

Post-Conciliar Developments in the Catholic Doctrine of Charisms: *Lumen Gentium* and *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* Compared

Irish Theological Quarterly
2022, Vol. 87(3) 192–211
© The Author(s) 2022



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/00211400221098013
journals.sagepub.com/home/itq



John Stayne

Durham University, UK

Abstract

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's letter *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* represents a considerable, and largely unnoticed, development in the Catholic doctrine of the charisms. Despite being widely overlooked, this document contains a sophisticated, and quasi-systematic, theological presentation of the charismatic gifts. The present essay compares the teaching on the charisms in *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* with the earlier teaching in *Lumen Gentium* in three areas: (1) the wider theological grounding of the charisms; (2) the meaning of the term charism; (3) the value assigned to the charisms. Through this, the postconciliar developments in the area of the charisms are brought sharply into focus, demonstrating the significance of *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* for the future of Catholic ecclesiology.

Keywords

catholic, charisms, ecclesiology, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, *Lumen Gentium*

On the Solemnity of Pentecost 2016 the letter *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, produced by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith and approved by Pope Francis, was sent out to the bishops of the Catholic Church.¹ In the press release, the then head of

1 *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* (15 May 2016), https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20160516_iuvenescit-ecclesia_en.html (hereafter cited as *IE*). Accessed 20 July 2021. Documents from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith which receive the express approval of the pope share in his ordinary magisterium. See *Donum Veritatis* (24 May 1990), 18, https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19900524_theologian-vocation_en.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

Corresponding author:

John Stayne, Durham University, Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham DH1 3RS, UK.
Email: johnstayne@yahoo.co.uk

the dicastery, Cardinal Gerhard Ludwig Müller, noted how the document ‘reached its definitive physiognomy after many years of reworking—the study began in the year 2000.’² But, despite this long gestation, the immediate reaction to the promulgation was decidedly muted. As Mary Healy notes, the letter was received with ‘little public fanfare,’ and has ‘not yet received nearly the attention it deserves from either theologians or those directly involved in evangelization.’³ Aside from Italy, and to a lesser extent Poland, it has received little sustained academic attention.⁴ One would think the subject matter—as the sub-heading describes: ‘regarding the relationship between hierarchical and charismatic gifts in the life and mission of the Church’—would be of great interest to Catholic ecclesialogists. Why, then, has there been a near-universal lack of ecclesiological engagement? Aside from anecdotal experience suggesting many theologians are unaware of the document’s existence, perhaps this is because it is thought of as only relating to the theology of ecclesial groups.⁵ As Jos Moons comments:

[I]n those instances that charisms are specified [in magisterial teaching], they tend to be narrowed down to the charismatic movements . . . and with the New Religious Movements generally . . . The Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith’s Letter *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* . . . has indeed that focus. In this case it is clear what charisms are, yet this understanding of charisms is much narrower than that of *Lumen gentium* 12.⁶

-
- 2 *Conferenza Stampa di presentazione della Lettera della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede «Iuvenescit Ecclesia»* (14 June 2016), <http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2016/06/14/0436/00982.html>. Accessed 20 July 2021. Unless stated otherwise, all translations in this essay are my own.
 - 3 Mary Healy, ‘“The Church Grows Young”: Recent Developments in the Doctrine of Charisms,’ in *Reading and Living Scripture: Essays in Honor of William S. Kurz, S.J.*, eds Jeremy Holmes and Kent J. Lasnoski (Emmaus Academic, 2021), 191–210 at 191.
 - 4 There have been three volumes of essays published in Italian: Domenico Sigalini ed. *Carismi e ministeri: riflessioni sul documento Iuvenescit Ecclesia*. (Bologna: EDB, 2019); Carlo Fusco, Pasquale De Rosa, Elisabetta Scomazzon eds *Carisma e Istituzione in Movimenti e Comunità ecclesiali: Atti della giornata di studio Roma, 18 gennaio 2018* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2018); Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia. Testo e commenti* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2019). I am grateful to Consuelo Panichi for having first brought these to my attention. Similarly, *Roczniki Teologiczne*, in Poland, has published several articles engaging (to various degrees) with the document, particularly in issues 5 and 7 (both 2018). The only equivalent to these in the English language was the conference Integrating the Charisms: The Charismatic Gifts in Recent Official Catholic Teaching (independent online conference, 15 May 2021), which the committee (myself included) organized with the specific aim to promote a wider theological engagement with *IE*. Proceedings have not been published, but the keynote papers were presented by Archbishop John Wilson, Reginald Cruz, Stephen Bullivant, and Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen.
 - 5 *IE* refers to these as ‘shared charisms’ (*IE*2;16)
 - 6 Jos Moons, *The Holy Spirit, the Church and Renewal: Mystici Corporis, Lumen Gentium and Beyond* (Boston: Brill, 2021), 327.

A similar interpretation would be found in most responses.⁷ Moons is certainly correct that the focus within official Catholic teaching has increasingly been linked to religious life and new communities/movements rather than the theology of ministries within the local Church. While this focus does hold a prominent role in *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, especially in chapter five, and is given as a key reason why the document was written, most commentators seem to have missed the significance of the teaching contained in earlier chapters.

Iuvenescit Ecclesia is, quite probably, the most important official Catholic treatment of the charisms since *Lumen Gentium*.⁸ It is certainly the longest (authoritative) theological exploration in modern history. Counting cognates, the term ‘charism’ appears a remarkable 170 times in the English version. Because *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* is a culmination of many postconciliar developments, one can fruitfully identify the main advances to have occurred in the intervening years through comparing it with *Lumen Gentium*. While there are many aspects such a comparative investigation could focus upon, for the sake of brevity this essay will highlight the similarities and differences in the way each document approaches three areas:⁹

1. How the charisms are theologically contextualized.
2. How the charisms are conceptualized.
3. How the charisms are valued.

For each point, there shall be a brief overview of the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* followed by a comparison with *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*. Alongside the charisms, some attention will be given to the hierarchical gifts in order to provide a useful point of reference. Having shown some of the substantial developments through exploring these three elements, this essay will conclude by pointing to some broad consequences implied by *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* for the future of Catholic ecclesiology.

7 Mary Healy and Anthony Epko are two exceptions. See Healy, ‘Recent Developments,’ and Anthony Epko, ‘Personal Charisms and the Charism of Office: A Possible Convergence,’ *The Australasian Catholic Record* 94 (2017), 180–99. Both, however, use *IE* as a new framing device for ideas previously expressed, rather than engaging in a close analysis of the document. Healy’s chapter is, at least in part, drawn from an earlier paper. See Mary Healy, ‘Discernment and Accompaniment of Charisms’ in ICCRS, *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church* (Rome: ICCRS, 2008), 62–75. Similarly, Epko’s article presents ideas from his doctoral dissertation. See Anthony Epko, ‘The Sensus Fidelium and canon law: An exploration’ (PhD diss., Australian Catholic University, 2013). While both do see implications wider than the theology of religious life, Healy sides with Moons in seeing the text as having ‘assumed . . . [a] narrower definition’ than Vatican II (‘Recent Developments,’ 195, footnote 13), and Epko critiques the attention on group charisms as being a ‘setback in that document’ (‘Personal Charism,’ 181).

8 *Lumen Gentium*, (21 November 1964), http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (hereafter cited as *LG*). Accessed 20 July 2021.

9 The expanded role of bishops in discernment of charisms (particularly *IE9* and footnote 27), while worthy of further study, was judged to be beyond the limited scope of this essay.

Contextualizing Charisms: Trinitarian Dynamics and the *Tria Munera*

Lumen Gentium

Immediately prior to the council it had been common to link, in an overly exclusive way, the hierarchical with Christ and the free-charismatic with the Spirit.¹⁰ It is notable, therefore, that *Lumen Gentium* somewhat resisted this trend. First, in §4 the document identified both charismatic and hierarchical gifts as related to the Holy Spirit:

The Church, which the Spirit guides in way of all truth and which He unified in communion and in works of ministry, He both equips and directs with hierarchical and charismatic gifts and adorns with His fruits. (*LG4*).¹¹

The charisms are later linked, although only implicitly, with the Son. This is witnessed in the way they are primarily treated within the context of the three-fold office of Christ (the *tria munera*) shared by the baptized faithful.¹² In the history of the document, the link between the two can be found for the first time in the second draft of the schema (then called *De Ecclesia*). This also happened to be the first time charisms were presented as gifts widely distributed among the faithful. Chapter three, §24 was titled ‘Concerning the Universal Priesthood, and also the *sensus fidei* and the charisms of the Christian faithful.’¹³ While this draft chapter did not explore the connection between ‘universal priesthood’ and the charisms (other than through the proximity with which it treated them), the link was made explicit by the *Commentarius*:

With the universal priesthood are connected both the *sensus fidei* of the whole community under the assistance of the Holy Spirit and [under] the lead of the magisterium, and the various charisms, that are not restricted to the wondrous and extraordinary but include all the gifts of the Holy Spirit for the building up of the Church.¹⁴

10 Yves Congar, for example, became critical of his early writings for this. See Yves Congar, ‘My Path-Findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries,’ *Jurist* 32 (1972), 169–88.

11 This phraseology was not uncontroversial, but resulting grammatical changes actually strengthened the charisms position. Moons, ‘Pneumatological Renewal,’ 235. For a detailed account of §4’s history, see 146–257.

12 On this, see Peter De Mey, ‘Sharing in the Threefold Office of Christ, a different Matter for Laity and Priests? The *Tria Munera* in *Lumen Gentium*, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* and *Presbyterorum Ordinis*,’ in *The Letter and the Spirit: On the Forgotten Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Annemarie C. Mayer (Bristol: Peeters, 2018), 155–79. It is interesting to note that the original schema did not see charisms as pertaining to the *tria munera*, but considered the offices themselves to be charisms. See *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, Vol. I, Pars IV (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1971), 12–122 at 15.

13 ASII/1, 258.

14 ASII/1, 268. Translation provided by Jos Moons.

However, the link established through textual proximity would be severed before the opening of the council's second session.¹⁵ As a result, the key paragraph on the charisms was permanently re-located to §12, which placed it within the context of the prophetic office. But although the relationship with the *tria munera* had changed the main implication remained, namely, that the reception and exercising of the charisms are linked with participation in Christ.¹⁶ This link was again alluded to in the (now moved) paragraph itself. While the charisms are spoken of as distributed by the Spirit, they are also described as being given so to 'contribute toward the renewal and building up of the Church' (LG12). This passage, clearly invoking the image of the Body in 1 Corinthians, again hints at the christological dimension.

Iuvenescit Ecclesia

With *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, the Trinitarian grounding of the charisms appears in a more sophisticated form.¹⁷ From the beginning, the letter grounds the charisms themselves in the mystery of the Trinity. Scripture, it notes, presents the origin of the charisms in different ways:

According to some texts they come from God (cf. *Rm* 12:3; *1 Cor* 12:28; *2 Tm* 1:6; *1 Pt* 4:10); according to *Eph* 4:7, they come from Christ; according to *1 Cor* 12:4–11, from the Spirit. As this last passage is the most insistent (it mentions the Spirit seven times), the charisms are usually presented as 'manifestations of the Spirit' (*1 Cor* 12:7). It is clear, nonetheless, that this

-
- 15 At Suenens suggestion, the sections of the schema pertaining to the faithful was separated from the sections related to the laity and formed a new second chapter, placed ahead of the chapter on the hierarchy. See Jan Grootaers, 'The drama continues the acts: the "second preparation" and its opponents,' in *History of Vatican II. Vol. II: The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession. October 1962 – September 1963*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 359–514 at 411–412. While this was approved before the opening of the second session, the draft was not updated to reflect this until after the council debates on DE24.
- 16 Rather than seeing the priesthood as just one dimension of the trilogy, Ormond Rush identifies an 'unresolved tension that remains within *Lumen Gentium* between the rubric of the common priesthood as primary and the rubric of the threefold *munera* as the overarching framework,' Ormond Rush, 'The Offices of Christ, *Lumen Gentium* and the People's Sense of the Faith,' *Pacifica* 16 (2003), 137–52 at 152.
- 17 This is reflective of a wider trend, as Congar writes: 'If I were to draw one conclusion from my studies on the Holy Spirit, it would concern the Spirit's bond with the Word,' Yves Congar, 'The Human Spirit and the Spirit of God,' in Mark E. Ginter, Susan Mader Brown, and Joseph G. Mueller, eds *Spirit of God: Short Writings on the Holy Spirit* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2018), 15–70 at 21. For a good introduction to this, see Adrian J. Brooks, 'Breathing Forth the Word: Yves Congar's Articulation of the Activity of The Holy Spirit in the Life of Christ,' *New Blackfriars* 101 (2020), 196–205. This development was not always reflected in official texts. The Code of Canon Law was criticized for an insufficiently Trinitarian foundation. See John Beal, 'It Shall Not Be So Among You! Crisis in the Church, Crisis in Church Law,' in Francis Oakley and Bruce Russett eds, *Governance, Accountability and the Future of the Catholic Church* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 88–102 at 96–97.

attribution is not exclusive and does not contradict the preceding two. The gifts of God always imply the entire Trinitarian horizon (*IE4*).

This Trinitarian orientation is a theme that runs throughout the entire document but is expressed particularly in §11, §12, and §13. No Person exists separately from the others. The influences of the Persons are entwined:

In reality, every gift of the Father implies the reference to the joint and differentiated actions of the divine missions: every gift comes from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. The gift of the Spirit in the Church is bound to the mission of the Son, accomplished definitively in his Paschal Mystery. Jesus Himself connects the fulfilment of his mission to the sending of the Spirit upon the community of believers. Through this, the Holy Spirit can in no way inaugurate an economy other than that of the divine incarnate *Logos*, crucified and risen. In truth, the whole sacramental economy of the Church is the pneumatological realization of the Incarnation . . . The action of God in history always implies the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit, who, in Irenaeus of Lyon's evocative words, are called 'the two hands of the Father.' In this sense, every gift of the Spirit cannot but be in relationship with the Word made flesh. (*IE11*)

Thus, while hierarchical gifts have a particular relationship with the salvific acts of Christ, it is 'equally manifest that no sacrament can be conferred without the action of the Holy Spirit' (*IE12*) for it is the Spirit who 'distributes efficaciously, through the sacraments, the salvific grace offered by Christ' (*IE12*).¹⁸ Similarly, the charismatic gifts, while freely given by the Holy Spirit, 'are objectively related to the new life in Christ, in as much as Christians are 'individually parts' (1 Cor 12:27) of his Body' (*IE12*). The charisms cannot be understood without reference to Christ (in addition to the Spirit) just as the sacraments cannot be understood without reference to the Spirit (in addition to Christ). While the Spirit has freedom beyond the institution, he does not possess autonomy in relation to Son (or the Father) as he is 'always the Spirit of the Father and of the Son' (*IE11*). *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* thus presents the view that, to borrow a quote from Yves Congar, there can be 'no Christology without pneumatology and no pneumatology without Christology.'¹⁹ This underlies the unity between charismatic and hierarchical gifts:

The bond in origin between the hierarchical gifts, conferred with the sacramental grace of Orders, and the charismatic gifts freely distributed by the Holy Spirit, has its deepest roots, therefore, in the relationship between the divine incarnate *Logos* and the Holy Spirit . . . Precisely to avoid equivocal theological visions that would posit a 'Church of the Spirit,' distinct and separate from the hierarchical-institutional Church, it must be repeated that the two divine missions mutually imply each other *in every gift* bestowed freely upon the Church. (*IE11*).

18 *IE* quotes Ephrem the Syrian describing the Eucharist: 'the fire of compassion descends / and takes the form of bread.' This, says *IE*, 'helps us to understand how, drawing near to the Eucharist, Christ gives us the Spirit. The same Spirit, then, by way of his actions in believers, feeds the life in Christ, leading them anew to a more profound sacramental life, above all in the Eucharist.' (*IE12*)

19 Yves Congar, *The Word and the Spirit* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), 1.

Iuvenescit Ecclesia also expands on the way the charisms relate to the *tria munera*. The hierarchal and charismatic gifts are both said to ‘rest upon’ the sacraments of initiation (*IE13*). While charisms are again linked with the prophetic office (*IE9*), the relation to the trilogy is expanded. Interestingly, the document restores the context found in the second draft of *De Ecclesia*: ‘charismatic gifts enable the faithful to live the common priesthood of the People of God as part of their day to day existence’ (*IE22*). Charisms, then, are understood by *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* as linked with the living out of both Christ’s prophetic and priestly offices. This could, therefore, be interpreted as representing a growing but only partially realized understanding where the charisms aid the participation in all three offices.²⁰

Conceptualizing Charisms: Terminological Precision?

Lumen Gentium

The concept of charism went through several significant transformations during *Lumen Gentium*’s writing process. Redactive history reveals how the term moved from being quite broad and undefined in the first draft, to appearing surprisingly narrow in the final version (although not without ambiguity). John Paul II would later call this ‘a considerable development in the doctrine of the charisms.’²¹

Perhaps the most notable and widely received aspect of the council’s teaching has been its understanding that the language of charisms does not only apply to more overtly supernatural gifts such as miracles or knowing the future but also to more ordinary gifts, and thus the charisms can be recognized as widely distributed.²² This is found in §12:

It is not only through the sacraments and the ministries of the Church that the Holy Spirit sanctifies and leads the people of God and enriches it with virtues, but, ‘allotting his gifts to everyone according as He wills,’ He distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. These charisms, whether they be the more outstanding or the more simple and widely diffused, are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation for they are perfectly suited to and useful for the needs of the Church. Extraordinary gifts are not to be [rashly] sought after, nor are the fruits of apostolic labor to be presumptuously expected from their use . . . (*LG12*)

20 This was argued prior to the council, see Yves M. J. Congar, *Lay People in the Church* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1963), 112–308. For a more recent example, see Jos Moons, ‘“Aroused and sustained by the Holy Spirit”? A Plea for a Pneumatological Reconsideration of Sensus Fidei on the Basis of Lumen Gentium 12,’ *Gregorianum* 99 (2018), 271–92 at 276. The fact that it is the kingly which is unmentioned might reveal the historic difficulties in grasping this dimension. Grillmeier noted that in *Lumen Gentium* the kingly dimension (even separate from the charisms) ‘is mentioned only briefly.’ Aloys Grillmeier, ‘The People of God,’ in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, ed. Herbert Vorgimler (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 182–84 at 156.

21 Bill McCarthy ed., *The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Pope John Paul II* (St Andrews, 2001), 405.

22 The fact that the commonality of certain gifts can change—something that was widely recognized in the debates—suggests not considering these categories as too fixed.

If today this seems to be a point of minor significance it is precisely because of the paradigm shift the passage caused. This understanding, seen in the *Commentarius* quote previously cited, first appeared in the second draft. Its inclusion was not without controversy, and caused conflict both in the council commissions and the open debates. In the latter, it was directly attacked by a number of Council Fathers, most famously by Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini.²³ Its survival, and then approval, represented a broadening of the conception of charism, whereby things considered more ordinary could be recognized as the work of God in and through the community.

The above use of the term ‘special graces’ also has interpretive importance. The Doctrinal Commission, when explaining the changes they had made to this section of the schema, gave three reasons for using ‘special graces’ to describe the charisms:

1. To more greatly stress the freedom of the Holy Spirit in their bestowal.
2. Because they are bestowed among the faithful of every condition.
3. The previous language which spoke of varied gifts for service did not sufficiently express the concept.²⁴

It relates, then, to *how* charisms are given, to *whom* they are given, and the reason *why* they are given. Francis Sullivan, who ghost-wrote the emendation these changes were primarily based upon, explains:

The *way* is special, because it involves a direct intervention of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. The Council distinguishes between the way the Holy Spirit works ‘through the sacraments and Church ministries,’ and the way he works in distributing his charismatic gifts. The latter is an immediate intervention of the Spirit, in which he exercises his sovereign freedom to allot his gifts as he wills and to whomever he wills, in a way that cannot be foreseen or controlled by man. Such gifts are ‘special’ also by reason of the purpose for which they are given. Unlike the gifts of faith, hope, and love, which are inseparable from the gift of the indwelling Spirit, and which everyone must have in order to be pleasing to God, the charisms are ‘*distributed among the faithful*’; no one of these gifts is necessarily connected with sanctifying grace . . . a charism is ‘special grace,’ in the sense that it equips a person in a particular kind of way for a particular kind of service.²⁵

-
- 23 ASII/1, 391–94 at 393. Ruffini did not believe that charisms (understood as overtly supernatural gifts) could be spoken of as widely distributed among the faithful, considering this to have ended with the Apostolic Age. Cardinal Léon Suenens famously defended the draft. See Léon Suenens, ‘The Charismatic Dimension of the Church,’ in Yves Congar, Hans Küng, and Daniel O’Hanlon eds, *Council Speeches of Vatican II* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1964), 18–21.
- 24 See ASIII/1, 119. This language appeared following the debate between Ruffini and Suenens. But, despite the attention given to these two cardinals, the Doctrinal Commission refrained from citing either when explaining the post-debate textual changes, instead citing an emendation submitted by bishop John McEleney.
- 25 Francis A. Sullivan, ‘The Ecclesiological Context of the Charismatic Renewal,’ in Kilian McDonnell, ed., *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 119–38 at 124–25. We can see, here, how ‘charisms’ is being used in a way that refers only to what might elsewhere be called ‘non-hierarchical charisms’

The term ‘special graces,’ then, is connected with a distinguishing from sacraments and ministries (LG12); from faith, hope, and love; as well as from sanctifying grace.²⁶ While all these elements are important, most commentators consider it particularly significant that charisms come directly from the Spirit rather than mediated through the hierarchy.²⁷

This, apparently quite technical, understanding of the charisms is reinforced by the explicit distinguishing from hierarchical gifts: ‘He [the Spirit] both equips and directs with hierarchical and charismatic gifts’ (LG4). While such a conceptual distinction was not totally foreign to Catholic theology prior to the council, it was common for both to be referred to as types or sub-sets of charisms.²⁸ Distinguishing the two linguistically further expressed this underlying conceptual distinction. Indeed, the vocabulary emerged in response to Ruffini who had explicitly requested this differentiation be more clearly expressed.²⁹

The particular wording of the passage was also shaped by the objection from Archbishop Ermenegildo Florit that the draft mixed Latin and Greek terms. While the Doctrinal Commission opted to retain both, Francesco Vermiglio writes,

or ‘charisms of the faithful.’ For a longer exploration of Sullivan’s reading (and an English translation of the emendation), see John Stayne, ‘The Contribution of Francis A. Sullivan, SJ to a Deeper Understanding of Charisms in the Church,’ *Theological Studies* 81 (2020), 810–27.

26 Many bishops at the council requested a passage be inserted mentioning love as the most excellent charism. This was explicitly rejected by the Doctrinal Commission. ASIII/1, 200.

27 Edward P. Hahnenberg, when commenting on *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 3, describes the idea of special (non-hierarchically mediated) grace being widely distributed as the ‘single most important insight of the document—overturning a hierarchical view in which all church activity trickles down through the clergy.’ Edward P. Hahnenberg, *A Concise Guide to the Documents of Vatican II* (Cincinnati, OH: St Anthony Messenger, 2007), 104.

28 This can be seen in the debate as to whether the grace of office should be considered a *gratia gratis data* despite its stability. For an overview see Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *Grace: Commentary on the Summa Theologica of St Thomas, Ia IIae, q. 109–14* (London: B. Herder, 1952), 150–54.

29 For Ruffini’s suggestion see ASII/1, 393. For the positive response of the Doctrinal Commission see AS III/1, 173. Earlier drafts lacked this linguistic distinction altogether, and the Doctrinal Commission had even explicitly described the grace of office as a charism. See ASII/1, 266 footnote 14. It seems the council was not intending to create wholly new conceptual categories. In the previous draft, charisms appear to have been presented as an overarching category containing both those gifts given through the sacrament of ordination, and those gifts distributed by the Spirit among the faithful more freely. This conceptual framework, despite having each part renamed, does not appear to have been fundamentally altered by LG4. Instead, what might have been called ‘hierarchical charisms’ are referred to as ‘hierarchical . . . gifts,’ and ‘non-hierarchical charisms’ become ‘charismatic gifts.’ The point for interpreters is that when this passage mentions the charisms the term is not referring to the overarching category (as in the previous draft), but strictly ‘non-hierarchical charisms’ or ‘charisms of the faithful.’ This is a subtle point, but important to grasp. The change in language was to more clearly express the recognized differences between the two, not to suggest that they should be held apart as radically dissimilar categories.

now ‘*dono*’ becomes the common category under which there are references to the hierarchy and charisms, overcoming that *dona / charismata* combination that had attracted the attention of the Archbishop of Florence.³⁰

This formulation, which Vermigli recognizes is ‘not a well-composed one in the conciliar text,’ offers a ‘nascent, but very fruitful’ way of reconciliation between the two while retaining their differences.³¹ Vermigli’s positive assessment aside, most commentators would agree with this analysis, recognizing that §4 and §12 used charism in a way separate from hierarchical gifts/sacraments.³² The appearance of charism in §25, however, makes things less straightforward:

For then the Roman Pontiff is not pronouncing judgment as a private person, but as the supreme teacher of the universal Church, in whom the charism of infallibility of the Church itself is individually present, he is expounding or defending a doctrine of Catholic faith.³³

Those commentators who stress a clear distinction in the language of charismatic and hierarchical gifts/sacraments tend to give minimal attention to this passage. The more common interpretation, exemplified by Giuseppe Rambaldi, does take account of §25. While accepting the previous distinctions, Rambaldi considers the hermeneutical difficulties of §25 as inviting readers ‘not to understand too rigidly that charisms are graces given outside the sacraments.’³⁴ Certainly, the scattered way the charisms are presented,

30 Francesco Vermigli, ‘I carismi al Concilio Vaticano II. La formazione delle pericopi sui carismi in *Lumen Gentium* 4.7.12.,’ *Vivens Homo* 27 (2016), 93–114 at 100.

31 *Ibid.*, 112.

32 For a fairly representative selection of commentaries (in addition to those previously cited on this point) that recognize the distinguishing as present in the final text see Albert Vanhoye, ‘The Biblical Question of “Charisms” After Vatican II,’ in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After*, vol. 1, ed. René Latourelle (New York: Paulist, 1988), 439–68 at 443–44; Grillmeier, ‘People of God,’ 144; Kevin McNamara, ‘The mystery of the Church,’ in *The Constitution on the Church*, ed. McNamara (Dublin: Veritas), 75–102 at 88; Gabriel Murphy, *Charisms and Church Renewal* (Rome: Catholic Books Agency, 1965), 124 and 127; Richard Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making* (New York: Paulist, 2006), 51. Not all of these authors personally adopt the particular language of *LG4*. Some prefer to call hierarchical gifts charisms. All, however, do recognize the point being made here, that charisms and hierarchical gifts are differentiated in sections of the council text.

33 The distinguishing of charisms from sacraments in *LG12*, from hierarchical gifts in *LG4*, and the application of charism to infallibility in *LG25*, all first appeared in the schema presented on 16 September 1964.

34 Giuseppe Rambaldi, ‘Uso e significato di ‘Carisma’ nel Vaticano II: Analisi e confronto di due passi conciliari sui carismi,’ *Gregorianum* 56 (1975), 141–62 at 158. Murphy, having also struggled with a perceived conflict within the final text, opts for a similar approach, see *Charisms*, 118–21. Likewise, Avery Dulles felt the need to theologially justify presenting hierarchical gifts as charisms because he considered this not to have been settled by Vatican II. See Avery Dulles, ‘Earthen Vessels: Institution and Charism in the Church,’ in *Above Every Name: The Lordship of Christ and Social Systems*, ed. Thomas E. Clarke (New York: Paulist, 2018), 155–87 at 163–69.

and the somewhat ad-hoc manner the teaching emerged through contrasting interventions and debates, raises questions about how precise a presentation the council intended. John C. Haughey, who describes the distinguishing between charismatic and hierarchical gifts as ‘perhaps the most important thing the Council did,’³⁵ also regards the council’s treatment of the charisms to have been ‘unsystematic.’³⁶ It also seems relevant that, while Catholic theology widely recognizes the same fundamental underlying conceptual differentiation between the grace bestowed through sacramental ordination and the charisms given more freely among the faithful, the reception of §4’s language has been minimal, rarely having been adopted or reflected upon in postconciliar ecclesiological writings.³⁷

Iuvenescit Ecclesia

Iuvenescit Ecclesia, despite the apparent inner-textual tension in *Lumen Gentium* and the inconsistency of its reception, largely interprets the Constitution through §4 and §12.³⁸ To start, the idea that charisms are widely distributed is taken as an unargued premise

35 John C. Haughey, ‘Charisms: An Ecclesiological Exploration,’ in *Retrieving Charisms for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Doris Donnelly (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1999), 1–16 at 5.

36 John C. Haughey, ‘Connecting Vatican II’s Call to Holiness with Public Life,’ *CTSA Proceedings* 55 (2000), 1–19 at 6. This view is held by others also; for example, see Christoph Hegge, *Rezeption und Charisma* (Würzburg: Echter, 1999), 113.

37 Instead, the tendency is to describe hierarchical gifts as charisms. There are many convincing reasons for thinking this language preferable; however, the one weakness that tends to characterize the work of those who have adopted this language is that they usually refer to the other sub-set of charisms (that is, the non-hierarchical charisms) simply as charisms. But because this term can also refer to the overarching category it becomes difficult to know when they are speaking about the non-hierarchical charisms particularly or about all charisms (hierarchical included) more broadly. For a list of some of those theologians (and popes) who opt to play down the linguistic distinction of *LG4* see Stayne, ‘Francis Sullivan,’ 819–20, footnote 39. It is important to note that every theologian mentioned in that list, despite not adopting the linguistic distinction, accepts an underlying conceptual distinction between the two.

38 The approach taken has a remarkable similarity with that found in the early writings of Francis Sullivan. This might not be a coincidence. In 1986, Gerhard Müller reviewed Sullivan’s *Die Charismatische Erneuerung. Wirken und Ziele*. In this review, Müller noted the need for the ‘traditional construction of sacrament and hierarchy’ to be balanced by an ecclesiological view that ‘emphasizes the charisms . . . that make the direct action of the Holy Spirit in the Church tangible’ (Gerhard L. Müller, ‘Review of Francis A. Sullivan, *Die Charismatische Erneuerung. Wirken und Ziele. Mit einem Nachwort von Leon Josef Kardinal Suenens*,’ in *Theologie und Philosophie* 61, 305–6 at 305). The role of the charisms had, in the past, not been sufficiently developed, which resulted in an ecclesiology which ‘lacked the sense of the original biblical character of the free work of the Spirit in the life of the churches’ (305). Müller identified Sullivan as correcting this deficiency, concluding his review by noting that ‘S. has provided important help for the mediation of sacramental and pneumatic ecclesiology’ (306). This means that Müller identified Sullivan’s theology of charisms, and the outline of the ecclesiology he sketched, as succeeding in precisely the same task *IE* would set itself under his own oversight some 30 years later.

(although mentioned in §15 and §24). Again, it is stated that there exist both ordinary and extraordinary charisms, although examples are now given: ‘there are exceptional gifts (of healing, of mighty deeds, of variety of tongues) and ordinary gifts (of teaching, of service, of beneficence)’ (IE6). Likewise, the ideas previously conveyed through the term ‘special graces’ return. Charisms are said to be sovereignly bestowed by the Spirit who ‘blows where he wills’ (IE12 quoting John 3:8) and, as a result, the document describes them as having something of an ‘unforeseeable nature’ (IE17). Charisms are gifts of grace and so explicitly denied as being ‘simply human capacities’ (IE4), but they are also different from what the document calls ‘fundamental graces’:

Unlike the fundamental graces such as sanctifying grace, or the gifts of faith, of hope, and of charity, that are indispensable for every Christian, an individual charism need not be a gift given to all (cf. 1 Co 12: 30). (IE4)³⁹

However, while charismatic and fundamental grace are conceptually distinguished, they are understood as being intimately related. Indeed, charisms can ‘have a personal usefulness, because their service of the common good favors the growth of charity in those who possess them’ (IE5).⁴⁰ It should not surprise us, therefore, that the importance of charity is twice listed in the criteria for discerning authentic (group) charisms (IE18). But although they should be united, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* recognizes, drawing upon 1 Corinthians 13:1–3 and Matthew 7:22–23, the charisms can ‘unfortunately coexist with the absence of an authentic relationship with the Savior’ (IE5).

Alongside these, the letter again presents the charisms as distinguishable from sacraments and from hierarchical gifts (IE9;11;12;13;14;22)—the latter differentiation holding a particularly prominent place:

In the present document the attention is placed on the binomial highlighted in paragraph 4 of the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* which speaks of ‘hierarchical gifts and charismatic gifts.’ (IE8)

These are directly spoken of as having a ‘distinction’ (IE9).⁴¹ There is both an underlying conceptual distinction, and the linguistic distinction, that latter of which, unlike in *Lumen*

39 While this passage comes from an overview of the different understandings of charism in scripture, this same idea is also found in §5 and §14.

40 Karl Rahner, who emphasizes the interconnectedness of charismatic and sanctifying grace throughout his writings on the charisms, is a probable influence here: ‘For how else could one truly sanctify oneself except by unselfish service to others in the one Body of Christ by the power of the Spirit?’ Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church* (London: Burns & Oates, 1964), 56.

41 It is necessary to re-state that *IE*, while adopting this language, is not suggesting any greater differentiation than that which is well established in the Catholic theological literature. When *IE* refers to charisms, it can fairly reliably be interpreted as referring to what Catholic theology might otherwise call ‘non-hierarchical charisms,’ or ‘charisms of the faithful.’ Likewise, and more obviously, ‘hierarchical gifts’ broadly refers to what Catholic theology might commonly call ‘hierarchical charisms.’ A major element of *IE* is that the difference between hierarchical and charismatic gifts, while real, is precisely what allows their unity to be stressed. Consuelo

Gentium, is consistently maintained.⁴² Expanding on this, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* makes clear what it means by hierarchical gifts:

The conferral of hierarchical gifts . . . can be traced back, above all, to the fullness of the sacrament of Orders, given at Episcopal consecration. . . . In short, the hierarchical gifts proper to the sacrament of Orders, in its diverse grades, are given so that the Church as communion may never fail to make to each member of the faithful an objective offer of grace in the sacraments, and so she may offer both normative proclamation of the Gospel and pastoral care. (*IE14*)

The document further lists some gifts that primarily relate to this area: ‘the Eucharist . . . the power to forgive sins . . . the apostolic mandate for the work of evangelisation and of Baptism’ (*IE12*), as well as wider service flowing from the sacrament (*IE14*). Consequently, the hierarchical gifts pertain to the ‘ecclesial sacramental structure’ (*IE13*). Unlike the potentially ‘unforeseeable’ (*IE17*) charisms which are ‘powerfully dynamic realities’ (*IE2*), the hierarchical gifts are ‘of their nature stable, permanent, and irrevocable’ (*IE13*). Through them ‘the offer of Christ’s grace, to the whole People of God throughout history, is assured’ (*IE15*).⁴³ As Cardinal Marc Ouellet noted at the press release ‘it is not a question of levelling the differences between hierarchical and charismatic gifts, but of better integrating the various charisms.’⁴⁴

While most of the above is clearly intended to be read in continuity with *Lumen Gentium*, the letter does appear to amend a specific element of the council’s understanding.

Panichi explored how this internal unity is further emphasized by the concept of co-essentiality, noting that ‘co-essentiality means that hierarchical or charismatic gifts would have no reason for being and would not absolve their nature if they were conceived apart from this constant permeation of one into the other . . . the document refers time and time again to the possible request for purification of the charismatic gifts, . . . let us take into consideration especially article n.20, but there is no mention about a reciprocal dynamic of purification between the two gifts. If they are rightly thought of in terms of co-essentiality, then each should be considered as an element of perfection for the other.’ Consuelo Panichi, ‘Towards a praxis of hierarchical and charismatic co-essentiality,’ (presented at Integrating the Charisms, 2021).

42 Nowhere in *IE* are hierarchical gifts said to be charisms. Even when detailing the fact that there is an ambiguity in certain texts in the NT (where things we might think of as hierarchical gifts are described as charisms) this is qualified by *IE* which notes: ‘It is not always clear that these gifts are considered “charisms” in the strict sense of the term’ (*IE6*). The only other point of possible tension is found in a Benedict XVI quote: ‘the essential institutions are charismatic’ (*IE10*). This can, however, be read in continuity with the wider document as Ratzinger/Benedict generally used ‘charismatic’ in a broader sense than just the specific charismatic gifts, but rather as quasi-synonymous with ‘pneumatic.’ On occasion he directly combined the two, speaking of the ‘pneumatological-charismatic.’ See Joseph Ratzinger, ‘The Theological Locus of Ecclesial Movements,’ *Communio* 25 (1998), 480–504 at 480 and 586.

43 It seems the term can also apply to canonical powers also—it describes there being ‘hierarchical gifts proper to the Successor of Peter’ (*IE21*). But as the resignation for Pope Benedict XVI clearly illustrates, such gifts can be revoked, which seems difficult to reconcile with understanding them as ‘irrevocable.’

44 *Conferenza Stampa*. Ouellet is speaking about the charisms of consecrated life, but this clearly applies more widely.

This is regarding the charisms as being intrinsically linked with ministry, bestowed specifically to make the faithful ‘fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices’ (LG12). This shift comes up when explaining the reasons charisms are given:

In *1 Cor 12:7* Paul declares that ‘To each individual the manifestation of the Spirit is given *for some benefit*.’ Many translations add ‘for the benefit of all’ because the majority of charisms mentioned by the Apostle, even if not all, are directly for the benefit of all . . . Paul, nevertheless, does not deny that a charism may be useful solely for the person who has received it. Such is the case with speaking in tongues, which, in this respect, is different from the gift of prophecy. (IE5)

The footnote accompanying the last sentence adds:

The Apostle does not reject the gift of glossolalia, a charism of prayer useful for the personal relationship with God, and he recognizes it as an authentic charism, although not directly having a communal benefit.⁴⁵

Thus, rather than *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* having a narrower understanding of charism as it has previously been claimed, its understanding is actually somewhat broader, as it does not restrict the term to gifts linked with ministry. This line of argument, both in the position taken and in giving the specific example of tongues, is extremely reminiscent of that made by Albert Vanhoye.⁴⁶ Thirty-five years prior to *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, Vanhoye had noted the limits of a strict association between charism and ministry because in the case of glossolalia, as he later wrote, ‘this orientation cannot be maintained.’⁴⁷ Vanhoye understood that one could reserve the title of ‘charism’ for those gifts of grace characterized by their usefulness for the church and that this is what ‘the Council does, following a theological tradition.’⁴⁸ But there is some tension here:

Such a theological development is possible and legitimate. However, we must bear clearly in mind the fact that this specialized notion is a later development, and that its relationship to the New Testament data will not necessarily be consistent.⁴⁹

45 There is possible tension here with the earlier insistence that charisms are not graces given primarily for the sanctification of the recipient.

46 Vanhoye, a leading Catholic scripture scholar based in Rome, had previously written on the charisms and served as Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission for 11 years. It is quite probable that he influenced (directly or indirectly) this part of the document. Following Vanhoye’s recent passing, it was widely reported that ‘whenever a pontifical text mentioned Scripture or a book commentating on Scripture posed a problem’ Benedict XVI would call upon Vanhoye’s help. CNA Staff, ‘Pope Francis mourns “authoritative biblical scholar” Cardinal Albert Vanhoye,’ *Catholic News Agency*, <https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/248536/pope-francis-mourns-authoritative-biblical-scholar-cardinal-albert-vanhoye>. Accessed 28 September 2021.

47 This first appeared in Albert Vanhoye, ‘Reviewed Work: *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal. A Biblical and Theological Study* by Francis A. Sullivan,’ *Biblica* 65 (1984), 290. For the quote, see Vanhoye, ‘Biblical Question,’ 460.

48 *Ibid*, 460–61.

49 *Ibid*, 465.

Iuvenescit Ecclesia continues, however, to stress that charisms are fundamentally ordered towards the church: ‘The charismatic gifts given to individuals actually belong to the Church herself and are ordered towards a more intense ecclesial life’ (IE13). The fact that, in some cases, charisms could be given primarily for the benefit of the individual receiving rather than (directly) for the community should not, therefore, be interpreted as undermining their essential ecclesiality.

The Importance of Charisms: Ecclesial Causality?

Lumen Gentium

The council clearly understood the charisms as important ecclesial realities. John Paul II once credited *Lumen Gentium* for heralding a ‘providential rediscovery of the Church’s charismatic dimension.’⁵⁰ As we have seen, it described them as helping ‘contribute toward the renewal and building up of the Church,’ and that they are ‘perfectly suited to and useful for the needs of the Church’ (LG12). Indeed, along with hierarchical gifts, the Holy Spirit ‘equips and directs’ the church with them (LG4). But while §4 couples the charisms with hierarchical gifts, it does not appear to treat the two equally. Charisms may be useful for the church, but hierarchical gifts are essential. As §17 puts it: ‘the priest alone can complete the building up of the Body in the eucharistic sacrifice.’ This is expanded in §26:

A bishop marked with the fullness of the sacrament of Orders, is ‘the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood,’ especially in the Eucharist, which he offers or causes to be offered, and by which the Church continually lives and grows. This Church of Christ is truly present in all legitimate local congregations of the faithful which, united with their pastors, are themselves called churches in the New Testament. . . . In these communities, though frequently small and poor, or living in the Diaspora, Christ is present, and in virtue of His presence there is brought together one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. For ‘the partaking of the body and blood of Christ does nothing other than make us be transformed into that which we consume.’

We see here a re-discovery of what has come to be called ‘eucharistic ecclesiology.’⁵¹ Understanding the eucharistic celebration as ontologically linked with ecclesiality allowed the council to recognize the Orthodox Churches as Churches.⁵² But the other

50 John Paul II, *Speech of the Holy Father Pope John Paul II Meeting with Ecclesial Movements and New Communities* (30 May 1998), 4, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1998/may/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19980530_riflessioni.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

51 The influence of Orthodox theologian Nicholas Afanasiev (who coined the term ‘Eucharistic ecclesiology’) on this paragraph has been previously noted. See Anastacia Wooden, ‘Eucharistic Ecclesiology of Nicholas Afanasiev and its Ecumenical Significance: A New Perspective,’ *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 45 (2010), 543–60 at 543–44.

52 *Unitatis Regintegratio*, (21 November 1964), 15, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html. For the positive effect of this in ecumenical dialogue see *The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity* (1982) http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19820706_munich_en.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

side of this teaching is that those Christian bodies lacking valid (tactile) apostolic succession and thereby (in the official Catholic understanding) the ‘proper reality of the eucharistic mystery in its fullness’ (UR22), were judged as ecclesially deficient.⁵³ Because of this, Vatican texts usually refer to Protestant denominations as ‘ecclesial communities.’⁵⁴ This, then, briefly explains how hierarchical gifts are understood as being an essential requirement for full ecclesiality. *Lumen Gentium* does not treat charismatic and hierarchical gifts as comparably important either in the value it assigned them regarding the ongoing life and mission of the church or in their importance as a means of making the church present.⁵⁵

Iuvenescit Ecclesia

Iuvenescit Ecclesia, while treating hierarchical and charismatic gifts as distinguishable, stresses their compatibility. It explicitly rejects a hermeneutic of opposition which would

53 The use of ‘tactile’ is to identify succession conferred through laying on of hands, rather than the more comprehensive understanding that emerged in ecumenical dialogues. For an overview of the latter, see Francis A. Sullivan, *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic* (New York: Paulist, 1988), 185–209.

54 This has not been without critics, but remains the official Catholic position. See Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church* (2007) https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20070629_responsa-quaestiones_en.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

55 Surprisingly, *LG* never describes the charisms as having any evangelistic utility (*LG*35 does strongly allude to this, but the charisms are not explicitly mentioned). It seems possible that the 2012 Synod of Bishops, focused on ‘The New Evangelization for the Transmission of the Christian Faith,’ helped shift the thinking. The *Propositiones* (final text) of the Synod included the following: ‘The Holy Spirit directs the Church in her missionary evangelization “with various hierarchical and charismatic gifts” (*Lumen gentium*, 4) . . . The hierarchical gifts and the charismatic gifts, flowing from the one Spirit of God, are not in competition but rather co-essential to the life of the Church and to the effectiveness of her missionary action . . . Studies should be undertaken at both diocesan and interdiocesan levels to see how both the charismatic and hierarchical gifts are able to cooperate in the pastoral action and in the spiritual life of the Church’ (Proposition 43, Holy See Press Office, *Synodus Episcoporum Bulletin, 27.10.2012 Summary* (2012), https://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b33_02.html). Accessed 20 July 2021.

It is interesting that Ouellet, who gave possibly the most important intervention on the charismatic and hierarchical gifts at the Synod (for the text of this speech see *Synodus Episcoporum Bulletin, 17.10.2012 Summary* (2012), https://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b20_02.html), was one of the two cardinals who introduced *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* at its press release. For another possible indicator of Ouellet’s influence, see how some core aspects of *IE*’s teaching—particularly related to the Trinitarian grounding—already appear in his 2010 lecture ‘Le principe d’unité des charismes dans la vie et la théologie de l’Église.’ This was published just prior to the Synod (along with another lecture) in Marc Ouellet, *Charismen: Eine Herausforderung* (Freiburg: Johannes Verlag Einsiedeln, 2011).

see in scripture and church history a certain dialectic antagonism between them.⁵⁶ Instead, they are said to have a close relationship, possessing ‘the same origin and the same purpose . . . given to contribute, in diverse ways, to the edification of the Church’ (IE8). Commenting on *Lumen Gentium* §4, the letter suggests that this difference enables their unity to be stressed

Lumen Gentium, in presenting the gifts mediated through the Spirit, precisely through the distinction between the diverse hierarchical and charismatic gifts, highlights their difference in unity. (IE9)

It is precisely because they are different that *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* argues for a divinely willed synergy between the two—a ‘unity in legitimate difference’ to quote Pope Francis.⁵⁷ This extends also to the person of the ordained, where both charismatic and hierarchical gifts can (and should) coincide.⁵⁸ The possession of hierarchical gifts does not dispense of the utility of charisms; indeed, one of the reasons the latter are given is ‘so that sacramental grace may be fruitful in Christian life in different ways and at every level’ (IE15). This includes being able to fully live out each personal mission, and the charisms, ‘can bear great fruit in the fulfilment of those duties that arise from Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, and Holy Orders’ (IE22).

But it is co-essentiality, and not just compatibility, that is the notable element present in *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*. This had already been a major theme in the postconciliar papal approach to the charisms, and in the paragraph given over to summarize these developments, the term ‘co-essential’ appears five times (IE10). This is interpreted firmly as a development of *Lumen Gentium* §4.⁵⁹ As the key paragraph reads:

56 The exegetical antithesis between an institutional structure of the church (of a Judaeo-Christian type) and a charismatic structure of the church (of a Pauline type), according to the letter, ‘lacks a foundation in the texts of the New Testament’ (IE7). This has been repeatedly stressed going back to Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (29 June 1943), 17, https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

57 This came in an address to the CDF immediately prior to the release of *IE*, and clearly referenced the document: ‘Another important contribution of yours to the renewal of ecclesial life is the study of the *complementarity between hierarchical and charismatic gifts*.’ Francis, *Discorso del santo padre Francesco ai partecipanti alla plenaria della congregazione per la dottrina della fede* (29 January 2016), http://m.vatican.va/content/francesco/it/speeches/2016/january/documents/papa-francesco_20160129_plenaria-dottrina-fede.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

58 See Stayne, ‘Sullivan,’ 820–25 for an exploration of this in greater detail.

59 John Paul II’s ambiguous language of ‘institutional and charismatic aspects’ is treated as referring simply to the charismatic and hierarchical gifts. John Paul II, *Speech of the Holy Father Pope John Paul II Meeting with Ecclesial Movements and New Communities* (1998), 4, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1998/may/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19980530_riflessioni.html. Accessed 20 July 2021. For a slightly broader interpretation of John Paul II, one which sees charismatic dimension as near-synonymous with the Marian dimension (receptivity to grace), see James Francis Stafford, ‘Institutional and Charismatic Aspects: Quasi Coessential to the Church’s Constitution,’ *L’Osservatore Romano*, Weekly Edition in English (17–26 April 2010), 6–7.

John Paul II, in his *Magisterium*, insists particularly on the principle of the *coessentiality* of these gifts: ‘I have often had occasion to stress that there is no conflict or opposition in the Church between the institutional dimension and the charismatic dimension, of which movements are a significant expression. Both are co-essential to the divine constitution of the Church founded by Jesus, because they both help to make the mystery of Christ and his saving work present in the world’ . . . Summarizing, therefore, it is possible to recognize a convergence in the recent *Magisterium* on the coessentiality between the hierarchical and charismatic gifts. (*IE10*)⁶⁰

At the press release, Müller called the affirmation of co-essentiality ‘undoubtedly’ one of ‘the central points of the document,’ while Piero Coda called it ‘the heart of the teaching it proposes.’⁶¹ In addition, the above paragraph is immediately predicated by the statement that, in light of Vatican II, the ‘authentic charisms, therefore, come to be considered as gifts of indispensable importance for the life and mission of the Church’ (*IE9*).⁶² Neither ecclesial life nor mission is omitted from the sphere of the charisms.

While the practicalities of this are explored regarding new communities, these account for only one particular expression of the charisms. How exactly should this teaching be understood more broadly? Charismatic essentiality remains less well understood and articulated (by most theologians as well as official texts) than the hierarchical counterparts. Perhaps, then, it was providential that the charisms were not simply recognized as essential, but rather as co-essential *with* the hierarchical gifts. By coupling the two, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* (following John Paul II) provides the well-developed notion of hierarchical essentiality as an apparent point of reference. Thus, while *Lumen Gentium* treated the hierarchical gifts as essential, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* seems to be saying, and doing so building upon at least 50 years of slow advances in papal thinking, that the charismatic gifts are necessary in a comparably important way. The rest of the document supports such a reading. While *Lumen Gentium* §26 noted how, due to the presence of the Eucharist, ‘Christ is present,’ *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* states that charismatic and hierarchical gifts have the ‘same purpose’ (*IE8*), and quotes John Paul II that ‘both help make the mystery of Christ present in the world’ (*IE10*). More conclusively, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* links charismatic and hierarchical gifts with Ephesians 2:20 whereby both are seen as the

60 Francis even reads co-essentiality back into *LG*: ‘in the light of the Second Vatican Council, we speak today of the co-essentiality of hierarchical and charismatic gifts (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 4), which flow from the one Spirit of God and nourish the life of the Church and her missionary action.’ Francis, *Address of His Holiness Pope Francis to Participants in the International Congress for the Episcopal Vicars and Delegates for Consecrated Life* (28 October 2016), 1, http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/october/documents/papa-francesco_20161028_vita-consacrata-convegno.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

61 *Conferenza Stampa*

62 The Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue anticipated this almost word-for-word: ‘Charisms are essential both for the life of the Church and for her evangelizing mission.’ See ‘*Do Not Quench the Spirit*’: *Charisms in the Life and Mission of the Church. Report on Sixth Phase of the International Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue (2011–2015)* https://www.prounione.it/dia/pe-rc/Dia-Pe-RC-07_Quench.pdf. Accessed 20 July 2021.

foundation upon which the Church is built (*IE8*).⁶³ To use more classical language, we could say that the charisms are presented as pertaining to the Church's *esse*, not just to her *bene esse*.⁶⁴ It seems to follow that a Church lacking the charismatic gifts should not be seen as simply a less lively or vibrant Church, but also (as in the case of the hierarchical gifts) *less fully the Church*.⁶⁵ The charisms too should be considered as essentially linked with ecclesial causality.

None of this should be read as if *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* were denying the unique place the sacramentally ordained have within the church. Rather, it should be understood as giving official impetus towards further integrating the charisms (plural) into the already well-articulated sacramental structure.⁶⁶ This should be done, however, while treating the charisms as something truly necessary. They must not, to re-purpose an analogy of Yves Congar, be 'sprinkled here and there throughout the texts like sugar on top of pastries without, however, being part of the dough.'⁶⁷

63 Healy comments 'This notion of the Church as consisting of two complementary dimensions is rooted in the New Testament . . . "Apostles" represents the permanent hierarchical structure established by Christ and founded on Peter and the Twelve; "prophets" represents those in every age who are moved by the spontaneous charismatic inspirations of the Holy Spirit.' Healy, 'Recent Developments,' 194.

64 Ouellet presented exactly this idea in a 2012 paper: 'I would say that the charisms are generally seen as useful to the Church's *bene esse*, but not as necessary to her *esse* as such. We would have to say more in order to support the new evangelization, and we can thanks to an ecclesiology of communion that integrates all the gifts of the Spirit, both hierarchical and charismatic (LG 4), in a comprehensive vision of the Church as the sacrament of salvation.' Ouellet, 'The Ecclesiology of Communion, Fifty Years After the Opening of Vatican II,' presented at International Theology Symposium (Maynooth, 2012) <https://www.catholicbishops.ie/2012/06/07/address-cardinal-marc-ouellet-international-theology-symposium-maynooth/>. Accessed 28 September 2021.

65 While the 'charismatic *dimension*,' according to *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, 'will never be lacking in the life and mission of the Church' (*IE13*), this does not mean that every local church has a multitude of charisms (or even any) visibly integrated. It is theoretically possible, as well as at least in some cases partially observable, for a local church to be largely charismatically barren—not because the Spirit has no desire to give his gifts, but because of a variety of possible factors, including a lack of receptivity among individuals, no place for discernment of gifts, and no structures to integrate them into the ecclesial life. St Paul's statement in 1 Cor 12:22 that even the weaker parts of the (charismatic) body are indispensable (*anankaia*) should prompt serious reflection.

66 This, one would presume, will require structural changes. The recent canonical establishment of the ministry of catechist would seem to be a development in the right direction. As Francis, in his *motu proprio*, notes: 'The Church wished to acknowledge this service as a concrete expression of a personal charism.' Francis, *Antiquum Ministerium* (10 May 2021), 2, https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/papa-francesco-motu-proprio-20210510_antiquum-ministerium.html. Accessed 20 July 2021.

67 Raniero Cantalamessa described Congar as having given this analogy regarding the Holy Spirit while at a meeting of the International Theological Commission. See CCR Golden Jubilee, 'CCR: A Current of Grace for the Whole Church - Cantalamessa - Martin - Hocken - Bayemi,' (YouTube video, 10 June 2017), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kPmH6sV-T5o>, at 33:19. Accessed 20 July 2021.

Final Reflections

There have been substantial developments in the Catholic doctrine of the charisms over the past 50 years. *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* not only draws from the council but is reliant on postconciliar advances in scholarship (both theological and scriptural) and in papal thought. While derivative of these, the document finds its value in giving many of these ideas official, canonically weighted, backing for the first time.

Without denying the importance of each aspect explored in this essay, it seems probable that, going forward, none will prove more enduring than the idea of co-essentiality. Ouellet is right when he states that *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* ‘undoubtedly represents an important step in the recognition and integration of the charismatic dimension in Catholic ecclesiology.’⁶⁸ This document should not, however, be viewed as the endpoint (as if the charisms are now successfully integrated), but rather as the impetus for further creative theologizing. *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* offers a new point of departure. Today Catholic doctrine recognizes the charisms of the faithful as co-essential with the hierarchical gifts and considers them indispensable to the church’s life and mission. What remains is for this doctrinal insight, and its implications, to be woven into Catholic ecclesiology more deeply.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Paul D. Murray, Jos Moons, Aleksandra Stayne, and Joseph Fava for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this text.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Author biography

John Stayne is a doctoral student at Durham University. His research is focused on the place of the charisms within Catholic ecclesiology.

68 *Conferenza Stampa*.