

The Contribution of Francis A. Sullivan, SJ to a Deeper Understanding of Charisms in the Church

Theological Studies
2020, Vol. 81 (4) 810–827
© Theological Studies, Inc. 2021



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0040563920985248
journals.sagepub.com/home/tsj



John Stayne 
Durham University, UK

Abstract

Francis A. Sullivan, SJ made a number of significant contributions to the Catholic theology of charism. Through an accepted emendation, he helped write *Lumen Gentium* 12; he investigated the new movement of “Catholic Pentecostals” for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith; he later produced a number of related academic works exploring the nature of the charisms and their role in ecclesiology. This article argues that Sullivan’s reading of the division in *Lumen Gentium* 4 between charismatic and hierarchical gifts, and how he uses this division to argue that sacramental ordained ministry should presume prior charismatic gifts, has the capacity to support a re-conceptualization of ecclesial ministry.

Keywords

Catholic, charism, charismatic, Francis A. Sullivan, ecclesiology, hierarchical gifts, *Lumen Gentium*, ministry, Vatican II

On the 23rd of October 2019 the earthly life of Francis Alfred Sullivan, SJ came to its end.* At the ripe old age of 97, Sullivan—known as Frank to his friends—had entered the Society of Jesus 81 years previously, and had (prior to his final

* I am grateful to Michael A. Fahey and Paul D. Murray for each reading a draft version of this text and offering valuable feedback.

Corresponding author:

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

retirement in 2009) taught ecclesiology for 53 of those years. Over that time he had authored 13 books (a number of which are widely cited) and more than 80 articles; he had served as the dean of the Pontifical Gregorian University for 6 years, taught or supervised several prominent theologians, and, as was read at his eulogy, “he was especially pleased that some 30 of his students from countries across the world became bishops and at least two—Americans Avery Dulles and William Levada—cardinals.”¹ But despite this notable theological career, it seems he has not had the wide recognition it warrants. It is difficult to argue with Neil Ormerod when he writes, “[Sullivan] has been in many ways a ‘theologian’s theologian,’ someone whose work regularly appears in the bibliographies and footnotes of other theologians, but has not received much critical attention in his own right.”² There are recent signs, however, that this has started to change. In the past ten years, a secondary literature on Sullivan’s theology has begun to appear. The first was a 2010 doctoral dissertation by Michael A. Novak entitled *An Ecclesiology of Charisms in the Theology of Francis A. Sullivan*.³ Later that same year, Dermot Ryan submitted his doctoral thesis, *Method to Mission: The Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian. As exemplified in the works of Francis A. Sullivan, SJ in the context of method at the Gregorian University*.⁴ Finally, 2017 saw the publication of Michael M. Canaris’s *Francis A. Sullivan, SJ and Ecclesiological Hermeneutics: An Exercise in Faithful Creativity* (which had also originally been a doctoral dissertation, submitted in 2012).⁵ This is to make no mention of the several publications and doctoral theses that engage his work while not having him as their sole focus.⁶ One can assume that more will be forthcoming.

While there are many areas of Sullivan’s work worthy of greater engagement, it is his ecclesiological reflections on the charisms of the faithful that are the focus of this article. While, as indicated, this area has already been explored, it is my belief that there is further potential in Sullivan’s writing on this topic that Novak leaves untapped. We are, however, in complete agreement when he states, “Sullivan never developed an

-
1. Jesuits USA Northeast Province, “Remembering Jesuit Father Francis A. Sullivan” (October 31, 2019): <https://www.jesuitseast.org/news-detail?TN=NEWS-20191031104638&Method=Draft>.
 2. Neil Ormerod, “Review: Francis A Sullivan, SJ and Ecclesiological Hermeneutics in Faithful Creativity,” *Reading Religion* (September 10, 2018), <https://readingreligion.org/books/francis-sullivan-sj-and-ecclesiological-hermeneutics-faithful-creativity>.
 3. Michael A. Novak, “An Ecclesiology of Charisms in The Theology of Francis A. Sullivan” (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2010).
 4. Dermot Ryan, “Method to Mission: The Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian. As exemplified in the works of Francis A. Sullivan, SJ in the context of method at the Gregorian University” (PhD diss., Gregorian University, 2010).
 5. Michael M. Canaris, *Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. and Ecclesiological Hermeneutics: An Exercise in Faithful Creativity* (Leiden: Brill, 2017); “Francis A. Sullivan’s Hermeneutical Approach to Magisterial Documents: Its Method and Application” (PhD diss., Fordham University, 2012).
 6. For just one example, see the use of Sullivan in James Pedlar, *Division, Diversity, and Unity: A Theology of Ecclesial Charisms* (New York: Peter Lang, 2015), 14, 16, 18, 68, 78, 83–85.

ecclesiology of charisms, yet there are currents within his work on charisms that move towards addressing these needs for integration, diversity, and structure.”⁷ The constructive intent behind this article is to show that Sullivan does indeed draw out some simple but highly significant implications in his ecclesial reflections on the charisms which, if developed and taken as the point of departure for further studies, have the capacity to support a much-needed re-conceptualization of this area of debate within Catholic ecclesiology. I will do this in an initial way by focusing on the relationship between Sullivan’s theology of charism and his theology of ordination.

An Overview of Francis Sullivan’s Charismatic Contributions⁸

Sullivan’s ecclesiological career did not have the most auspicious of beginnings. In 1956 he had been unexpectedly assigned to teach the ecclesiology course at the Gregorian University in Rome (having originally meant to teach Patristics at Weston College back in the USA). As was then the custom, after a number of years professors would turn their course notes into a book. Accordingly, in 1962 Sullivan’s developed course notes were published as *De Ecclesia. I. Quaestiones Theologiae Fundamentalibus*.⁹ The book largely followed the *Mystici corporis* approach to the church that was standard at the time. Unfortunately, the fact that his *De Ecclesia* was released the same year as the opening of the Second Vatican Council meant that it was out of date almost as soon as it was published. As a largely negative review of the book by Yves Congar put it,

In the first 250 pages, we are given an apologetic *De Ecclesia* according to the old school formula: a demonstration of the foundation, by Christ, of a society of public law, hierarchical, structured by Petrine primacy and the college of bishops . . . The magisterium is still seen too much from a jurisdictional point of view, without its link with the sacrament of episcopal consecration being elucidated.¹⁰

But this was soon to change. Just as the ecclesiology of the council began to take shape, Sullivan’s own theology began undergoing a similar transformation. The two would soon converge. In October 1963, during the second session of the council (while the

7. Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 108.

8. This section is reliant upon the excellent biographical details contained in Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” as well as the interview by the Jesuit Oral History program published as Francis A. Sullivan, *Rev. Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.*, New England Jesuit Oral History Program, 85, ed. Richard W. Rousseau, S.J. (Weston, MA: Society of Jesus of New England, 2009).

9. The first of a projected two volumes, the second never being completed due to commitments required of Sullivan as dean, and the changes to ecclesiology that Vatican II brought about.

10. Yves Congar, “Fr. A. Sullivan, S. J., *De Ecclesia. I. Quaestiones Theologiae Fundamentalibus*,” *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 38, no. 2 (1964): 211–12 [my own translation].

debate concerning the charisms of the faithful was taking place¹¹), Sullivan would, for the first time, turn his attention towards the charisms. Throughout the council, many of the bishops had realised that they needed theological expertise to help explain the subtleties of what was being disputed. Groups of bishops would meet (unofficially) with some regularity, and it was not uncommon for a theologian to be invited to address them on a particular point.¹² Due to the notion of charism being a concept many of the bishops were fairly unfamiliar with, the bishops of the United States felt the need for a theologian to elucidate. On this particular occasion, Sullivan was the one invited to speak.¹³ This was probably more due to him being an American ecclesiolgologist based in Rome than because of any speciality on the particular subject. As Sullivan himself recounts:

Of all things, when they came to this question of charisms of the faithful, somebody must have suggested that I might be able to tell them about it—although I had never studied the question, myself, in any depth, I must say. But it was a question somehow they thought I might be able to enlighten them to some length. So I got this invitation to speak to the bishops on that issue. And in order to give me a little background, they actually gave me the text of the draft, which was the first time—I’m quite sure—the first time I had had any of these secret documents in my hand.¹⁴

Sullivan decided, drawing on modern biblical studies as well as the recent work of Karl Rahner and Yves Congar,¹⁵ to present a Pauline view of charisms as graces widely distributed for the building up of the body. As he writes, “I later learned that this was also the view that Cardinal Suenens defended in a speech that he gave at the council in response to Cardinal Ruffini.”¹⁶

11. See especially the speech in defence of the charisms of Léon Suenens, “The Charismatic Dimension of the Church,” in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. Yves Congar, Hans Küng, and Daniel O’Hanlon (New York: Paulist, 1964), 18–21.
12. These meetings were particularly important, not just for the development of the council, but as “an exercise in collegiality as an ongoing process.” John W. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 124.
13. According to the council diaries of USA bishops Marion F. Forest and Leo Dworschak, Sullivan’s sharing took place on 17 October 1963 and was part of a panel discussion on the *Populus Dei*, the charisms and the *Sensus Fidei* chaired by Bishop George W. Ahr (the other panelists being Gustave A. Weigel and George W. Shea). See Marion F. Forest, *Daily Journal of Vatican II* (Catholic Diocese of Dodge City, 2013), 71 and Leo Dworschak, “Council Diary: Second Session” (Unpublished manuscript, Diocese of Fargo Archive, 1963), 16.
14. Novak conducted several oral interviews with Sullivan, and he draws upon them throughout his thesis. The above paragraph comes from one of these interviews. Quoted in Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 35.
15. Sullivan explicitly mentions their impact on him, see Sullivan, *Charisms*, 14. The two books in particular were: Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, trans. W.J. O’Hara (London: Burns & Oates, 1964) and Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*, trans. D. Attwater (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1957).
16. Francis A. Sullivan, “Vatican II on the Charisms of the Faithful,” in *Vatican II: Forty Personal Stories*, ed. William Madges and Michael J. Daley (Twenty-Third Publications, 2003), 94–97 at 95.

However, the decision of the US bishops to invite Sullivan was to have wider implications than they would have anticipated. Having now had a chance to read the working text, and study the topic in-depth in order to deliver his presentation, an idea came to Sullivan: “along the way, you know—I suppose brash enough—I said to myself, ‘Well, now that I’ve really looked into this question, I think I could write a better paragraph than that.’”¹⁷ This could be done, so he thought, by “making more ample use of the teaching and language of St. Paul.”¹⁸ Sullivan was still a fairly new theologian at the time of Vatican II and so had not been called up as one of the *periti*. Yet his old Rector, John J. McEleney, who had been appointed Bishop of Kingston, Jamaica just before Sullivan left America to study in Rome, still maintained a close relationship with him. As Novak recounts: “At some point McEleney had said to Sullivan that if he had any ideas that [he] might be able to use during the Council to let him know.”¹⁹ Sullivan thus presented him with his revised version of the text, and McEleney agreed that it was an improvement on the original and thus presented it to the council:

Bishop McEleney graciously accepted my text and promised to submit it in his own name. When the constitution *Lumen Gentium* was promulgated, I had the pleasure of seeing that the paragraph on the charisms of the faithful now corresponded substantially with what I had written. And when the *Acta Synodalia* were eventually published, I was able to verify the fact that in reworking that paragraph, the Theological Commission had accepted an emendation that had been proposed by Bishop John McEleney of Kingston, Jamaica.²⁰

The relevant section of the emendation reads as follows:

Note 24, page 8, lines 24–28: let it say: “Therefore, the same Holy Spirit, who operates with divine freedom everywhere in the Church, gives his ‘apportioning to each as he wills’ (1 Cor 12:11), continuingly distributed among the faithful of all orders the same special graces to which they are restored ready and able in order to sustain the various work or offices or utility of the Church, according to . . . (1 Peter 4:10).” Reasons being:

1. The word “Therefore-*Praeterea*” is a better than “therefore-*propterea*” which is currently in the sentence.
2. The notion of the Holy Spirit’s freedom in his distributing gifts is of great import, but is not sufficiently apparent in the sentence.
3. It ought to be clearly said that the Holy Spirit gives charisms to the faithful in all orders in the Church.
4. In the sentence the concept of “Charisma” is not sufficiently clearly exposed in the words: “various gifts and offices for service”.

17. Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 35–36.

18. Sullivan, “Charisms of the Faithful,” 95.

19. Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 36.

20. Sullivan, “Charisms of the Faithful,” 95–96.

Note 24, page 8, lines 30–31: let it say: “[these charisms] ought to be accepted with an act of thanksgiving, and as much as it can be done by complying”. Reason being: the mention of human presenting cooperation to divine grace ought not be omitted, so that the fruit of the charism be included.²¹

Looking back at this emendation reveals two important things. First is the remarkable unity of vision that existed between Sullivan’s thinking and the speech of Cardinal Léon Suenens, and second, the closeness of Sullivan’s suggested paragraph and the final paragraph of *Lumen Gentium*, article 12.²² Giuseppe Rambaldi, in his article “The use and meaning of ‘Charism’ in Vatican II,” notes that this was “welcomed and presented almost to the letter by the *Relatio* in giving reasons for the new text” and therefore he sees this emendation as the most important for interpreting the teaching of the charisms in *Lumen Gentium* 12.²³ It is also important to bear in mind as we move forward that the major things argued for here—greater insistence on the Spirit’s freedom; the wide bestowal of the charisms; the objection to imprecision which blurs office with charism—will each continue to be distinctive themes of Sullivan’s later academic writing on the charisms.

The contribution to the conciliar text would not be the only time Sullivan would exert an unanticipated influence on the theology of charism within Catholicism. As chance would have it, several years after the close of the council, he was invited to a meeting with a member of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith²⁴ who tasked him with writing a report on the new movement of “Catholic Pentecostals” in the USA.²⁵ This is an interesting coincidence considering that there is no evidence that those at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had any idea of Sullivan’s contribution to *Lumen Gentium*. Again, it seems being an American based in Rome was the primary qualifying factor. Sullivan’s investigation consisted of first becoming familiar with the history and character of Pentecostalism, before then engaging the fledgling literature on the Catholic movement including some of the early work of Edward O’Connor and Kilian McDonnell.²⁶ The positive report he eventually sent

21. *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Secundi* 2, no. 3 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1972), 504–05 [trans. Antony Chirovsky].

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

23. Giuseppe Rambaldi, “Uso e significato di ‘Carisma’ nel Vaticano II: Analisi e confronto di due passi conciliari sui carismi,” *Gregorianum* 56, no.1 (1975): 141–62 at 145 [trans. Caterina Resca].

24. Hereafter cited as CDF.

25. Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 37–40.

26. Sullivan cites Edward O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria, 1971); Killian McDonnell, “The Ideology of Pentecostal Conversion,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 7 (1968): 23–40; “The Holy Spirit and Pentecostalism,” *Commonweal* 89 (1968), 198–204; “Pentecostals and the Holy Spirit Today,” *Sisters Today* 40 (1969): 497–506; *Catholic Pentecostalism: Problems in Evaluation* (Pecos, NM: Dove, 1970).

back no doubt helped allay confusion and potential fears in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and, within eight years of the movement's birth, leaders of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal had received a meeting with Pope Paul VI.

It is difficult to say how wide an influence, in an indirect way, this report had. Similarly, it is impossible to imagine how different Catholic ecclesiology would be if it were not for the major studies in Pneumatology and the charisms which the birth of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal prompted. In an indirect way, this might potentially be one of the most significant contributions Sullivan made to the theology of charisms within Catholicism.

Having submitted his report to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Sullivan also had it published in the *Gregorianum* under the title, "The Pentecostal Movement"²⁷—the first of his publications to deal with the charisms. With his task now completed, Sullivan put the topic to one side and expected to move into other research areas. But this expectation was not to be realized. As Novak narrates, up until this point Sullivan's research into the charismatic movement "had been entirely documentary and not experiential or observational in any way. That was about to change."²⁸

In the early 1970s, after accepting an invitation to attend from Fr. Carlo Martini, Sullivan became involved with the group later known as *Lumen Christi*. This was the first Catholic Charismatic Renewal prayer group meeting in Rome, which—thanks to Sullivan—was thereafter hosted in the Gregorian University until his first retirement twenty years later in 1992.²⁹

Sullivan's personal involvement with the charismatic movement initiated a new phase in his academic writing, one predominantly attentive to the charisms. Between 1974 and 1977, in what would be the most thematically focused three years of his academic life, Sullivan authored (or co-authored) eight articles, all of which dealt to some degree with the theology surrounding the charisms.³⁰ This period of writing culminated

27. Francis A. Sullivan, "The Pentecostal Movement," *Gregorianum* 53, no. 2 (1972): 237–66.

28. Novak, "Ecclesiology of Charisms," 40.

29. Novak gives an excellent overview of this. See Novak, "Ecclesiology of Charisms," 41–44. The only thing to add to his account is how Sullivan was not simply a member, but quickly became part of the group's leadership.

30. Francis A. Sullivan, "Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Catholic Interpretation of the Pentecostal Experience," *Gregorianum* 55, no. 1 (1974): 49–68; Francis A. Sullivan, "The Ecclesiological Context of the Charismatic Renewal," in *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 119–38; "Speaking in Tongues," *Lumen Vitae* 31 (1976): 145–70; Basil M Pennington and Francis Sullivan, "Baptism in the Holy Spirit and Christian Tradition," in *The Spirit and the Church: A Personal and Documentary Record of the Charismatic Renewal and the Ways It Is Bursting to Life in the Catholic Church*, ed. Ralph Martin (New York: Paulist, 1976), 192–98; Kilian McDonnell, Salvador Carrillo, Albert de Monléon, Francis Martin, Donatien Mollat, Heribert Mühlen, and Francis Sullivan, "A Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal," in *The Spirit and the Church: A Personal and Documentary Record of the Charismatic Renewal and the Ways It Is Bursting to Life in the Catholic Church*, ed. Ralph Martin (New York: Paulist, 1976), 199–213; Francis

in 1982 with the publication of the influential *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal* (with a foreword by Cardinal Suenens).³¹ Following *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal*, Sullivan would only return to the topic of the charisms sporadically, although he always remained associated with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.³²

As we look back and reflect upon Sullivan's life, we can notice the profound interconnectedness of his contributions to the theology of charism. If he had not concluded in 1963 that the charisms were widely distributed, it is unlikely he would have then gone on to write a positive report about the early Catholic Charismatic Renewal. He then would not have become personally involved with the movement, and thus would not have written the books and articles that he did. As Sullivan himself reflected some fifty years after the events of the council,

I am convinced that Vatican II's positive teaching concerning the charisms of the faithful had a great deal to do with the acceptance of the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church . . . In any case I think it unlikely that if the council had accepted Ruffini's view, I myself would have had an open mind about the claims that people were making about the charisms they had received through their participation in this movement.³³

The Ecclesial Implications of Vatican II's Particular Understanding of Charism

Perhaps because of his involvement in helping to write *Lumen Gentium* 12 par. 2, Sullivan almost entirely builds his theological reflections on a close reading of the conciliar texts.³⁴ Therefore, to understand Sullivan's theology of charism it is necessary to understand how he read these conciliar documents. This is very important to

A. Sullivan, and Robert Faricy, *Ignatian Exercises, Charismatic Renewal: Similarities? Differences? Contrasts? Convergences?* (Centrum Ignatianum Spiritualitatis, 1977); "What is a Pentecostal Experience?" *Theological Renewal* 6 (1977): 21–26; Francis A. Sullivan, "Speaking in Tongues in the New Testament and in the Modern Charismatic Renewal," in *The Spirit of God in Christian Life*, ed. Barnabas M. Ahern and Edward Malatesta (New York: Paulist, 1977), 23–74.

31. Sullivan, *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 1982). The following year Sullivan would produce another book: Francis A. Sullivan and Robert L. Faricy, *On Making the Spiritual Exercises for the Renewal of Jesuit Charisms* (St. Louis, MO: American Assistancy Seminar, 1983). But it is clear that *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal* was a culmination of all that came before in a way that the latter book was not.
32. For a comprehensive bibliography of Sullivan's works, see Novak, "Ecclesiology of Charisms," 328–38. This list does not include the title Francis A. Sullivan and Robert Faricy, *Ignatian Exercises, Charismatic Renewal: Similarities? Differences? Contrasts? Convergences?* (Rome: Centrum Ignatianum Spiritualitatis, 1977).
33. Sullivan, "Charisms of the Faithful," 96.
34. Although he only revealed his own involvement in writing the council document later in life, Sullivan references the emendation of McEleney immediately before his very first attempt at conciliar exegesis. Sullivan, "Ecclesial Context," 124.

get right, as even a slightly different understanding of charism might not lead to the same conclusions Sullivan is able to draw.

He first expounded his analysis of Vatican II's teaching on the charisms in his article, "The Ecclesial Context of the Charismatic Renewal" (this part of the article also later re-appeared in *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal*).³⁵ The following is a long quote from that article but expresses the way Sullivan understood the Council's teaching on the charisms, and thus requires a careful reading:

Some of these gifts [charisms] may be rare and extraordinary, but others are "simple and widely diffused." But they are all called "special graces." The conciliar text suggests two reasons for this: the way these gifts are given and the purpose for which they are given. 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. Their purpose, as described by the Council, is to make people "fit and ready to undertake various tasks or offices advantageous for the renewal and upbuilding of the Church." . . . [W]e can say that every genuine charism presupposes the gift of love, which moves the person to employ his gift in loving service to others. But 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.³⁶

While Sullivan can give a short, snappy summary of what a charism (in the language of Vatican II, and thus his own thought) is—"A charism, then, as understood by Vatican II, can be defined as *a grace given ability and willingness for any kind of service that contributes to the renewal and upbuilding of the Church*"³⁷—it is also fundamentally important to keep in mind those things which are not to be considered charisms: hierarchical gifts; sacraments; ministries; sanctifying grace; and natural talents.³⁸ This, then, is a very particular understanding of charism. If this particularity is not

35. Sullivan, *Charisms*, 12–13.

36. Sullivan, "Ecclesial Context," 124–25.

37. Sullivan, "Ecclesial Context," 125.

38. The last of these appears in his slightly extended version of the text just cited, and is found also in *Charisms*, 15. There are only three texts Sullivan was involved with which do not maintain this clear distinction. The first is found in Kilian McDonnell et al., "A Statement," where hierarchical gifts are referred to as charisms. But we can assume that this is due to the influence of multiple other theologians who favor this language. The second is in his book *Magisterium* when drawing on the pastoral Epistles to critique the way Hans Küng plays down the grace associated with ordination. But this is primarily in trying to stress the witness of Scripture that ecclesial office is graced. It does not seem that Sullivan is trying

adequately grasped, then we will not be able to understand the conclusions Sullivan points towards. We have to be especially careful here as most major Catholic theologians have tended to minimise the distinction between charismatic and hierarchical gifts so vital to interpreting *Lumen Gentium*.³⁹ Sullivan, as we have just noted, leans

to evolve his concept of charism, as he relies on the Vatican II concept in other sections of the same book. See *Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Church* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002), 47, 202, 215. The final place is in what would be his last published book, *Apostles to Bishops: The Development of the Episcopacy in the Early Church* (New York: Newman, 2001). In this, Sullivan argues that because the office of bishops was received by the universal church it remains normative. But he argues that structured church office appears to have developed out of charismatic ministries, and points to patristic evidence that some charisms (and events, such as enduring persecution) could qualify someone to celebrate the Eucharist without sacramental ordination. This does seem different. Further study is required to see how this later work compares and contrasts with the earlier ecclesiological reflections on the charisms which are the focus of this article.

39. For a selection of those who do treat the distinction of *LG* 4 with ambivalence—either maintaining the conceptual distinction but referring to each as different types of charisms, or referring to each as charisms without any attempt at distinguishing—see the following: Gabriel Murphy, *Charisms and Church Renewal* (Rome: Catholic Books Agency, 1965); Avery Dulles, “Earthen Vessels: Institution and Charism in the Church,” in *Above Every Name: The Lordship of Christ and Social Systems*, ed. T. E. Clarke (New York: Paulist, 1980), 155–90; Joseph Ratzinger, “The Theological Locus of Ecclesial Movements,” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 25, no. 3 (1998): 480–504; Rahner, *Dynamic*, 42–48; Leonardo Boff, *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*, trans. John W. Dierckmeier (New York: Crossroads, 1988), 164; Hans Küng, “The Charismatic Structure of the Church,” *Concillium* 4 (1965): 41–61 at 57; Hans Urs von Balthasar, “Charis and Charism,” in *Explorations in Theology*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991), 313. Hierarchical gifts are also referred to as charisms in the documents of the International Theological Commission, the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and (with great regularity) the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. For a selection see: International Theological Commission, *Catholic Teaching on Apostolic Succession* (1973), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_cti_1973_successione-apostolica_en.html; Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, International Dialogue between the World Methodist Council and the Roman Catholic Church, *Encountering Christ the Saviour: Church and Sacraments* (2011), <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-occidentale/consiglio-metodista-mondiale/dialogo/documenti-di-dialogo/en14.html>; *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Word of Life, 1974), <http://webmedia.jcu.edu.s3.amazonaws.com/pdf/Suenens%20Writings/A%20Theological%20and%20Pastoral%20Orientations%20On%20The%20Catholic%20Cha.pdf>. Lastly, we can note that this ambivalence at times also extends to papal texts. See John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici* (December 30, 1988) 22, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici.html; Benedict XVI, Meeting of His Holiness Benedict XVI with the Parish Priests of the Rome Diocese (February 23, 2012), http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2012/february/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20120223_parroci-roma.html;

into this distinction. This means that, while it sounds strange to say, what makes Sullivan's charismatic theology different from the wider Catholic theological literature is precisely the degree to which it corresponds with the council's teaching.

One insight that flows from this distinction between hierarchical and charismatic gifts can be found in the section of his article, "The Ecclesial Context of the Charismatic Renewal," titled "What would a 'charismatic renewal of the church' involve?"⁴⁰ In this, Sullivan gives a vision of the role the charisms could, and indeed should, have in the life of the Church. These short few pages, therefore, are key to understanding the ecclesial role of the charisms in Sullivan's thinking.⁴¹ All of these are worthy of further reflection, but I want to draw attention particularly to the seventh point Sullivan identifies:

In a charismatically renewed Church, the choice of persons for roles of pastoral leadership (e.g. pastors, bishops, popes) would be made solely on the basis of the demonstrated presence in that person of the gifts of the Spirit that would equip him for such a role. Thus, however and by whomever the choice was made, ultimately it would be the Holy Spirit himself who, by the distribution of his gifts, would designate the leaders for the Church (cf. Acts 20:28—"Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has given you charge, as shepherds of the church of the Lord.")⁴²

The argument Sullivan is making here is a simple one: those who are to be ordained should already be demonstrating those charisms which will equip them for ordained ministry.⁴³ This is not to deny that sacramental ordination bestows grace, but rather simply drawing out the claim of *Lumen Gentium* 12 par. 2 that: "By these gifts [charisms] He makes them fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices which contribute toward the renewal and building up of the Church." If charismatic gifts are what makes someone fit and ready to undertake official ministry in the church (as well as all other ministries), then it is obvious that we cannot assume that the grace received

Francis. *Group of Clergy Sex Abuse Victims* (July 7, 2014). http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/cotidie/2014/documents/papa-francesco-cotidie_20140707_vittime-abusi.html. By pointing this out, the intent is not to suggest that they are wrong to do this. There are good reasons for applying the language of charism to the grace of ordination (not least arguments from Scripture). It is simply to make clear that a quite different language of charism has ascendancy in mainstream Catholic theology today. This is what makes Sullivan's contribution unique. While it is uncommon, there are a few others who have also explored this distinction between charismatic and hierarchical gifts. John C. Haughey is one example, who can describe the distinction as "perhaps the most important thing the Council did"; see 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.

40. Sullivan, "Ecclesial Context," 128–29.

41. It is worth noting that this opinion is not shared by Novak, who gives the article little attention. Novak engages with the charismatic theology of Karl Rahner in significantly greater detail than this article, which is referenced only nine times in his thesis.

42. Sullivan, "Ecclesial Context," 129.

43. He further develops this argument in *Charisms*, 81–82.

through sacramental ordination was, of itself, a wholly sufficient basis for the priestly ministry. Presbyterian and episcopal ministry requires more than simply hierarchical gifts; according to Sullivan's reading of the council, they also require charisms. The charisms are necessary for the fruitful and proper functioning of hierarchical ministry, which means that charism and institution should be united, not just in the church, but in the very person of the ordained minister. This is, writes Sullivan, "a goal to be aimed at and striven for, and the closer the reality comes to attaining it, the better the condition of the church will be."⁴⁴

Because Sullivan maintains the distinction between charismatic and hierarchical gifts, he is able to point at the interplay between the two, not simply within the community, but in the actual person of the priest/bishop/pope. It is because he follows Vatican II in distinguishing between them, he is able to insist on the necessity of both. Consequently, Sullivan can argue that, while new grace is given through sacramental ordination, hierarchical gifts should presume prior charismatic gifts, and therefore *ordination is not just a bestowal of new grace, but also recognition of charisms previously given*.

Although Sullivan does not use this language, it makes it possible to speak of an interlinked two-layered structure of the church: one charismatic and one hierarchical/sacramental (while maintaining that both flow forth from the Spirit). Each structure would be incomplete without the other. In this understanding, the hierarchical/sacramental structure is only able to properly function when it is, shall we say, drawing from the charismatic structure. If hierarchical gifts presuppose charismatic gifts, the hierarchical/sacramental structure necessarily presupposes a charismatic structure. The hierarchical/sacramental structure consists of certain official ministries that must be present in every church (bestowed through the laying on of hands and apostolic succession), but it is the charismatic structure which provides people to fill these offices (as well as the multiplicity of other ministries). The charismatic structure is then, in one sense, the foundation upon which the hierarchical is built. This reveals how wrong it would be to conceive an essential contradiction between the charismatically ordered church and the hierarchically/sacramentally ordered church. From this perspective, it could even be argued that, provided both hierarchical and charismatic dimensions were working as they should be, there need not be any tension between them. Instead, there should be integration, alignment, and synergy. We could speak of legitimate tension (as Sullivan himself does) if either dimension was not functioning as it should.⁴⁵ But the tension must be seen as a response to an issue, while collaboration remains the ideal we seek to achieve and maintain.

Both charismatic and hierarchical gifts are given by the Spirit for the building up of the Body of Christ. But the fact that they are not *guaranteed* to be united can help

44. Sullivan, *Charisms*, 82.

45. Sullivan describes how, despite the fact that the Spirit is the source of hierarchical gifts, the church at times especially needs the charisms to shake it out of complacency. This is what has happened many times in history through the different charismatic movements. *Charisms*, 47–50.

explain how it is that, as John C. Haughey writes, there occasionally appear “to be office holders without any real charisms.”⁴⁶ It can also explain, at least partially, some of the tensions which have arisen between the “charismatic” and the “institutional” over the course of history. But charism and hierarchy, if both are functioning correctly, should not be in conflict any more than the Spirit is in conflict with himself.

In insisting that official sacramental ministries and charismatic movements are two “equally important”⁴⁷ ways the Spirit gives life in the Church, and that the unity of the two must be particularly manifested in the person of priest/bishop/pope, Sullivan was anticipating to a notable degree the later papal position that “the institutional and charismatic aspects are co-essential as it were to the Church’s constitution.”⁴⁸

In some ways, this retrospectively seems obvious. But we are only able to come to this insight if we first maintain the conciliar distinction between hierarchical and charismatic gifts. The reason Sullivan has a contribution to make here is because this distinction is routinely suppressed. I will give the example of Yves Congar and his otherwise very ecclesologically rich theology of ministries to highlight the distinct contribution of Sullivan’s approach.⁴⁹

Congar, like many others, considers hierarchical gifts to be charisms. He thinks that by recognizing this we can retain the Catholic insistence of the necessity of sacramental ordination as the fundamental ordering principle while still being able to refer to a charismatic structure of the church. This is seen in his analysis of Gotthold Hasenbüttel:

46. Haughey, “Charisms,” 7.

47. Sullivan, *Charisms*, 47.

48. Charismatic and institutional co-essentiality was language especially favoured by John Paul II, and regularly used in the build up to Pentecost 1998. See *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998* (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999), 221. Also later appears in the speeches of Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis. See Benedict XVI, Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Members of Communion and Liberation Movement on the 25th Anniversary of its Pontifical Recognition (March 24, 2007), http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2007/march/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070324_comunione-liberazione.html; Francis, Address of His Holiness Pope Francis to Participants in the International Congress for the Episcopal Vicars and Delegates for Consecrated Life (October 28, 2016), http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/october/documents/papa-francesco_20161028_vita-consacrata-convegno.html. Any ambiguity as to whether “charismatic dimension” can legitimately be equated with the “charismatic gifts” of Vatican II was removed by the CDF explicitly interpreting them in continuity; see *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* (May 15, 2016), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20160516_iuvenescit-ecclesia_en.html. This is also found in the text of Francis just referenced. When speaking of the charismatic and hierarchical as co-essential, Francis does not cite John Paul II but instead cites *LG* 4.

49. The aim here is not to use Sullivan to critique Congar or to point out some fundamental weakness of his ecclesiology, but rather to show how Sullivan’s approach can offer something to the theology of ministries, and protect it from a reading Congar himself would not have supported.

Gotthold Hasenbüttl, a disciple of Hans Küng, has suggested that charisms provide the lines on which the Church is structured . . . It is an admissible theory on condition that we are quite clear about the exact place occupied amongst the charisms or gifts of the Spirit by those which are linked with the sacrament significantly known as the sacrament of Holy Orders, which has a distinct structural function in the community (the Church).⁵⁰

So, when expressing his theology of ministries, he writes the following:

One of the greatest gains of the present day is the reinstatement of the notion of the charisms and, linked with them, ministries (note the plural) . . . Ministries differ from one another. Some are sacramental structures: they come from the above although at the same time they belong very much within the community.⁵¹

This emphasis does not deny a distinction between the way ministries come into being. Congar notes that within the structured community instituted by Christ there are those ministries “freely raised up by the Spirit, others linked by the imposition of hands to the institution and mission of the Twelve.”⁵² There are those who have ministries flowing forth from the “charisms of the faithful” (what Vatican II would simply call “charisms”), and then you have those ministries flowing forth from the “charisms” of sacramental ordination (“hierarchical gifts” in Vatican II’s language). But there is no discussion about the interrelation between these two in the person of the priest/bishop. This gives the unfortunate impression that everyone in the community needs to rely on the unpredictable and dynamic help of the Spirit *apart* from those who are sacramentally ordained. Those who have received sacramental ordination, it seems to suggest, do not need other charisms as their ministry flows from their “charisms” of office. They find their place in the community through their ordination alone. This is the problem: if hierarchical gifts are called charisms, then within a church structure where everyone’s ministry is based upon charisms, it gives the impression that the grace of ordination is a sufficient “charismatic” basis for a fruitful priestly ministry. The necessity of the charisms (in Vatican II’s sense of the term) would thus be relegated to lay ministry. This, of course, was not what Congar believed, but it is an unfortunate implication of referring to both charismatic and hierarchical gifts as charisms and therefore insufficiently exploring the dynamic between the two. It means that by attempting to hold together the charismatic and hierarchical gifts by downplaying the distinction and uniting them etymologically, the actual result is that the two are held apart existentially, each “type” of gift relating to different persons with different ministries. This, in turn, means that there is no discussion about requirements for ordination and how the two “types” of ministry would interplay. I can find no place in his later writings where Congar explicitly describes someone as having a

50. Yves Congar, *Called to Life*, trans. William Burridge (Slough, UK: St Paul, 1987), 70.

51. Congar, *Called to Life*, 116.

52. Yves Congar, “My Path-Findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries,” *Jurist* 32, no. 2 (1972): 169–88 at 178.

ministry based upon both charisms *and* the grace of ordination.⁵³ This gap leaves us with questions: Did the person ordained not have a prior charismatic ministry? Is the fact that he did unrelated to his ordination? Did he give up this ministry when he was ordained? Congar, in his theology of ministries, offers no direct answers to these questions, but Sullivan does. The person ordained *should* have had a prior charismatic ministry, which *was* related to his ordination, and these charisms *continue* to help him in his new sacramental ministry. As we noted earlier, Sullivan's insight is that hierarchical gifts presuppose charismatic gifts. By integrating Sullivan's understanding we can strengthen Congar's theology of ministries by removing ambiguity and thereby protecting it against the possible reading identified above. Somewhat paradoxically, it is because Sullivan treats charismatic and hierarchical gifts as distinct that he can insist that they should be united.

Sullivan's view, therefore, is not just an inspiring vision, but a challenge to the church. At present the only charism explicitly required for ordination (in the Roman rite) is celibacy.⁵⁴ If this charism is judged not to be present in a particular applicant then, as the 1961 guidelines bluntly stated, the superiors should "bar him from the religious life and the priesthood,"⁵⁵ The prospective candidate for the priesthood must

53. Congar held a position analogous to Sullivan's in his earlier writings when discussing of the interrelatedness of the man of God *ex Spiritu* and the man of God *ex officio* in *Lay People*, 309–32. He also discusses the interconnectedness in Yves Congar, "The Holy Spirit and the Apostolic Body, Continuations of the Work of Christ," in *The Mystery of the Church* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1960), 147–86. It is a shame he did not return to this topic and attempt to incorporate this into these later reflections. He does come close to it in some places, but never with the same sharpness. For examples of this, see Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit. Volume II: Lord and Giver of Life*, trans. David Smith (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 10–12; Yves Congar, *The Word and the Spirit*, trans. David Smith. (London: Geoffrey Chapman), 58–62, 69, 78–84. Some secondary literature on Congar has since attempted to combine his early and later writings to give a more holistic picture, but this is only partially successful as they too do not sufficiently distinguish between charismatic and hierarchical gifts. Because of this it becomes difficult to understand the precise meaning the author intends when he is discussing the relationship between institution and charism. See Johnson Mudavassery, *The Role and Function of Charism in the Theology of Yves Congar* (New York: Peter Lang, 2016), especially 205–06.

54. For a good exploration of celibacy as a charism, see Ratzinger, "Theological Locus." Ratzinger does, however, unfortunately appear to suggest that celibacy is the primary qualifying charism for sacramental ordination, and treats it as if it is a necessary part of a vocation to the priesthood. If this is indeed Ratzinger's position, then this aspect of the article is unsatisfactory for biblical, historical, canonical, and ecumenical reasons.

55. Congregation for Religious, *Religiosorum Institutio* (February 2, 1961), <https://adoremus.org/1961/02/02/religiosorum-institutio/>. The current Code of Canon Law says the same thing differently: "An unmarried candidate for the permanent diaconate and a candidate for the presbyterate are not to be admitted to the order of diaconate unless they have assumed the obligation of celibacy in the prescribed rite publicly before God and the Church or have made perpetual vows in a religious institute," *Code of Canon Law*, c. 1037, https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P3R.HTM#7M.

demonstrate this charism over a number of years prior to being ordained (it is certainly not assumed that the charism will be given via ordination).⁵⁶ If we take Sullivan's point seriously, we must ask the following: *why is it that celibacy is the only charism explicitly requiring prior demonstration?* Why is there not a requirement to demonstrate a charism of service, or discernment, or teaching, or preaching, or administration, or any of a hundred other possible charismatic ministries? There are, of course, different models of the priesthood, but surely a prospective priest should have at least some kind of recognized charismatic ministry prior to ordination? If not, for what reason are they (rather than anyone else) being ordained? As this is presently not a requirement, are we not therefore in a situation where the men being ordained will quite possibly lack the gifts required for a maximally fruitful ecclesial ministry? No amount of seminary training can force the Spirit to grant his gifts. It seems that here again we find the mistaken (and unstated) assumption that the grace of ordination renders charisms unnecessary. Sullivan directly challenges this, and by doing so he invites us to imagine how different the church would be if such a requirement was implemented. How different would the church seem if: every priest/bishop possessed a charismatic ministry relevant to the needs of the hierarchical ministry; every sermon was preached in the power of the Holy Spirit; the authenticity of every initiative was able to be correctly discerned; every pope was able to faithfully facilitate Christian unity—in short, if, at every level of the church, there was a true *charismatic renewal*?

Conclusion

As we look back at Sullivan's life it is easy to notice how often, almost without warning, the topic of the charisms would continue to present itself. The spontaneity and unpredictability of the Spirit—something Sullivan always sought to stress—can be seen in the situations he found himself in, and in the impact neither planned nor expected. That spontaneous and unpredictable reality was not simply something Sullivan wrote about; it was something that characterised his life. As Novak writes in the conclusion of his thesis,

Sullivan was an accidental ecclesiologist and, knowing little about charisms, was given an opportunity to help define the Church's understanding of charisms in *Lumen Gentium*, still

56. The Congregation for Catholic Education, *Instruction Concerning the Criteria for the Discernment of Vocations with regard to Persons with Homosexual Tendencies in view of their Admission to the Seminary and to Holy Orders* (November 4, 2005), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_20051104_istruzione_en.html. This document most clearly states that celibacy must be demonstrated over a three-year period before there can be ordination to the diaconate. This requirement has been interpreted as applying to all applicants, not simply those with, as the document puts it, "homosexual tendencies." For an example of this interpretation, see Bishops of Belgium, *A propos de la récente instruction concernant l'admission de candidats à la prêtrise* (November 29, 2005), <https://web.archive.org/web/20070311023453/http://www.catho.be/single.aspx?id=1127&lng=fr>.

with no hint of becoming a scholar of charisms and a part of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Using his own words, from his summary of how he became involved in the Renewal, his whole life could be characterized by “what you can either call ‘accidents’ or ‘Providence.’”⁵⁷

All those Catholics interested in the charisms, and especially those involved with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, have a debt to Sullivan, and we can only thank God for the way he responded to these moments of Providence.

Suenens, in his introduction to *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal*, describes Sullivan as someone who restores the original meaning of words.⁵⁸ This is high praise coming from someone Sullivan disagrees with on several points—including how each of them conceptualizes the charisms.⁵⁹ Although some minor elements of Sullivan’s understanding of the charisms could possibly be considered exegetically questionable (in so far as it is perfectly reflective of St. Paul),⁶⁰ no one can doubt that it is remarkably faithful to *Lumen Gentium*. Indeed, is there another ecclesialogist who bases their charismatic theology as closely on the conciliar texts as does Francis Sullivan?

By sticking to his close reading of the conciliar texts, Sullivan is able to sketch a vision of an authentically Catholic understanding of a charismatically structured church which manages to maintain the insights elsewhere emphasised while avoiding the pitfalls which have plagued those attempts.⁶¹ Sullivan is able to maintain both the

57. Novak, “Ecclesiology of Charisms,” 317.

58. Sullivan, *Charisms*, 7.

59. Suenens is another who, at least occasionally, plays down the distinction between charismatic and hierarchical gifts. Leon J. Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1978), 15, 32.

60. See, for example, Albert Vanhoye’s point, which he makes more widely with regard to the theology of charism at Vatican II, that in St. Paul charisms are not only seen as those gifts which benefit the community (he argues this based on his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:7, which he notes never says “common good,” and on his understanding that “tongues” can be a personal prayer language yet still be considered a charism). This is not a large criticism and must be read in the context of an otherwise very positive review of *Charisms and the Charismatic Renewal*. Sullivan’s book, and the council teaching itself, Vanhoye sees as a legitimate development of what is found in the letters of Paul. Albert Vanhoye, “Reviewed Work: *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal. A Biblical and Theological Study* by Francis A. Sullivan,” *Biblica* 65, no. 2 (1984): 290. It is an interesting exercise to compare this review with Vanhoye’s critique of Küng’s charismatic ecclesiology. It is very clear that Vanhoye thinks Sullivan’s theological approach is more exegetically sound. Albert Vanhoye, “The Biblical Question of ‘Charisms’ after Vatican II,” in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, vol. 1, ed. Rene Latourelle (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1988), 349–468.

61. The attempts of both Hans Küng and Leonardo Boff have, it seems rightly, been criticized for understating the role of the hierarchical. See Hans Küng, *The Church*, trans. Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden (London: Burns & Oats, 1967); Leonardo Boff, *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*, trans. John W. Dierckmeier (New York: Crossroads, 1988). Both were also investigated by the CDF for this reason (among

totally free and dynamic structure brought about by the spontaneous bestowal of the charisms, and the ordered, stable structure brought about by sacramental ordination, simply by insisting that the two must be joined in the person of the ordained.

“Francis A. Sullivan,” writes Richard R. Gaillardetz, “is surely one of the most underappreciated theologians of the post-Vatican II era.”⁶² My hope is that this article brings greater awareness to Sullivan’s theology of charism, helps grow his recognition as one of the most significant authorities on this topic, and further establishes him as indispensable to anyone seeking to engage with *Lumen Gentium* 12. I also hope that this article may prompt other theologians to take a look (or a second look) at Sullivan’s theology of charism. The fact that his approach (and it seems some of the subtleties of the conciliar texts) has not made a large impact in wider theological literature means that Sullivan’s writings on the charisms are a rich resource largely untapped, and thus ripe for future engagement.

As the titles of the recent doctoral dissertations on Sullivan suggest, he was one of the leading Catholic theologians in the areas of the charisms and the magisterium. He thus had the rare distinction of being an expert in both, to use the language of *Lumen Gentium*, “charismatic and hierarchical gifts” (*LG* 4). It is apt, then, that it is he who can serve as a springboard to a future constructive ecclesiology seeking to do justice to both works of the Spirit.

ORCID iD

John Stayne  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7608-4517>

Author Biography

John Stayne is a doctoral student at Durham University in England. His research is focused on the particular concept of charism that appears in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, as well as exploring some of the ecclesiological implications of this understanding.

others). See CDF, *Declaration Regarding Two Works of Professor Hans Küng* (February 15, 1975), https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19750215_libri-kung_en.html; CDF, *Notification on the Book “Church: Charism and Power” by Father Leonardo Boff OFM* (March 11, 1985), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19850311_notif-boff_en.html.

62. Richard R. Gaillardetz, “Review of Michael M. Canaris, *Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. and Ecclesiological Hermeneutics: An Exercise in Faithful Creativity*,” *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 4, no. 3 (2007): 548–50 at 458, <https://doi.org/10.1163/22141332-00403007-20>.