⁹⁸

Influential Persons and Authors

The number of books and articles on CCR, and the number of different people writing about CCR, grew greatly in the 1974-1978 timeframe. First, we will describe books and major articles that gave a general introduction to CCR, an evaluation of CCR, and/or a sense of direction for CCR. Secondly, we will describe the literature on more specific areas like healing prayer, ecumenism, the growth of community life, Catholic issues, etc.

LITERATURE CONCERNING THE OVERALL DIRECTION OF CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

The literature from this period demonstrated a growing tension in CCR concerning aspects of the direction of the movement. Some authors described the tension as a serious polarization, while others saw it mainly as the inevitable need to work through growing pains. We will begin to unfold this issue by

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 23-25.

looking at studies about CCR (during this timeframe) from authors not directly involved in the movement.

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES

Meredith B. McGuire, in a sociological study covering the years 1971-1977,¹⁹⁹ described groups in CCR as either “a cultic type” or “a sectarian type.” She included the central organization of CCR, the covenant communities, and some other groups under the “sectarian type.” She characterized this type as involving “totalistic allegiance, opposition to the larger society, internal elitism, purism, and emphasis on order and authority.”²⁰⁰ The “cultic type” was more flexible, and interrelated with the whole Catholic Church.

Richard J. Bord and Joseph E. Faulkner in their sociological study of CCR²⁰¹ described tensions arising in CCR because of three types of leadership styles: 1) Strong lay leadership (especially in the covenant communities) that saw charismatic renewal as a total way of life; 2) Priest leadership that focused more on Catholic renewal than *Christian* renewal; 3) Weak lay leadership (possibly the numerical majority) who were loyal Catholics, but did not intend to commit their whole lives to CCR.²⁰²

Bord and Faulkner also described inevitable tensions that arose because CCR's major focus was to bring as many people as possible to an experiential relationship with Christ, but the leadership of CCR wanted to do this while both being undeniably within the Catholic Church, yet trying to unite all Christians. The authors pointed out that, while CCR groups did tend to be reluctant to discuss anything that threatened unity because of the ecumenical concern, the leadership of CCR, through *New Covenant*, did publish articles that raised differing opinions on issues.

Finally, Bord and Faulkner stressed that the rapid growth and size of CCR made it difficult to maintain a common understanding (and a similar level) of commitment throughout the movement. The authors predicted that the strong communitarian drive of the early leaders of CCR would “all but ground to a

¹⁹⁹ Meredith B. McGuire, *Pentecostal Catholics. Power, Charisma and Order in a Religious Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982).

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 216.

²⁰¹ Richard J. Bord and Joseph E. Faulkner, *The Catholic Charismatics. The Anatomy of a Modern Religious Movement* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983). Their systematic study covered the years 1972-1974. From 1975-1978 they describe their study as “less systematic.” Finally, from 1979-1983 they only mention a few concluding ideas.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 17-18.

halt.”²⁰³ The movement would continue to become more clericalized, but not be able to involve large numbers of Catholics.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

JAMES F. BRECKENRIDGE

Breckenridge did a study on the theological focus of CCR.²⁰⁴ He described an opposition between “charismatic” theological understanding and traditional Catholic theology. The “charismatic” approach is experiential, focusing on the immediate personal awareness of God. The traditional Catholic approach is rational and sacramental. He pointed out that CCR leaders did not think that the two approaches excluded one another. However, he believed “that charismatic religious experience is simply incompatible with sacramental religious experience as officially defined within the Catholic Church.”²⁰⁵

Breckenridge believed that the “charismatic” approach would be divisive for the Catholic Church. He wrote:

The charismatic renewal contains the synthesizing element sought by progressive theologians. Given the current religious atmosphere in Catholicism created by the failure of previous Vatican II reforms, the contribution of the charismatic renewal, the installation of a new, dynamic and different Pope, the unceasing pressure from progressives, and the acceptance of relativity via Vatican II, one may project the Catholic Church will make dramatic changes to effect ecumenism in this decade. The Pope will accept new and compromising definitions concerning papal infallibility, as will the Church concerning apostolicity. ‘Spiritual’ ecumenism and ecclesial ‘essence’ will become words of challenge to Protestants who have historically resisted overtures on the basis of doctrinal and historical questions.²⁰⁶

Breckenridge discussed the two thrusts of CCR toward covenant community or parish prayer groups. However, he thought that the way J. M. Ford divided CCR into two dramatically different types did not sufficiently distinguish the many types of groups in CCR. He questioned Ford’s motives, calling her an “ardent feminist.”²⁰⁷

²⁰³ Ibid., 143.

²⁰⁴ James F. Breckenridge, *The Theological Self-Understanding of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1980). Includes information up to April 1979.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 9. Breckenridge did not take into consideration Vatican II’s teaching on the Church being both charismatic and hierarchical. He does not take into consideration how Religious Orders continuously have brought a new dimension to the Church.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 89. Clearly this has not happened.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 32. We will be discussing Ford’s major book later in this study.

RENÉ LAURENTIN

The theologian, historian, and journalist René Laurentin did a study on Catholic Charismatic Renewal in the United States and Europe entitled *Catholic Pentecostalism*.²⁰⁸ Laurentin discussed the positive judgments of the movement by psychologists, theologians, pastors, and bishops. He reflected on CCR in the context of other enthusiastic and charismatic revivals in Church history. He thought that these movements were important for the life of the Church, but did involve some dangers. Laurentin reflected on a series of these possible dangers, such as illuminism, subjectivism, emotionalism, anti-intellectualism and fundamentalism, spiritual pride and elitism, lack of social involvement, and an aggressive reaction to the rejection of others.

He believed that leaders in CCR were aware of these possible problem areas. He saw no *major* problems in CCR with these issues at that time. However, he did believe that CCR needed to continue to work at synthesizing itself with all of Catholic life and teaching. He perceived in CCR leadership an "effort to combine fidelity to institutions with a freedom of initiative that is based on an authentic commitment to Christian life and is open to ecumenism."²⁰⁹ He believed that after its initial enthusiasm CCR would have "a desert through which it must pass."²¹⁰ However, if CCR learned to cope with their internal and external tensions, the movement would be an important grace for the Church.

JOSEPH FICHTER'S MAJOR STUDY

The most complete sociological/theological study of CCR was *The Catholic Cult of the Paraclete* by Joseph F. Fichter, SJ.²¹¹ His study dealt with lay people in CCR (not with clergy). Fichter concluded that CCR was not sectarian (that is, having a tendency to split from the Catholic Church). The great majority of people in CCR (including lay leadership) thought of themselves as loyal members of the Church.²¹² In most areas lay people in CCR were more committed to Catholic practices and teaching than the average Catholic. At the same time, the movement was growing so fast that there were not enough properly trained lay leaders and priests to keep up with the growth.²¹³ As a result of this,

²⁰⁸ René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1977). First published in French in 1974. Additions were made to the English edition updating it to the end of 1975.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 163.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.191.

²¹¹ Joseph F. Fichter, SJ, *The Catholic Cult of the Paraclete* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1975). See also his article in Robert Heyer, ed., *Pentecostal Catholics* (New York: Paulist, 1974), 1-7.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 27-31.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 115.

CCR groups sometimes imitated Protestant Pentecostal practices, and had the tendency of accepting some teachings of Protestant Pentecostals that were not consistent with Catholic teaching. The three areas inconsistent with Catholic teaching which Fichter described were: 1) the imminent second coming of Jesus; 2) once a person has accepted Jesus as their Savior s/he is already saved; and 3) the Spirit speaks to the heart, not to the mind (tendency toward anti-intellectualism).²¹⁴

Fichter discussed two areas where CCR tended to go against trends both in society and the Catholic Church. While there were more women involved in CCR than men, the national leadership was almost exclusively male, and the biblically-based teaching about the subordination of the wife to the husband's authority in marriage was commonly taught. Secondly, CCR was not very involved in the Church's growing emphasis on organized social action. Fichter pointed out that CCR leaders had frequently discussed this issue, but they believed that the focus of the movement should be on personal spiritual reform and the development of Christian community life. It was believed that inner renewal and growth in relationships were essential for any lasting social change. Fichter mentioned that people involved in CCR were more involved in helping the needy in their personal lives, and in their groups, than the average Catholic.²¹⁵

Finally, Fichter described the tension between two contrasting organizational concepts in CCR: the highly structured covenant communities, which included most of the national leadership, and the less structured prayer groups. Fichter said that there was not yet a split between supporters of these two approaches, and "it may be that the total charismatic movement will prove broad enough to embrace both."²¹⁶

J. KERKHOF, SJ

Catholic Pentecostals Now, 1967-1977,²¹⁷ edited by J. Kerkhofs, SJ, was a study of CCR that claimed to be an "endeavor to give a balanced, objective evaluation from the historical, theological, sociological, and religious points of view."²¹⁸ However, the beginning of the book gave a negative picture of the "enthusiast" in the history of the Church, and then called the Catholic Pen-

²¹⁴ Ibid., 43-47, 51.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 141-144.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 148.

²¹⁷ J. Kerkhofs, SJ, ed., *Catholic Pentecostals Now, 1967-1977* (Canfield, Ohio: Alba House, 1977). Reproduced from *Pro Mundi Vita Bulletin* 60 (1976).

²¹⁸ Ibid., 14.

tecostal the new "enthusiast" before giving any description or analysis of the movement.²¹⁹

Kerkhofs admitted that Catholic Pentecostals accepted the role of the hierarchy and reason in their lives, but they also sought a "felt knowledge of God based on the inner and outer workings of the Spirit," and an "experience-oriented" community, rather than a belief-oriented or task-oriented community.²²⁰ He agreed with Kilian McDonnell that Pentecostal spirituality is valid, and flows from the nature of the Church. However, Kerkhofs greatest emphasis was that the movement had a "climate that is dangerously conducive to manipulating sincere believers." He mentioned in particular:

- A. An unhealthiness in the ease of accepting charismatic utterances and happenings with the absolute assurance that they come from God;
- B. Too little time discerning "when God is speaking and when man is speaking;"
- C. The willing and unquestioning submission of people to community leaders, in charismatic communities.²²¹

Kerkhofs, almost exclusively, used ideas from William Storey and J. Massingberd Ford in portraying negative aspects of Catholic Pentecostalism.²²²

REFLECTIONS ON THE DIRECTION OF CCR FROM AUTHORS IN THE MOVEMENT

With this background we can now develop the major ideas of authors who were active in CCR.

J. MASSINGBERD FORD

J. Massingberd Ford's book, *Which Way For Catholic Pentecostals?*,²²³ developed, more strongly than any other author who was involved with CCR, her belief that CCR was going in two very different directions. She divided CCR into two types. Type I was modeled after the Word of God Community in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and the People of Praise Community in South Bend, Indiana (Ford taught at Notre Dame University in South Bend). She characterized Type I groups as stressing headship and subordination in the family and community; an initiation system; a disciplinary system (with Anabaptist tendencies); a paraecclesial structure; and a teaching, advisory, and executive

²¹⁹ Ibid., 4.

²²⁰ Ibid., 99.

²²¹ Ibid., 100-101.

²²² Ford and Storey, both professors at Notre Dame University, were involved in CCR from its beginnings, but within a few years had major disagreements with the National Service Committee.

²²³ Ford, *Which Way for Catholic Pentecostals* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976)

magisterium. According to Ford, all but two or three members of the National Service Committee for CCR at that time were Type I.²²⁴

Type II groups, according to Ford, could be characterized as more flexible and less structured; fully integrated with the theology and sacramentality of the contemporary Catholic Church; open to non-Pentecostal influences; encouraging the talents of women; socially concerned and involved. She included among these groups the Benedictine Monastery at Pecos, New Mexico, and groups at the University of New Orleans, Boston College, Catholic University of America, and in St. Louis, Missouri.²²⁵ Some evaluation of Ford's major concerns about the directions of the National Service Committee of CCR needs to be given. From the analysis of all the literature during this period, Ford gave both fair and helpful evaluations/suggestions, as well as, some narrow and self-serving evaluations/suggestions in her reflections on CCR.

RALPH MARTIN AND KILIAN MCDONNELL

Both Ralph Martin²²⁶ and Kilian McDonnell²²⁷ wrote articles in *New Covenant* (July 1978) that agreed with Ford that there were two "streams" within CCR: the prayer groups, and the covenant communities. While Ford recommended that CCR should foster small groups with minimal structure,²²⁸ Martin and McDonnell encouraged both local parish groups and covenant communities. Martin wrote:

I don't believe that ecumenical covenant communities are the best approach for all or even for most situations... I don't believe the issues for the charismatic renewal is to decide that one or another approach to renewal is the best or the right one. Rather, the issue is, how can Christian life be built up and strengthened most effectively, God be glorified, and the gospel be the most effectively preached in each of the multitude of situations the renewal is facing around the world.²²⁹

Both Martin and McDonnell pointed out that parish prayer groups had a difficult time developing if the local pastor was not involved, or at least, actively supportive. CCR had grown so fast that frequently the development of experienced leadership could not keep up with the rapid proliferation of groups.

McDonnell described a number of possible areas of tension in CCR at that time. The covenant communities could dismiss the prayer groups as "lacking vision" for a fuller communal Christian life, and they could believe that their

²²⁴ Ibid., 1-18.

²²⁵ Ibid., 65-70.

²²⁶ Ralph Martin, "Parish Renewal or Covenant Community," *New Covenant* (July 1978), 20-22.

²²⁷ Kilian McDonnell, "Prayer Groups and Communities," *New Covenant* (July 1978), 23-27.

²²⁸ Ford, *Which Way*, 129.

²²⁹ Martin, "Parish Renewal or Covenant Community?", 21.

time would be better spent in building communities, rather than in supporting small groups. Prayer groups might feel like "second-class citizens" because they did not have the same kind of resources to be as fully active in developing CCR as the covenant communities. As a natural outflow of this, most of the overall leaders for CCR tended to come from the covenant communities. Furthermore, McDonnell discussed the tension between the lay versus clerical outlook in CCR. Covenant communities were mostly lay in membership. Priests are more trained to think of parish renewal. Lay persons more easily think beyond the parish mold.²³⁰ The strengths of CCR, up to that time, had not been in parish renewal. Only in a few parishes did CCR have a wide, overall influence. It was the leadership strength of the covenant communities that supported much of the growth and expansion of CCR. Strong communal life is essential for evangelization. A major emphasis of CCR had always been basic evangelization. Therefore, the development of communal life was seen as essential. McDonnell encouraged covenant communities not to forget or neglect the smaller parish groups. However, priests and parishes would have to express an openness and interest in charismatic renewal as a way to bring about parish renewal, which up to that time had not been common.

Finally, McDonnell mentioned the tension in CCR between a more sacramental piety and a more personalistic, evangelical piety. The more ecumenically oriented groups tended toward a personalistic piety since they could not celebrate the sacramental life in common. McDonnell emphasized that both aspects of piety are needed, and both are a part of a traditional Catholic approach. However, Catholics in ecumenical groups needed to find ways to integrate the sacraments into their lives.

The main difference between McDonnell's and Ford's analyses of CCR during this timeframe was that McDonnell perceived unavoidable tensions in the movement arising from its rapid growth, its diversity, its lay character, and its attempts to be both Catholic and ecumenical. McDonnell believed that the CCR leadership was honestly attempting to work with these tensions. Ford, on the other hand, believed that the South Bend and Ann Arbor communities were dominating CCR for their own purposes.²³¹ Ford expressed her fear that these

²³⁰ Steve Clark in his book, *Unordained Elders and Renewal Communities* (New York: Paulist, 1976), described how the 4th century ascetic movement and the start of religious orders helped to renew the Church. He reflected on covenant communities as being a similar kind of renewal movement in the Church today. While J.M. Ford described covenant communities like an "Anabaptist sect," Clark portrayed these communities as a movement within the Church, like other movements in the history of the Church which usually led to the development of a new religious order. Ford never spoke of any analogy between covenant communities and religious orders.

²³¹ Ford, *Which Way*, 3.

groups were heading in "Anabaptist" directions that would not be fully rooted in the Catholic Church. However, Ford, herself, expressed difficulties with Catholic Church authority. She actively promoted women's ordination,²³² and expressed negative feelings about too much structure in the Church.²³³

McDonnell's analysis took all the facts into account in a more accurate way. Tensions clearly existed, but the National Service Committee was making efforts to work with these. Two examples of these efforts were the committee formed by the NSC to discuss the role of women in CCR, and the publishing in 1976 of George Martin's book *Parish Renewal: A Charismatic Approach* by Servant Publications (Ann Arbor)²³⁴ Ford, McDonnell, and the NSC were all aware that there was not enough experienced and trained leadership for the rapid growth of the movement. Ford wanted groups to stay small, scattered, and diverse, while the NSC was trying to both strengthen the movement and develop more leadership by getting smaller groups to relate with larger groups that had more developed leadership.

ROBERT HEYER

Many books written in this timeframe continued to promote the insights and benefits of CCR, while other books raised concerns. At the very end of 1974, Robert Heyer edited a book of articles called *Pentecostal Catholics*.²³⁵ Two of the articles described the growth of two particular charismatic communities. Five of the articles gave some evaluation of CCR from various viewpoints. Ralph Martin, Fr. James Ferry, and Fr. Harold Cohen gave very positive reflections.

RALPH MARTIN

Ralph Martin began his article by saying, "Today God is calling Christians of all denominations to complete unity."²³⁶ He explained the Pentecostal, Neo-Pentecostal, and Catholic Charismatic movements of this century. He described the sympathetic response of the Catholic hierarchy to CCR in contrast to the negative response of most other churches to the Pentecostal Movement. He mentioned his great hopes that the various branches of the Pentecostal Movement throughout the churches can work together to promote unity among the Christian churches.

²³² Ibid., ix.

²³³ Ibid., 129.

²³⁴ Servant Publications was a ministry of the Word of God Community in Ann Arbor. It became the major publisher of Catholic Charismatic books.

²³⁵ Robert Heyer, ed., *Pentecostal Catholics* (New York: Paulist, 1974). The articles in the book originally appeared in the November/December 1974 issue of *New Catholic World*.

²³⁶ Ibid., 9.

In 1976 Martin also edited two books that were collections of articles from *New Covenant*.²³⁷ *The Spirit and the Church* included articles about the beginnings and early growth of CCR as well as articles by bishops and theologians who gave a positive response to the movement. The book concluded with articles about what a renewed Church might look like. *Sent By the Spirit* focused on articles about the Holy Spirit and mission. It included accounts of new communities, and new ways of serving and caring that Catholics in charismatic renewal were developing for the needy. Both of these books were ways of promoting CCR, and passing on a greater understanding of the movement.

HAROLD COHEN

Fr. Harold Cohen (NSC member, 1973-1982) described the charismatic movement as "a sovereign act of God the Father restoring the Lordship of Jesus in the power and love of the Holy Spirit in individuals, in the Church, in the churches, and in society."²³⁸ He thought that CCR was helping to renew the Church in such areas as the ministry of prophecy, trusting in God's power versus the influence of secular humanism in the churches, healing and deliverance, intercessory prayer, evangelization, and ecumenical outreach. He also believed that CCR would get more involved in social concern as it progressed.

JIM FERRY

Fr. Jim Ferry (NSC member, 1977-1983) described the covenant community, the People of HOPE, of which he was a member. The community life had helped them to grow in faith and to share their lives more deeply than they had ever done before. They became actively involved in serving the local church in New Jersey by offering parish renewal programs which they called Jesus Weeks.

Ferry also wrote with great enthusiasm in the book, *Prophecy in Action*,²³⁹ which described the planning and implementation of an ecumenical "Jesus 78" day that was attended by 60,000 people in New Jersey. He believed that the Holy Spirit was breaking down walls that have kept Christians from being united.

EDWARD O'CONNOR AND DONALD GELPI

Fr. Edward O'Connor (NSC member, 1970-1973) and Donald Gelpi, SJ, also had articles in *Pentecostal Catholics*, but their words conveyed a different tone. While Ralph Martin was proclaiming a new "prophetic stage" for CCR, O'Con-

²³⁷ Ralph Martin, ed., *The Spirit and the Church* and *Sent By the Spirit* (New York: Paulist, 1976).

²³⁸ Harold F. Cohen, "Restoring the Lordship of Jesus," *Pentecostal Catholics*, 54.

²³⁹ Fr. Jim Ferry and Dan Malachuk, *Prophecy in Action* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1978).

nor described a "new phase" for a movement that had "lost its first enthusiasm and is now facing the test of whether it is to have an enduring effect or to evaporate like many revivals of the past."²⁴⁰ According to O'Connor mistakes had been made, and not every group had survived. The charismatic experience of the Spirit tended to raise undue expectations of immediate sanctification, and led to disillusionment when petty human frailties emerged. O'Connor believed that CCR would now need to move beyond its initial enthusiasm to a greater depth.

In the book, *Perspectives on Charismatic Renewal*, O'Connor expressed some other concerns about CCR. O'Connor thought that it was premature for CCR to announce that it was moving beyond the "apologetic stage." As of yet there had not been any thorough-going, well-informed critiques of the movement that could be used to clarify the focus of CCR. He was concerned about the multiplication of contacts with Protestants. He wrote, "the rapid growth of interdenominational prayer groups and communities has tended to foster development of a kind of piety and doctrine in which the distinctive features of Catholicism (belief in the Real Presence, Sacramental Confession, Marian devotion, etc.) are somewhat neglected and at times even called into question. The resulting spirituality, although often zealous and efficacious, is cut off from some of its roots and inhibited from attaining its full and balanced development."²⁴¹

O'Connor also worked at promoting CCR's rootedness in the Catholic tradition by authoring an article, "The Hidden Roots of the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church," in the book, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*,²⁴² and authoring his own book, *Pope Paul and the Holy Spirit*,²⁴³ which reflected on the relationship of CCR with Pope Paul VI, and how this Pope taught about the Holy Spirit.

Donald Gelpi, SJ, like O'Connor, continued to be supportive of CCR, but had significant concerns about the movement. His literature during this period²⁴⁴ consistently described the problems that he saw arising from the premature ecumenical contacts of relatively uneducated Catholic Charismatics with

²⁴⁰ Edward D. O'Connor, "When the Cloud of Glory Dissipates," *Pentecostal Catholics*, 26.

²⁴¹ Edward D. O'Connor, "The Literature of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal," *Perspectives on Charismatic Renewal*. O'Connor, ed., (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 149.

²⁴² Edward D. O'Connor, "The Hidden Roots of the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church," *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*. Vinson Synan, ed., (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1978).

²⁴³ Edward D. O'Connor, *Pope Paul and the Holy Spirit* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1978).

²⁴⁴ Donald L. Gelpi, SJ, "Can You Institutionalize the Spirit?" *Pentecostal Catholics* (New York: Paulist, 1974), 17-24; Ecumenical Problems and Possibilities," *The Holy Spirit and Power*,

Protestant Pentecostals. This problem was compounded by the fact that official Catholic teachers did not know how to respond to an issue like spiritual gifts, leaving Catholic Charismatics to look to Protestant teachers in this area. Gelpi called for serious discussion of the issues that divide Christians, not just “spiritual ecumenism” through prayer and fellowship together. He also thought that “Charismatics” needed a deeper understanding of the complexity of the conversion process beyond the simplified notions of Protestant Evangelicals and Pentecostals.²⁴⁵

Gelpi, himself, had disagreements with Catholic Church teaching. Like J.M. Ford, he was an advocate for women’s ordination.²⁴⁶ He, also, promoted other ideas (about which the Church’s position is not so clear) that put him at odds with the NSC of CCR. One idea that many people in CCR were uncomfortable with was his consistently calling the Holy Spirit “she.” Also, with very strong words, but little explanation or argumentation, he dismissed the biblical notion of the husband’s “headship” within a marriage as outdated and sexist. He called this idea an abuse, and a source of scandal in the charismatic renewal and in the Church as a whole.²⁴⁷

POSTIVE ENDORSEMENTS OF CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

There were a number of authors during this timeframe who gave a basically positive endorsement and explanation of CCR or some particular aspect of CCR. First, we will study those authors who had an ongoing leadership role and influence in CCR.

BERT GHEZZI

Bert Ghezzi (editor of *New Covenant*, 1975-1983; NSC member 1970-1975, 1982-1984) wrote a widely read book, *Build with the Lord*,²⁴⁸ that gave pastoral guidance for prayer groups in the charismatic renewal. Ghezzi described the need for structure and stability in groups, balanced with flexibility and the ability to change as the group develops. The book focused on five areas that

Kilian McDonnell, ed., (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975), 173-186; *Charism and Sacrament* (New York: Paulist, 1976); *Experiencing God* (New York: Paulist, 1978).

²⁴⁵ Gelpi used the notion of conversion having four aspects: affective, intellectual, religious, and moral. His book, *Charism and Sacrament*, describes these four aspects in the most complete way.

²⁴⁶ See *Charism and Sacrament*, 200-201, 247, where he calls priests and bishops “(s)he” without any explanation, and more explicitly in *Experiencing God*, 197-201, where he downplays the statement by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the issue of women’s ordination, stating that the church was repressing the action of the Holy Spirit.

²⁴⁷ See *Charism and Sacrament*, 178, 256.

²⁴⁸ Bert Ghezzi, *Build With the Lord* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1976).

needed constant attention according to Ghezzi: 1) effective prayer meetings; 2) leadership; 3) a way to help others to receive new life; 4) sound teaching; and 5) relationships among participants.

Ghezzi spoke in glowing terms of CCR as having “extraordinary success and promise.”²⁴⁹ The emphasis in the book was on *team* leadership, and leaders as servants. He mentioned both men and women as leaders, but said that “for the sake of family order,” if the husband was not in the group, the wife should not be on the leaders team.²⁵⁰ He strongly encouraged keeping good relationships with the parish, the priests, and the bishop, and being active in the parish, as well as the prayer group. While Ghezzi believed that charismatic renewal had an important role to play in ecumenism, people should be openly committed to their own church, not slide into religious indifferentism, or teach the idea of an invisible “spiritual” church. However, teachings offensive to different traditions should not be emphasized.²⁵¹

Ghezzi emphasized the need for right order in relating with the wider Catholic Church. However, little was said in the book about the integration of the *content* of specifically Catholic teachings and practices. The book had a strong emphasis on basic Christian teaching, but little was said about the integration of Catholic teaching and tradition in the teaching process.

GEORGE MARTIN

As mentioned earlier, George Martin (NSC member 1970-71, 82-85) in 1976 wrote the book, *Parish Renewal, A Charismatic Approach*. Martin was excited about CCR, but saw its integration into the full life of the Church as a slow and difficult process.

He wrote:

The renewal of the Church and the absorption of the charismatic movement into the life of the Church will happen neither quickly nor automatically. Nor will it happen except by the sovereign grace of God.²⁵²

In general, the Catholic charismatic renewal today is neither fully integrated into parish life nor has it formed itself into a permanently separate structure. On the whole, the movement usually has some kind of ties to a local parish, but has yet only had a limited impact on parish life. Most groups are searching for the right kind of relationship to their parish and are anxious to come under the right kind of pastoral direction from their pastor. And there is a good deal of uncertainty on all sides how this is to be accomplished.²⁵³

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 7.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 42.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 117-119.

²⁵² G. Martin, *Parish Renewal*, 129.

²⁵³ Ibid., 17.

Martin described CCR as a diverse and complex movement because of the various sizes of groups, levels of commitment (e.g. a once a week meeting versus a whole community lifestyle), and the inclusion of both ecumenical groups and exclusively Roman Catholic groups. He mentioned how some large groups had tried to divide up to be in the local parishes, but found that they did not have enough leadership resources to sustain the smaller group. Involvement in a parish needed the active support of the parish priest(s), which was not always present. While parish renewal needed to be a primary thrust of charismatic renewal in the Catholic Church, not every group should or could immediately go in this direction, according to Martin. Groups needed to discern the best way that they could serve the work of renewal in their local situation. Finally, Martin cautioned that the attitude of those in CCR should not be on evangelizing the parish to their approach, but on getting to know people on a person-to-person basis, and getting involved in being a servant to others in the parish, keeping the emphasis on growing in Jesus, rather than on charismatic renewal.

In 1975 Martin also wrote a book called *Reading Scripture as the Word of God*.²⁵⁴ The book gave both some practical background, and a method for studying Scripture from a Roman Catholic viewpoint. He emphasized the importance of the bible being a book of the Church, and touched on some of the tendencies and problems with a fundamentalistic approach to the Scriptures.

JUDITH TYDINGS

Judith C. Tydings (one of the founders of a large covenant community) wrote a book, *Gathering a People: Catholic Saints in Charismatic Perspective*.²⁵⁵ In its introduction Tydings explained two major goals in writing this book. The first goal was to help Catholic theologians to see charismatic renewal "as continuous and completely in harmony with Catholic tradition and classical spiritual theology, which, after all, is a distillation of the wisdom contained in the saint's lives." The second goal was to promote ecumenism. She said that Protestant and Catholic Pentecostals must not only pray together, but begin to work toward a common mind:

We have to have an individual and denominational historical consciousness before we can share together in a common Christian historical consciousness.

The Lord is calling us to go back into our past – our common past – first alone, and then with each other. As we do this, the Lord will, I think, grant us a gi-

²⁵⁴ George Martin, *Reading Scripture as the Word of God* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Word of Life, 1975).

²⁵⁵ Judith C. Tydings, *Gathering a People. Catholic Saints in Charismatic Perspective* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1977). Tydings was one of the founders of the Mother of God community in the Washington, D.C. area. It is noteworthy that the book was published by a Protestant Pentecostal publishing house.

gantic healing of memories. The Lord wants us to come to grips with what each denomination and part of his body would rather put under the rug. Together we must share the guilt and hurt and pain we have caused one another....the Lord wants us to look at how we have sinned against one another. Then He wants us to seek and receive forgiveness, first from Him, for it is His body that we have injured, and then from each other.²⁵⁶

After this progression of events happened, Tydings believed that denominations could then share and learn from the treasures in each other's storehouse. She disagreed with Vinson Synan (author of *Charismatic Bridges*) that the pulling back to be integrated in one's own denomination was building "charismatic walls" in the interdenominational charismatic movement. She believed it was necessary to have a healthy self-understanding and a continuity with the past in order to come to a deeper work of unity.

Tydings was convinced of the need to correlate and compare the language of charismatic renewal with the language of traditional Catholic spiritual teaching. She did not think that charismatic renewal was a new school of spirituality. She explained that "baptism in the Spirit is a *unitive experience* which can occur at any *stage* of the spiritual life, purgative, illuminative or unitive, or even before a "spiritual life" begins, before one enters on the purgative way."²⁵⁷ She believed that our age especially needed theologians that were "deeply plunged into the life of the Spirit," and understood the balance between the institutional, intellectual and mystical elements of religion.²⁵⁸

RONDA CHERVIN

Ronda Chervin, a popular Catholic author of books on Christian living, and a professor of Philosophy, wrote a book called *Why I Am a Charismatic*.²⁵⁹ The book is a positive introduction to CCR. She wanted to respond to critics of charismatic prayer who denigrated it as a cheap emotional high or a passing wave of enthusiasm. She described CCR as an answer to the "resignation to doubt, to despair, and to the absence of felt love (that) is a terrible sickness in the Church."²⁶⁰ Baptism in the Spirit and the use of spiritual gifts can bring a tremendous inner transformation in people's lives. Chervin admitted that there needs to be caution and sobriety with spiritual gifts because the human element can effect their use. There also needs to be growth in patient love along with

²⁵⁶ The pages of the Introduction to *Gathering a People* by Tydings are not numbered.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 238.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 248.

²⁵⁹ Ronda Chervin, *Why I Am a Charismatic* (Liguori, MO: Liguori, 1978).

²⁶⁰ Ibid., p.38.

spiritual gifts. However, these gifts are truly a means that God uses to touch and transform people's lives.

Chervin emphasized the integration of charismatic renewal with the whole Catholic tradition. Her book had separate chapters on the sacraments and on Mary, the bride of the Spirit. Her final chapter was an interview with Fr. Ralph Tichenor, SJ who was active in CCR leadership. Tichenor pointed out that it is heretical to think that a group can be guided always by the direct inspiration of the Spirit. Scripture, tradition, dogma, and the authority of the hierarchy must always be involved in discernment. Finally, he commented on the question of male domination in CCR:

There is no doubt that there has been and there still is a real emphasizing of male domination in the renewal. The usual appeal to Paul without taking into account the many women – Lydia, Priscilla and so on – who were instrumental in building the Church with Paul, is a mistaken one. We are learning from our mistakes. Leadership should be given by the Holy Spirit and discerned by the community. If the Spirit gives the gift of leadership to a woman, the community has no right to reject her gift.²⁶¹

OTHER LESS-INFLUENTIAL AUTHORS

JAMES BYRNE

James Byrne (NSC member 1970-1973) authored two new publications during this timeframe.²⁶² He emphasized that charismatic spirituality must be *contemporary*, deeply rooted in the *Catholic heritage*, and *charismatic*. For Byrne the liturgy and Marian devotion gave an ongoing pattern of devotion that is a necessary balance for the more spontaneous, charismatic approach. For Byrne it was important that CCR not exaggerate the importance of religious experience. Experience does not give instant understanding and is not infallible. It can be distorted by sin and pride. Religious experience needs to be reflected on rationally and discerned within the context of a deep faith in the whole Church, her teachings, and obedience to the bishops.

There needs to be respect for the work of the Spirit in the Church throughout the centuries. The strength of a religious experience should not make people scorn sacraments, hierarchy, and doctrine.

RICHARD QUEBEDEAUX

Richard Quebedeaux described Catholic Pentecostals as determined to remain Catholic yet wanting ecumenical contacts with Protestant Pentecostals.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 116.

²⁶² James E. Byrne, *Living in the Spirit. A Handbook of Catholic Charismatic Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1975) and *The Charismatic Experience of the Spirit* (Pecos, N.M: Dove, 1976).

The charismatic renewal was more concerned with bringing people to Jesus than doctrinal disagreements. Quebedeaux believed that "charismatic renewal ought to be regarded as a legitimate contemporary force for renewal of the Church."²⁶³

JOHN B. HEALY

John B. Healey, a Catholic priest, explained from a pastor's point of view that CCR was concerned with basic Christianity and sought to be integrated into the total life of the Church. CCR was not a fad, nor were its members fanatics. The movement was not elitist or esoteric.²⁶⁴

ROBERT J. VOIGT

Robert J. Voigt wrote a general introduction to CCR.²⁶⁵ Voigt was clearly supportive of the movement. He discussed areas that CCR needed to be aware of for continued healthy growth. He mentioned that in a 1972 survey of U.S. bishops 90% of the bishops thought that CCR was good for the Church, but expressed concerns about emotionalism, anti-intellectualism, and ecumenical indifferntism in the movement.²⁶⁶ Like Bryne, Voigt emphasized the need for a balanced understanding of religious experience. There needs to be a harmonization of charismatic experience with the public deposit of the faith. Emotions should be part of our religious experience, but there also needs to be a rational examination and critique of spiritual experiences. Voigt also pointed out the danger of excessive intellectualism that was not open to the spiritual dimension of life. Finally, Voigt thought that the approach to ecumenism within CCR was basically healthy, but there must be a continued concern to be honest about differences, rather than promoting a shallow harmonization.

ROBERT WILD

Robert Wild in his book, *Enthusiasm in the Spirit*,²⁶⁷ expressed a three-fold conviction about CCR: 1) "that charismatic renewal is a Spirit-inspired spirituality for our times;" 2) "that it needs constantly to be critically examined;" and 3) "that people in the institutional Churches, in our case the Roman Catholic

²⁶³ Richard Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976), 199.

²⁶⁴ John B. Healey, *The Charismatic Renewal, Reflections of a Pastor* (New York: Paulist, 1976).

²⁶⁵ Robert J. Voigt, *Go To the Mountain. An Insight into Charismatic Renewal* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1975).

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁶⁷ Robert Wild, *Enthusiasm in the Spirit* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1975). Wild is a priest who at that time was at Madonna House in Ontario, Canada.

Church, need help in understanding and integrating this work of the Spirit into their traditional Church devotion and practice."²⁶⁸

For Wild charismatic renewal is optional, but growth in the Spirit is not optional. He explained that enthusiastic movements can sometimes lack critical judgment. He feared the repercussions of people in CCR sometimes not being willing to discuss "touchy points of Scripture and Theology."²⁶⁹ Finally, he emphasized that the integration of CCR into the life of the Church would not happen overnight. Great delicacy and discernment would be needed. CCR must make sure it recognizes the gifts in the rest of the Church, and not act as if the Church had nothing in the past to compare with this new movement.

THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS ON CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

A number of theologians (during this timeframe) who became involved in CCR offered their evaluations of CCR in a more systematic theological context. Heribert Mühlen and Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens were two of the most noteworthy authors.

HERIBERT MÜHLEN

Paulist Press published in 1978 (in English) the book, *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit* by the German theologian, Heribert Mühlen. The July 1974 issue of *New Covenant* had a cover story called "An Interview with Heribert Mühlen: Theologian of the Holy Spirit." The book, *The Holy Spirit and Power*, contained two articles by Mühlen. He also had articles published in *Theology Digest* in 1976 and 1977 that included insights concerning how his involvement in CCR had influenced his work in theology.²⁷⁰ However, Mühlen could not be described as commonly known within CCR in the United States because he didn't visit and speak in the U.S.

Mühlen emphasized that theology must be a reflection on real experience. Doctrine emerged from experience. His book, *A Charismatic Theology*, had both theological and pastoral sections so as to show the importance and unity of both. The book not only *gave* theological reflections, but *led* people to come to experience God in a deeper way.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 18.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 100.

²⁷⁰ Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology. Initiation in the Spirit* (New York: Paulist, 1978; 1976 in German); "An Interview with Heribert Mühlen: Theologian of the Holy Spirit," *New Covenant* (July 1974), 3-6; "New Directions in Mariology," *Theology Digest* (Fall 1976), 286-292; "Sacrament and Charism: The Spirit and the Church," *Theology Digest* (Spring 1977), 45-49; "The Person of the Holy Spirit" (11-33) and "The Charismatic Renewal as Experience" (107-117), *The Holy Spirit and Power*, Kilian McDonnell, ed., (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975).

Mühlen was a strong promoter of ecumenical efforts, but he believed that each denomination should use the grace of charismatic renewal in a way that corresponded to the tradition of their own Church. Rather than writing a uniform text acceptable by all denominations in the book, *A Charismatic Theology*, Mühlen collaborated with Protestant theologians so the work could be supplemented by each tradition's particular focus. In this way each group could learn more about what the other group had to offer. For example, Mühlen commented that if the Catholic Church could integrate the pneumatic experiences of Pentecostals, could not Pentecostals learn from the Catholic Church's charisms of authority and unity. In contrast to this approach, as we have seen, U.S. authors in CCR frequently did write uniform texts which tried to stay away from denominational differences.

Mühlen wrote on issues, like the sacraments and Mary, that were causes for disagreement among the churches. He sought to explain what the various denominations could learn from each other. About the sacraments he wrote, "The Spirit's interior presence, guaranteed by the sacrament, must be progressively externalized in charismatic acts. The sacrament-sign must become a charismatic-sign."²⁷¹ Concerning Mary, he admitted the error in the ways that some Catholics had portrayed Mary. At times Mary seemed to usurp the role of the Holy Spirit. However, Mühlen then went on to demonstrate the great importance of Mary because of her close union with the Holy Spirit.²⁷²

CARDINAL LÉON JOSEPH SUENENS

While Mühlen never became commonly known in the U.S., Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens became a well-known and influential figure in CCR through speaking at the Notre Dame conferences, working closely with the NSC for CCR in the U.S., and eventually starting the international office for Catholic Charismatic Renewal in Belgium. When his book, *A New Pentecost*,²⁷³ was published in English, many people in CCR wanted to hear what this high-ranking Church official would say.

Suenens basic attitude toward CCR is found in these quotes:

If I have spoken of the Renewal as a privileged manifestation of the Spirit at this moment in the Church, it is not because I consider it an exclusive reality destined to replace everything else... However, I do believe, with all my heart, that we are

²⁷¹ Mühlen, "Sacrament and Charism," 18.

²⁷² See "New Directions in Mariology," especially pages 286, 290-292.

²⁷³ Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* (New York: Seabury and Ann Arbor: Word of Life, 1975). The original edition was published in 1974 in French. Two other books concerning Suenens appeared during this timeframe: *Essays on Renewal* (Ann Arbor: Servant, 1977), which was a collection of various essays by Suenens, and *Ways of the Spirit. The Spirituality of Cardinal Suenens* (New York: Seabury, 1976), ed., Elizabeth Hamilton.

in the presence here of a very special grace for the Church provided we know how to receive it, guide its growth from within, preserve it from counterfeits which the evil one will certainly produce, and let it penetrate, by a sort of osmosis, into the heart of our collective and individual attitudes and behavior.²⁷⁴

We should not see in this Renewal just one more movement to be set alongside many others in the Church today, or, worse still, as in competition with them. Rather than a movement, Charismatic Renewal is a moving of the Holy Spirit which can reach all Christians, lay or cleric. It is comparable to a high voltage current of grace which is coursing through the Church. Every Christian is charismatic by definition; the difference lies in our degree of faith, our awareness of this fundamental and necessarily common reality.²⁷⁵

Suenens sought to show how CCR related to the whole life of the Church. He included chapters on the hierarchical and charismatic dimensions of the Church as expressed in the documents of Vatican II, the charismatic experience in the history of the Church, the place of the Holy Spirit in liturgical renewal, the Holy Spirit and action in the world, the Holy Spirit and ecumenism, and the Holy Spirit and Mary.

Chapters three through eight of his book reflected more specifically on CCR and the charismatic religious experience. Suenens described the importance and dangers of an experiential focus in religion. His judgement about CCR was that 1) it was Christocentric; 2) it helped to deepen a life of prayer and love for the Scriptures; 3) its use of the gift of tongues was not miraculous nor pathological, but a preconceptual form of prayer; 4) its leaders saw the danger of a spiritual focus without social action, but at this point focused more on the localized helping of people that could be tied into evangelization, rather than on large scale social causes; and 5) the movement had a sense for the Church, and a love for the Church.²⁷⁶ He believed that CCR leadership was working toward a balanced approach in its religious experience focus that would not be cut off from the whole life of the Church.

Finally, Suenens emphasized the great need in the Church to create authentic Christian communities. He supported efforts in CCR to build community. He also mentioned the positive efforts of the Focalari and Marriage Encounter Movements to create new communal experiences. He realized that there would be some tensions and conflict between new communities and the development of parish life. Suenens suggested keeping strong contacts with the local bishop, keeping some minimum contact with local parishes, but allowing groups to develop along their own lines. Suenens supported both the development of cove-

²⁷⁴ Suenens, *A New Pentecost?*, 105-106.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 110.

²⁷⁶ See pages 96-105.

nant communities, and the involvement of CCR in parish renewal. In different places and situations one approach could be more fruitful than the other.²⁷⁷

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMITTEE THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE ON CCR - 1976

Along with Mühlen and Suenens, other theologians involved in Catholic Charismatic Renewal were beginning to do more systematic theological reflection on aspects of charismatic renewal. The National Service Committee sponsored a theological conference on CCR (October 1-2, 1976).²⁷⁸ There were four presentations with one or two respondents for each topic. The presentations were entitled "The Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics" by Fr. Francis Martin, "New Aspects of Spiritual Direction" by Ernest E. Larkin, O.Carm., "The Role Of Tradition" by Francis A. Sullivan, SJ, and "The Relationship Between Charismatic Authority and Church Office" by John C. Haughey, SJ

Francis Martin and Sullivan's ideas were accepted with little disagreement. Martin believed that charismatic renewal, as a faith experience and an experience of communal living, provides the essential principles of continuity by which the authors of the New Testament can be understood in today's world. Sullivan emphasized that the charismatic experience should be interpreted in the light of the Catholic tradition, rather than being content with the Classical Pentecostals' interpretation of it. He wrote:

There is now a Pentecostal tradition in Christianity by which our own tradition can be enriched, but we have to discern where the wealth of the Pentecostal tradition really lies. Surely it is not in its theology or exegesis; rather, its richness is to be found in its openness to the powerful working of the Spirit through the whole community, its participative and creative worship, its extraordinary effectiveness in communicating the good news of Jesus Christ. It is in these areas that Pentecostals are leading the way, and that we of the more venerable and "respectable" Christian traditions must have the humility to learn and to follow.²⁷⁹

The presentations by Larkin and Haughey were more controversial.

Larkin examined the practice of spiritual direction in CCR in light of the history of spiritual direction in the Church. He said that experience, knowledge, and prudence are all necessary for engaging in direction. While he supported the predominantly lay character of CCR, he feared that the knowledge of life in Christ of many CCR leaders "is not objectified, reflected on, or evaluated. This knowledge is subject to all the vagaries of subjectivity when it is without the control of the community experience past and present. It is not integrated

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 142-143.

²⁷⁸ The proceedings were published as: John C. Haughey, SJ, ed., *Theological Reflections on the Charismatic Renewal* (Ann Arbor: Servant, 1978).

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 92.

into the tradition."²⁸⁰ Larkin perceived a need for knowledge beyond personal experience, which would lead to a greater sense of prudence.

Larkin also believed that persons exercising "headship" in charismatic groups, at times, were overstepping their authority. Larkin explained that these persons were not official Church leaders (most often). They should not exceed their competence or invade a person's right to privacy. There needed to be clear agreements about the roles of leaders. Larkin believed that the history of the Church showed the wisdom of not giving one person the role of both internal (spiritual) direction, and external direction in a person's life. A person's spiritual director and the head of the community in Religious Orders were usually different people.

In her response to Larkin's presentation Judith Tydings expressed some significant disagreements. She disliked the idea of separating the roles of superior and spiritual director. In her reading of history, she believed that this separation came because of the loss of a sense of Christian community. The separation hinders growth in the Spirit. She said that she didn't perceive happening anywhere in the Church a significant and consistent growth in people's lives as in covenant communities that take a headship approach.

She also disagreed with Larkin's point that a community should talk more generally about "guidance" of people, but not about "obedience" until it is officially recognized in the Church. She pointed out that many religious orders and institutes in the history of the Church used the language of "obedience" before having the Church's official recognition.

Finally, she raised the issue of the tension that arose from the need for people with charismatic experience to get more theological background, but the difficulty of finding people with theological background who truly understand the experience of charismatic renewal. She wrote:

Pastoral leaders in the renewal can only benefit from good theology. But good theology assisting God's work in the renewal can only be produced by those who have an accurate knowledge of what is at the heart of charismatic renewal, and this by being in touch with what God is really saying and doing. As I believe that the formation of Christian community is central to the charismatic renewal, it is important for the theology of those involved in the renewal that theologians have an understanding of the communities arising there.²⁸¹

Also, from the NSC Theological Conference John C. Haughey, SJ wrote about charismatic authority and church office. He thought that charismatic leadership should not be as binding as office. There must not be a "para-clericalism" developed in CCR. Charismatic leadership should not be permanent,

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 53.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 77.

and commitments in communities that are not formally related to the Church should not be permanent. He feared an "Anabaptist" understanding of Church, which he described as revivalistic, non-institutional, privatistic, and only recognizing leadership from those who demonstrate charismatic experiences and gifts. At the same time, he realized that the Canon Law of the Catholic Church did not consider how to relate *ecumenical* communities (that include Catholics) with the wider Church. He thought that charismatic authority and Church office are necessary checks and balances for each other. Church office must not depend on its commission without openness to the charismatic dimension, while charismatic leadership needed the discerning and uniting role of Church office.

In his response to Haughey, Bruce Yocum (a coordinator of the Word of God Community in Ann Arbor, MI.) was uncomfortable with a number of the ideas expressed by Haughey. He felt that Haughey's likening some covenant communities to an Anabaptist ecclesiology was unfair to the communities, as well as, a misrepresentation of the Anabaptist tradition. According to Yocum, the covenant communities have a great respect for authority. He compared these communities to the start of movements inspired by the Desert Fathers, or Francis of Assisi or Ignatius of Loyola, which were within the Church, but distinct from the official leadership of the Church.

Yocum realized that the existence of covenant communities within the Church was a challenge to the Church. He wrote:

There is, however, a realization that in its relation to formal authority within the Church, the renewal is speaking from an experience with which many who hold office in the Church are simply not familiar. They too will have to take cognizance of the genuine newness of what is experienced in the renewal.²⁸²

He agreed with Haughey that it was essential for CCR leaders to work closely with Church authorities. He concluded by saying:

If both Church officials and the leaders of such communities are devoted to the good of God's people, then the movement can be successfully integrated with great benefit for all. If they are defensive or uncooperative, much good that God intends can be lost.²⁸³

FURTHER THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

Another collection of articles that was an effort to deepen the theological reflection on CCR was entitled *The Spirit of God in Christian Life*.²⁸⁴ The four articles did not evaluate the CCR movement, itself, very much, but were at-

²⁸² Ibid., 127.

²⁸³ Ibid., 129.

²⁸⁴ Edward Malatesta, S.J., ed., *The Spirit of God in Christian Life* (New York: Paulist, 1977). The book is described as a contribution to the charismatic renewal by professors of the Pontif-

tempts to give a deeper grounding in Scripture and theological reflection to aspects of life in the Spirit. Barnabas Ahern, C.P. did a study of the Spirit's role in the theology of holiness of St. Paul's writings. Francis Sullivan, SJ compared "speaking in tongues" in the Scriptures with the use of the gift of tongues in the modern charismatic renewal. He concluded that "speaking in tongues," both in Scripture and in modern usage, is "unintelligible language-like speech, which is neither the speaking of unlearned foreign languages nor a product of religious ecstasy, but is found by its users to be helpful as a way of praying, especially in private."²⁸⁵

Antonio Queralto, SJ also studied St. Paul's writings, but from the point of view of the complementarity of the action of the Holy Spirit and of the risen Christ in the Christian. Finally, Robert Faricy, SJ also developed the idea of complementarity in his article on "Nature, Social Sin, and the Spirit." The human race in Genesis is called both to "have dominion" over nature, but also to work in complementarity with nature. In a similar way, as seen in St. Paul's writings, the Christian is to allow the Holy Spirit to "have dominion" in one's life, but is also to work in complementarity with the Spirit. By the Christian's union of complementarity with both nature and the Holy Spirit, the Christian is called to be transformed by the Spirit in the image of Christ, but also to participate with the Spirit in the transformation in Christ of all creation and social structures.

Another book that gave a deeper Scriptural and theological background to the focus of CCR without reflecting on the movement directly, was *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* by George Montague, SM²⁸⁶ The book is a commentary on the principle texts about the Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments. Montague described the book as seeking "to avoid fundamentalism on the one hand and purely rational exegesis on the other."²⁸⁷

CHRISTIAN LIVING FROM A CCR PERSPECTIVE

Two series of books were written during this timeframe that attempted to give a broader framework for growing in Catholic-Christian living from a perspective that had been influenced by CCR.

ical Gregorian University in Rome. The contributors are Barnabas Mary Ahern, CP, Francis A. Sullivan, SJ, Robert Faricy, SJ, and Antonio Queralto, SJ.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 66-67.

²⁸⁶ George Montague, SM, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist, 1976).

²⁸⁷ Ibid., vii.

PAUL HINNEBUSCH

Paul Hinnebusch, OP wrote three books from 1974-1976: *Friendship in the Lord*, *Community in the Lord*, and *Praise: A Way of Life*.²⁸⁸ Hinnebusch mentioned that these books came out of his experience of being a member of the charismatic *Community of God's Delight* in Dallas, Texas. The books demonstrated an effort to link CCR with the riches of the Catholic tradition. Hinnebusch frequently used examples and stories about the saints (including Mary, the mother of Jesus). He explained the value of celibacy. He had a strong Trinitarian and sacramental orientation. He believed that charismatic renewal is in the mainstream of Christian spirituality as this has run through the centuries.²⁸⁹

Hinnebusch emphasized the importance of Christian community. He frequently described the blessings he had received from being a part of a covenant community. Some type of community life is important for all Christians, he believed. Not everyone, however, would be called to be part of a "covenant" community. In describing headship and leadership in community, Hinnebusch talked about a twofold submission: the communities' submission to the Holy Spirit working in the leader, and the leader's submission to the Holy Spirit working in the rest of the community. In matters involving the whole community the leaders make the decisions after listening to the community, but in individual, personal matters the leader gives counsel, but then lets the person make one's own decision. The leader respects the unique dignity of each individual, and aims to develop the maximum personal maturity in each person. Submission involves active and responsible cooperation, not a passive surrender or abdication of responsibility.²⁹⁰

Hinnebusch affirmed the role of the father as head of the family. The father is meant to be the image of God for his family. By his love the father invites the families' loving response, but also, in love, he holds before them love's requirements and responsibilities. The wife is also meant to be the image of God to the husband, as he is to her. Finally, the husband and wife together reflect God's image to the family because God's image is perfected in mutual love.²⁹¹ Hinnebusch described a complementarity of men and women:

Since the feminine way of receiving and reflecting Christ differs in many ways from the masculine way, friendship between male and female is likely to be more

²⁸⁸ Paul Hinnebusch, OP, *Friendship in the Lord* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1974); *Community in the Lord* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria, 1975); *Praise: A Way of Life* (Ann Arbor: Word of Life, 1976).

²⁸⁹ *Community in the Lord*, 10.

²⁹⁰ See *Community in the Lord*, 180-183.

²⁹¹ See *Community in the Lord*, 42, 78-81.

enriching than friendship between two of the same sex. Only a woman can open a man to certain aspects of the divine mystery, just as only a man can open a woman to other aspects. No doubt this explains why many of the great saints had close friends of the opposite sex. God made the image of God male and female, and that is why particularly always a religious order has its feminine as well as its masculine branches. When their religious life was truly fervent, it was because the two were mutually influencing each other for good.²⁹²

Hinnebusch believed that charismatic renewal was a form of "incipient mysticism." Vocal praise and prayer in tongues disposes a person for quiet adoration and listening silence. He strongly believed that active vocal praise and quiet inner listening were both essential for full openness to the Holy Spirit, and a necessary balance for one another.²⁹³

JOSEPH LANGE AND ANTHONY GUSHING

Joseph Lange, OSFS (the editor of *Catholic Charismatic* magazine starting in 1976) and Anthony Gushing authored four books that were entitled the *Living Christian Community Series*.²⁹⁴ Like Hinnebusch, they wrote from their experience of being a part of a charismatic community, the *Children of Joy* community in Allentown, Pennsylvania. They believed that there was a need in CCR for more extensive teaching on growth in the Lord beyond the initial experience of baptism in the Spirit. They also thought that not all charismatic renewal books were good from a sound theological and fully Catholic standpoint. CCR needed to be linked to all the treasures of the Catholic tradition to give it a sense of balance. Charismatic renewal was understood as part of God's work of renewal in the Church, but not the whole of it.

The series attempted to integrate charismatic spirituality with the whole life of the Church. The books contain a significant amount on the sacraments, the meaning of Church, the social mission of the Church, and some reflections on the saints. The series described the great benefit of Christian community life, but also talked about dangers for charismatic communities through superficiality, exclusiveness, cliques, and a fundamentalistic reading of the Scriptures.

The authors advocated a less structured approach to community life. We have seen that different communities and authors in CCR had different

²⁹² *Friendship in the Lord*, 80-81.

²⁹³ See *Praise: A Way of Life*, 237, 263-264.

²⁹⁴ Joseph Lange, OSFS and Anthony Gushing, *Living Christian Community Series*: Vol. I, *Friendship With Jesus* (1974); Vol. II, *Worshipping Community* (1975); Vol. III, *Freedom and Healing* (1976); Vol. IV, *Called To Service* (1976). The series was co-published by New York: Paulist, and Pecos, New Mexico: Dove.

attitudes toward structure in charismatic communities.²⁹⁵ Lange and Gushing feared the paternalism of using structures and authority to protect people from mistakes. They believed that it was important to call people to personal responsibility and freedom. This approach, they said, could be less peaceful and lead to more individual mistakes, but is the only way to develop maturity. They described their approach as a loving submissiveness to order in the community, rather than a submission to persons. Conformity should not be required. Structures should be subordinate to persons, and should work to maximize freedom.²⁹⁶ Finally, the authors had some strong words about the role of women in the Church. Lange and Gushing did not go as far as Ford and Gelpi in promoting the ordination of women, but they believed that all other forms of leadership in the Church, besides priesthood, should be allowed to women. They believed that there should be an equal representation of both men and women on the leadership teams of prayer groups and communities. The exclusion of women is an "archaic social custom."²⁹⁷

Lange and Gushing also disliked the teaching about the headship of the husband in marriage. They wrote, "St. Paul's teaching on male headship is an inspired pastoral teaching on how first century Christians could integrate their Christianity with the popular culture. It is not a universal teaching which applies to all Christians at all times."²⁹⁸ They interpreted the creation and fall stories in Genesis as teaching that male headship is one of the effects of the first sin. Their community did not use the language of headship and submission because they believed that in a democratic society submission connotes inferiority and subservience. They encouraged the couples in their community to discern their own approach to patterns of family life. Male headship was only one possibility.

The *Living Christian Community* series encompassed both the elements of a Life in the Spirit Seminar along with an extended follow-up on how to live one's Christian life in the Spirit. The series approached the living of Christiani-

²⁹⁵ Ralph Martin, Steve Clark and the covenant communities modeled after those in Ann Arbor (The Word of God) and South Bend (The People of Praise) had a strong common covenant and a structured lifestyle which they felt best helped them to serve the Lord and grow in the Lord together (these were the largest groups). Hinnebusch described a communal life that was structured for communal service and growth, but somewhat less structured in giving personal headship to all the individual members. J.M. Ford wanted as little structure as possible in charismatic groups for maximum personal freedom. Lange and Gushing would fit between Ford and Hinnebusch. They believed that structure exists only as a service to maximize freedom, and they feared too much structure and the idea of headship.

²⁹⁶ See *Freedom and Healing*, 59, 88-91.

²⁹⁷ *Called to Service*, 48.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 164.

ty within an individual's life, within community, and within the Catholic tradition. Being a four-book series, however, the project required an extended commitment for those people who were willing to go through the whole process. Because of this fact, the series was not used widely in CCR.

YOU WILL RECEIVE POWER SEMINAR SERIES

The *Life in the Spirit Seminar, Team Manual*, first published in 1971, had been widely used for introducing people to the baptism in the Spirit and to the basic ideas of charismatic renewal. It was written with an approach that could be used with any Christian denomination. In 1977, Sr. Philip Marie Burle, C.P.P.S. and Sr. Sharon Ann Plankenhorn, C.P.P.S. published *You Will Receive Power: A Holy Spirit Seminar – Eight Sessions of Catholic Teaching*.²⁹⁹ This new seminar had the same basic purposes as the 1971 manual, but was written specifically for Catholics. The seminar wanted to show how the best of authentic charismatic experience could be harmoniously integrated with the richness of the Catholic tradition. Quotations from Vatican II were included with each session. The sacraments, saints, and quotes from the pope were included throughout the seminar. More ideas were mentioned about being involved in the life of a local parish, than in the first seminar manual. While openness to the gift of tongues was still encouraged, the seminar clearly stated that Catholics have never demanded the gift of tongues as a sign of baptism of the Spirit.

Fr. Vincent M. Walsh also wanted a way to prepare Catholics better for the Life in the Spirit seminars. His book, *Preparing Newcomers for Life in the Spirit*, was published in 1976.³⁰⁰ The book rooted charismatic renewal within the history of the Catholic Church, and showed the relation of life in the Spirit to the Catholic sacramental system.

LITERATURE ON SPECIFIC AREAS OF INTEREST IN CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

We will finish our study of authors by describing some of the literature that did not focus on the entire CCR, but focused on particular areas of interest within the movement.

HEALING PRAYER

Prayer for healing became a major emphasis in CCR, especially after the healing service at the 1974 Notre Dame conference. The most popular Catholic

²⁹⁹ Sr. Philip Marie Burle, C.P.P.S. and Sr. Sharon Ann Plankenhorn, C.P.P.S., *You Will Receive Power: A Holy Spirit Seminar – Eight Sessions of Catholic Teaching* (Pecos, New Mexico: Dove, 1977).

³⁰⁰ Vincent M. Walsh, *Preparing Newcomers for Life in the Spirit* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1976).

writers on healing prayer during this timeframe were all Catholic priests (Fr. Francis MacNutt, Fr. Michael Scanlon, and Frs. Dennis and Matthew Linn). All of these authors described approaches to individual and group prayer for the healing of others, but they also stressed the healing power of the sacraments.

PROPHECY

Leaders in CCR believed that prophecy was an important gift of the Spirit by which God guided his people. Prophecies at major conferences had a significant influence for guiding CCR. The book *Prophecy* by Bruce Yocum (a Catholic and a coordinator of the Word of God community in Ann Arbor) developed an understanding of the importance of prophecy in the Church. The first half of the book was a study of prophecy in Scripture and in the early Church. The second part of the book described how to grow in prophetic gifts based on the experience of people involved in charismatic renewal.

Prophecy was written with an interdenominational audience in mind. However, Yocum taught that it was important that prophets and communities where prophecy is exercised be under the authority of the wider Church. He mentioned that for him, as a Roman Catholic, the ultimate authority in discerning prophecy and right teaching rests with the teaching authority of the Catholic Church.³⁰¹ He believed that there needed to be a strong Christian community life for prophecy to function properly. False and misguided prophecy was discussed. The overall emphasis was more on the importance of this gift for the Church than the dangers of promoting this gift. The book did not contain any study of what Catholic spiritual masters have said about receiving messages from God.

PRACTICAL GUIDES FOR PRAYER

Msgr. David E. Rosage continued to promote prayer and the spiritual life through his book, *Discovering Pathways to Prayer*.³⁰² Rosage reflected on many aspects of prayer (listening, meditation, contemplation, the use of Scripture in prayer, etc.). He devoted one chapter specifically to "praying charismatically" where he mentioned prayer groups, the prayer of praise, the baptism in the Spirit and praying in tongues, the importance of a regular prayer time, and how charismatic renewal had deepened the appreciation of many people for the sacraments and devotion to Mary.

³⁰¹ *Prophecy*, 113.

³⁰² David E. Rosage, *Discovering Pathways to Prayer* (Hauppauge, New York: Living Flame, 1975).

PROTESTANT AUTHORS INFLUENTIAL IN CCR

From the beginnings of CCR many pentecostal/charismatic authors who were not Catholic had some significant influence on the movement. It is beyond the scope of this study to catalogue all of these authors. However, the most influential person was the Pentecostal minister, David du Plessis. The book, *A Man Called Mr. Pentecost*,³⁰³ included du Plessis' own description of his call to share the "Pentecostal experience" with Catholics. He was invited to the Second Vatican Council where he was able to talk with Cardinal Bea and other bishops about the role of the Holy Spirit. When CCR began, he was an important guide for the early movement, encouraging people to stay in their own Churches. He wrote for *New Covenant* and spoke at the early Notre Dame conferences. He strongly believed that God did not want a new Pentecostal or Charismatic Church, but wanted to renew all the churches in the Spirit of Pentecost.³⁰⁴

Marian Content

NEW COVENANT MAGAZINE

The May 1975 issue of *New Covenant* carried, for the first time, an article specifically on Mary: "Mary's Gift for God's People: A Scriptural View" by George Montague, SM³⁰⁵ In the editor's notes, Ralph Martin introduced this article by saying, "We are presenting this scriptural study on Mary's gift for the body of Christ because we think it will increase our understanding of a topic which has been a point of disunity among Christians for centuries." The topic was clearly being raised very cautiously, but it was significant that greater understanding was being sought in an ecumenically disputed area.

GEORGE MONTAGUE

Montague began by directly confronting the ecumenical tension. He explained that the Pentecostal experience among Catholics has seemed to help in reviving Marian devotion. Protestant Pentecostals could be surprised by this development. Montague admitted that some of the concerns of Protestants were not unfounded. In the past there had been excessive and superstitious Marian devotion and descriptions of Mary that were not founded on sound theology and biblical study. Montague wanted to share reflections that he hoped would "provide a context for a Spirit-filled and biblical understanding of the place

³⁰³ David Duplessis as told to Bob Slosser, *A Man Called Mr. Pentecost* (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1977).

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 243.

³⁰⁵ George Montague, SM, "Mary's Gift For God's People: A Scriptural View," *New Covenant* (May 1975), 28-30.

of Mary.”³⁰⁶ He hoped that “charismatics” could learn from each other’s traditions, so as to build charismatic bridges among the churches.

Montague described how God reveals himself through persons. Jesus is the fullness of this revelation. However, all who believe in Jesus and are filled by the Spirit become lights to reveal God to others.

Montague then indicated how in Luke’s gospel a person is a disciple in the measure in which s/he listens to the word. Mary is presented as a model of discipleship. Montague demonstrated this through Luke’s infancy account where Mary is portrayed as blessed for hearing the word of God and keeping it (Luke 11:28). He explained how Mary is portrayed as “Daughter Zion” and the “Ark of the Covenant.” Finally, at the marriage feast of Cana in John’s gospel, it was Mary’s faith that led to Jesus’ miracle, resulting in the disciples belief in Jesus (John 2:11).

Montague wrote that Mary’s perfect and unique receptivity to God is a special and enduring charism for the Church. God gives his gifts for the sake of the whole body of Christ. Therefore, we need to learn from Mary’s gift. In Luke, Mary is presented as the model charismatic. She should be dear to all “charismatic” people.

New Covenant printed two other articles specifically on Mary within this timeframe. “The Mother of Jesus and the Meaning of Discipleship” was written by the Scripture scholar, Fr. Donald Senior.³⁰⁷ This article was reproduced from *Sign* magazine because it fit in with the overall theme of “discipleship” in the December 1975 issue of *New Covenant*. The content of the article is similar to Montague’s article in that it focused on the portrayal of Mary in Luke’s gospel, showing how Mary embodied the definition of a disciple in this gospel. One addition was Senior’s recalling Mary’s presence in Acts 1-2 (written by Luke) as the disciples waited for the coming of the Holy Spirit. He also mentioned the overall positive portrayal of women as disciples in Luke’s writings.

KILIAN MCDONNELL AND ECUMENICAL REFLECTIONS RELATED TO MARY

The third article specifically on Mary was “Protestants, Pentecostals, and Mary” by Kilian McDonnell.³⁰⁸ It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that McDonnell had written an article in each of the February and March 1976 issues of *New Covenant*, concerning the proper approach to ecumenism in charismatic renewal. He mentioned that the role of Mary is one of the issues that cannot be

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 28.

³⁰⁷ Donald Senior, “The Mother of Jesus and the Meaning of Discipleship,” *New Covenant* (December 1975), 10-13.

³⁰⁸ Kilian McDonnell, “Protestants, Pentecostals, and Mary,” *New Covenant* (March 1977), 26-29.

ignored as not "central" to the basic Christian message. In the article of March 1977 McDonnell went further in showing how Mary might be an instrument of unity between Catholics and Protestant Pentecostals.

McDonnell described the fact that classical Pentecostalism itself has no real unity in many doctrinal matters. However, they are bound together by the emphasis they give to *Presence* and *praise*.

McDonnell admitted that he tended to take a restrained approach to Marian theology because of his ecumenical work (executive director of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research), and because of real exaggerations about Mary in some Catholic piety. When someone at the 1974 Synod of bishops called Mary "the first charismatic," he protested this expression as a dangerous exaggeration. When a Scripture scholar suggested he look more closely at the gospel of Luke and Acts 1-2, McDonnell found Mary described as a woman who was filled with Presence and praise. In the article McDonnell examined how Mary in Luke's gospel is portrayed as the new "ark" of God's presence, and a person who responded to God's presence with praise (especially in the Magnificat). Mary's role is a charismatic one. However, McDonnell would want to speak of Jesus as the first charismatic in a more primary theological sense. Finally, McDonnell mentioned how Classical Pentecostals often talk about the "full gospel." He called Pentecostals to understand the Scriptural teaching on Mary not as Catholic baggage, but as part of the "full gospel." There should be no "zones of silence" about Mary's role (especially the Scriptural evidence) in the charismatic renewal. The CCR would be restricting the Spirit if it did not see the Spirit working in the whole history of the Church, which includes the experience of millions of Christians who witness to the role of Mary. McDonnell hoped that by looking at Mary in relation to Christ and the Church, rather than in isolation, she could become an instrument of understanding between Catholics and Pentecostals.

Russell Spittler (an Assembly of God minister) mentioned his support of Kilian McDonnell's description of Mary as a model of both God's presence and praise in his article, "Classical Pentecostals and Christian Unity."³⁰⁹ However, according to Spittler doctrines not specifically mentioned in the bible (e.g. her sinlessness and bodily transference to heaven) are a problem because Pentecostals tend to see the bible as the only source of religious authority. Spittler described the Catholic understanding of tradition, and admitted that Scripture itself gives authority to tradition (1 Corinthians 11:2-16). He wrote, "As we

³⁰⁹ Russell Spittler, "Classical Pentecostals and Christian Unity," *New Covenant* (August 1977), 10-14.

seek greater togetherness, theological differences should be acknowledged and not ignored, understood and not belittled."³¹⁰

Finally, in the area of ecumenism there were two other references to Mary. In one article "Marian Theology" was mentioned as one of the areas of tension in ecumenical prayer groups.³¹¹ A second article was a reprint of John Wesley's "A Letter to a Roman Catholic"³¹² which included his belief that Mary continued as a pure and spotless virgin both before and after the birth of Jesus.

CARDINAL SUENENS

Cardinal Suenens continued to include a strong Marian dimension in his writings. *New Covenant* (May 1975) carried a section from the final chapter of his book, *A New Pentecost?*³¹³ The section included a reflection about how it is easy to confuse the human and the divine in our inner experiences. Suenens implied that Mary could help us with this struggle. He wrote, "Only Mary in the Magnificat was able to sing the marvels that the Lord worked in her, and in a tone befitting a pure transparency before God."³¹⁴ The August 1975 issue of *New Covenant* gave a review of *A New Pentecost?*³¹⁵ which mentioned that Suenens saw a renewed appreciation of the role of Mary developing through the influence of CCR.

POPE PAUL VI

As Catholic Charismatic Renewal made more contacts with Pope Paul VI during this timeframe, *New Covenant* included a number of reflections by him. The December 1974 issue printed his 1973 Christmas address about Jesus and his birth from Mary, who is virgin and mother, mother of Christ and mother of God. The January 1975 issue contained an October 16, 1974, address of the Paul VI in which he stated that the Church needs a new abundance of the charismatic gifts. The pope called everyone to invoke and pray like the apostles did with Mary for the Holy Spirit. The July 1975 issue reported on the International Conference at Rome. Paul VI's message to the conference was included. The pope called CCR to involve Mary in its efforts to bring renewal. He said, "Beloved sons and daughters, with the help of the Lord, strong in the intercession of Mary, Mother of the Church, and in communion of faith, charity, and of the

³¹⁰ Ibid., 14.

³¹¹ Steve Peterson, "Building Bridges: Protestants in Catholic Prayer Groups," *New Covenant* (January 1976), 16-19.

³¹² John Wesley, "A Letter to a Roman Catholic." *New Covenant* (May 1978), 24-26.

³¹³ Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, "The Holy Spirit: My Hope," *New Covenant* (May 1975), 4-7.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 7.

³¹⁵ Ibid., 27.

apostolate with your Pastors, you will be sure of not deceiving yourselves. And thus you will contribute for your part, to the renewal of the Church.”³¹⁶

PERSONAL TESTIMONIES ABOUT MARY

Three personal testimonies in *New Covenant* during this timeframe referred to the role of Mary. A woman described how she was looking at a picture of Mary, and she kept seeing her baby, who had drowned, with Mary. She felt the Lord telling her that her baby was with Mary and him. The woman said that she was deeply touched, and part of her was healed.³¹⁷

In the February 1977 issue Patti Mansfield (Patti Gallagher from the Duquesne Weekend) described how she had asked for Mary’s special intercession for her father, who was attending prayer meetings, but had not been baptized in the Spirit. Within a week he signed up for a Life in the Spirit Seminar, and has been growing in the Lord ever since. Mansfield also mentioned that as a mother she is learning the lessons of Mary of Nazareth, “whose daily life was filled with activities that were really extraordinary because Jesus was there.”³¹⁸

Finally, in the June 1978 issue, which focused on the Christian woman, Dorothy Ranaghan (National Service Committee, 1978-1984) wrote about a statue of Mary kneeling, head bent, with hands open that a friend had given to her when she was in college. Ranaghan wrote:

It is Mary’s surrender, her yes to the will of God. Both as a work of art, and as a spiritual statement on womanhood, it has always moved me deeply. As I have meditated on it over the years, I have seen that all women, like Mary, are called to “make a place” for the work of the Spirit and that our response precisely as women is in total and complete adaptability, submission to the will of God.³¹⁹

Ranaghan also recalled how prayerful women seeking the Lord and open to the Spirit had a special role in the origins of charismatic renewal, both in the beginnings of Pentecostalism and in CCR. This was not surprising, Ranaghan said, because they were making a place for the working of the Spirit like Mary’s “sensitive, maternal nudge made a place at Cana for the miracle only her Son could perform.” According to Ranaghan, women often sense before men the coming of God’s action, which enables them to prepare the way for God’s full work.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 25.

³¹⁷ Ibid., 20.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 22-25.

³¹⁹ “Fully a Woman,” 4-6.

MARY AS A MODEL OF FAITH AND PRAYER

A number of topical articles used Mary as an example of faith or prayer. The article, "The Incarnation," by Fr. Richard Rohr, OFM³²⁰ (popular speaker in CCR) spoke of the importance of Mary's "yes" to God. Rohr wrote:

We will know in the end that the divinity of the Savior-God has been revealed precisely through the flesh and in the human. And the Church, which once "perished by its inhumanity," as someone has put it, will glory precisely because its humanness has been freed and redeemed. Like Mary, whose "yes" was crucial to the first Incarnation, mankind will come to know that its own "yes" was necessary and significant and, that it was in fact, quite dear to God.

Fr. Tom Forrest (National Service Committee, 1975-1978) also emphasized Mary's faith and her "yes" to God: "We offer ourselves in instrumentality. We say, here I am, use me, the way Mary said, here I am, use me according to your word. That attitude in faith is very important."³²¹

In his regular *Your Word* column, George Martin (December 1974) explained that we must continually treasure and ponder the events of Christmas, like Mary, who is described in the Scriptures as acting in this fashion (Luke 2:19).

MARIAN APPARITIONS

The final references to Mary in *New Covenant* during this timeframe were related to the Marian apparitions at Lourdes. Fr. Francis MacNutt described the approach used for approving miracles at Lourdes in an article on healing prayer.³²² Lourdes was also mentioned in a news item that described 7,000 people involved in CCR making a pilgrimage during Pentecost weekend to Lourdes. Cardinal Suenens initiated the idea for the pilgrimage. Cardinal Guyot of Toulouse, France spoke to the group, encouraging them to imitate the humility and commitment of Mary in responding to the Spirit.

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE NEWSLETTER

The only mention of Mary in the National Communications Office newsletter during this timeframe was in an article by Bishop Kevin McNamara of Kerry, Ireland.³²³ McNamara will become one of the strong promoters of a Marian dimension in CCR. The conclusion of his reflections on CCR demonstrated this Marian focus:

³²⁰ Richard Rohr, OFM, "The Incarnation," *New Covenant* (December 1976), 18-21.

³²¹ Tom Forrest, "Parish Renewal in Progress," *New Covenant* (August 1978), 8-11. Quote from 11.

³²² Francis MacNutt, "Healing: Some Problems and Issues," *New Covenant* (April 1976), 15-18.

³²³ Bishop Kevin McNamara, "Irish Bishop Views the Renewal as Work of the Holy Spirit," *NCO Newsletter* December 1977), 4.

This question of baptism is one example of the need to remain firmly rooted in the ordinary life of the Church and to remain conscious of the continuity rather than the discontinuity of the spirituality of the charismatic renewal movement with that of the general body of the faithful.

Let me conclude by mentioning another example, namely devotion to Our Lady. Mary has experienced the fullness of the life of the Spirit. She dwells at the very heart of the Church, at the still center of the community of faith where the holy Church really lives up to its name. She is there as the masterpiece of the Spirit of God and as the one who is always associated with his work as he builds up the body of Christ.

We cannot better worship the Spirit of God than in her company and with her help. She is the model of docility to the Spirit and of faith in the word which he speaks to us. She is the model, too, of a life of praise, of living in joy in the presence of the Lord, of loving God and giving all the glory to him. "My soul proclaims the greatness of the Lord and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior" (Luke 1:46).

Yes, Mary is the perfect example of the Spirit-filled Christian. In her company, the infant Church awaited the coming of the Spirit at the first Pentecost. Today, too, those who wish to experience the power of the Spirit in their lives would do well to remain close to her.

THE PECOS BENEDICTINE NEWSLETTER

The *Pecos Benedictine* newsletter did not contain any articles specifically on Mary. However, two books on Mary were reviewed and added to their booklist: *Mary: The Womb of God* by George Maloney, SJ, and *Mary, the Model Charismatic* by David Rosage. We reviewed Rosage's book when it was first published in 1971. The republishing of this book by Dove Publications in 1977 gave it a much wider circulation. We will review Maloney's book later.

In January of 1978 the Pecos community began a *Charismatic School for Spiritual Directors* to help train more people in CCR as spiritual directors. One of the focuses of this program involved the interpretation of dreams and inner healing, using ideas from Jungian psychology. There also seemed to be a Marian emphasis. One woman reported that her devotion to Mary was confirmed on the program through talks by Abbot David and Fr. George Maloney, and through her prayer at the Pecos monastery dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe.³²⁴

MARIAN CONTENT IN BOOKS OF THIS TIMEFRAME

For our study of the Marian content of books written within this timeframe, first, we will examine authors who specifically referred to the question of the Marian aspect of CCR. Second, we will study the books written about Mary.

³²⁴ See *Pecos Benedictine Newsletter* (June 1978), 2,7.

Third, we will examine books with significant Marian content. Finally, we will mention other themes that arise in Marian references.

REFERENCES TO MARY AND CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

The authors of this timeframe gave mixed conclusions concerning the significance of Marian devotion within CCR.

The 1975 U.S. bishops' *Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal* stated that many who belong to the movement have found that "reverence for the Mother of the Lord takes on fresh meaning."³²⁵ In a similar way (with a slightly different focus), the document, *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (1974), stated among the effects of CCR: "It fosters a new appreciation of the evidence for Mary's presence at Pentecost and of her relationship to the Church."³²⁶ Francis MacNutt quoted a priest who said that through CCR he "experienced a great love of prayer, of Mary, of the Scriptures, and of the Eucharist."³²⁷ Breckenridge quoted one person who "found a deep devotion to Mary," and another who reported among "charismatics" a greater appreciation for the role of Mary.³²⁸ Healey stated among the effects of CCR an "increasing love for the Father and the Spirit and Mary."³²⁹

At the same time, other authors focused on the lack of Marian devotion in CCR. Fichter, in his sociological study on lay people in CCR, reported that Marian devotion was not a feature of the movement at that time. However, his study left a certain ambivalence. He noted that in some places in CCR people may be told that devotion to Mary and the saints is idolatry, while in other places people are ushered out of the group who give prophecies that denigrate Mary. People in ecumenical prayer groups had a lower record of participation in traditional Catholic practices like the rosary. About 10% of people in CCR said that they pray the rosary less than before their involvement with the movement, but 30% said that they now pray the rosary more.³³⁰ Fichter's evidence seems to show that involvement in the movement encouraged Marian devotion more than discourage it, but the encouragement was not very strong.

O'Connor also noted the influence of interdenominational prayer groups on Marian devotion. He wrote:

³²⁵ *Statement on Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, 3.

³²⁶ *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, 2.

³²⁷ *Healing* (1974), 34.

³²⁸ *The Theological Self-Understanding of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, 2.

³²⁹ *The Charismatic Renewal Reflections of a Pastor* (1976), 42. Healey made one other reference to Mary in mentioning the Hail Mary and the Litanies of the Blessed Lady in a section on "praise and joy" (65-66).

³³⁰ *The Catholic Cult of the Paraclete* (1975), 42, 65, 72, 104, 123.

However, the rapid growth of interdenominational prayer groups and communities has tended to foster the development of a kind of piety and doctrine in which the distinctive features of Catholicism (belief in the real Presence, sacramental confession, Marian devotion, etc.) are somewhat neglected and at times even called into question. The resulting spirituality, although often zealous and efficacious, is cut off from some of its roots and inhibited from attaining its full and balanced development.³³¹

Ford proposed that there were two types of Catholic Charismatics. Type II, she said, because of its greater Catholicity, had a much greater veneration of Mary than Type I (the ecumenical covenant communities and groups influenced by them). She described Type II individuals as witnessing to a greater love for the Eucharist and Mary than they had before their involvement in CCR. Type II also emphasized the Jesus Prayer and the rosary as ways of prayer that can bring the same results as praying in tongues. Ford pointed out that the *Life in the Spirit Team Manual*, developed by Type I charismatics had no mention of Mary. She believed that the intercession and presence of Mary should be invoked at the Life in the Spirit seminars because Mary is the "first Pentecostal" through the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Annunciation and because of her presence at Pentecost.³³²

Ford ended her strong critique of CCR leadership by stating, "I place my work in the capable hands of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whose courage in the face of the dangerous charismatic ministry and teaching of her son has never been and never will be equaled."³³³

Bord and Faulkner, in their study of CCR, concluded that Marian devotion had never been an integral part of CCR. However, they described the strong, clerical leadership in CCR as welcoming veneration to Mary, while the strong lay leadership was much less enthusiastic about bringing veneration of Mary to the movement.³³⁴ Breckenridge also noted the clerical influence. Cardinal Suenens and other priests in CCR emphasized the strong association between Mary and the Holy Spirit. The attitude in official writings of CCR was to preserve Mary's historic position. Breckenridge thought that the trend toward giving more recognition to Mary in CCR was beginning to have a growing influence.³³⁵

³³¹ *Perspectives on Charismatic Renewal* (1975), 149.

³³² *Which Way for Catholic Pentecostals?* (1976), 66, 69-74, 97, 116, 120. Also in her booklet, *Six Pentecosts*, she described Mary's "Pentecost" at the Annunciation.

³³³ *Ibid.*, 135.

³³⁴ *The Catholic Charismatics*, 122, 146.

³³⁵ *The Theological Self-Understanding of Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, 101.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF MARIAN DEVOTION IN CCR

Three people who directly encouraged the integration of a Marian dimension within CCR were Cardinal Suenens, Pope Paul VI, and René Laurentin.

CARDINAL SUENENS

We have examined how Cardinal Suenens in his talks at the Notre Dame conferences highly encouraged devotion to Mary. His writings also demonstrate a strong Marian concern. His book, *A New Pentecost?*, included a number of Marian references throughout the book, as well as, a chapter on "The Holy Spirit and Mary."³³⁶

The first half of his chapter on "The Holy Spirit and Mary" was entitled "The Holy Spirit or Mary?" It began with a reflection on the diminishing of appreciation for Mary throughout the Church since the Second Vatican Council. Some of the reasons for this reaction could include a Marian approach that had been: too focused on her privileges and not Christological enough; too dependent on private revelations; too remote from biblical theology. Vatican II had a strong ecumenical concern. The decision not to have a separate document on Mary, but to include her in the document on the Church, was misinterpreted by many as a downplaying of Mary's role. Suenens believed that it was time to recover a lost balance about Mary. He believed that by stressing Mary's role in the perspective of the Holy Spirit (linked to the Holy Spirit and lived under the Spirit's guidance) Marian devotion would again come to life. Mary would appear as the one on whom the Spirit "showered his graces, as the first Christian, the first charismatic."³³⁷

Suenens took seriously the contention by some Protestants that Mary in Catholic piety seemed to usurp the role of the Holy Spirit. Suenens thought this happened because of a deficient pneumatology in the Church. Suenens stated that we need to make clear the absolute priority of the Holy Spirit. Then we can come to understand Mary's unique depth of surrender to the Spirit.

Suenens was involved in the beginnings (1971) of the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary. He gave the opening talk on "The Holy Spirit and Mary" at their first international congress in April 1971. Suenens said that he

³³⁶ Marian references include 10 (John XXIII's prayer for Vatican II to be a new Pentecost); 47 (Mary's response at the Annunciation); 72 (the rosary and being thankful to God throughout the day); 152 (the Spirit covered Mary with his shadow); 175 (on ecumenism and Catholics not minimizing their beliefs and devotion to Mary); 183-196 (chapter on the Holy Spirit and Mary); 202 (Jesus, born of the Holy Spirit and Mary); 207-209 (conclusion of book, including the importance of loving Mary and learning from her transparency before God).

³³⁷ Ibid., 184.

found it hard to imagine a homecoming of long separated children without "a mother to welcome them at the door and take them to the Lord."³³⁸

The second half of Suenens' chapter on Mary was called "Mary Led by the Spirit." This section was a biblical reflection on Mary's role in the Church. Suenens emphasized Mary's "total transparency" in her response to Jesus:

Mary is not a screen concealing the Lord from us. Our hesitation in loving her for fear this will distract from our loving the Lord, derives from a basic misunderstanding of who she is. We are here at the heart of God's mystery. His work is not limited by our categories of time and space: In him we enter into a world of mutual openness, selflessness, communion. The Spirit who fills Mary is and always will be, the Spirit of the Son. It is the Spirit who "Christianized" Mary at a depth beyond our understanding. She is the Christian *par excellence*, filled to overflowing with the Spirit of Christ. In Mary, the Holy Spirit has created his masterpiece: She is his pride, his glory... Mary's role is not in the order of bestowing grace. The Spirit alone is and remains the Envoy of the Father and the Son. Her place is not as a mediator. Mary's role is in relation to our response. In union with her and following in her steps, we are helped to receive the Holy Spirit and to listen to his promptings. Already enjoying the glory of heaven, she encourages us to continue on our way in confidence and joy.³³⁹

Suenens explained that Mary's *fiat* at the Annunciation grew from this initial response through the Cross into the light of the Resurrection. Her *fiat* remains an actual and personal reality in the communion of saints. Mary is totally dependent on and subordinate to the Spirit. She shares in the Spirit's role of giving and revealing to the world Jesus Christ. Suenens went so far as to say, "To be receptive to the spiritual motherhood of Mary, is an unfailing sign of our openness to the Holy Spirit."³⁴⁰ He said that many saints like St. Louis Marie de Montfort confirm this understanding. This kind of experience of Mary admits of degrees. A person must have some openness and focus on Mary.

Suenens finished the chapter by describing three traits he believes are signs of receiving the Holy Spirit in union with Mary. He quoted George Montague's notion that Mary is a charism of the Spirit in person. Mary guarantees humanity, humility, and balance:

- 1) Humanity: She helps us to embrace the mystery of the Incarnation, protecting us from docetism and deism.
As a woman and mother she brings a human touch to the Church. We see this at Cana. After Jesus, she is the most human creature who ever lived.
- 2) Humility: God willed for his Son to become humbly dependent on Mary as his mother. Jesus followed his own advice about our need to become like children

³³⁸ Ibid., 188.

³³⁹ Ibid., 191.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 192.

to enter the kingdom of God. Placing ourselves under Mary's formative influence guarantees our humility.

- 3) Balance and Wisdom: Mary helps us to balance the divine and the human in our spiritual lives so there is no exaggeration or illuminism. This is particularly important for a movement like CCR where there have been many extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. The extraordinary and dramatic cannot be the main focus and norm for living the Christian life.

In the article "Who is She?," in *Essays on Renewal*, Suenens described who Mary is for the Father, for Jesus, for the Spirit, and for us. She is the Father's daughter, "in Christ, his first thought and first love."³⁴¹ She is the one whom Christ eternally chose and prepared to be his mother. She is the one whom the Spirit "flooded with sanctifying grace even from the moment of her birth."³⁴² She was overshadowed by the Spirit at the Annunciation, and "presided over the outpouring of the fire of Pentecost."³⁴³ For us Mary continues to work with the Spirit to produce Jesus in us so as to hasten the coming of Christ.³⁴⁴

POPE PAUL VI

The book *Pope Paul and the Spirit* by Edward O'Connor, CSC, helped to extend to Catholic Charismatic Renewal Paul VI's focus on the importance of Mary. Paul VI encouraged the reading of Cardinal Suenens' book, *A New Pentecost?* In the Foreward to *Pope Paul and the Spirit* Suenens wrote:

They [those involved in CCR] will benefit likewise from the important passages in which he [Paul VI] insists on the necessary connection between charism and hierarchy, charism and sacramental life, charism and devotion to Mary. In the closing session of the International Charismatic Conference at South Bend in 1974, I pointed out that the future of Charismatic Renewal as well as its fruitfulness would depend, as far as Catholics are concerned, on the latter being deeply rooted in the Church. Concretely, this means their acceptance of the *magesterium* of Peter and of the spiritual motherhood of Mary. Christ was born of Mary and the Holy Spirit, and this indissoluble association remains a vital one.³⁴⁵

O'Connor pointed out that Suenens suggested that the 1975 International Charismatic Conference be moved to Rome in view of the Holy Year being celebrated in 1975. However, Suenens was also president of the committee responsible for the International Mariological and Marian Conferences (the theme for that year was The Holy Spirit and Mary) that were being held in Rome at

³⁴¹ Suenens, *Essays on Renewal*, 87.

³⁴² *Ibid.*, 88.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁴ Suenens' influence on Marian devotion in CCR is also mentioned by Breckenridge (100), Voigt (10-13), and in Elizabeth Hamilton, eds. *Ways of the Spirit: The Spirituality of Cardinal Suenens* (New York: Seabury, 1976), 22.

³⁴⁵ *Pope Paul and the Spirit*, ix-x.

the same time. Suenens wanted to take advantage of this occasion to stress the relationship between Mary and the Spirit.³⁴⁶

O'Connor demonstrated how Paul VI stressed Mary as the eminent biblical exemplar of the Spirit-filled Christian. Paul VI frequently recalled Mary's presence at Pentecost. For him our primary devotion should be to the Holy Spirit, but devotion to Mary leads us to devotion to the Spirit and to Christ. Mary is a type or figure of the Church in its response to the Holy Spirit. Paul VI believed that devotion to Mary will become not an obstacle to Christian unity, but "a path and a rallying point for the union of all who believe in Christ."³⁴⁷

In Paul VI's Apostolic Exhortation on Mary *Marialis Cultus* (1974) he wrote about the importance of understanding the relationship of the Holy Spirit and Mary:

Our concern is to exhort everyone, especially pastors and theologians, to deepen their appreciation of the Holy Spirit's work in salvation history and so ensure that Christian spiritual writings pay due attention to his life-giving action. Such a deepening will bring out in particular the mysterious connection between the Spirit of God and the Virgin of Nazareth, as well as their action in the Church.³⁴⁸

For Paul VI worship of the Spirit finds its most complete harmony when it includes veneration of Mary as Mother of God, and Mother of the Church.

RENÉ LAURENTIN

René Laurentin (the renowned Theologian and Mariologist) included a chapter called "Mary, the Model Charismatic" in his book *Catholic Pentecostalism*. Laurentin regarded this chapter as a basis for dialogue between classical Pentecostalism and CCR. Like Suenens, Laurentin pointed out that contemporary Catholicism since Vatican II had seemed to ignore devotion to Mary, but this devotion was beginning to return through CCR. Laurentin described devotion to Mary in CCR as enthusiastic in France and Quebec, but more reserved in the United States because of the large number of interdenominational groups.

Laurentin believed that CCR, in a special way, could shed light on the mystery of Mary's presence in the Church ever since the first outpouring of the Spirit. He wrote:

The charismatic renewal has made an authentic rediscovery of Mary; now it must learn to express Mary's Spirit-animated presence in the communion of saints in a way that is faithful to the experience of the movement itself, which is so truly biblical and ecumenical and which will not be satisfied with mere words.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 45.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., 108.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 202-203.

³⁴⁹ *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 194.

The rest of this chapter by Laurentin is a biblical study done in light of the focuses of CCR. From Mary's presence at Pentecost, and the parallels between Luke 1-2 and Acts 1-2, Laurentin justified three statements about Mary:

- 1) Mary is the model for the Church in her receptivity to the Holy Spirit.
- 2) Mary is the model for Christians baptized in the Spirit.
- 3) Mary is also model of the charismatic life. She is a model of praise, prophecy, and praying in tongues.

Laurentin believed that Mary's role, even if unobtrusive, is at the heart of Christianity and must not be overlooked. He believed that CCR was helping to restore the proper focus on Mary as the model of a spiritual person in relation to Christ, the Spirit, and the Church.

BOOKS ON MARY

In this timeframe three books were written on Mary by people who noted that Catholic Charismatic Renewal had influenced their writing.

GEORGE MALONEY

George A. Maloney, SJ dedicated his book *Mary: The Womb of God* to Cardinal Suenens because of all that Suenens had done to promote true devotion to Mary. Maloney believed that Western civilization had lost much of its sense of the intuitive, contemplative, feminine approach to God. He emphasized the feminine aspects seen in the relationship between Mary and the Church:

Grace mediated through Mary or the Church is always a participation in the incarnational, free-will act of Mary which is both maternal and spousal. Mary is the perfect type of regenerated humanity, the Church, in attaining its supreme fruit, through the feminine, maternal act of receiving Divine Life through the Holy Spirit.³⁵⁰

For Maloney people enter into the depths of Christianity through the feminine power of contemplation:

Deep within us is an unquenchable hunger to surround, enfold, possess, hold, embrace, as a mother does her child in the womb, God's very own life-giving Word. From that inner possession of God's life we give birth to Jesus Christ in the events of our daily lives. Virginally by our total surrender in faith, hope and love, we conceive by the Holy Spirit and then maternally we give birth to God's Word and give that Word to others by our love and humble service shown to them.³⁵¹

Maloney believed that the biblical and liturgical revivals, along with the charismatic renewal and the hunger for deeper, contemplative prayer, was bringing about a new appreciation for Mary. Also, the study of Eastern Chris-

³⁵⁰ George Maloney, SJ, *Mary: The Womb of God* (Denville, New Jersey: Dimension, 1976), 7.

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

tian contemplation helped to illuminate the strong interconnection of Mary, the Holy Spirit, and the Church. Maloney's book drew strongly on the Scriptures,³⁵² the early Church Fathers,³⁵³ and insights from the psychology of Carl G. Jung. His chapters described various aspects of Mary: contemplative, virgin, mother of God, her relationship to the Holy Spirit, holy, the Valiant Woman (of suffering), her relationship to the Church, in glory, and as one who prays for us now.

The first chapter on "Mary, the Contemplative" made use of the Jungian concept of the *anima*, which is described as the "principle of relationships, of communion and unity."³⁵⁴ It is the feminine power of receptivity, response, surrender, and the giving of the self that is needed to balance the *animus* (intelligible principle of analysis) in every person. Maloney believed with Carl Jung that "Mary the contemplative is the archetypal symbol of the feminine in every human being."³⁵⁵ This archetype of the feminine is described as the integrating, healing force between our conscious and unconscious.

Mary is described by Maloney as the completely realized, integrated human being as virgin and mother. She is a contemplative in action. As virgin, she awaits, reflects, and listens. As mother, she responds by helping to release life to others.

While Maloney focused a great deal on Mary as the archetype of the feminine (Sophia-wisdom), the collective mother, and as the prototype of the Church (the New Eve), he also noted that she is an individual person whom we can relate to in a personal way, especially in her role as an intercessor within the communion of saints. Like all of us, Mary had to grow in her faith journey throughout her life. She is more fully human than any human being other than Jesus, Himself.

Maloney emphasized the importance of understanding Mary in relation to the Holy Spirit, and the Church. Mary is described as the ideal charismatic Christian, the Holy Spirit's masterpiece. She continually cooperated and yielded to the Holy Spirit throughout her life, and was a channel for bringing the Spirit to others. Maloney believed that true devotion to Mary leads to devotion to the

³⁵² Maloney's use of Scripture includes Genesis 3:15 and Revelation 12 (the New Eve); Matthew 1-2; comparing Luke 1-2 to Acts 1-2; the Johannine accounts of Mary as "woman" at Cana, at the Cross, and in Revelation 12; and Mary as an embodiment of Sophia-wisdom from the Old Testament.

³⁵³ Maloney used ideas and quotes from Augustine, Tertullian, John Damascene, Ephrem, Epiphanius, Maximus the Confessor, Athanasius, Justin, Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen, Andrew of Crete, and others.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 23-24.

Spirit and the Church, and true devotion to the Spirit will lead to devotion to Mary and the Church.

Christians in their true devotion to Mary will be drawn to a devotion to the Holy Spirit. For Mary's uniqueness as Mother of God comes from her cooperation with the Holy Spirit in faith and loving obedience. It is the Holy Spirit that effects *Church* in Mary at the deepest level of her conscious surrender of herself. "He it is who opened Mary in a total self-giving to Christ... As we increase in our understanding and love of the Holy Spirit, we will also grow in greater true love of Mary and the Church."³⁵⁶

Maloney's book is a wonderful study bringing together insights on Mary from Vatican II and CCR with reflection on significant texts from Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. The book received some attention in CCR because it was promoted by the Pecos, N.M. Benedictine community (Dove Publications). However, its strong use of Jungian concepts lessened its overall impact in CCR. As we will point out more completely in the following timeframes, a disagreement about the use of ideas from Carl Jung developed in CCR. The Pecos community frequently used Jungian ideas,³⁵⁷ while covenant communities like Ann Arbor and South Bend expressed concern about the use of Jungian ideas. The concern about Jung involved both the consistency of Jung's ideas with Scripture, and concern over Jung's personal morality and spirituality.

JOHN HAFFERT

Another book, which did not have a *widespread* influence within CCR, but reflected on CCR and Marian movements, was *Explosion of the Supernatural* by John M. Haffert.³⁵⁸ The book was significant since Haffert was the co-founder of the Blue Army of Fatima apostolate which had 25 million members. He was the only lay speaker at the 1975 Marian Congress on "Mary and the Holy Spirit" in Rome. His presentation at Rome contained the ideas expressed in this book. Haffert sent the manuscript of the book to all the U.S. Ordinaries (bishops) to get their feedback before its final printing.

Haffert began his book by quoting paragraph twenty-seven of *Marialis Cultus*, in which Pope Paul VI spoke of the need to understand more clearly the

³⁵⁶ Ibid 151-152,155.

³⁵⁷ The Episcopal priest, "charismatic," and professor at Notre Dame, Morton Kelsey, was a frequent speaker at Pecos. Dove Publications from Pecos published many of his writings and tapes. His use of Jungian ideas had a strong influence on the Pecos community. While *New Covenant* published articles by many non-Catholic "charismatics," I did not find any articles by Kelsey, even though he was at the very place where CCR began to develop and expand, Notre Dame University.

³⁵⁸ John M. Haffert, *Explosion of the Supernatural* (Washington, New Jersey: Ave Maria Institute Press, 1975).

hidden relationship between the Holy Spirit and Mary. Haffert believed that there was a link between the apparitions at Lourdes and Fatima and the Charismatic Movement. He followed the reasoning of St. Louis de Montfort who said that the Immaculate Heart of Mary attracted the Holy Spirit to bring about the Incarnation. Therefore, devotion to the heart of Mary throughout the world will attract the Holy Spirit to bring about the "second coming."³⁵⁹ At Fatima it was prophesied that the Immaculate Heart would triumph. Other hearts united to the heart of Mary would attract the Holy Spirit and Jesus would enter, bringing an era of peace. Haffert saw a close link between a coming "age of the Spirit" and the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Both the Marian Movement and the CCR were helping to restore the belief in prayer, the supernatural, and the miraculous in a very secularized age.

The Blue Army of Fatima created centers or "cenacles" of prayer united with Mary in order to attract the Holy Spirit. Haffert believed that the Blue Army needed to learn from CCR's openness to the gifts of the Spirit, while CCR needed the Blue Army's understanding of the role of Mary and the Eucharist.³⁶⁰ Together, the Marian Movement and the CCR could create a crusade of prayer everywhere, which would lead to a deeper trust in God's Providence, and a greater outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the world. CCR's openness to the miraculous would help various "Marian miracles" to get a greater hearing around the world. Haffert believed that people need a true supernatural experience, a personal Pentecost. Marian apparitions like Guadalupe, Lourdes and Fatima were like a new Pentecost leading to many conversions and miraculous signs. CCR was leading people to this experience of a personal Pentecost. He believed, however, that CCR would only be accepted widely in the Church through a special grace of humility. He wrote:

Experience [in CCR] shows that anyone can experience fervor at any time. But for older persons – especially for those who have not reached out for this experience during many years of opportunity – it will certainly be difficult. It will require a tremendous act of humility – sometimes even a repudiation of a whole pattern of life. And for these persons can there be hope except through the intercession of the model of humility, the Spouse of the Holy Spirit, the Mother of the Church?³⁶¹

At the same time, devotion to Mary could give CCR the humility it needed to spread its message throughout the entire Church.

Finally, Haffert described John XXIII and Paul VI's focus on the relationship between Mary and the Spirit, and the Mariological and Charismatic

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 166.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 201-203.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 187.

Congresses being together in 1975 at Rome during the same dates, as significant signs of Mary helping to usher in a new Pentecost.

JOHN RANDALL

The third book written about Mary from a "charismatic" perspective was *Mary: Pathway to Fruitfulness* by Rev. John Randall (member of NSC, 1977-1983), Helen Hawkinson, and Sharyn MaHoy. Each of the three authors wrote one chapter of the book. All three were members of St. Patrick's Parish in Providence, Rhode Island which was one of the first parishes significantly influenced by CCR (cf. *In God's Providence: The Birth of a Catholic Charismatic Parish* by John Randall).

In the foreword to the book Randall explained that the Holy Spirit has been showing the parish that Mary, the spouse of the Spirit, is a remarkable pathway to fruitfulness: "when he [Holy Spirit] finds a Mary heart he hastens there to bring forth his greatest fruit – Jesus Christ."³⁶² Randall hoped to build bridges between Mary and Catholics who no longer had much devotion to Mary, and between Mary and other Christians. If reflection on Mary is biblically, experientially and ecumenically based, Randall believed it had tremendous promise: "The mother will gather her children from all parts."³⁶³

The first chapter by Hawkinson is called "Mary, the Model Relative." Mary is described as having a deep faith that matured throughout her life. She is a model of ongoing successful relating within a faith context. Hawkinson discussed seven relationships of Mary from a biblical perspective: child of God, cousin of Elizabeth, wife of Joseph, mother of the child Jesus, mother of the man Jesus, mother of mankind, and mother of the Church.

Chapter two by Malloy is called "Mary, the Suffering Servant." First, Jesus is described as the Suffering Servant. Then, Mary, as "the mirror of Jesus and the model of the Church,"³⁶⁴ is described as sharing in Jesus' sufferings for the sake of the world. Mary identifies herself as the "servant of the Lord," and accepts the sword which will pierce her heart. Malloy explained that Mary can help us to go through the suffering that leads to God's glory.

The final chapter by Randall is called "Living Under the Glory Spout." Randall used the image of God's glory pouring out of a spout. After a charismatic conference Randall felt that the Lord was telling him that Mary would show him how to remain under the glory spout, not only during big confer-

³⁶² John Randall, Helen P. Hawkinson, Sharyn Malloy, *Mary: Pathway to Fruitfulness* (Locust Valley, New York: Living Flame, 1978), 9.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 11.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 71.

ences, but always. He described Mary as The Seat of Wisdom because she was always so attuned to God.

The main thesis of Randall's chapter was that Christians could stay under the glory spout even in difficult times, if they sought the help of Mary who teaches us how to keep clinging to the cross until God brings about victory and resurrection. The secret of receiving God's power is having a bridal love for Jesus like Mary did; to be totally absorbed and attuned to Jesus. Then Jesus, the bridegroom, shares everything with us. God tests us in order to purify our love. If we do not abandon God, we become a seat of wisdom like Mary, and experience God's victory. Mary shows us how to keep praising God, cling to the cross, pray, and keep looking to Jesus, our bridegroom, with love in the midst of trials. We need to admit that we don't love Jesus like Mary did, and ask Mary to help us to learn to love like her.

Randall addressed the ecumenical objection that his approach seemed to honor and focus on Mary too much. He explained that what God did in Mary shows us what God wants to do in us. We are all to become Christ-bearers and spouses of the Spirit, filled with a bridal love, as Mary was. Randall mentioned that he agreed with Cardinal Suenens that Catholics need to share with other Christians their experience of coming to the Lord through Mary. He said that it is clear to him that the Holy Spirit has led their charismatic community to a deeper devotion of Mary. As they have followed this leading, they have borne more fruit. Randall believed that Catholics need to be true to their traditions and origins, or they will not bear as much good fruit. He pointed out that the charisms of the Spirit have been kept alive over the centuries through many apparitions of Mary, and through the mystical tradition of bridal love in which Mary has been the major model.

Finally, Randall called people to turn to Mary as intercessor, using the example of the wedding feast of Cana. We should ask her to give us her attitude and heart toward Jesus. Randall concluded with the notion of filial piety: "If we would truly be Christlike in every regard, we will have Christ's own heart toward his mother."³⁶⁵

REFERENCES TO MARY IN CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC RENEWAL BOOKS

Along with Suenens, Paul VI, Ford, Laurentin, Maloney, Haffert, and Randall (also Pelletier, Rosage, Montague, and O'Connor, as seen in the previous timeframe), a growing number of other writers began to place a significant emphasis on Mary in books written within CCR.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 105.

HAROLD COHEN

Fr. Harold Cohen (NSC, 1973-1982) expressed his belief that Pope Leo XIII had shown the way for the Christianization of the world when he ended his encyclical on the Holy Spirit, *Divinum Illud*, by "asking the faithful to pray with our Lady that God would send forth his Spirit to renew the face of the earth with signs and wonders."³⁶⁶ Cohen also referred to the charismatic dimension present at many Marian shrines. In future literature he will develop more fully the important place he believed Mary should have in CCR.

DAVID ROSAGE

Fr. David Rosage continued his strong Marian focus in his book, *Discovering Pathways to Prayer*.³⁶⁷ In his chapter on "Praying Charismatically" he mentioned that reverence for Mary is taking on a fresh meaning through people's charismatic experience. One of his chapters is called "Mary at Prayer." The chapter described Mary as the "exemplar par excellence" of prayer. She is the model for public prayer, communal prayer, meditation, contemplative prayer, praying with Scripture, faith-a prayer posture, poverty of spirit-a prayer posture, and for saying "yes" to the Lord.

Also, Dove Publications in 1977 reprinted Rosage's book *Mary, the Model Charismatic* (first published locally by Rosage in 1971). Being a Dove Publication gave this book a much wider circulation in CCR.

GEORGE MONTAGUE

Fr. George Montague added greater biblical scholarship to reflections on the relationship of Mary and the Holy Spirit in his book, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. Montague studied the ways in which Luke's Infancy Narrative (Luke 1-2) is portrayed as a foreshadowing of the life of the Church as seen in Acts 1-2. Mary and the others are described as filled with the Spirit (Luke 1:15, 35, 67; 2: 25-27, 36), and there is a flood of rejoicing and praise (Luke 1:44, 46-55, 67-79; 2: 13-14, 20, 29-32, 38). He wrote:

We are really faced with a liturgical drama in which Luke is clearly up to something quite different from what he portrays during the rest of the gospel. It sounds as if the small circle around Mary have already experienced Pentecost! How to explain this? Clearly, the infancy narrative which originated out of post-pentecostal meditation on the earliest beginnings, is meant to be in some way both the Gospel and the Acts in foreshadowing and anticipation. The result is not only a prologue

³⁶⁶ Cohen, in *Pentecostal Catholics*, 54.

³⁶⁷ Msgr. David E. Rosage, *Discovering Pathways to Prayer* (Hauppauge, New York: Living Flame, 1975).

to the Christology of the gospel but a prologue to the ecclesiology of Acts'. Other parallels between Luke 1-2 and Acts confirm this view.

Mary is explicitly mentioned in the upper room with the disciples devoting themselves to constant prayer (as did Anna, 2-37) and she is obviously present at the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The parallel between the Annunciation and Pentecost seems to be intentional, as would also be Mary's role as prototype for the community of believers who receive the Spirit (cf. 1:42-45; 2:19,51; 11:28).³⁶⁸

Montague also demonstrated how Mary's special role is described by Luke through the use of reflections from the Old Testament concerning Daughter Zion (Zephaniah 3:14-20; Zechariah 9:9), great women like Ruth and Judith (Ruth 2:4; Judith 13:18), the cloud that overshadowed the Dwelling in the desert (Exodus 40:34-38), and the role of the Queen-Mother (Isaiah 7:14).³⁶⁹ Finally, he briefly reflected on Mary's role of petitioning faith and anticipating Jesus' "hour" at Cana (John 2:1-11).³⁷⁰

PAUL HINNEBUSCH

Fr. Paul Hinnebusch had written several articles and a book on Mary before his involvement in Catholic Charismatic Renewal. His three books during this timeframe demonstrated a continuing interest in Mary's role.

In *Friendship in the Lord* and *Community in the Lord* Hinnebusch used the relationship of Joseph and Mary to describe the importance of allowing people to be what God means for them to be, letting them become their true selves, and not demanding that people be what we want. Joseph is described as allowing Mary to be her true self: "spouse of the Holy Spirit and mother of a divine work of love, knitting all mankind together in love...bride of the Lord God... forever a virgin."³⁷¹

Hinnebusch wrote that Mary "belonged totally to the Lord," and "the bridal union of each Christian directly with Christ in faith is exemplified perfectly in Mary at the Annunciation."³⁷² As Mary pondered in her heart God's action in the life of her Son, she learned to allow her Son to become what God wanted Him to be.³⁷³

³⁶⁸ Montague, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*, 268 (see also 273).

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 265-266.

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 339.

³⁷¹ Hinnebusch, *Friendship in the Lord*, 13-15. See also *Community in the Lord*, 95, 99, 211-212.

³⁷² *Community in the Lord*, 211-212.

³⁷³ Ibid., 213.

In *Praise: A Way of Life* Hinnebusch said that Luke's gospel portrays Mary "as a type or symbol of the Church praising God."³⁷⁴ He focused on Mary's visit of Elizabeth (Luke 1:4-44). This event is described by Luke using words and imagery from 2 Sam. 6: 15, where David brings the ark of the covenant into the city amid shouting and the sound of the horn. Mary is the new ark of the covenant, greeted by Elizabeth's loud cry of joy. Mary responds with her symphony of praise and joy in the Magnificat. Hinnebusch pointed out how appropriate it is for the Church in her liturgy to frequently call on all of us to join with Mary in her prayer and praise.³⁷⁵

JAMES BYRNE

James Byrne believed that Mary has an important role in helping charismatic spirituality to be authentically Catholic. CCR needed balance and wisdom. Wisdom could be gained by pondering God's work, like Mary, and asking Mary "to pray for us for this gift, since she is the *Seat of Wisdom*, having borne the Wisdom of God."³⁷⁶ While there have been certain excesses in devotion to Mary, Byrne wrote that "authentic devotion to Mary has been a special gift to Christ to his Church and especially to those close to him (cf. John 19:25-27). ...devotion to Mary forms one in the deepest love and adoration of Christ."³⁷⁷ He recommended the rosary and the Church's tradition of Saturday being a day especially devoted to Mary.

JUDITH TYDINGS

Gathering of a People: Catholic Saints in Charismatic Perspective by Tydings offered many insights for the development of the understanding of Mary within a charismatic context. Tydings was one of the founders of the Mother of God (charismatic) community in the Washington, D.C. area. She was very concerned with helping other Christians to understand Catholic devotion to Mary and the saints. She explained her own change of heart about this issue.

It has taken a number of years for me to see saints as "treasures in the storehouse." Just as the person of Jesus had somehow been hidden from me, so too, Mary, His Mother, and the saints were obscured by exaggerated practices meant to honor them and by poorly written, overly-pious biographies.³⁷⁸

Tydings gave helpful background for understanding devotion to Mary. She explained the difference between worship/adoration and veneration. She men-

³⁷⁴ Hinnebusch, *Praise: A Way of Life*, 32.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 28-32.

³⁷⁶ Byrne, *Living in the Spirit*, VIII.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 62.

³⁷⁸ Tydings, *Gathering of a People*, 11.

tioned that in the Litany of the Saints the Divine Persons are asked to "have mercy on us" while Mary and the saints are asked to "pray for us." The most ancient prayer to Mary is dated back to, at least, the 4th century, and Ephesus had a church called the "Church of Mary" before 431 A.D. She explained that love of neighbor and love of God are distinct acts, but love of neighbor should also be an act of love of God. Veneration is an act distinct from adoring God, but it can and should be an act of love of God. Jesus continually gave and shared what was His with His followers. He gave them His Father and His Spirit. On the cross He gave His Mother to the beloved disciple and to all of us. It seemed natural to Tydings that Jesus would want to share His mother and friends with us.³⁷⁹

Tydings wrote about Marian apparitions in one section of the book. She explained that Catholics do not have to believe in any particular apparition, but the Church allows pilgrimages and devotions for certain Marian apparitions when the Church can find no natural explanation for the event, nothing contrary to the faith, and the basic gospel message is supported. Tydings named seven of the sights of recognized Marian apparitions.³⁸⁰

Tydings wrote positively about the rosary. She mentioned that many of the saints prayed the rosary, and she explained how the rosary is prayed. She believed that when the rosary is said with the prayers as a kind of "background music" and one's mind on the Lord and His mysteries, then the rosary is analogous to the gift of praying in tongues privately.³⁸¹ Both types of prayer seem to embody meditation, praise, and petition leading to contemplation. She also mentioned that the rosary teaches us that we can't just stay with Christ for the Joyful Mysteries. Without fidelity through the Sorrowful Mysteries, we won't reach the Glorious Mysteries.³⁸²

The notion of Marian consecration is explained by Tydings in a section about St. Louis Mary Grignion de Montfort. Marian consecration involves uniting ourselves with Mary in her perfect consecration to Jesus, bringing about a renewal of our Baptismal vows. It is an adult, voluntary renewal of our Baptism.³⁸³ This involvement of Mary in renewing the graces of our Baptisms is appropriate since Jesus' disciples were first baptized in the Spirit at Pentecost. Tydings wrote, "just as the Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary and formed the body of Jesus in her womb, the Holy Spirit broods over the people of God and forms them into the body of Christ, until all culminates in the coming again of

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 23-27.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 113-116.

³⁸¹ Ibid., 155-156.

³⁸² Ibid., 101.

³⁸³ Ibid., 139, 308.

Jesus, this time in glory."³⁸⁴ Mary's openness to the Spirit prepared the way for the whole Church to receive the Spirit.

Tydings noted the special devotion to Mary of St. Dominic³⁸⁵ and St. John Bosco.³⁸⁶

At the end of the book Tydings offered many resources for studying saints. She included a section specifically on Mary with eleven books published from 1954-1973.³⁸⁷ A brief description is given of each book. None of the books are written by people involved with CCR.

RONDA CHERVIN

Ronda Chervin included a chapter entitled "Mary, Our Model, Bride of the Spirit" in her book, *Why I Am a Charismatic*. The chapter is in the form of an extended poem that moves through Mary's life invoking her under eight titles: Our Lady...of the Annunciation, of the Visitation, of the Nativity, of the Presentation, of the Hidden Years, of the Cross, of Pentecost, of the Assumption. Mary is called mother, mother of the Church, virgin and sister. Mary is asked in the poem to impart to us the graces she experienced in each of these events of her life. We will see in future timeframes that Chervin continues to write from a strong Marian perspective.

HERIBERT MÜHLEN

Heribert Mühlen developed a theological foundation for reflection on Mary from a charismatic point of view. In his article, "New Directions in Mariology," Mühlen expressed the need to go beyond erroneous developments in Mariology that stressed fleeing to Mary from a strict Father to lessen or avoid punishment, or speaking about Mary's role in a way that usurps the primary role of the Holy Spirit (the result of a deficient theology of the Holy Spirit). Mühlen explained how the Holy Spirit is both the primary principle of conceiving and receiving God's grace, the prime mediator of the grace of Christ. However, Mary can be properly understood as "the prototype for understanding the function of grace and is the historical beginning of the experience of grace."³⁸⁸

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 7.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 191-192.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 216-217.

³⁸⁷ Donald Attwater, *A Dictionary of Mary*; Louis Bouyer, *The Seat of Wisdom*; John Delaney, ed., *A Woman Clothed With the Sun*; Charles Dollen, Rev., *A Voice Said Ave!*; R. Garrigou-Lagrange, Rev., OP, *The Mother of the Savior and Our Interior Life*; Hilda Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*; National Conference of Catholic Bishops (U.S.), *Behold Your Mother*; Carl Rahner, *Mary, Mother of the Lord*; Hugo Rahner, SJ, *Our Lady and the Church*; Max Thurian, *Mary. Mother of All Christians*; J. Neville Ward, *Five for Sorrow Ten for Joy*.

³⁸⁸ Mühlen, "New Directions in Mariology," 287.

In both this article and in *A Charismatic Theology*, Mühlen described Mary as a person who was granted a fullness of charisms. The story of the annunciation has the character of the baptism of the Spirit. Mary is the archetype of the person who in faith lets happen to her what God has promised. Mary's meeting with Elizabeth has echoes of a charismatic service, and anticipates Pentecost. Both are filled with the Spirit, speak prophetic words, cry aloud blessing and praising God, serve one another, and become witnesses to God's action. Mary's Magnificat has the same basic structure as the pentecostal gift of tongues, verbally proclaiming the great deeds that God had done in their midst. Mühlen also understood Mary's words at Cana, "Do whatever he tells you," as a prophetic charism.

Mühlen attributed great significance to Mary's presence at Jesus' death. He wrote:

In a historically unique way, she (Mary) accepted her own death beneath the cross. Only thus could she understand her son's death as redemptive. In John (where we find no Pentecost narrative) it says Jesus gave up his spirit (19:30). This passage means not only, as in the Synoptics, that he breathed his last, but also that he shared with the ones present beneath the cross his very own experience of the Spirit, in whose power he offered this sacrifice (cf. Hebrews 9:14). Mary, at the cross, remained the "believer," but her unique, solitary, and spiritual relationship to her son (cf. Luke 1:35) became the historical beginning of the priesthood of all believers. She is both prototype of the Church and its historical beginning. The Church rests on the foundation both of the Twelve and on this common priesthood of all believers. Insofar as the Church is the historical continuation of the experience of the Spirit of Jesus, the Christian community is simultaneously the historical continuation of Mary's experience of the Spirit.³⁸⁹

For Mühlen a person becomes a Christian not only through infant baptism and education. There needs to be a total, personal acceptance of Christ as Lord. This acceptance includes not only one's reason, or will, or emotion, but the whole person. This is most clearly seen in Mary. Mühlen believed that CCR would need a solid Marian devotion for its acceptance in the wider Church.

The acceptance of the longed-for intervention of God in the history of the Church will, therefore, not be possible without a new devotion to Mary, who is in fact the historical beginning of the fundamental Christian charismatic experience.³⁹⁰

THE "YOU WILL RECEIVE POWER" BOOK

The *You Will Receive Power* Holy Spirit seminar book (specifically written for Catholics) contained a great deal more on Mary than the commonly used *Life in the Spirit, Team Manual* (written for an interdenominational audience;

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 291.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 292.

no mention of Mary). In the preface to the book John XXIII's prayer for Vatican II, asking for a new Pentecost, is quoted. Mary is mentioned as a special intercessor in this prayer. In the preface it also is noted that the program emphasizes "the example of Spirit-filled men and women from Jesus' own Blessed Mother, down to our own day."³⁹¹ Mary's receptivity to the Spirit is frequently mentioned throughout the book,³⁹² and the rosary is encouraged as a way to meditate on the mysteries of Christ.³⁹³

The required reading books for this seminar included *Mary, the Model Charismatic* and *Speak Lord, Your Servant Is Listening* (containing significant Marian content) by Rosage, and *A New Pentecost?* by Suenens (including his chapter on Mary). *Mary: The Womb of God* by Maloney was also mentioned in the list of recommended books. The other recommended books included authors from the classics of Catholic spirituality, and modern CCR authors who were widely accepted in the movement. Also Morton Kelsey, John Sanford, and George Maloney, whose use of Jungian concepts made them suspect among some people in CCR, were recommended. Since Dove Publications from Pecos published the book, many of the books recommended were one's that were recommended and distributed by Dove.

JOSEPH LANGE AND ANTHONY GUSHING

The *Living Christian Community* series (four volumes) by Lange and Gushing did not contain a great deal of reflection on Mary, but the series contained signs of a cautious, but growing openness to devotion to Mary. Gushing wrote about an elderly woman whom he would see at daily mass, and would talk with about CCR. She asked him if he had ever tried the rosary. So he did try it, which led to Mary "taking a greater place in my life with God."³⁹⁴ Gushing also described how he once was singing the Litany of the Saints in his car during a depressing time in his life, and he received a mental picture of Mary and the saints being with him offering him encouragement.³⁹⁵

Gushing mentioned the rosary a number of other times, describing it as one form of communal prayer,³⁹⁶ and as a type of conversational prayer in which you can imagine Jesus present with you.³⁹⁷ He said that he used to be bored

³⁹¹ Burle and Plankenhorn, *You Will Receive Power*, VII.

³⁹² Ibid., see 2, 8, 18, 31.

³⁹³ Ibid., 40-B.

³⁹⁴ Lange and Gushing, *Friendship with Jesus*, 113.

³⁹⁵ Lange and Gushing, *Called to Service*, 108.

³⁹⁶ *Friendship with Jesus*, 135.

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 99.

with the rosary “until I “discovered” that it was meditating on the life of Jesus.”³⁹⁸

In a section on “Discernment in Church History” in *Called To Service*, Gushing explained that recently there had been many Marian prophecies, but only a few have been discerned as authentic. He mentioned Lourdes and Fatima as recognized places of devotion, but that Catholics do not have to believe in any specific apparition. He pointed out that St. Catherine of Sienna had a false apparition in which she thought Mary had told her that she was not the Immaculate Conception.³⁹⁹ In another place he described a problem about some approaches to Marian devotion. Some Marian devotions when he was growing up gave the impression that Mary was a comfortable, approachable person while Jesus seemed like the untouchable God.⁴⁰⁰

Finally, Lange and Gushing, at the very end of the series, have an appendix on “Order in Marriage and the Role of Women in the Church.” As we reflected on earlier, they described this issue as a controversial topic in CCR. One of the examples they used in reflecting on this issue was the place of Mary in the Church. They wrote, “We find in the Church honoring Mary the mother of God a tradition and example for the equality and dignity of women in the Church.”⁴⁰¹ They quote from four sections of *Marialis Cultus* by Pope Paul VI in which the pope expressed the need for Marian devotion to be expressed in a way that speaks to the modern woman. Paul VI pointed out that Mary was not a timidly submissive woman. Her active and responsible consent in her dialogue with God can be an image of the equality and co-responsibility which women deserve. Lange and Gushing believed that women should be welcomed and encouraged to participate in all areas of the Church’s life (with the one exception of priesthood).

RALPH MARTIN

It is appropriate to note at this time the use of Marian reflection in *Husbands, Wives, Parents, Children* by Ralph Martin, since this book portrayed an approach to women’s roles that in some areas was at odds with Lange and Gushing’s approach.

Like Lange and Gushing, Martin did not do a great deal of reflection on Mary. Mary was mentioned as an example of “the work of supporting life among God’s people,” which is described as a special characteristic of women in the Scriptures. Mary’s “willingness to bear and raise a child was essential to

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 84.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 30.

⁴⁰⁰ *Friendship with Jesus*, 129

⁴⁰¹ *Called to Service*, 166.

God's plan of salvation."⁴⁰² Secondly, Mary is mentioned in a section on faith as one of four particular Scriptural qualities of the Christian woman. Concerning women of faith in the Scriptures, Martin wrote, "What Elizabeth said of Mary could be said of them all: "Blessed is she who believed that the promise made her by the Lord would be fulfilled" (Luke 1:45)."⁴⁰³ Martin explained that, while these women were great examples of submission, it was not a submission of passivity or fear.

MARIAN CONTENT IN BOOKS ON HEALING PRAYER

The books in this timeframe that focused on prayer for healing contained a few references to Mary. MacNutt commonly mentioned Marian apparitions and shrines (especially Lourdes) in talking about healing prayer.⁴⁰⁴ In 1975 MacNutt attended a two-day dialogue with chaplains and doctors at Lourdes about verifying miraculous healings. MacNutt explained that shrines were places that encouraged the expectant faith and devotion of the simple people. They helped to keep alive the Catholic belief in the miraculous. Mary seemed like an approachable and compassionate mother. MacNutt quotes Isaiah. 49:15 ("even if your mother forgets you, I (God) will not") to point out that the love of God is even greater than Mary's love.

The difficulty that MacNutt saw in shrines, like Lourdes, was that healing was only expected through special shrines and devotions, not through the official representatives and sacraments of the Church. Even more so, ordinary believers did not come to believe that their own prayers could have an extraordinary effect. Finally, MacNutt thought that many people now considered shrines a pre-Vatican II spirituality. The younger generation, he said, tended to see it as another worldly Christianity.

MacNutt, Scanlon, and the Linn brothers all mentioned (without much elaboration) examples of Mary having a role in healing prayer. Scanlon talked about people who had little experience of love from their fathers or mothers. He would have people visualize Jesus taking them to the heavenly Father, so that they could experience fatherly love, and Jesus taking them to Mary, leading them to experience a mother's love.⁴⁰⁵ The Linn brothers would lead people through the stations of the cross and Jesus' last words as a way to open people to graces of healing. They explained that often the station of Jesus meeting his mother or Jesus' words from the cross, "Son, behold your mother; woman, behold your son" (John 19:27), would help to bring healing for persons in their

⁴⁰² Ralph Martin, *Husbands, Wives, Parents, Children*, 95.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁴⁰⁴ See MacNutt, *Healing*, 71-73, 91, 103; and *Power to Heal*, 65-66, 128, 176.

⁴⁰⁵ Scanlon, *Inner Healing*, 50.

relationships with their own mothers.⁴⁰⁶ MacNutt mentioned that during deliverance prayer he would "pray that Mary, the Mother of God, and all the angels and saints intercede for us."⁴⁰⁷ Finally, the Linn brothers talked about the importance of thanking God for healing. They encouraged people to use Mary's Magnificat as a prayer of thanksgiving.⁴⁰⁸

OTHER BRIEF REFERENCES TO MARY

We will conclude this section on Marian content with the other brief references to Mary from books in this timeframe.

George Martin made significant use of Mary as the one who ponders and treasures God's Word in *Reading the Scriptures as the Word of God*.⁴⁰⁹ He also mentioned Mary's humility as a model for Catholic "Charismatics" in *Parish Renewal: A Charismatic Approach*:

Catholic Charismatics can intercede for their parish both as individuals and as a group. If we are serious about bringing renewal to our parish, it should be our daily prayer concern. If we are committed as a group to becoming a part of the parish, it should be reflected in the way we pray together. Our prayer should be humble, not triumphal. It should be a prayer modeled on Mary's: "I am the handmaid of the Lord. Let his will be carried out in me."⁴¹⁰

Although he had not written any books yet, Fr. John Bertolucci was already becoming one of the most well-known speakers in CCR. This fact adds to the significance of his raising the issue of Mary at the large interdenominational rally, Jesus 78, in New Jersey. He mentioned Mary among the group gathered at Pentecost, and later referred to Mary when talking about how people from different denominations should treat one another.

Be considerate of each other's knowledge and understanding. Understand my position on Mary. Don't criticize it until you understand it, and don't criticize it even when you understand it. I don't ask you to agree.⁴¹¹

In an interesting comparison, the Pentecostal Minister, David du Plessis, raised the issue of Mary in talking with a group of Catholic nuns. He mentioned that he knows how highly Catholic sisters think of Mary. He pointed out that Mary was at Pentecost, so she spoke in tongues. If Mary needed the baptism in the Spirit, than so do all of you: "You may be the mother superior...but

⁴⁰⁶ D. and M. Linn, *Healing Life's Hurts*, 233, 235.

⁴⁰⁷ MacNutt, *Healing*, 221.

⁴⁰⁸ D. and M. Linn, *Healing Life's Hurts*, 229.

⁴⁰⁹ George Martin, *Reading the Scriptures as the Word of God*, 75-80.

⁴¹⁰ George Martin, *Parish Renewal: A Charismatic Approach*, 69-70.

⁴¹¹ Quoted in Ferry and Malachuk, *Prophecy in Action*, 157, 161.

you are not superior to Mary.”⁴¹² Du Plessis also reflected on the significance of Paul VI’s message to the CCR conference in Rome (1975). He included the Pope’s quote about the disciples’ continuous prayer “with Mary” before Pentecost.⁴¹³

Rarely have we seen Marian dogmas mentioned in CCR writings. Fr. Francis Sullivan did mention the Immaculate Conception and Assumption as examples of Catholic intuitions from the Holy Spirit that are not appreciated immediately by people. These dogmas are truly contained in the gospel message, but in an obscure and implicit way.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹² du Plessis, *A Man Called Mr. Pentecost*, 187.

⁴¹³ Ibid., 241.

⁴¹⁴ F. Sullivan, “The Role of Tradition,” in *Theological Reflections on the Charismatic Renewal*, 84.

IV. Evaluation and Conclusions

Four Background Issues

From our study, four background issues emerge as particularly significant for giving us the context from which Marian devotion and reflection developed during this timeframe: 1) *Was the announcement of CCR's moving from an apologetic stage to a prophetic stage premature?* Ralph Martin's announcement of a new stage created a great deal of excitement in CCR. In 1974 Pope Paul VI had met with CCR leaders, and the U.S. bishops had published a statement on CCR. Both the Pope and the U.S. bishops spoke positively about CCR with some cautions. Also, the 1974 statement on *Theological and Pastoral Orientation on Catholic Charismatic Renewal* was developed under the guidance of Cardinal Suenens and included the consultation of internationally recognized theologians. This statement helped to create, at least the appearance of, a greater validation and acceptance of CCR. Martin and the NSC thought that CCR could now speak more openly and widely to the Church about the insights which they believed God had been teaching them. This belief was demonstrated in the open use of charismatic gifts through the healing service at the 1974 Notre Dame conference and the prophetic message, "What is the Spirit Saying to the Churches" (*New Covenant*, September 1974), proclaimed publically after the Notre Dame conference. The general feeling in CCR was that the new stage was confirmed at the Rome conference (1975) when Pope Paul VI called the movement a "chance" for the Church. At the 1976 Notre Dame conference Gabe Meyer told the audience that CCR had been accepted at the highest levels of the Catholic Church. Therefore, CCR should take this opportunity to be used by God and move forward boldly. In the same conference Ralph Martin talked about the amazing speed of the spread and acceptance of CCR in the Church. Because the time was short, God was moving at an incredible pace, he said.

On the other hand, O'Connor suggested that the announcement of moving beyond an apologetic stage was premature. He proposed that CCR would now have to face the test of perseverance after losing its initial enthusiasm in order to have an enduring effect in the Church. Some CCR groups were disillusioned by internal relational struggles. Expectations had been raised very high through people's initial experience of the Spirit and through the sometimes overly positive portrayal of how quickly (and easily) CCR was growing.

Authors like Suenens, Mühlen, Laurentin, Gelpi, and Haffert (who were all very positive about CCR) expressed the concern that Catholic Charismatic Renewal still needed to be more fully integrated with the whole Catholic tradition, and that many in the Church still needed to be helped to understand and accept the role of CCR in the Church. While CCR had received a measure

of acceptance from the Pope and the U.S. bishops, most clergy and ordinary parishioners were unaware of CCR or uncomfortable with CCR. This idea was expressed in George Martin's book on parish renewal where he stated that the integration of CCR into the full life of the local church will be a slow and difficult process.

It is clear that CCR leadership was overly enthusiastic and not realistic enough in their public statements about CCR. The movement had grown at an amazing rate. CCR leadership had made outstanding efforts to show that they wanted to be fully under the authority of the Pope and the bishops of the Catholic Church. However, not enough was said publically about two "apologetic" problems that still remained: 1) the uncomfortability of many priests and parishes with CCR, which tended to keep prayer groups on the fringes of parish life; and 2) the lack of integration of the full Catholic tradition with the charismatic experience of most of the people involved in CCR. The second area strongly influenced the first, since many people in CCR did not know how to explain and integrate their charismatic experience with the language and approaches to the spiritual life that were significant in the ordinary parish. Much of the language and the approaches to spiritual growth in CCR seemed too "new" and too "Protestant" to the average parish priest and parishioner. More "apologetic" work needed to be done to bring CCR within the Catholic mainstream of ordinary parish life.

2) *What should be the approach to ecumenism in CCR?* The February 1977 issue of *New Covenant* described a "pause" in CCR, as to whether the focus and membership of CCR should be Catholic or ecumenical. Two contending impulses about ecumenism were evident during this timeframe. First, there was the belief that God was using charismatic renewal to bring about the unity of the Christian churches. Ralph Martin and other leaders strongly proclaimed this belief, and the 1977 interdenominational conference in Kansas City was the major rallying point and evidence of this belief. Second, many voices in CCR (Kilian McDonnell was the most influential)⁴¹⁵ were stating that Christian unity cannot come from downplaying the specifically "Catholic" elements of Christianity. The areas that divide Christians must be discussed. People involved in CCR need a stronger sense of the whole of Catholic life (i.e. liturgy, saints, popes, the history of the Church and spirituality), so they can share these gifts in the ecumenical dialogue.

Everyone in Catholic Charismatic Renewal believed that CCR had an ecumenical purpose. However, by the end of this timeframe most of CCR leader-

⁴¹⁵ We have seen this also in various degrees in Suenens, Laurentin, Ford, O'Connor, Gelpi, Maloney, Tydings, Chervin, Byrne, Voigt, Wild, Mühlen, Lange, Hinnebusch, etc.

ship were beginning to be convinced that more needed to be done to integrate the full Catholic tradition into CCR, and into its approach to ecumenism.

3) *How should CCR respond to prophecies about "hard times" ahead?* These prophecies started at the 1975 conference in Rome, but continued throughout this timeframe. There was never a consensus about their full meaning. Francis Martin (and others) emphasized the need for purification and a greater degree of holiness in CCR. While the focus of Francis Martin was consistently mentioned by CCR leaders, the belief that "hard times" meant external events in the world which were going to work against God's purposes in CCR and the Church, had the greater overall impact within CCR.

The feeling that CCR had to be prepared for the hard times ahead had a number of significant effects. First, it tended to make the covenant communities focus on their own internal growth, and influenced many smaller groups to combine with larger groups. This inner focus of the covenant communities tended to make them less likely to be involved with the integration of CCR with local parishes. Second, CCR leaders spoke and acted with a greater urgency in pointing out what they believed was needed to bring renewal within the Catholic Church. The December 1977 letter of the NSC to the U.S. bishops demonstrated an urgency that gave a harshness to the overall statement (even though it is my belief that the contents of the statement described accurately many of the needs of the Church). The tone of the document comes across more as an indictment, than as an effort toward working together. By only stressing the problems that CCR could help the Church with, but not admitting the difficulties CCR had in coming to a healthy integration with all of Catholic life, the NSC statement lacked a sense of humility to balance its sense of urgency (even though, it can be argued, the urgency was real). The statement mainly asks the bishops to learn from CCR, and use CCR's gifts. It does not ask how CCR can work with the wider Church in what is already being done. Instead of helping the wider Church, this type of statement made it more difficult for CCR to work with local Churches.

4) *Were CCR groups moving toward two distinct types of charismatic spirituality that was dividing the movement?* The literature of this timeframe clearly shows a growing tension about aspects of the direction CCR was heading. The evidence indicates that neither the National Service Committee nor the covenant communities were trying to force their own approach in CCR. We have seen that the NSC and *New Covenant* discussed issues for which there was not agreement in CCR. In light of Religious Orders and Associations in the Church, the creation of covenant communities cannot be seen as an illegitimate development in the Church. Placing more emphasis on covenant communities than parish renewal may have been a pastoral mistake (although it is unclear how

well CCR would have developed without the strong leadership and resources of covenant communities), but it was a legitimate development. CCR shared in the overall confusion in the Church after Vatican II. The wider Church was in the midst of trying to reintegrate the rich tradition of the Catholic Church in the light of the council. It is not surprising that CCR was not able to accomplish quickly what the rest of the Church was also struggling with.

Inevitable tensions arose because of the desire to bring as many people as possible into this experiential relationship with Christ in the Spirit, but not having enough trained leaders to keep up with the movement's rapid expansion. Tensions arose from wanting to be undeniably within the Catholic Church, but also wanting to work for the unity of all Christians.

Influence of major CCR issues on Marian devotion and reflection

How did this background influence the growth of Marian reflection and devotion in Catholic Charismatic Renewal?

Both the announcement of the move from an "apologetic" to a "prophetic" stage, and the message about the "hard times ahead" tended to keep the issue of "Mary and CCR" on the periphery of the major concerns of the movement. The "prophetic" focus involved promoting the specific foundational areas of CCR (baptism in the Spirit, living under the Lordship of Jesus, spiritual gifts, community building, evangelization, the unity of Christians in the Spirit). If CCR had already moved beyond an "apologetic" stage, there would not seem to be as much of a need to focus on integrating specifically Catholic content, like Marian devotion. The "hard times ahead" message also tended to make people focus on the basic foundations of CCR in order to be prepared for the future troubles. The focus was more on immediate concerns of evangelization and strengthening of groups, rather than reflection on the full riches of the Christian life.

However, Marian reflection and devotion did take a significant step forward in CCR during this timeframe. It is true that it was not a major topic of concern for the NSC or in the major conferences of CCR. Nevertheless, a growing number of significant leaders in CCR were becoming bolder in expressing their thoughts on the role of Mary.

In the previous timeframe a *few* individuals had described aspects of the role of Mary. Cardinal Suenens' promotion of the importance of Mary at the 1973 Notre Dame conference, and his subsequent writings and speeches, encouraged others (Randall, Maloney, Pelletier, Haffert, Laurentin, Mühlen, Hinnebusch, Tydings, McNamara, Montague, O'Connor, Cohen, Bryne, Rosage) to begin or continue promoting Marian devotion more directly.

The important influence of Kilian McDonnell

Along with Suenens' contributions, the writings of Kilian McDonnell were very important for the development of Marian reflection, although in a more "behind the scene" way. Individuals such as Suenens, Montague, Maloney, Hinnebusch, O'Connor, Pelletier and Rosage already had considered devotion to Mary to be important before their involvement in CCR. CCR had helped to revive, strengthen and deepen this devotion. However, McDonnell stated that he never had a strong Marian devotion. It was through other people pointing out to him the significance of the relationship of Mary and the Holy Spirit (especially in Luke and Acts) that he saw a greater importance in her role.

McDonnell's articles on ecumenism in *New Covenant* emphasized the importance of integrating the experience of CCR with the whole tradition of the Catholic Church, and for not making specifically Catholic issues (like Marian devotion) into "zones of silence" among "charismatics." His article on Mary as a model of Presence and praise for all Christians, coming after his articles on the proper approach to ecumenism in CCR, gave biblical, theological and ecumenical validation of the right to promote Marian devotion in CCR (especially from such a noted ecumenist).

Stronger theological foundation for Marian devotion in CCR

The writings of Suenens, Laurentin, Maloney and Mühlen also gave a much stronger theological foundation towards a "charismatic" approach to Marian devotion. These authors developed the understanding of Mary's relationship with the Holy Spirit, with Jesus Christ, and with the Church. However, these authors were not as commonly read within CCR in the U.S. as members of the National Service Team and other early leaders in CCR. Their ideas did not quickly become part of the "common knowledge" of people involved with CCR in the U.S. Nevertheless, it is clear from our study that a significant number of priests (not many lay people at this time), who had a positive reputation within CCR, were now promoting the importance of Marian devotion for the movement.

Content of Marian reflection – Biblical model

The major focus for the content of Marian reflection was still similar to the last timeframe, but was now more precisely developed biblically and theologically. The Marian reflection focused on a *biblical* description of Mary as a model of discipleship and receptivity to the Holy Spirit. The first three articles on Mary in *New Covenant* by Montague, Senior, and McDonnell, as well as the literature of Suenens, Laurentin, Montague, Mühlen, and Maloney highlighted the common themes that are apparent when comparing Luke 1-2 with Acts 1-2. All of these authors emphasized the idea of Mary as a *model* (some used

“prototype” or “archetype”) of *discipleship and receptivity to the Spirit*. She was frequently described as a “model charismatic” (Montague, Mühlen, McDonnell, Rosage, Laurentin) who first embodied in her actions the effects of the Spirit (praise of God, joy, charismatic gifts, reaching out to share the Good News, prophecy) that would only be seen among *all* the disciples at Pentecost. She was also called the “masterpiece of the Holy Spirit” (Suenens, McNamara, Maloney). As a disciple, Mary is a model of *pondering the Word of God* (G. Martin, Bryne, Rosage, Senior), and a model for *praising God* (McDonnell, McNamara, Hinnebusch). She is described in the Scriptures using the Old Testament images of Daughter Zion, the Ark of the Covenant, and various heroic women of faith. The biblical evidence for Mary’s receptivity to the Spirit was presented in a more complete and precise fashion than in the previous years.

Content of Marian reflection – theological reflections

Our study also has shown that a broader theological reflection on Mary, building upon the biblical base, started during this timeframe. Laurentin, Suenens, Mühlen, and Maloney developed the understanding of Mary in relation to Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Church in a more systematic way. The document *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* carefully stated that CCR “fosters a new appreciation of the evidence for Mary’s presence at Pentecost and of her relationship to the Church.” Many authors clarified the importance of the primary role of the Holy Spirit, so that Mary did not usurp that role. Mary was described as prototype, archetype, and mother of the Church. Maloney, especially, developed the early Church Fathers’ notion of Mary as the New Eve in relation to Christ, the New Adam. Mary was more frequently mentioned as “spouse” or “bride” in her relationship with Christ or the Spirit (Maloney, Randall, Hinnebusch, Haffert, Tydings). Suenens, Maloney, and Tydings introduced CCR to the Marian reflections of saints (like St. Louis de Montfort) who had a strong devotion to Mary. However, only Sullivan mentioned specific dogmas of Mary (Immaculate Conception and the Assumption) in light of CCR. He described the recognition of these dogmas as influenced by a “Catholic intuition from the Holy Spirit.”

Mary and women

Some diverse reflections on Mary in relation to women began in this timeframe. Gushing and Lange used Mary as an example in promoting the equality and dignity of women. Maloney used Jungian concepts in describing Mary as the archetype of the feminine. Patty Mansfield, Dorothy Ranaghan, and Ralph Martin (all of whom would be cautious about Jungian concepts) portrayed Mary as an example of women’s special ability to “make a place for” the work of the Spirit.

From model to motherly presence

The emphasis in CCR concerning Mary had been on Mary's *past* life as a model for us. Within this timeframe more reflection began on Mary's *present* role as someone who can personally influence the Church and the world. Mary's presence was described as being important for CCR because she provides a sense of humility, humanity, balance, and wisdom (Suenens, Randall, Bryne, Haffert, Montague). Many authors (Suenens, Haffert, McDonnell, Randall, Tydings, Bertolucci, du Plessis) expressed the belief that Mary would become a help for ecumenism, rather than a hinderance. A few other ideas concerning Mary's active presence were mentioned, but not as commonly. Randall and Maloney touched on the ideas of Mary as an intercessor and as one who suffers at the cross with Jesus. However, these ideas were not widely developed in CCR. Also, some authors of books on healing briefly mentioned Mary having a role in certain healings. Finally, such notions as "filial piety" and "Marian consecration" were mentioned in passing by a few authors (Tydings, Randall, Haffert).

Marian apparitions and the rosary

The rosary and Marian apparitions were commonly mentioned without any negative tone, but they were not highly promoted. An effort was made to explain that the rosary is a biblical prayer, since it focuses mainly on biblical events in Jesus' life. Apparitions still were mentioned mainly as examples of the Catholic Church's positive attitude toward the miraculous and prayer for healing. Marian shrines and apparitions were not promoted as a way of spiritual growth within CCR in the U.S. Reference was made in *New Covenant* of CCR sponsored pilgrimages to Lourdes in France. However, the significance of Lourdes as a Marian shrine was never explained.

V. Summation

By the end of this timeframe, a growing number of people in CCR were hearing from priests involved in CCR about the biblical portrayal of Mary as a model of discipleship and receptivity to the Holy Spirit (some people would also be aware of Pope Paul VI's teachings on the Holy Spirit and Mary). The relationship of Mary to the Spirit was giving a renewed focus for Marian devotion, both in CCR and in the wider Church.

Fichter in his sociological study had pointed out that baptism in the Spirit tended to inspire people to seek out all the ways that they could grow in their Christian lives. As Marian devotion became better understood in relation to the working of the Spirit, the fears that a focus on Mary could take away from the centrality of Jesus, and the fear that a Marian focus would hinder ecumenism, slowly began to fade. CCR leaders (mainly priests) started to invite people to be open to the gift of Mary in the Church. The growing concern to integrate charismatic experience with the full riches of the Catholic tradition, also, helped to create an openness to Marian devotion.

Three factors seemed to be needed for the growth of Marian devotion:

- 1) Understanding that Marian devotion is biblically rooted;
- 2) The desire to be rooted in the entire Catholic tradition;
- 3) The invitation to seek the personal involvement of Mary in one's life, creating a sense of faith-filled expectation that God can work in this way.

At the same time, it cannot be said that Marian devotion was a widespread phenomenon in CCR by 1978. The National Service Committee and the major conferences of CCR had not promoted (or discouraged) Marian devotion. Because of this, the reflection on the relationship of Mary and the Spirit was not common knowledge throughout CCR. Many people still did not understand how devotion to Mary related to the basic message of new life in Christ and the Spirit which had been CCR's main concern. The large ecumenical gatherings, starting with the Kansas City conference in 1977, created a focus on a kind of ecumenism that tended to put Marian devotion on the periphery. Finally, the prophetic message of "hard times" ahead initially tended to influence CCR to focus more on basic evangelization and community building, rather than the integration of the whole Catholic tradition. Being a popular movement (and mainly lay), any new trend in CCR had to both develop out of some significant spiritual experience, and an understanding of how this trend has a biblical mandate. Throughout this timeframe the biblical mandate concerning Marian devotion was becoming more recognized in Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and more individuals were proclaiming how their experience of Marian devotion was an important influence in their growth in Jesus and the Spirit. A significant current of Marian devotion and reflection was developing.